BUCKS COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING

Wednesday, July 6, 2016
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 June 1, 2016
4. Executive Director’s Report – Written Report is enclosed
5. Presentation: Proposed Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for 2017-2020 – Richard Brabler, Senior Transportation 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
BUCKS COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
Minutes of Meeting
June 1, 2016

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

STAFF PRESENT:  Lynn T. Bush; Donna Byers; Debra Canale; David P. Johnson; Timothy A. Koehler; Michael A. Roedig; David A. Sebastian; Maureen Wheatley

GUESTS:  Lia Brussock, BCPC Intern – New Hope-Solebury High School Student; Dr. David Damsker, Director of the Bucks County Health Department; William Devane, Opt 4 Group; Justin Geller, Gas Tech Enterprises.

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. PRESENTATION: THE ZIKA VIRUS AND BUCKS COUNTY RESPONSE – DR. DAVID DAMSKER, DIRECTOR OF THE BUCKS COUNTY HEALTH DEPARTMENT
Dr. Damsker began his presentation by explaining that the Zika virus is the latest health concern. In Bucks County, our most recent concerns were H1N1 from 2009 through 2010, when we had people lining up for vaccines to combat that epidemic. This was followed by Ebola in 2014 through 2015, where the health department tracked everyone coming from Africa. Zika was discovered 70 years ago in Uganda, in the Zika forest, but only 14 human cases were confirmed until 2007 when Brazil had its first locally transmitted confirmed Zika case. It has since spread to most or all of South America, Central America and the Caribbean.

Dr. Damsker explained that the Zika virus is similar to West Nile Virus, Dengue and Yellow Fever in that it is spread primarily through the bite of an infected Aedes species mosquito. The symptoms begin approximately three to twelve days after being bitten and are mostly flu-like symptoms but can also include a rash and red eyes. He said that the illness is mostly mild and can last four to seven days. It is rare that hospitalization is necessary or that it would be terminal.

Dr. Damsker said that the major concern of the Zika virus is the threat to unborn children. It has been determined that the virus causes microcephaly and other brain abnormalities. This condition is unfortunately not usually found until late in the pregnancy and the mother must carry to the end putting both at risk. There is a blood test to determine if you have Zika, but it has not been perfected yet.

Dr. Damsker advised us that traveling to areas where the Zika virus is known to be transmitted is strongly discouraged if you are pregnant or planning to become pregnant.
Dr. Damsker said that at this time there is no medication or vaccine to combat this disease. The best method of prevention is not traveling to areas where the disease has been transmitted. He recommended the usual mosquito precautions such as long sleeves, staying indoors, mosquito repellant and eliminating standing water. He emphasized the importance of pregnant women or those women wanting to become pregnant not traveling to areas where the Zika virus is present.

Dr. Damsker informed us that there have not been any reported locally transmitted cases of Zika virus in Bucks County. He reminded us that the Aedes species of mosquitoes are the primary transmitter of Zika. Aedes aegypti has no known presence in Bucks County. He educated us as to the Culex and Aedes albopictus species of mosquito which are the main disease carrying mosquitos that can be found in Bucks County. The Culex species carries the West Nile Virus and are biters during dusk and dawn. The Aedes albopictus are day biters that prefers humans and are potential carriers of Zika.

Dr. Damsker then told us the steps that Bucks County is taking for the controlling of mosquitos. He said that 60 traps a week are set throughout the County for adult mosquitos and their larva. We are constantly conducting larval sampling and larviciding. The samples are sent to the State lab for testing. When the results of those tests reveal that the thresholds have been exceeded for West Nile Virus, action is required and pesticide sprays for adult mosquitos are advertised and conducted. This is effective for the Culex species because the sprays are conducted in the evenings. It would not affect Aedes albopictus due to them being day biters. He explained that we may have to begin spraying from two o’clock to five o’clock in the morning to kill this type of mosquito larva.

Dr. Damsker said that the State has announced a plan to conduct baseline surveys for the Aedes mosquitoes. The State will be increasing DEP funding for control of the Aedes mosquito species which may allow for additional trapping, pesticides, educational outreach and manpower. Dr. Damsker believes that our current West Nile Virus program makes us more than capable of dealing with the eventual increased concerns about Zika.

Dr. Damsker then fielded numerous questions regarding cures, testing, identification and transmission.

The board thanked Dr. Damsker for his time and presentation.

4. **Approval of Minutes for the Meeting, May 4, 2016**
   Upon motion of Mr. Goodnoe, seconded by Ms. Pierce, with the vote being 8-0 the motion carried to approve the minutes of the May 4, 2016, meeting as presented.

5. **Executive Director’s Report**
The Executive Director’s Report was submitted to the board with the packet prior to the meeting.

Ms. Bush wanted to acknowledge the Household Hazardous Waste collection event that was held this past Saturday at Harry S. Truman High School in Bristol Township. There were 812 participants served. Staff prepared a handout for the people who brought old electronics, to explain that the County is not able to collect electronics and suggest where to take them for recycling. The event was staffed by BCPC staff and Adult Probation volunteers. Many counties around the state are struggling with the lack of places to recycle electronics. This is a result of the 2010 Covered Devices Recycling Act, which has not worked as planned.
Ms. Bush said that she and Rich Brahler met with PennDOT and General Services about Bucks County bridges. Ms. Bush addressed Ms. Pierce stating that the Rickert Road Bridge project is inching forward. The project was on the agenda today at the Commissioners Meeting. It has been determined that the bridge is not a historic structure and PennDOT has allocated more funds for the repairs to that bridge. Ms. Pierce was happy to hear about the progress of this project as it has been a community concern for several years.

Ms. Bush stated that she attended the farewell event for Dr. Joe Brosnan, the retiring President of Delaware Valley University. They highlighted some of the accomplishments of the University during his tenure, such as being designated as a University and the completion of the Life Sciences building.

Ms. Bush stated that for the first time we have created an on-line Survey Monkey survey for the business community of Warminster Township. She will keep us informed as to how that turns out.

Ms. Bush wanted to highlight a couple expanded services our GIS staff has been undertaking. The first is the division of a voting district in Bedminster Township. The Bedminster West voting district has expanded to 3,500 registered voters, the highest in Bucks County. The GIS staff has determined two possible ways to divide this very large voting district. Ms. Bush said that this is an excellent application of our GIS technology because the law requires that voting districts meet certain criteria, which we are able to take into account in developing new district boundaries. We have to allocate voter population relatively equally between the two new districts, and we must follow census tract lines. Mr. Nyman questioned whether this project was originated from the Municipality or the Commissioners. Ms. Bush replied that it originated with Commissioner Loughery.

Ms. Bush stated that GIS has also worked on a project with the Doylestown Township Municipal Authority. They had some issues with wells and had to contact residents surrounding those wells. They required names and addresses of the property owners. Ms. Bush stated that in a very short amount of time the GIS department was able to supply them with all the information they required.

Ms. Bush stated that she and Matthew Walters attended an excellent town hall meeting on the New Britain Borough plan for Butler Avenue, with good attendance and very positive comments. Ms. Bush believes that the amount of time that has been spent involving the residents has benefitted this project.

Ms. Bush informed us that Warrington Township sent out a survey to its residents almost two months ago and they have received record responses. We are working on tabulating the results of the questions and the many comments.

Ms. Bush mentioned the Doylestown Bike and Hike Committee Conference that she and Rich Brahler attended along with representatives from PennDot. More than 25 miles of bike and hike paths have been constructed within Chalfont Borough, Doylestown Borough and Township, New Britain Borough and Township, and Warrington Township.
Ms. Bush stated that Mike Roedig, who presented to the board last month on Morrisville Borough’s downtown area, made the presentation to the Morrisville Borough Council. We have been working with their economic development committee and wanted to bring Borough Council up to date to make sure they are on board.

Ms. Bush stated that she attended the Delaware Canal 21 organization luncheon. They are a local non-profit organization, chaired by Alan Black (former Chairperson of the Bucks County Airport Authority). The conference focused on restoring and maintaining the canal and the advantages of the canal to tourism, the local economy, the preservation of history, and the preservation of an important walking/biking path.

The floor was then opened for questions. Discussion ensued on the Bedminster West voting district.

6. **PRESENTATION: APEX PROJECT – LIA BRUSSOCK, BCPC INTERN – NEW HOPE-SOLEBURY HIGH SCHOOL STUDENT**

Ms. Bush introduced Lia Brussock, stating that New Hope-Solebury initiated a new project for senior classmen called the Senior APEX Project. It is the last formal learning experience of New Hope-Solebury High School Seniors educational career. Ms. Brussock stated that she will be attending Johns Hopkins University in the fall to study civil engineering. Her father is an environmental consultant and has been working on many projects that she found interesting. She plans on continuing her education with a master’s degree in urban planning. Ms. Brussock stated that she has been attending township meetings, commissioners meetings and that she found it fascinating that everything we are surrounded by, from buildings to traffic patterns, open space and parking spaces, has been touched by the Bucks County Commissioners and the Planning Commission. She stated that when she was choosing a career path she wanted to do something that would impact people, and she believes that a path in civil engineering will do that.

Ms. Bush added that Ms. Brussock was a key player in the Warrington Township survey results and has learned all about citizen involvement in the planning of communities.

Mr. Wydro and the board congratulated Ms. Brussock on her graduation and wished her well in her future endeavors.

7. **ACT 247 REVIEWS**

The reviews of June 1, 2016, were mailed to the board for their review prior to the meeting. Upon motion of Mr. Dowling, seconded by Ms. Pierce, the motion carried to approve the June 1, 2016 Act 247 reviews including walk-in BCPC Municipal Review #2-16-2R - Bensalem Township - ZO-Monument Display Overlay.

8. **OLD BUSINESS**

Mr. Wydro asked Ms. Bush if there has been any progress on the celebration of the BCPC’s 65th Anniversary. Ms. Bush stated that she has been continuing to compile the highlights of the 65 years of the BCPC in anticipation of a presentation. She stated she will keep us updated as to any progress.
9. **NEW BUSINESS**
Mr. Goodnoe questioned as to whether there was requirement or statute to update Sewage Facility Act 537 plans on a regular basis. Ms. Bush deferred to Mr. Koehler who stated that, as far as he is aware, there is not a requirement to update Sewerage Facility Act 537 and that some municipalities are still working under the *1970 Bucks County Sewage Facilities Plan* as their official plan. Mr. Koehler does not believe there is a mandate for the DEP to enforce unless they are under a corrective action plan. Mr. Koehler stated that he will research this and let Mr. Goodnoe know his findings.

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

11. **ADJOURNMENT**
Mr. Wydro adjourned the meeting at 2:45 PM.

Submitted by:
Debra Canale, Staff Secretary
Commissioner Loughery Staff Visit/New Staff Conference Room – Commissioner Loughery spent several hours with the staff on June 9, hearing about all the projects we are working on. We used are reorganized Library for the meeting, with our new video screen.

Bedminster Polling Place – Board of Elections and Planning Commission GIS staff have developed a proposal for redefining the Bedminster East and Bedminster West districts that meet the Election law criteria and that split the registered voters roughly between the two new districts. The advantages of shifting the lines instead of creating a third district are that the polling places can remain the same and no new election officials will be required to provide election day staffing. The existing polling places – Bedminster Police Station and the Deep Run Presbyterian Church – will continue to be the polling places. The process of implementing this includes the following:

- Receive verbal approval from the Commissioners move ahead with the split.
- Produce a listing of streets within the two districts, and develop a legal description of both districts.
- Present our work at a Board of Elections meeting, and if approved, then proceed to prepare documents for court.
- Court approval.
- Voter registration follows up by changing the SURE system and voter registration notifications.

Polling Places in Bristol Township – The closing of several schools by Bristol Township School District has the secondary effect of losing polling places. BOE is working on finding as many as 10 new places.

Cross Keys Meeting – We had a very good meeting on our Cross Keys project, where we invited elected officials and all the property owners in the study area. We had a decent turnout of about 40 people. Our traffic engineer for the project, Gilmore & Associates, explained that the building of a connector road and the elimination of left-hand turns at Old Easton and Swamp Road could allow the traffic signal at that intersection to be removed. There are serious back-ups at that light. Several of the large property owners were there, including the owners of the Anthony Sylvan Pool property. We discussed the possibility of a hotel with conference facilities and the future biotechnology corridor along Cold Spring Creamery Road in Buckingham. We will make presentations to the four municipalities in the study area.

June 23rd DVRPC Board meeting – There are two items related to Bucks County

- Approval of the TCDI Grant for Bucks County/ Bristol Township, Economic Development Analysis, $80,000
  - In an effort to address the investment in the I-95-PA turnpike connection and Route 13, an economic development study will be performed to assess the
impact of the transportation improvements on economic conditions and adjoining land uses and zoning.

- Addition to the DVRPC work program of funding to study proposed improvements to the Delaware Canal pedestrian and bike facilities.

**Electronic Recycling** – County Commissioners Association of Pennsylvania now involved. The Commissioners suggested that I get CCAP involved in the discussion of the failure of the electronics recycling act. Since that time, I drafted language to be considered by CCAP as a position and had it approved by the Energy, Environment, and Land Use Committee for inclusion in the CCAP platform that will be voted on at the August meeting.

**I-95 Turnpike Project** – I attended the briefing on the I-95 project. There is no funding in place beyond the projects that are underway. The other three corners of the intersection remain unfunded.

**Morrisville Levee** – We participated in a conference call on the Morrisville levee, which is being decertified by FEMA. The levee was built in the 1930s, and no one knows for sure how it was constructed. We talked to PEMA, FEMA, DCED, borough engineers, and Army Corps of Engineers. Morrisville has no money to pay for a study, so they may seek grant money to do a feasibility study to determine what is needed to recertify it.

**New Britain Borough** – We are wrapping up our work on New Britain Borough’s Butler Avenue Main Street project and on the Cross Keys Study, both of which were funded with $100,000 grants.

**Senior Project Student** – I attended the presentation made by my high school senior on the project she did at the planning commission. She had some insightful conclusions, which I have summarized here because they are interesting:

- Planning commission touches many aspects of the lives of people in the county
- Opinions of residents are important
- Compromises are needed – there are competing objectives in public policy
- Planning commission has a focus on quality of life, from dealing with homelessness to preserving farms

She also tabulated the results of the Warrington resident surveys and said that the people responding must be old because they all write in cursive.
The Planning Commission staff helps townships and boroughs in several ways: we attend local planning commissioner meetings to provide advice and guidance, and we prepare plans and ordinances in cooperation with local representatives. We are entering our fourth year of providing municipal assistance through the Municipal Economic Development Initiative (MEDI), and several of the activities below are in that category and are so noted.

We attended the Sellersville Borough Planning Commission, Dublin Borough Planning Commission, Hilltown Township Planning Commission, and the Quakertown Area Planning Committee (QAPC) meetings.

Preparing Plans. Completed a final draft of the New Britain Borough Main Street Plan (part of our MEDI program). The steering committee and Borough will now review and make recommendations during the month of July.

A Stakeholder’s Meeting was held on June 16th at the Buckingham Township Building as part of the Cross Keys Land Use and Transportation Plan. The meeting was well-attended and included municipal officials and business owners within the study area. Questions arose regarding current zoning requirements, potential connector road locations, the potential Biotechnology Corridor, and the remaining project schedule. Following the completion of the draft study, a presentation will be provided to the four respective municipalities.

The Warminster Township Economic Development Committee did not meet in June due to the business survey being offered on the township website.

A staff meeting was held to discuss the Morrisville Borough MEDI project. Staff developed a project outline at the meeting, which will include: a project vision statement, identification of assets and opportunities, a rationale and framework for revitalization, a series of visuals to convey the project vision, and zoning ordinance language to help implement the vision. Work will begin by mid-summer.

We met with the Dublin Borough planning commission to continue discussing draft amendments to their zoning and subdivision and land development ordinances which would implement recommendations of the borough Revitalization and Visioning Plan (2013).

Staff continued to work on the Richboro Village Master Plan MEDI project. Initial designs for public space and roundabout landscaping were produced and reviewed by Northampton Township staff. GIS staff is also currently developing mapping of key village locations and photographic simulations of opportunity areas.

In addition to special studies and plans, we continue to prepare, under contract, Comprehensive Plans for Northampton Township, Lower Makefield Township, and Hilltown Township.

We completed analysis of township survey results for the Warrington Township Planning Commission in anticipation of work with them on an update of their comprehensive plan. The survey responses offered clear comments on issues for future planning efforts.
A public meeting was held on June 14th with the West Rockhill Township Planning Commission to discuss the merits of the “Village Concept Plan” developed as part of the Almont Village Master Plan. Resident concerns over the plan included density, stormwater runoff from the site, and potential traffic.

**Preparing Ordinances** We continued an assessment of changes needed to the Newtown Area Joint Zoning Ordinance related to Planned Residential Development use requirements and definitions and requirements associated with water and sewer facilities.

**Trails Program** We met with the Plumstead Township trails committee to review proposed trails prior to a meeting scheduled for July with their Board of Supervisors and Park and Recreation Committee.

**Providing Planning Information and Coordinating with other Agencies**

The planning commission staff provides information and assistance to the many people who call us for help. This includes topics such as demographic and socioeconomic data, development proposals, BCPC reports, local zoning, and municipal regulations. Some of this work results from our mandated functions (reviewing proposed developments and reviewing various permit applications), some from other groups that need information, and some from residents who need guidance. Staff completed review of DVRPC’s draft 2045 population forecast and began review of the draft 2013 employee estimates as a precursor to the draft 2045 employee forecasts.

**Act 247 and 537 Review Activity**

- 16 Subdivision and Land Development Proposal
- 0 Sketch Plans
- 4 Municipal Plans and Ordinances

**Transportation**

BCPC Transportation Planning staff is responsible for working with PennDOT, DVRPC, SEPTA, TMA Bucks, and other groups to ensure that our transportation and funding needs are addressed. We also keep up with the various PennDOT funding avenues and grant programs. This month, we participated in the project selection process with DVRPC regarding the Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) grant funding program.

The County is currently pursuing two trail development initiatives. The Upper Bucks Rail Trail will connect the Lehigh Valley’s Saucon Rail Trail with the borough of Quakertown by converting a currently unused portion of SEPTA rail line to a trail through Springfield and Richland townships. Staff provided assistance to the project consultant and PA DEP, as well as working through leasing issues with SEPTA. Staff is also in the process of hiring a consultant to design the Newtown Rail Trail. The current project will construct the portion of the Newtown Rail Trail in Upper Southampton Township that will connect with the Pennypack Trail in Montgomery County. Both of these trails are part of the Circuit, which is envisioned as a 750-mile regional trail network.

**Geographic Information Systems (GIS)**

GIS has become a central function in Bucks County government, with our GIS staff providing the overall management for a system that involves not only BCPC but also Emergency Communications and 9-1-1, Board of Assessment, Health Departments, and others. We help to keep the county tax map parcel records and road centerlines updated.
The GIS data is increasingly used by people outside the county, either through our very popular public viewer, or through our GIS Consortium of municipalities.

Updates of GIS data are provided to our Consortium members by request. This month Upper Makefield requested and was provided an update of their GIS data. County GIS is developing a GIS Open Data Portal web site that when completed members will be able to access their municipal data sets for both downloading and mapping.

The Southeastern Pennsylvania Shared Services GIS project is a collaborative effort of the counties of Bucks, Berks, Chester, Delaware, Montgomery, and the City of Philadelphia. The group meets monthly and is developing a cloud hosted infrastructure to support a centralized and shared regional GIS database. Our June meeting was held at the Montgomery County Public Safety Center in Conshohocken PA. Chester County will be hosting the July meeting at the Government Services Complex in West Chester PA.

County GIS staff has been attending a series informational seminars this month related to Open Source GIS and Open Data. Both of these concepts support and promote governmental, interagency and departmental communication. The City of Philadelphia and Chester County, as well as the Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission have active Open Records and Open Data sites.
<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>15-16-2</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors</td>
<td></td>
<td>Zoning Ordinance Amendment: Table of Performance Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langhorne Borough</td>
<td>18-16-1</td>
<td>Borough Council</td>
<td></td>
<td>Zoning Ordinance Amendment: Accessory Solar Energy Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langhorne Manor Borough</td>
<td>19-16-1</td>
<td>Borough Council</td>
<td>(19-4-20 &amp; -21)</td>
<td>Zoning Map Change: RB to I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Zoning Ordinance Amendment: Municipal Building Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Southampton Township</td>
<td>48-16-2 (P)</td>
<td>Columbia/Wegman Acquisition II, LLC</td>
<td>(48-17-37)</td>
<td>Private Zoning Map Change: CC to R2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEMORANDUM

TO: Hilltown Township Board of Supervisors
   Hilltown Township Planning Commission

FROM: Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Proposal to Amend the Zoning Ordinance—Table of Performance Standards

Applicant: Board of Supervisors
Received: May 27, 2016
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 July 6, 2016.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposed Action: Amend Section 160-26. Table of Performance Standards of the Hilltown Township zoning ordinance by adding “Development Plan” to the existing Column 5 and adding a new Column 8 “Individual Lot Maximum Impervious Surface.” The revisions would increase the maximum permitted impervious surface for the single-family, single-family cluster, and performance subdivision uses within the CR-1 District and the single-family dwelling on lots with a minimum lot area of 50,000 square feet use within the VC District. Additionally, the minimum site area for a TND use within the VC District would be reduced from 15 acres to 5 acres.

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.

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.

MMW:dc

cc: Stephen B. Harris, Esq., Township Solicitor
    C. Robert Wynn, P.E., Township Engineer
    Don Delamater, Township Manager (via email)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Langhorne Borough Council
Langhorne Borough Planning Commission

FROM: Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Proposal to Amend the Zoning Ordinance—Accessory Solar Energy Systems
Applicant: Langhorne Borough
Received: June 7, 2016
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 July 6, 2016.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposed Action: Create regulations for accessory roof and ground mounted solar energy systems.

Proposed Zoning Provisions: Solar energy system is defined as an energy conversion system, including appurtenances, which converts solar energy to a usable form of energy to meet all or part of the energy requirements of the on-site user. It includes both passive and active solar systems. Definitions for mechanical equipment, solar access, and solar glare are also included in Article 2.

A solar energy system is permitted in any zoning district as an accessory to a principal use, and may be roof mounted or ground mounted. A roof mounted system may be mounted on a principal or accessory building but may not exceed the maximum height specified for a primary or accessory building, and may not extend beyond the edge of the roof.

A ground mounted system may not exceed the maximum building height for an accessory building and the surface area must be calculated as part of the overall lot coverage. A ground mounted system, or system attached to an accessory building, may not be located within the required front yard setback and the minimum setback from property lines must be equivalent to the building setback or accessory building setback requirement.

Existing Zoning Provisions: The ordinance does not contain regulations for solar energy systems.
COMMENTS

We commend borough officials for incorporating solar energy systems that can benefit property owners and help build a sustainable community. Permitting renewable energy resources, such as solar, with reasonable regulation standards in land use ordinances is a recommended land use strategy in the Energy Conservation and Efficiency chapter of the Bucks County Comprehensive Plan (2011). The county plan recommends that emerging energy sources and energy efficiency be clearly defined and that appropriate standards for location, size, and setbacks be addressed in municipal ordinances.

Likewise, the Energy and Conservation section in the borough’s comprehensive plan recommends that opportunities to encourage solar, geothermal, wind, hydropower, or other on-site regenerative energy production be explored to benefit public and private use in a manner compatible with the historic nature of the community.

Therefore, prior to adoption of the proposed ordinance amendment, we recommend that borough officials consider the following comments:

1. **Historic impact**—Much of Langhorne Borough is situated within the National Register Historic District. The Historic Resources section of the borough’s comprehensive plan states that there is a need to balance energy efficient construction and historic preservation policies while providing flexibility to respective property owners. For instance, while installation of solar panels can be a very effective way to reduce a building’s energy dependence, they may overshadow the historic integrity of a structure. We note that it is possible to regulate the visual impact of solar energy systems by prohibiting them on the front façade of a historic building, or in an area visible from a public street, or in any other manner that diminishes the historic integrity of a building or structure.

   To address this issue and emerging types of energy technologies, the comprehensive plan recommends that the HARB Design Guidelines be reviewed and updated to address solar panel locations. Therefore, we recommend that the HARB address the preferred locations and size or area thresholds to protect historic features prior to adoption of the proposed amendments.

2. **Mechanical Equipment**—The definition of mechanical equipment is proposed to be added to the zoning ordinance’s general definition section (Article 2). This definition is specific to solar energy systems; and therefore, we suggest the definition be expanded to include other equipment associated with the operation of central air units, power generators, swim pool/hot tub connections and the like.

   Section 3, item J.i of the ordinance resolution contains screening requirements for mechanical equipment associated with a solar energy system. To prevent subjective interpretation of screening provisions in the second sentence, we suggest that the term “complete” be added before the words “visual screen” and/or the term, “to the satisfaction of the borough officials” be provided at the end of the sentence.

3. **Permitted solar systems**—In addition to roof and ground mounted solar energy systems, officials may want to consider provisions for wall mounted (which would include solar windows) or small pole mounted energy systems.
Also, so as to not interfere with the installation of small solar lighting (e.g., landscape lights), borough officials could consider exempting single solar panels under 2 square feet in size.

4. **Zoning ordinance references**—Section 2 of the ordinance resolution relates to applicability associated to solar energy systems, but there is no reference to where these applicability requirements are intended to be located in the zoning ordinance. Since they are related to solar energy systems, they should be incorporated as requirements in Article 4, Accessory Uses, along with the requirements specified for solar energy systems in Section 3 of the ordinance resolution.

In addition, Section 3 of the ordinance resolution references Article 4, Accessory Uses, but does not assign a use letter and number for solar energy systems similar to the accessory uses listed in Article 4, Section I of the zoning ordinance. Also, we recommend that the section letter and numbering be consistent with that already used in the zoning ordinance.

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:dc

cc: C. Anne Porter, Esq., Borough Solicitor
    Scott Mitchell, Borough Manager (via email)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Langhorne Manor Borough Council
   Langhorne Manor Borough Planning Commission

FROM: Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Proposal to Amend the Zoning Ordinance and Zoning Map—Municipal Building Use

TMP # 19-4-20 and 19-4-21
Applicant: Langhorne Manor Borough Council
Received: June 27, 2016
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 July 6, 2016.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposed Action: Amend the zoning ordinance to create a new use category for Municipal Building. Municipal Building would be permitted in the I Institutional zoning district.

In addition, two borough-owned parcels consisting of approximately 1.18 acres, located on the western side of Hulmeville Road (across and just north of its intersection with Prospect Avenue), are proposed to be rezoned from RB Residential to I Institutional district.

Proposed Zoning Provisions: Subsection v, creating use Municipal Building, would be added to Section 403 Use Regulations. Municipal Building use includes meeting areas, police station, administrative offices, and maintenance facilities. The use is allowed in the I Institutional district, but is not permitted in the RA, RB, or RC residential districts.

Existing Zoning Provisions: Table of Performance Standards in Section 603 requires that Other Permitted Uses in the RB Residential district have a minimum lot area of 15,000 square feet and lot width of at least 125 feet. The minimum front, rear, and side yard requirements are 75, 30, and 15 feet respectively. A maximum height of 35 feet and maximum impervious surface ratio of 35 percent is also allowed.
The Institutional district requires a minimum lot area of 20,000 square feet and lot width of at least 120 feet. The minimum yard setbacks and maximum height and impervious surface ratio is the same as required by the RB district.

COMMENTS

The proposal appears to be consistent with the municipal and county comprehensive plans and municipal ordinances, however; we recommend that borough officials consider the following comments prior to adoption:

1. **Zoning Amendment Text**
   
   - **Use regulations**—Municipal Building is proposed to be added to Section 403 Use Regulations as a new subsection v. Uses in Section 403 contain parking requirement and a few nonresidential uses in this section also contain regulations for buffers and landscaping. Borough officials may wish to include such standards for a Municipal Building use.
   
   - **Other references**—In addition to Municipal Building being added as subsection v in Section 403, we recommend that it also be added to Section 404, Table of Use Regulations. According to the version of Langhorne Manor’s zoning ordinance the county office has on file, the new Municipal Building use would be subsection u instead of v. We suggest that the borough recheck this subsection reference to ensure proper placement of the new use.

2. **Zoning Map Change**
   
   - **Nonconforming issues**—Both borough-owned parcels proposed to be rezoned are currently nonconforming in terms of lot width. The RB Residential District requires a lot width of 125 feet and 120 feet for the I Institutional district. Together, the two parcels have a lot width of about 145 feet (82 feet and 63 feet respectively). Prior to adopting the proposed rezoning and text amendment, borough officials should consider how this existing nonconformity may affect the future expansion of facilities on either parcel, including potential setbacks and stormwater facility issues.
   
   - **Institutional rezoning**—The area to be rezoned is just over an acre in size and consists of two borough-owned parcels that contain the existing municipal building and police station. The subject site is adjacent to preserved open space owned by Middletown Township. Residential properties are located directly north of, and across Hulmeville Road from the subject site.

   RA, RB, and RC Residential zoning districts surround the acre plus area proposed to be rezoned to the Institutional district. However, given the existing municipal uses of the subject parcels, and the adjacent preserved open space, rezoning the parcels to Institutional seems reasonable, especially since Municipal Building would be added to, and only permitted in, the Institutional district.
Zoning map—Section 4 of the proposed amendment states in part that the municipal “… zoning ordinance of 1993, as amended, is in all other respects reaffirmed and ratified subject to the amendment to same as set forth in this Ordinance.” We note that the zoning map attached to the proposal listed as Appendix A and Exhibit B, is not the most up-to-date version, and does not contain the two zoning district revisions adopted in 1998 and 2005. We recommend that the current zoning map (as previously amended) be used instead to avoid any misunderstanding regarding parcel zoning (see attached updated zoning map with previous areas rezoned to institutional highlighted).

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.

CIG:jk

Attachment

cc: Thomas J. Profy III, Esq., Municipal Solicitor
    Loretta M. Luff, Municipal Manager (via email)
PERTINENT INFORMATION

Site Characteristics, Natural Features: Woodlands cover the rear portion of the parcels.

Existing Land Use: Borough hall which contains municipal offices and police station.

Surrounding Land Use:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></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>South</td>
<td>Water tower and preserved open space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>Preserved open space (woodlands, steep slopes, floodplain and stream)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Surrounding Zoning:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>RB Residential B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>RA Residential A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>RB Residential B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>RC Residential C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

County Comprehensive Plan: Langhorne Manor Borough is classified as a Secondary Town Center by the Bucks County Comprehensive Plan (2011).

Municipal Comprehensive Plan: The Langhorne Manor Borough Comprehensive Plan (2005) shows the parcels in Government and Institutional use on Figure 1, Existing Land Use. Chapter 3. Planning, Land Use, and Zoning of the comprehensive plan states that the intent of the Institutional district is to provide for religious, educational, and public service uses compatible with the residential character of the community, and to preserve open space and natural resources.

The Future Land Use section (page 28) indicates that future land use within the borough should not significantly differ over the next 10 years since most of the borough is built out, and existing residential buildings are in good condition precluding the need for redevelopment.
Langhorne Manor Borough
Zoning Map (as amended, 2005)

Zoning District Legend:
RA Residential A
RB Residential B
RC Residential C
I Institutional

Prepared by Bucks County Planning Commission 2016
CONFIDENTIAL — NOT FOR RELEASE

July 6, 2016
BCPC # 48-16-2(P)

MEMORANDUM

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

FROM: Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Private Request for Zoning Map Change from CC Controlled Commercial to R-2 Low Density Residential District
TMP #48-17-37
Owner: GL Bowen Properties, LLC
Applicant: Columbia/Wegman Acquisition II, LLC
Received: June 21, 2016
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 July 6, 2016.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Requested Action: Amend the Upper Southampton Township zoning map to change the zoning district classification of TMP #48-17-37 from CC Controlled Commercial District to R-2 Low Density Residential.

A separate preliminary land development application has been formally submitted simultaneously for review that includes the subject tract (TMP #48-17-37) and the vacant R-2 district tract to the south and east (TMP #48-20-43). The proposal is to consolidate the two lots to form a 10.3878-acre lot to construct a two-story senior living facility (Use 23) with 136 beds.

Location & Size of Tract: West side of Street Road, approximately 520 feet south of Kutcher Road and is 0.7265 acres.

Proposed Zoning Provisions: The R-2 Low Density Residential District is to provide a place for detached dwelling units, a place to live and raise families; to provide standards which will encourage the installation of public facilities yet at the same time enhance the physical environment by giving maximum concern for the preservation of open space and natural features; to exclude commercial, industrial or any other activity not compatible with residential development. The minimum lot area in the R-2 district ranges from 20,000 square feet to 10 acres for various permitted uses that include and are not limited to cluster development, schools, nursing home, religious uses, kennels or stables.
Existing Zoning Provisions: The CC Controlled Commercial District is to provide for nonretail commercial uses, such as administrative and professional offices, medical facilities, educational, religious and philanthropic institutions, and other related low-traffic-generating, nonretail commercial uses; to provide standards which will ensure that such development will be of character compatible with adjacent residential land uses, and of such design as to create minimum interference with the traffic flow on public streets. The minimum lot area for a single-family detached use is 20,000 square feet and 5 acres for a nursing home or hotel.

COMMENTS

We recommend that the township officials consider the following in addressing the proposal to rezone the subject site from CC Controlled Commercial District to R-2 Low Density Residential District:

1. Consistency with 2010 Upper Southampton Comprehensive Plan Update
   a. CC Controlled Commercial District—The 2010 Comprehensive Plan discusses existing land use and zoning and the zoning breakdown in Table 3.2 (page 3-5) notes that the CC Controlled Commercial District totals 95.8 acres or 2.3 percent of the total land area in the township. The township should consider the loss of additional land zoned CC Controlled Commercial when reviewing this application.
   b. Street road corridor—Chapter 11, Revitalization Plan promotes the upgrading and replacement of existing properties and businesses within the corridor. As a means to achieve that strategy, they promote potential infill development in underutilized development parcels along the corridor. The subject site is currently underutilized and occupied by remnants of a concrete and asphalt driveway with no structure located on the property. Rezoning the property to the R-2 district will prohibit future commercial development on the lot. However, consolidating the subject site with TMP #48-20-43 located within the adjacent R-2 district (as proposed in the separate land development application) may promote the development of underutilized properties which is consistent with the comprehensive plan.
   c. Future land use/Street Road corridor—Chapter 12, Growth Areas and Future Land Use Plan identifies the subject site as being in a proposed revitalization overlay zoning area that borders a large tract that is called out as a potential housing development area. The revitalization overlay district has not been adopted as outlined in the comprehensive plan.

As a single lot, the subject site is limited and constrained by its’ size. Consolidating the subject site with the adjacent surrounding R-2 district property (i.e., TMP #48-20-43) would result in a 10-plus acre site. If the subject site is consolidated and rezoned to the R-2 district, the opportunities to become viable increase, which appears to be consistent with the comprehensive plan. For instance, creating a 10-plus acre site in the R-2 district opens the possibility of permitting a cluster development by-right.

2. Compatibility with surrounding zoning—The subject site is bordered by CC Controlled Commercial District tract to the west and is surrounded by the R-2 Low Density Residential District on the other three sides including across its frontage on Street Road. The R-2 district allows for a variety of uses from single-family detached to institutional and agricultural uses. The rezoning of the subject site does not impact the surrounding zoning and creates more opportunity for allowable uses within the R-2 district.
3. **Compatibility with surrounding land use**—A large vacant, unimproved lot borders the subject site to the south and east that contains a large woodland area and wetlands. A row of commercial uses lie to the west along the Street Road frontage. Directly across Street Road is a single-family detached residential use.

The pattern of land use along the Street Road corridor is primarily commercial and institutional uses to the west and dominated by residential use to the east. The subject site lies in a transition area between both uses. The proposed rezoning of the subject site to the R-2 district does not impact the compatibility with the surrounding land uses. Mitigation such as screening and setbacks can alleviate potential compatibility issues.

4. **Subject site**—The net area of the subject site is 0.7165 acres (31,209 square feet) and can accommodate only a single-family detached dwelling use within the CC district. All other permitted uses in the CC district are prohibited and limited due to the lot area constraint. Since it is a commercial lot, a single-family detached home would be misplaced along the frontage of Street Road. If the tract is rezoned to the R-2 district, the potential to subdivide to form an additional lot or two would be created.

As noted, the site appears to be in a transition area between commercial/institutional and residential uses. Rezoning the property to the R-2 district does not change the overall existing condition of the individual lot. However, if the lot is consolidated with adjacent lots, new uses and opportunity become attainable.

5. **Summary**—The proposal is consistent with the township’s comprehensive plan in that it stresses upgrading and redeveloping underutilized properties, especially within the Street Road corridor. However, the loss of commercially zoned property should be evaluated. The size constraint on the tract lends itself to be consolidated. If the subject site is consolidated with the adjacent R-2 district tract, the township should consider all the uses that can be accommodated, whether a nursing home as proposed or a cluster development. Prior to adoption, we recommend that consideration be given to how expansion and future use of the subject site will adversely affect adjacent parcels and what measures could be implemented (e.g., landscape buffering and screening) to reduce potential impacts.

If township officials determine that the proposed zoning map change is appropriate for the subject site, the comprehensive plan should be amended and consistent with Section 301 of the Municipalities Planning Code.

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.

JSI:dc
c
cc: Columbia/Wegman Acquisition II, LLC
    G.L. Bowen Properties, LLC
    Michael Yanoff, Esq., Friedman Schuman
    John Anderson, Cornerstone Consulting Engineers & Architecture, Inc.
    Donald E. Williams, Esq., Township Solicitor
    Joe Golden, Township Manager (via email)
PERTINENT INFORMATION

Site Characteristics, Natural Features: The 0.7165 net-acre site contains remnants of a concrete and asphalt driveway. The remainder of the site contains limited scrub vegetation.

Existing Land Use: Vacant and vegetated.

Surrounding Land Use:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Land Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>Across Street Road, residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>Vacant, wooded area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>Vacant, wooded area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>Commercial, real estate office and hair care</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 Low Density Residential District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>R-2 Low Density Residential District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>R-2 Low Density Residential District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>CC Controlled Commercial District</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Zoning History: CC Controlled Commercial District


Municipal Sewage Facilities Plan: The Upper Southampton Township Act 537 Plan places the subject site within a public sewer service area.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>BCPC Number</th>
<th>Tax Parcel Numbers</th>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Submission Level</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buckingham Township</td>
<td>5844-E</td>
<td>(6-4-69-3 &amp; -69-8)</td>
<td>Fell Road Tract</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>2 Single-family Lot Lot Line Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chalfont Borough</td>
<td>4918-D</td>
<td>(7-4-4-1 &amp; -4-3)</td>
<td>Chalfont View</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>54 Single-family Lots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doylestown Borough</td>
<td>12166</td>
<td>(8-9-57)</td>
<td>Plakins</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>2 Commercial Lots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilltown Township</td>
<td>12168</td>
<td>(15-23-28-1 &amp; -29)</td>
<td>D'Angelo</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Lot Line Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middletown Township</td>
<td>10108-A</td>
<td>(22-13-88)</td>
<td>131 North Hawthorne Avenue</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>2 Single-family Lots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middletown Township</td>
<td>12169</td>
<td>(22-21-66-2)</td>
<td>1050 Wheeler Way</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Commercial Land Development: 27,190 Square-feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milford Township</td>
<td>11660-G</td>
<td>(23-10-172-2, etc.)</td>
<td>Milford Village Center</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Lot Line Changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Britain Township</td>
<td>11892-A</td>
<td>(26-1-103.1)</td>
<td>Mode Transportation</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Office Land Development: 58,748 Square-feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northampton Township</td>
<td>12147</td>
<td>(31-23-45)</td>
<td>444 Saint Leonards Road</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>9 Single-family Lots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perkasie Borough</td>
<td>11294-A</td>
<td>(33-9-1)</td>
<td>Perkasie Square Shopping Center</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>2 Commercial Lots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richland Township</td>
<td>8952-C</td>
<td>(36-13-7)</td>
<td>380 Trumbauersville Road</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>37 Single-family Lots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sellersville Borough</td>
<td>7415-C</td>
<td>(39-8-367)</td>
<td>CCSK Holding LLC</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Industrial Land Development: 20,250 Square-feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solebury Township</td>
<td>12163</td>
<td>(41-36-49)</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Lot Line Changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipality</td>
<td>BCPC Number</td>
<td>Tax Parcel Numbers</td>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>Submission Level</td>
<td>Proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Southampton Township</td>
<td>12170</td>
<td>(48-17-37 &amp; -20-43)</td>
<td>Southampton Senior Living Facility</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Institutional Land Development: 98,298 Square-feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Southampton Township</td>
<td>9723-C</td>
<td>(48-12-120)</td>
<td>Knowies Avenue Holdings, LLC</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Industrial Land Development: 20,000 Square-feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warwick Township</td>
<td>11248-A</td>
<td>(51-6-8)</td>
<td>1447 Almshouse Road</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>3 Single-family Lots</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEMORANDUM

TO: Buckingham Township Board of Supervisors
    Buckingham Township Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Preliminary Subdivision Plan for Fell Road Tract
TMP #6-4-69-3; 6-4-69-8
Applicant: Elkay Property Management LLC
Owner: Same
Plan Dated: May 27, 2016
Date Received: June 2, 2016

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 an 8.511-gross-acre tract into two lots, consisting of 3.911 gross acres (Lot 1) and 4.266 gross acres (Lot 2). Convey a 0.504-acre portion of TMP #6-4-69-3 to TMP #6-4-69-8 to form a 2.183-gross-acre property. Individual on-lot water and sewage disposal facilities will serve the new lots.

Location: Southeast side of Fell Road, approximately 430 feet southwest of its intersection with Burnt House Hill Road.

Zoning: R-1 Residential District permits single-family detached dwellings (Use B1) by-right.

The Buckingham Township Zoning Hearing Board granted the following variances from the zoning ordinance:

Section 3003.B to permit the minimum lot width to be measured at the rear of the Gundry property, exceeding the requirement that it be measured at the minimum 50-foot front yard setback, allowing both lots to comply with the area and dimensional requirements of the R-1 Residential District and not be subject to the lane lot requirements of Zoning ordinance Section 3004.

Section 3104.A to permit the driveway to encroach into the perimeter buffer.

Present Use: Agricultural/vacant.
COMMENTS

1. **Shared driveway**—The plans show a 12-foot wide shared driveway off Fell Road that extends approximately 450-linear feet before it splits to each dwelling unit. There are some steep side slopes along each side of the shared driveway and the township should consider requiring a pull-off along the driveway to avoid potential conflicts between vehicles, delivery vehicles, and pedestrians. The pull-off should be adequate in size and sited to not impact the perimeter buffer plantings.

2. **Tax map parcels**—On several sheets, the tax map parcel numbers are incorrectly labeled as TMP #6-4-68-3 and #6-4-68-8. The sheets should be corrected with the correct label (TMP #6-4-69-3 and #6-4-69-8).

3. **Buffer**—The township should determine if the existing vegetation along the outer perimeter that is inter-mixed with new buffer plantings is adequate enough to meet the objectives of the Type 1 buffer requirement of zoning ordinance Section 3104.A and subdivision and land development ordinance Section 9.20.D.2.a.

   In addition, it is unclear on the plans if the limits of the proposed stormwater management facility are within the front yard buffer setback. The Record Plan, Sheet 2 of 16 shows the limits of the proposed stormwater management facility within the front yard setback and the Grading and PCSWM Plan, Sheet 7 of 16, shows the actual subsurface infiltration bed just outside of the front yard setback. The township should determine if the plans comply with zoning ordinance Section 3104.A and subdivision and land development ordinance Section 9.20.D.2.d.

4. **On-lot sewage systems**—Zoning ordinance Section 3101.A.2 notes that a 3,000-square foot or larger area is required for an on-lot sewage system as well as a 3,000-square foot back-up area. The plans display smaller areas than required. The township should ensure adequate size, functioning, and compliance with this requirement. Also, the township should determine if TMP #6-4-69-8 requires a back-up area.

5. **Subdivision and land development ordinance requirements**—We defer to Knight Engineering, Inc. for any issues regarding compliance and conformance with the subdivision and land development ordinance, 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 the July 6, 2016 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.

JSI:dc

cc: Elkay Property Management LLC
Sharon K. Dotts, P.E., Gilmore and Associates, Inc.
Edward F. Murphy, Esq., Wisler Pearlstine, LLP
Dan Gray, P.E., Knight Engineering, Township Engineer
Dana S. Cozza, Esq., Township Manager (via email)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Chalfont Borough Council
    Chalfont Borough Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Preliminary Plan of Subdivision for Chalfont View
         TMP # 7-4-4-1; 7-4-4-3
         Applicant: KTMT LIG I, L.P.
         Owners: Lenape Valley Swim & Tennis Club, Inc. and Bucks County Redevelopment
                  Authority
         Plan Dated: April 22, 2016
         Date Received: May 4, 2016

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 16.014-acre parcel into 54 single-family detached dwelling lots. Open space of 29,680
square feet (4.48 percent of site area) 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 small-lot village houses on lots of a
minimum of 7,000 square feet as part of a Planned Village Development on tracts of 10 acres or more
as a conditional use. A minimum of 4 percent of the Planned Village Development base site area shall
be open space.

Present Use: Commercial and recreational

COMMENTS

1. Waivers requested—The site plan indicates that the applicant is requesting waivers from the
   following subdivision and land development ordinance requirements:

   Section 22-703.3    To permit double frontage lots along Westview Avenue.
   Section 22-704.10   To permit a minimum centerline radius of 50 feet instead of 150 feet for
                        local streets.
Section 22-704.11  To permit the existing width of Westview Avenue to remain instead of widening it to 30 feet.

Section 22-705.2.G  To grant relief from a requirement for a 4-foot wide grass strip between sidewalk and back of curb.

Section 22-705.4.A.(2)  To permit a maximum driveway slope of 7 percent rather than required maximum of 4 percent.

Section 22-707  To permit a storm sewer easement width of 10 feet rather than 20 feet for a roof drain collection system area easement.

Section 22-708  To permit use of iron pins instead of concrete monuments at internal property corners and direction changes.

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. **Plan stage**—The plan was submitted as a “Preliminary/Final,” however, Section 22-505 of the subdivision and land development ordinance requires that a preliminary plan be approved before a final plan is submitted. The plan requests a number of waivers to both the subdivision and land development and stormwater management ordinances and requires site remediation and, thus, will require significant review by the planning commission and borough engineer. We recommend that the plan be reviewed as a preliminary plan.

3. **Building coverage**—The plan’s zoning data table indicates a permitted maximum building coverage per lot of 40 percent and maximum impervious surface per lot of 55 percent, but does not indicate the proposed amounts. The plan should be revised to indicate compliance with these requirements. The plan also should indicate the percentage of additional impervious surface allowable per lot for patios, sheds or other improvements.

4. **Open space**—Section 27-551 of the zoning ordinance prohibits land occupied by stormwater detention and retention basins in open space. The plan shows an existing stormwater basin serving Chalfont Greene will be expanded to serve Chalfont View. The expansion will be in open space land. The plan should show a subdivision of the land/easement area to be used for Chalfont View stormwater management (0.608 acre) and designate the exact area that is dedicated to Chalfont View.

5. **Open space delineation**—Section 27-533 of the zoning ordinance requires that open space areas be physically delineated from private lots by shrubbery, trees, markers or other method. The plan shows Open Space Lot B (with a path to the adjacent Chalfont Greene townhouses) located along Lots 33 and 34, and Open Space Lot C abutting Lots 46 and 47. We recommend providing plantings or other delineation of the open space lots to indicate the limits of the common areas and create privacy for the adjacent lots.

6. **Recreation land**—Section 22-714 of the subdivision and land development ordinance requires that recreation land be provided for residential subdivisions with 50 to 99 units. Land for two playfields and two tot lots shall be provided. The minimum area for a playfield is 25,000 square feet with a grade not exceeding 2 percent. The plan shows a 24,006-square-foot open space parcel (Open Space Lot A) in the center of the proposed subdivision with a small portion graded at 2 percent or less and the remainder with greater slopes up to 35 percent. No playfields or tot lots are shown. The plan should be revised to provide the necessary recreation land and facilities.
Section 22-714.13 of the subdivision and land development ordinance permits donation of a fee in lieu of land for recreation. The borough and applicant should discuss this option if it is determined that recreation land is not appropriate on the site.

7. **Open space design**—The central open space area should be designed to attract all residents in the new community. It should be considered a focal point and be improved with either a pavilion, pond, or paved patio area with a fountain or other notable feature, along with ornamental landscaping and appropriate seating, to help identify it as a pocket park and central gathering place for the development. We recommend that it be designed as an amenity rather than meeting the minimum open space requirement.

8. **Westview Avenue traffic calming**—Westview Avenue along the northwestern side of the site contains a number of traffic calming devices (speed tables or speed bumps) which are not shown on the plan. The devices may make ingress/egress from proposed site driveways difficult. Therefore, we recommend that the plan be revised to show the devices to ensure that they do not conflict with the location of the proposed driveways.

9. **Driveway access**—Section 22-705 A. (1) of the subdivision and land development ordinance requires that residential driveways 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 Susan’s Way and Westview Avenue have frontage on Ruthie’s Way, which is the street of lowest potential traffic. Borough officials should determine if that alignment would be inconsistent with the existing streetscape.

10. **Landscaping plan**

   a. **Mix of species**—The plan shows only one type of large shade tree and one type of evergreen tree for the site: 190 *Acer rubrum* (red maple) and 74 *Pinus strobus* (white pine) trees, respectively. The only other tree species proposed is *Cercis canadensis* (eastern redbud) which is a small tree; seven redbuds are shown. Planting many of one type of plant should be avoided because if a major pest or disease problem develops, all of the planting may be wiped out. Tree and stump removal, trimming, insect and disease control, inspection, and replanting as a result of an outbreak would be significant burdens for property owners and the borough. In addition, when planned properly, diverse plantings create a more interesting and attractive community. We strongly recommend that a mix of shade and evergreen tree species be provided.

   b. **Street trees**—The plan shows street trees along all the proposed streets except for an offsite portion of Ruthie’s Way between TMPs #7-4-4 and 7-4-4-2. We recommend that the applicant and borough coordinate with these property owners to provide street trees along the street.

   c. **Open Space Lot A planting**—A row of white pine trees is proposed along the 6-foot-high black ornamental fence intended to delineate Open Space Lot A from the adjacent lots (Lots 14, 15, 24, and 25). We recommend that a more appropriate planting be shown that would be integrated with and complement the open space design, as discussed in Comment 7, while providing additional privacy for the adjacent lots.

11. **Lighting plan**—Section 27-525.2.D of the zoning ordinance, Lighting Standards, requires that lighting be shielded to protect adjacent properties from direct glare or light radiation which may
cause a nuisance. The applicant should ensure that the proposed street light B-2 on the lighting plan does not create direct glare or light radiation on the dwellings on adjacent Lots 1 and 54.

12. **Requested stormwater management waivers**—A waiver request letter indicates that the following waivers are requested from the Stormwater Management Ordinance:

- Section 322.2C(5)(a)  To permit 2 feet from basin bottom to bedrock or high water table.
- Section 26-325.3C(5)(b)  To permit HDPE pipe instead of concrete pipe.
- Section 26-325.3C(10)  To permit 2 foot minimum cover over storm sewer.
- Section 26-325.3D(7)  To permit 3:1 side slopes rather than 4:1.
- Section 26-325.3D(9)  To permit bioretention basin bottom slope of 2 percent to promote infiltration.
- Section 277-712.6B  To permit deciduous basin plantings instead of evergreen trees.

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.

13. **Stormwater maintenance responsibilities**—The plan shows that an existing stormwater basin serving adjacent Chalfont Greene will also serve the proposed development. A note about stormwater management maintenance responsibility on the plan states that the facilities will be managed by the homeowners association but doesn’t specify which one. The basin lies on Chalfont Greene property, but would serve two developments. We recommend that the arrangement be clarified, and ownership and maintenance responsibilities be clearly stated.

14. **Site redevelopment**—The subject site will be remediated per requirements of the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (PaDEP) under Act 2. The applicant should assure the borough that remediation has been completed by placing a note on the plan.

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 July 6, 2016 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:dc

cc: KTMT LIG I, L.P.
R.L. Showalter Associates Inc.
Patrick DiGangi, P.E., CKS Engineers, Municipal Engineer
Sandra Zadell, Municipal Manager (via email)
Bob White, Bucks County Redevelopment Authority
MEMORANDUM

TO: Doylestown Borough Council
    Doylestown Borough Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Preliminary Plan of Land Development for Naomi A. Plakins
        TMP #8-9-57
        Applicant: Naomi A. Plakins
        Owner: Same
        Plan Dated: May 6, 2016
        Date Received: May 9, 2016

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 20,937-square-foot parcel into two lots. Lot 1 (11,003.72 square feet) contains an existing 2-story frame building used as a professional office (Use 23). The parking area on Lot 1 is proposed to be improved to include landscaping and a retaining wall. Connections from the parking area are proposed to be made to the unnamed alley located at the northeast side of the parcel and to East Oakland Avenue through an access easement on Lot 2. There is no construction proposed on Lot 2 (6,167.59 square feet) at this time.

Location: On the south side of East State Street, approximately 200 feet west of Church Street. Lot 2 is proposed to front on East Oakland Avenue.

Zoning: CR-Central Residential District permits single-family detached dwellings on a minimum lot area of 5,000 square feet and other permitted uses on a minimum lot area of 8,000 square feet.

Lot 1 is nonconforming with respect to minimum lot width at building line, minimum lot width at the street, and minimum front, rear, and side yard setbacks. The professional service use on Lot 1 is an existing nonconforming use.

Present Use: Professional service (law office, physician office, investment banker office, and psychologist office).
COMMENTS

1. **Waivers**—The site plan indicates that the applicant is requesting waivers from the following subdivision and land development ordinance requirements:

   - Section 404: Preliminary plan requirement
   - Section 509(a): Grade of driveway stopping area
   - Section 509(c): Driveway width and grade and curb radius
   - Section 510(b): Parking lot curb
   - Section 510(c): Parking lot access drive width
   - Section 510(h): Curb radius for parking stalls
   - Section 510(j): Parking area construction in accordance with Borough standards
   - Section 516(f): Edge of slopes within 5 feet of property line
   - Section 520(d)1.D.(iii): Double staggered row of evergreen trees in buffer yard
   - Section 804(a)(1) & 805(a)(1): Plan scale
   - Section 804(b)(5) & 805(b)(5): Location map scale
   - Section 804(c)(2) & 805(c)(2): Location map scale
   - Section 805(a)(6): Plan sheet size

   The final plan should include a list of waivers granted by Borough Council.

2. **Driveway setback and buffering**—The proposed driveway along the side of Lot 2 is 2 feet from the lot line and will be shared between Lot 1 and Lot 2. No buffering is shown on the plan for the portion of the driveway on Lot 2. Section 514.1 of the zoning ordinance requires that nonresidential driveways shall be located no closer than six feet to a side lot line and subject to the buffer requirements of Section 803.1.

3. **Driveway width**—A waiver from the requirement of Section 509.(c) of the subdivision and land development ordinance for a 12-foot wide one-way access driveway has been requested. The plan does not indicate that this driveway would be one-way. If that is the intent, we recommend that the one-way circulation be shown on the plan. We would also recommend that access and circulation for a future single-family detached dwelling be shown on Lot 2.

4. **Parking**
   a. **Handicap accessible parking space**—The Americans with Disabilities Act Accessibility Guidelines (ADAAG) requires that a minimum of one accessible parking space be provided for parking lots with between 1 and 25 total spaces. The plan should be revised to provide an accessible parking space.
   b. **Parking area**—The applicant should demonstrate that a vehicle could proceed to and from the parallel parking space located closest to the building when the other parallel spaces are occupied.

5. **Street trees**—The plan does not depict any new street trees for the frontage along East Oakland Avenue. Section 520(d)1.A(1) of the subdivision and land development ordinance requires street trees for any land development where suitable street trees do not exist.
6. **Tree protection**—No tree protection fencing is shown for the trees to remain on the site or for the trees with their dripline that falls within the site. Section 520.(c).1.Q of the subdivision and land development ordinance requires that tree protection shall be shown on the landscape plan.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the July 6, 2016 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: Naomi A. Plakins  
William R. McNaney, P.E., Van Cleef Engineering Associates  
Robert Solarz, P.E., Gilmore & Associates, Borough Engineer  
Karyn Hyland, P.E., Director of Building and Zoning (via email)  
John Davis, Borough Manager (via email)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Hilltown Township Board of Supervisors
Hilltown Township Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Preliminary Plan of Lot Line Adjustment for D’Angelo
TMP #15-23-29 and 15-23-28-1
Applicant: Justin and Linda D’Angelo
Owner: Same
Plan Dated: May 18, 2016
Date Received: May 27, 2016

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 40,903 square feet from TMP #15-23-28-1 to TMP #15-23-29 to form lots of 119,870 square feet (Lot 1) and 105,320 square feet (Lot 2). Both parcels contain existing single-family detached dwellings. No development is proposed. The site is served by individual on-lot wells and sewage disposal systems.

Location: On the south side of Fairhill Road, approximately 800 feet east of Spur Road.

Zoning: Rural Residential (RR) District permits single-family detached dwellings on lots of 3-acres when not served by public water.

TMP #15-23-29 is nonconforming with respect to the required minimum lot area of 3 acres.

Present Use: Residential.

COMMENTS

1. Minimum lot area—The proposed lot line adjustment would result in both properties having less than the required minimum lot area of 3 acres for single-family detached dwellings not served by public water within the Rural Residential District.
2. **Plan information**—The plan is missing information required by Section 140-16 of the subdivision and land development ordinance for lot line adjustments and minor subdivisions. Subsequent submissions should include the following as required by Section 140-16.

   a. **Site measurements**—Section 140-16.C(10) requires that the total acreage of the site (net and gross), areas of ultimate right-of-way, and area being conveyed be shown on the plan.

   b. **Existing utilities**—Section 140-16-C(14) requires that existing wells and sewer systems be shown on the plan.

   c. **Soil types**—Section 140-16.D(1) requires soil types to be shown on the plan.

   d. **Contour lines**—The plan depicts contour lines but does not provide the elevation height for the lines. Section 140-16.D(2) requires contour lines measured at vertical intervals of two feet to be shown on the plan.

   e. **Existing vegetation**—Aerial photographs show existing trees on Lot 1 and Lot 2. Section 140-16.D(4) requires that existing vegetation including trees over six-inch caliper to be shown.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the July 6, 2016 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:de

cc: Justin and Linda D’Angelo  
    Boucher & James, Inc.  
    C. Robert Wynn, Township Engineer  
    Don Delamater, 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 Subdivision for 131 North Hawthorne Avenue
        TMP #22-13-88
        Applicant: Thomas Brennan
        Owner: Maria Carrozza and Thomas Brennan
        Plan Dated: October 24, 2014
        Last Revised: March 18, 2016
        Date Received: June 7, 2016

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 15,697-square-foot parcel into two single-family residential lots of 8,650 square feet (Lot 1) and 7,047 square feet (Lot 2). Lot 1 contains an existing single-family dwelling. A two-story single-family dwelling is proposed for Lot 2. Both lots are served by public water and sewer facilities.

Location: East side of North Hawthorne Avenue between Brownsville Road and Broadview Avenue.

Zoning: R-2 Residence District permits single-family detached dwellings on a minimum lot area of 10,000 square feet, lot width of at least 80 feet, and front yard setback of 25 feet. The plan notes that variances were granted by the zoning hearing board on August 26, 2015 (Appeal No. 15-32) from the following zoning ordinance provisions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>500-903A</td>
<td>minimum required lot area for each lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500-2602B</td>
<td>minimum building envelop area for each lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500-903.1</td>
<td>maximum impervious surface ratio for Lot 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500-2301</td>
<td>subdividing an existing compliant lot into two nonconforming lots (each having less than the required lot area).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Present Use: Residential.
COMMENTS

1. **Porch and fence encroachments**—The proposed porch on Lot 2 encroaches a couple of feet within the required 25 foot front yard setback (Section 903.F of the zoning ordinance). The zoning officer should determine whether this encroachment is acceptable under the provisions of front yard exceptions (zoning ordinance Section 2203) and nonconforming structures regulations outlined in Part 28 of the zoning ordinance. If permitted, the zoning requirements notes on the plan for minimum front yard (Proposed Lot 2) should be revised to highlight this setback exception.

   In addition, the existing fence on Lot 2 encroaches slightly onto adjacent parcel 22-13-88-2. Since earth disturbance and tree planting are proposed in that area of the site, relocating the fence so that is entirely situated on or within the lot’s property line should be considered.

2. **Waivers and required improvements**—The plan indicates that waivers are requested from the curbing and sidewalk provisions of the subdivision and land development ordinance since none exist along North Hawthorne Avenue. In accordance with the requirements of Section 512.1(b) of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, township officials should determine whether the waivers should be granted in whole or in part. The final plan should note all granted waivers.

   Section 411.7.E of the subdivision and land development ordinance indicates that when curbing is not required, 2 foot wide stabilized shoulders should be provided. This improvement should be considered when township officials discuss the waiver requests.

3. **Street trees and tree protection**—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 planted along North Hawthorne Avenue.

   The proposed limits of disturbance on Lot 2 should be revised around the existing tree in the front yard on Lot 2 and appropriate tree protection fencing should be indicated in accordance with zoning ordinance Section 2601(E). Any disturbance involving sanitary sewer and gas utilities in the tree protection zone should also be undertaken in accordance with the ordinance provisions.

4. **Stormwater management plan**—The plan does not address stormwater management. Subdivision and land development ordinance Section 406.D exempts any regulated activity which would create less than 2,500 square feet of additional impervious cover. However, this section also states that the township may require plan preparation and submission of the individual lot grading plans in connection with zoning permit applications in order to promote the purposes of the stormwater management provisions. We recommend that the plan be revised to comply with the stormwater management provisions of the ordinance, if it is determined to be necessary by township officials.
5. **Planning module**—The applicant should submit a Sewage Facilities Planning Module Application Mailer to the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection to determine if a Sewage Facilities Planning Module must be submitted for the proposal.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the July 6, 2016, 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:dc

cc: Thomas Brennan
   ACCU-Land Surveyors
   Larry Young, P.E., TriState Engineers, Township Engineer
   Stephanie Teoli Kuhls, Township Manager (via email)
   Patrick Duffy, Zoning Officer (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 1050 Wheeler Way
    TMP #22-21-66-2
    Applicant: Eastern Warehouse Distributors, Inc.
    Owner: Paris Real Estate, LP
    Plan Dated: June 2, 2016
    Date Received: June 14, 2016

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 27,190-square-foot addition to an existing warehouse situated on a 9.24-acre lot. Public sewer and water facilities serve the building.

Location: Western side of Wheeler Way abutting U.S. Route 1.

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 building coverage of 30 percent.

The Zoning Hearing Board (Appeal No. 16-13) granted variances from the 30 percent maximum permitted building ratio (Section 1904.A.1.C) and from the required 50-foot side yard setback (Section 1904.A.1.f.2).

Present Use: Industrial; warehouse/office.

COMMENTS

1. **Number of employees clarification**—Required off-street parking is calculated on one space for every two employees. Note 6 on Sheet 1 indicates that there are 132 parking spaces on the site and 90 employees. However, in the Zoning Hearing Board’s Finding of Fact Decision, Note 9 indicates that there are approximately 200 employees with an addition of about 10 to 12 workers as a result of the construction of the proposed addition (Note 23). Although the existing amount of parking is sufficient for either worker scenario, we suggest that the plan be clarified as appropriate.
2. **Rail track spur**—The existing warehouse encroaches about 5 feet into the 40-foot wide rail spur track easement. The addition is proposed to be constructed along the same building line as the warehouse thereby extending the 5-foot building encroachment by another 150 feet. Although it is unlikely the rail spur will be reactivated, the applicant should provide documentation from the holder of the easement that the proposed building encroachment is acceptable.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the July 6, 2016, 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:dc

cc: Steve Thorne, Eastern Warehouse Distributors, Inc.  
Lawrence Byrne, Eastern/Chadrow Associates, Inc.  
Larry Young, P.E., TriState Engineers, Township Engineer  
Stephanie Teoli Kuhls, Township Manager (via email)  
Patrick Duffy, Township Zoning Officer (via email)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Milford Township Board of Supervisors
   Milford Township Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Final Plan of Lot Line Change for Milford Village
   TMP #23-10-172-2; -10-175-1; -10-175-2; -10-177-1; -10-178; -10-179; -15-99;
   -15-100; and -15-115

Applicant: LifeQuest c/o Roger Hiser
Owner: LifeQuest, Milford Village, LP, LifeQuest Nursing Center
Plan Dated: May 18, 2016
Last Revised June 15, 2016
Date Received: June 17, 2016

We have received a request from a representative for the applicant to sign the linens for the subject
proposal that have already been approved by the Milford Township Board of Supervisors. However,
in accordance with the provisions of Section 502 of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code,
plans for the proposal should be sent to the Bucks County Planning Commission (BCPC) for review.
Moreover, Section 513 of the MPC requires review by the county prior to the recording of the plat.
To meet the BCPC obligations as set forth by the MPC, the professional staff of the BCPC prepared
the following review.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposal: As part of the Milford Village Master Plan, 9 existing lots totaling 175.61 acres, will be re-
subdivided to create 18 separate lots. Lots will range in size from 0.24 to 71.81 acres.

Location: Northeastern corner of John Fries Highway (SR 663) and Mill Hill Road.

Zoning: RD—Rural Development District permits single-family detached dwellings (Use B1) with a
minimum lot area of 1 acre, single-family cluster (Use B5) with a minimum lot area of 20,000
square feet, and institutional uses with a minimum lot area of 2 acres.

Present Use: Institutional (LifeQuest facility).

COMMENTS

After reviewing the subject plan, we find no major issues to address regarding the proposal.
This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the July 6, 2016 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.

DAS:dc

cc: LifeQuest c/o Roger Hiser
    Pany & Lentz Engineering Company
    Kevin Wolf, Andersen Engineering Associates, Inc.
    Terry Clemons, Esq., Clemons, Richter & Reiss PC, Township Solicitor (via email)
    Jeff A. Vey, Township Manager (via email)
    Lisa Wolff, QAPC
MEMORANDUM

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

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Preliminary/Final Land Development Plan of Mode Transportation
         TMP #26-1-103.1
         Applicant: Mode Transportation, LLC
         Owner: Blue Bus Holdings, LLC
         Plan Dated: May 20, 2016
         Date Received: May 20, 2016

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 two story 58,748 gross-square-foot professional office building on a 7.957-gross-acre lot. Public water and sewer service the site.

Location: Southwest side of Schoolhouse Road, between Trewigtown and New Galena roads.

Zoning: IO Industrial Office District permits office and industrial activities on lots of 3 acres or more. Professional office is a use permitted by right.

Present Use: Vacant

COMMENTS

1. **Waivers requested**—The site plan indicates that the applicant is requesting waivers from the following subdivision and land development ordinance requirements:

   - **Section 22-502.C** Provide existing features up to 1,600 feet of the property line. (Partial waiver requested)
   - **Section 22-705.3.C** Improve the street (Schoolhouse Road) to the Township standards for ultimate right-of-way and cartway widths.
   - **Section 22-705.3.G** Mill and overlay the entire width of the roadway a depth of one and one-half inches.
   - **Section 22-706.1.B** Curbs shall be installed along the property frontage of every existing street abutting a proposed subdivision and/or land development.
Section 22-706.1.C Curbs shall be required for all parking areas, including access drives and services drives, with a capacity of four or more vehicles.

Section 22-706.2.B Sidewalks shall be installed along the property frontage of every existing street abutting a proposed subdivision and/or land development.

Section 22-708.2.C All proposed planting islands and strips shall be provided with curb.

Section 22-713.3.A All 10-foot by 36-foot planting islands shall contain two shade trees and all 10-foot by 18-foot planting islands shall contain one shade tree.

Section 22-713.3.B Planting strips shall be a minimum of 10 feet wide, and shall run the length of a parking row. Planting strips shall contain one shade tree at intervals of every 25 feet on average.

Section 22-713.4.A Street trees shall be planted every 30 feet along all proposed streets and existing streets when they abut or lie within the proposed subdivision and/or land development.

Section 22-713.5 Landscaped buffers and screens: off-street parking areas and detention basins.

We have concerns with several of the requested waivers that are addressed in the review comments that follow. The specific comment numbers that cross reference and discuss issues regarding the waiver requests are noted below:

- Section 22-706.2.B: sidewalks, see Comment 8.
- Section 22-713.3.A: 10-foot by 36-foot planting islands, see Comment 11.
- Section 22-713.3.B: planting strips, see Comment 11.
- Section 22-713.4.A: street trees, see Comment 12.
- Section 22-713.5: landscaped buffers, see Comment 13.

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. **Traffic impact analysis**—Zoning ordinance Section 27-2500.a.4 requires a traffic impact study for an office development consisting of 25,000 square feet or more of total floor area. Besides increased vehicular volume and skewed street intersection alignments, the current traffic circulation patterns should be evaluated from both a volume and safety viewpoint. The traffic impact study should include an evaluation of the intersection of Trewigtown and New Galena roads.

In addition, the township should assess the level of service and aesthetic function of Schoolhouse Road. It currently acts as rural collector with scenic views between Boulder Drive and Trewigtown Road. As the Industrial Office District builds out along its frontage, the appearance of the road will change, therefore the township should determine if it is beneficial to maintain the rural perception of the road.

3. **Building setback**—Related to how the township views development along Schoolhouse Road, the township should consider moving the proposed office building closer to Schoolhouse Road. The current pattern established by the placement of the existing child care and pet resort structures east of subject property has a fairly large building setback with one
row or no rows of parking in front. It appears that the proposed office building can move closer to the road while maintaining the same overall layout and be consistent with the existing buildings without losing any parking spaces.

4. **Conditional parking**—The applicant should comply with zoning ordinance Sections 27-2903 and 27-2903.b.1 and demonstrate to township officials, based on data listed in zoning ordinance Section 27-2903.b.1, that the conditional reduction in parking from 334 to 246 spaces is warranted.

5. **Parking aisle**—Zoning ordinance Section 27-2904.c.3 states that no aisle shall exceed 200 feet in length. The parking aisles along the north and south length of the building exceed 200 feet. The plans should be revised to comply.

6. **Paved area landscaping**—Zoning ordinance Section 27-2904.h.2 requires one deciduous tree for every 4,000 square feet of paved area. The plan proposes 88 reserve parking spaces to be constructed in the future. The trees required for the future paved 88 spaces should be held in reserve and planted at the time of construction or be planted during the initial phase as determined by the township.

7. **Off-street loading**—Zoning ordinance Section 27-2906.b.2 requires two off-street loading spaces for office buildings between 45,000 square feet up to 119,999 square feet. The plans do not display off-street loading and should be revised to accommodate off-street loading.

8. **Sidewalks**—The applicant is requesting a waiver from constructing sidewalks on the existing streets that include Schoolhouse Road and New Britain Boulevard. We note that sidewalks currently exist both east and west of the site along Schoolhouse and Trewigtown Roads as well as along New Britain Boulevard. We do not recommend granting the waiver request from subdivision and land development ordinance (SALDO) Section 22-706.2.B. The sidewalks along the street frontage will be a small span in providing pedestrian mobility and linking the New Britain Business Park and Schoolhouse Road with West Branch Park and other potential destinations.

In addition, the township should consider requiring a sidewalk connection into the property from the sidewalks along the street frontages. It would allow safe pedestrian passage and separation from vehicular traffic entering and exiting the property.

9. **Easements**—The plans display several existing and proposed easements that are not kept as lawn or in a natural state as required in SALDO Section 22-704.4.

10. **Detention basin slope**—SALDO Section 22-712.4.C requires that the toe of any detention basin slope be located a minimum of five feet from any property line or street right-of-way line. The slope associated with the infiltration basin #1 in the northeastern corner of the site appears to be within five feet of the ultimate right-of-way and the plans should be revised accordingly.

11. **Parking area landscaping**—There are several planting islands and planting strips that do not contain shade trees as required by SALDO Sections 22-713.3.A and B. The applicant is seeking a partial waiver to not place shade trees in islands and planting strips where utilities are located. The township should determine if the trees (those needed to comply with the ordinance) can be placed elsewhere on the site, require a fee in lieu of, or substitute them for an equivalent number of shrubs.
12. **Street trees**—Twelve street trees are required and six are displayed along the frontage of Schoolhouse Road. It appears that there is space to plant the remaining six even though not along a road frontage. The areas include the proposed front yard space between the six proposed street trees along Schoolhouse Road and the parking lot screening shrubs. Also, there is space on both sides along the access drive off New Britain Boulevard that does not conflict with the clear sight triangle and the underground pipeline. The township should determine if the trees (those needed to comply with the ordinance) can be placed elsewhere on the site, require a fee in lieu of, or substitute them for an equivalent number of shrubs.

13. **Landscape buffers and screens**—The landscape buffers and screens chart on the Landscape Plan, Sheet 8 of 22 shows a noncomplying condition for the number of trees and shrubs required around the detention/retention basins’ edge and plantings needed to screen the off-street parking areas per SALDO Sections 22-713.5.B.(1) and (3). The township should determine if the existing vegetation around the site’s perimeter is adequate for screening or needs to be supplemented, or if the trees and shrubs (those needed to comply with the ordinance) can be placed elsewhere on the site or require a fee in lieu of, or provide a partial waiver as requested.

There is one shrub grouping within infiltration basin #1 that is not labeled and should be corrected on the plans.

14. **Park and recreation land**—SALDO Sections 22-715.1 and 2.C.(2) requires nonresidential land development to dedicate park and recreation area to the Township (2,500 square feet per 4,000 square feet of building area) or meet alternatives such as fee-in-lieu or others as outlined in Section 22-715.G. Compliance with this requirement should be indicated.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the July 6, 2016 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.

JSI:dc

cc: Mode Transportation, LLC
    Blue Bus Holdings, LLC
    Erik Garton, P.E., Gilmore & Associates, Township Engineer
    Eileen Bradley, Township Manager (via e-mail)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Northampton Township Board of Supervisors
Northampton Township Planning Commission

FROM: Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Preliminary Plan of Subdivision for 444 Saint Leonards Road
TMP #31-23-45
Applicant: 444 St. Leonards, LLC
Owner: Larisa DuBirsky
Plan Dated: May 13, 2016
Date Received: May 25, 2016

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 5.928 acres into 9 single-family detached lots, ranging from 20,839 to 32,059 square feet. An existing single-family dwelling is shown on Lot 3. Public water and sewerage are proposed.

Location: Along the west side of Saint Leonards Road, 150 feet south of its intersection with Summer Drive.

Zoning: R-2 Single Family District permits residential uses on a minimum lot area of 20,000 square feet with a minimum lot width of 100 feet.

Present Use: Residential.

COMMENTS

1. **Open space**—Section 406.2.A(6) of the zoning ordinance requires that 15 percent of the site be preserved in open space. The applicant is proposing to pay a fee in-lieu-of dedicated open space in accordance with Section 1001.E of the zoning ordinance. The Board of Supervisors should determine if a fee in lieu of open space is acceptable.

2. **Sidewalks**—Section 403.2B of the subdivision and land development ordinance requires sidewalks on both sides of all existing and proposed streets. The plan should provide the required sidewalks.
3. **Stormwater management**—We commend the use of underground detention basins under Road “A” and “rain garden/detention basins” on individual lots to manage the site’s stormwater runoff. However, we are concerned whether the individual stormwater management facilities will be properly maintained in the future, especially after properties are sold and new owners take up residence. New homeowners may have no idea of how or why a stormwater facility on their property works, or even what it is, and therefore can do great harm to it by changing the facility unwittingly. For example, many of the plantings that have been designated for the proposed basin may be altered, removed, or replanted with inappropriate vegetation.

General Note 20 on Sheet 1 states that the owners, their successors and assigns are responsible for the stormwater facilities and the township may inspect the facilities to determine if they are operating and being maintained properly. The township should consider whether an operation and maintenance manual should be provided to the lot owners and that any turnover of the property should be subject to disclosure about the stormwater facilities and ongoing maintenance responsibilities.

We also recommend that the applicant consider giving responsibility for the maintenance of all stormwater facilities to the homeowners association. Under this arrangement, maintenance tasks can be regularly scheduled and performed by professionals contracted by the association, thus relieving homeowners of the burden of the time and individual cost involved with maintenance, and ensuring the long-term management of the site’s stormwater runoff.

Additionally, the township should consider the impact on residents if the underground detention basins proposed in the private street need to be opened up for maintenance. It could be disruptive to the lots with adjacent driveways and to residents’ vehicular movements or service vehicle movements.

4. **Tree protection**—The plan should be revised so that the limit of disturbance on Lot 6 excludes the entire tree protection area for the 72-inch caliper maple tree that is to remain to the rear of the proposed house.

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 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 July 6, 2016, 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:dc

cc: 444 St. Leonards, LLC
    Robert W. Gundlach, Jr., Esq., Fox Rothschild LLP
    Dave Connell, P.E., CKS Engineers, Inc., Township Engineers
    Michael Solomon, Township Director of Planning and Zoning
    Robert Pellegrino, Township Manager (via email)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Perkasie Borough Council
    Perkasie Borough Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Final Plan of Minor Subdivision for Perkasie Square Shopping Center
         TMP #33-9-1
         Applicant: Pacaz Realty L.L.C.
         Owner: Same.
         Plan Dated: November 5, 2015
         Date Received: May 3, 2016

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 22.179-acre parcel into two lots: Lot 1 would be 14.24 acres and Lot 2 would be 7.94 acres. Lot 1 contains the Perkasie Square Shopping Center, including a bank and a fast food restaurant on separate pads. Public water and sewerage serve the existing development on Lot 1.

Location: Southern side of Constitution Avenue, adjacent to the Sellersville Borough line along the western side of the tract. A very small area at the western corner of the tract along Constitution Avenue is in Sellersville.

Zoning: The I-2 Light Industrial District permits a planned commercial development on a minimum lot area of 2 acres (87,120 square feet), and various retail, office, and light industrial uses on a minimum lot area of 20,000 square feet.

Present Use: Shopping center and vacant.

COMMENTS

1. **Paved path easement**—An easement should be shown for the existing paved path that provides access to the shopping center from the adjacent Meadow Wood residential community east of the tract. Access is provided through the fence located along the common property line of the shopping center and residential neighborhood. Maintenance responsibilities should be established regarding snow removal and repairs for the paved path.
2. **Zoning information**—The plan’s Zoning Data Table indicates the minimum lot area for Other Principal Structure or Use as 2 acres, instead of 20,000 square feet as required by zoning ordinance Section 186-20.I(3) for the I-2 Light Industrial District. This information should be corrected on the plan.

3. **Plan scale**—The plan indicates the scale as 1 inch = 50 feet, but the graphic scale bar does not scale at any standard engineering scale. The plan drawing scales at approximately 1 inch = 60 feet. Future plans should provide an accurate scale in accordance with Section 164-69.A(1) of the subdivision and land development ordinance (SALDO).

4. **Existing easements**—SALDO Section 164-69.C(2) requires the plan to show the location of features such as watercourses and easements. SALDO Section 164-32.A states that easements with a minimum of 20 feet shall be provided as necessary for utilities and drainage. The applicant should ensure that the plan shows any necessary drainage easements along the waterway.

5. **Water volumes**—According to SALDO Section 164-69.D(6), a minor subdivision plan shall show or be accompanied by information indicating the estimated average and peak volumes of water needed to serve the proposed subdivision, an indication of the available water volume for fire flow, and the water volume required to satisfy the Insurance Services Office (ISO) standards for fire protection.

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.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the July 6, 2016, 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:dc

cc: Pacaz Realty, L.L.C.
    Nave Newell
    Erik Garton, Gilmore & Associates, Borough Engineer
    Andrea Coaxum, Borough Manager (via email)
    Brandy McKeever, Code Enforcement Administrator (via email)
    Sellersville Borough (adjacent municipality)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Richland Township Board of Supervisors
    Richland Township Planning Commission

FROM: Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Preliminary Plan of Subdivision for 380 Trumbauersville Road
    TMP #36-13-7
    Applicant: PPG Ahlum, LLC c/o Ben Goldthorp
    Owner: Josephine Ahlum Trust & Carol & Michael Ahlum Trustees
    Plan Dated: April 29, 2016
    Date Received: May 17, 2016

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 28.0861-acre tract into a single-family detached enhanced density development with 37 single-family detached lots. Lot 22 will be 11,263.89 square feet and contain an existing single-family home. The remaining residential lots will range from 7,585.79 to 9,534.55 square feet (net area). The proposed development includes a total of 19.4279 acres of open space. The net density of the proposed development is approximately 1.7 units per acre. Public water and sewer would serve the proposed development.

Location: The site is located on Trumbauersville Road at its intersection with Bartram Lane.

Zoning: Suburban Residential Low (SRL) District, in which single-family detached enhanced density developments are a permitted use with minimum site area of 17,500 square feet, minimum lot area of 5,000 square feet, minimum average lot area of 6,000 square feet, maximum density of 2.5 dwelling units per acre, and required minimum open space of 60 percent.

Present Use: Agriculture.
COMMENTS

1. **Waiver**—The plan lists anticipated waiver of Section 22-515.3 of the subdivision and land development ordinance, regarding plan sheet size. 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. **Parking**—The zoning and site data schedule on Sheet 2 of the plan indicates the requirement for off-street parking is 1 space per bedroom. According to Section 27-405.B4.e of the zoning ordinance, 3 off-street parking spaces are required for dwellings having 3 bedrooms or less and 4 off-street parking spaces are required for dwellings having 4 bedrooms or more. The schedule should be revised to state the specific requirement, what number of bedrooms are proposed, and what number of off-street parking spaces are being provided based on the number of proposed bedrooms.

   The plan is basically showing room for 2 off-street parking spaces in the proposed driveways, which would be less than the minimum of 3 spaces required if the dwelling units have 3 or less bedrooms. The plan does not specify whether the dwellings include a garage and, if so, how many parking spaces would be provided in a garage area. If garage area is intended to meet a portion of the off-street parking space requirements, we recommend that this space be deed restricted so that the space cannot be converted in the future to living space. The plan should be revised if no garage areas are proposed or if the garage space along with the driveway parking is insufficient to meet the required off-street parking requirement.

3. **Recreation land**—The site capacity calculations on Sheet 2 of the plan provide a calculation of recreation land consistent with Section 511.C of the zoning ordinance; however, the plan shows no specific recreation facilities consistent with Section 27-563.C of the zoning ordinance. The plan should be revised accordingly. Township officials should determine how the provisions of Section 22-503 of the subdivision and land development ordinance pertaining to the dedication of land or payment of fees in lieu thereof for park, recreation, and open space would relate to the zoning ordinance requirements of Sections 27-511.C and 27-563.C.

4. **Site capacity summary**—The plan should be revised to provide a site capacity summary in accordance with Section 27-511.I of the zoning ordinance.

5. **Lot width**—The plan should be revised so that Lot #22 meets the minimum lot width of 45 feet in accordance with Section 27-513 of the zoning ordinance. The plan shows this lot as having a lot width of only 25 feet. Section 27-553 of the zoning ordinance permits lane lots, but only where a street could not reasonably be developed to serve the lots with each meeting the minimum lot width requirements. The proposed lots could have been arranged to provide Lot #22 with adequate lot width.

6. **Woodland protection**—The plan should be revised to indicate how much woodland will be removed due to the proposed stormwater management basin construction and compare that
amount to the amount of woodland disturbance permitted by the woodland protection
requirements of Section 27-514.E of the zoning ordinance. This section only allows 20 percent
of woodlands to be disturbed and any disturbance over 20 percent would be subject to tree
replacement at a ratio determined by the Township governing body.

In addition, the plan shows the proposed grading and a portion of stormwater basin A within
the dripline of two trees lining the driveway to Lot 22. There’s no indication that these trees
are to be removed, so the grading and basin should be arranged not to intrude in driplines of
these trees in accordance with tree protection zone provisions of Section 27-514.F of the
zoning ordinance.

7. **Buffer yards**

   a. **Buffer setback lines**—Township officials should determine if the plan should be
      revised to show setback lines conforming to the buffer yard widths required in
      Sections 27-516.A and 27-516.D of the zoning ordinance. The required planting is
      shown, but not a specific setback line.

   b. **Class B buffer**—The plan should be revised to show a Class B buffer along the
      property line adjacent to TMP #36-21-53-5 which contains a medical office, in
      accordance with Section 27-516.A (Tables 1 and 2) of the zoning ordinance.

   c. **Storm Basin A**—The plan shows numerous shade trees, flowering trees, evergreen
      trees, and shrubs, as part of the required buffer and street trees, within Storm Basin A.
      Township officials and the township engineer should determine if these proposed
      plantings in this location will function as they are intended by the zoning ordinance
      (buffer and street trees) and if they would be suitable plantings for a stormwater
      management facility.

   d. **Groundcover**—The plan indicates that the groundcover plant species are to be
determined. We recommend that the plan be revised to indicate the groundcover
      plants in accordance with the plant list in Section 27-516 - Table 3.

8. **Clear-sight triangles**—The plan should be revised to show 10-foot clear-sight triangles for
   the proposed driveways that intersect the proposed road in accordance with Section 27-554.B
   of the zoning ordinance.

9. **Future right-of-way**—The plan should be revised to show a 60-foot future right-of-way for
   the proposed street in accordance with Section 27-555.B.2.b of the zoning ordinance. The
   plan shows only a 50-foot right-of-way.

10. **Open space**

    a. **Stormwater basins**—Section 27-561.B of the zoning ordinance states that open space
        as part of a B4 Single Family Detached Enhanced Density use shall not include
        stormwater detention/retention basin. The two proposed stormwater basins appear
        to be part of the area designated as open space. In addition, the driveway and access
c. **Delineation**—Section 27-563.B of the zoning ordinance requires that a method, such as shrubbery, trees, markers, or other method acceptable to the Township, shall be provided to physically delineate private lots from open space area. This physical delineation would be particularly important between Open Space Area B and the residential lots proposed adjacent to it. Without a distinct delineation, this open space area will most likely become an extension of the side and rear yards of these lots. The plan should be revised to indicate what measures will be provided to physically delineate all the residential lots adjacent to proposed open space.

d. **Ownership**—The plan should be revised to indicate who will maintain ownership of the proposed open space and common facilities in accordance with Section 27-565 of the zoning ordinance.

11. **Trees and utilities**—Several proposed trees are shown being located over or in close proximity to utilities, such as water and sewer lines, that would serve 16 lots. We recommend that the plan be revised so that planting materials and utilities be an appropriate distance away from each other to eliminate potential problems from root growth or from maintenance and repair of utility lines.

12. **Emergency access**—The plan shows a proposed emergency access connection to the Harvest Lane cul-de-sac in the adjacent Sweetbriar development. It appears that this cul-de-sac was designed to allow a full extension of Harvest Lane into the subject site. We recommend that Township officials consider requiring the proposed development to be designed in a way that would extend Harvest Lane as a residential street (with sidewalks) through the subject site to Trumbauersville Road. This would benefit both the proposed development and the Sweetbriar development by providing two points of access to Trumbauersville Road. Section 22-504 of the subdivision and land development ordinance states that residential streets should be laid out as to discourage through traffic; however, the arrangement of streets should provide for continuation of existing or platted streets. Since Harvest Lane intersects Colonial Drive in the Sweetbriar development, the likelihood of an extension of Harvest Lane being used as a through road would be minimal.
13. **Right-of-way and cartway width**—The plan shows the right-of-way and cartway widths of the proposed street as 50 feet and 30 feet, respectively. Section 22-506.1 of the subdivision and land development ordinance requires the right-of-way and cartway width of residential streets to be 60 feet and 40 feet, respectively. The plan should be revised accordingly.

14. **Driveway turn-around**—The plan should be revised to meet Section 22-517 of the subdivision and land development ordinance, which requires adequate driveway turn-around space on each lot so that no car need to back out onto a street in order to leave the lot.

15. **Sidewalk and trail connections**—We recommend that the plan be revised to extend the proposed sidewalk through the proposed emergency access easement with connection to the sidewalk along Harvest Lane in the adjacent Sweetbriar development to join the two communities. Section 22-518.1 of the subdivision and land development ordinance requires sidewalks to be installed “where required by the municipality.”

   In addition, we recommend that consideration be given to revising the plan to include a trail that would extend from the proposed sidewalk to the existing trail on TMPs #36-21-53-5 and 36-21-210. Such a trail could assist in meeting the zoning ordinance recreation requirement (see comment #3 above).

16. **Traffic impact study**—A community of 37 single-family detached homes, as proposed, could potentially generate about 370 average daily vehicle trips, according to figures from *Trip Generation* (Institute of Transportation Engineers, 8th edition). A traffic impact study should be conducted in accordance with Section 22-524 of the subdivision and land development ordinance, which requires a study for developments capable of generating 100 or more daily trips.

17. **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 subdivision.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the July 6, 2016, 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.

TAK:dc

cc: PPG Ahlum, LLC c/o Ben Goldthorp
    Josephine Ahlum Trust & Carol & Michael Ahlum Trustees
    Woodrow & Assoc., Inc.
    Mike Schwartz, Gilmore & Associates (via e-mail)
    Paul Stepanoff, Township Manager (via e-mail)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Sellersville Borough Council
   Sellersville Borough Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Preliminary Plan of Land Development for CCSK Holding LLC
   TMP #39-8-367
   Applicant: Gorski Engineering, Inc.
   Owner: CCSK Holding LLC
   Plan Dated: May 31, 2016
   Date Received: May 27, 2016

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 20,250-square-foot industrial (truck repair) building on a 3.82-acre parcel within the Sellersville Business Campus. The lot will be served by public water and sewer.

Location: Northern side of East Clymer Avenue in the Sellersville Business Campus.

Zoning: I Industrial District permits manufacturing on lots of 20,000 square feet or more.

Present Use: Vacant brownfield

COMMENTS

1. Plan stage—The plan was submitted as a “Preliminary/Final,” however, Section 135-9 of the subdivision and land development ordinance states the procedure for review of land development plans includes two stages, preliminary and final. These stages are necessary to provide the Planning Commission and the Borough Council adequate opportunity to review each proposal and ensure that their recommendations may be included in the final plan. A waiver is being requested and the borough should determine if the submission is sufficient to be reviewed only once.
2. **Tree protection zone**—Section 160-25.E of the zoning ordinance establishes a tree protection zone which shall be free of alteration, grading, compaction or vehicle storage. The plan does not show a tree protection zone and shows grading beneath existing trees within an existing treeline along the relocated stone driveway. Also, the limit of disturbance line on the Erosion and Sediment Control Plan is located within existing trees to remain along the stone driveway. The plan should be revised to show a tree protection zone, tree protection fence, and revised tree removal plan to comply with the zoning ordinance requirements.

3. **Buffer plantings**—Section 160-82 of the zoning ordinance requires buffer yards and screening where industrial development abuts a residential district. The plan shows a buffer yard with existing trees along the northeastern property boundary line which abuts a PR Planned Residential District, but no additional screening is proposed. The borough should determine if sufficient screening is provided by the existing trees.

4. **Parking Issues**
   
   a. **Space location**—Eleven future parking spaces are shown along the apron on the western side of the parcel opposite the proposed buildings and driveway building. Driveway circulation could be impeded because vehicles maneuvering in and out of the parking area may conflict with the larger vehicles passing to and from the garage bays. We recommend that the applicant consider moving the parking spaces to an enlarged parking area in the front of the proposed building or that parking in these spaces be restricted to employees.

   b. **Parking information**—The parking requirement table on the plan indicates that 34 parking spaces are required and an additional six spaces are provided “in reserve.” The plan shows 40 total spaces but the six reserve spaces are not designated. We recommend that the plan be revised to show which spaces are in reserve.

5. **Sidewalks**—The final subdivision plan for the Sellersville Business Campus shows a sidewalk along the frontage of the subject parcel along the perimeter of the cul-de-sac. The plan should be revised to show the required sidewalk. The required sidewalk would not connect to any facility on the site so we recommend that the sidewalk be extended west to the site driveway. We also recommend that a painted crosswalk be provided between the site and the eastern side of Clymer Avenue.

6. **Landscaping**—The plan shows four trees at the corners of the proposed parking lot, but no specifications are provided indicating the type and size of the proposed trees. The trees at the northwestern end of the parking lot are located in a ten-foot wide space between the curbing and an easement. The applicant and borough should determine if this space is wide enough for the future growth of the trees without interfering with the utility lines.

   The plan also does not provide specifications for the street trees required by the final plan along East Clymer Avenue. We recommend that the plan be revised to provide the size and species of the proposed plantings and a planting detail drawing.

7. **Editorial comment**—The plan is dated May 31, 2016 but was submitted to this office on May 27. We recommend that the correct date be noted on the plan.
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.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the July 6, 2016, 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:dc

cc: John Riebow, Gorski Engineering, Applicant’s Engineer/Surveyor
Cheryleen Strothers, Cowan Associates, Municipal Engineer
David Rivet, Municipal Manager (via email)
Jorden Peter Krause, Bucks County Industrial Development Corporation
MEMORANDUM

TO: Solebury Township Board of Supervisors
   Solebury Township Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Preliminary Plan Lot Line Adjustments for Johnson
         TMP# 41-3-49
         Applicant: David and Sylvia Johnson
         Owner: Same
         Plan Dated: May 9, 2016
         Date Received: May 24, 2016

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: Adjust the lot lines among three parcels to accommodate existing features that encroach within, or cross, the side yard or parcel boundary (driveway, fence and accessory buildings). To accommodate the entire driveway on TMP #41-36-50-1, 1,259 square feet would be conveyed from TMP #41-36-49. To provide a conforming side yard setback for accessory buildings and the existing fence on TMP #41-36-49, 19,704 square feet would be conveyed from adjoining TMP #41-36-48. No new development is proposed as a result of these lot line changes.

Location: Between Windy Bush and Old Windy Bush Roads, approximately 600 feet north of Great Oaks Road.

Zoning: RA Residential/Agricultural District permits single-family detached dwellings on a minimum lot size of 1.5 acres with a minimum front yard of 70 feet, side yard of 35 feet, and a rear yard of 50 feet, and a lot width of at least 160 feet at the building line.

Present Use: Residential; single-family detached dwelling units.

COMMENTS

The plan will bring existing nonconforming structures into zoning compliance, and it appears the proposal will comply with all major ordinance requirements. Since no land development is proposed that would alter existing conditions, the applicant is requesting several waivers from the subdivision and land development ordinance provisions (contours, slopes and woodlands area information).
We recommend that the plan be approved on the condition that waivers are approved in accordance with the requirements of the PaMPC Section 512.1(b), and if it meets all ordinance requirements as determined by the municipal engineer and other applicable reviewing agencies.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the July 6, 2016, 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:dc

c: David and Sylvia Johnson
   ND REMY Associates, LLC
   Dennis H. Carney, Township Manager (via email)
MEMORANDUM

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

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Preliminary Plan of Land Development for Southampton Senior Living Facility
   TMP #48-20-43; 48-17-37
   Applicant: Columbia/Wegman Acquisition II, LLC
   Owner: GL Bowen Properties, LLC
   Plan Dated: May 23, 2016
   Date Received: June 14, 2016

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 two story 98,298-square-foot (gross) floor area senior living facility (Use 23) with 136 beds. The plan will consolidate two parcels into one 10.3878-acre tract (TMP #48-20-43 is 9.6714 acres and TMP #48-17-37 is 0.7165 acre). Sixty-nine parking spaces are proposed and the facility will be serviced by public water and sewer facilities.

Location: On the west side of Street Road, approximately 520 feet south of Kutcher Road.

Zoning: 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. Proposed use 23 (nursing home) is permitted by Special Exception in the R-2 Low Density Residential District. A minimum lot area of five acres is required in addition to access to an arterial street. The CC Controlled Commercial District is to provide for nonretail commercial uses, professional offices, institutional uses, and other related low-traffic-generating uses. The CC District permits nursing homes (Use 23) on a minimum site area of 5 acres.
The Upper Southampton Township Zoning Hearing Board granted a special exception to permit a nursing home use (Use 23) in accordance with Sections 185-85 and 185-16 of the zoning ordinance and granted the following zoning variance on May 23, 2016 for TMP #48-20-43 in the R-2 Low Density Residential District:

Section 185-47 to permit 69 parking spaces, where 137 are required (a variance of 68 parking spaces).

The Upper Southampton Township Zoning Hearing Board denied the following zoning variance on May 23, 2016 for TMP #48-20-43 in the R-2 Low Density Residential District:

Section 185-22 to provide a 15-foot side yard along the western property line.

The Upper Southampton Township Zoning Hearing Board also denied the following zoning variances on May 23, 2016 for TMP #48-17-37 in the CC Controlled Commercial Zoning District:

Section 185-16 (Use 23)(a) to permit a 0.72 acre lot where five acres is required for nursing home.

Section 185-16 (Use 23)(b) to permit a lot area to accommodate 15 patients where a lot area to accommodate 136 patients is required (a variance of 121 patients or 242,000 square foot of lot area).

Section 185-22 to permit a lot width at the street line of 125 feet where 200 feet is required (a variance of 75 feet).

Section 185-22 to permit a front yard 70.8 feet where 125 feet is required (a variance of 54.2 feet).

Section 185-22 to permit a side yard of 0 feet where 20 feet is required (a variance of 20 feet).

Section 185-60B.(1) to permit no buffer yard and screen plantings between the R2 and CC zoning districts along the southern and eastern property lines of TMP #48-17-37 where a 50 foot buffer yard and screening are required.

Section 185-47 to permit 69 parking spaces, where 137 are required (a variance of 68 parking spaces).

Additionally, the applicant has submitted a simultaneous submission requesting a rezoning of TMP #48-17-37 from CC Controlled Commercial District to R-2 Low Density Residential district.

Present Use: TMP #48-20-43 and #48-17-37 are vacant and vegetated.
COMMENTS

1. **Concurrent rezoning application**—As noted, the applicant has submitted a simultaneous submission requesting a rezoning of TMP #48-17-37 from CC Controlled Commercial District to R-2 Low Density Residential District. The Bucks County Planning Commission (BCPC) comments regarding the proposed rezoning are in review correspondence BCPC #48-16-2(P), dated July 6, 2016. Since there has been no determination on the rezoning, this review will comment on the plans as submitted with two separate lots in two separate districts. The variances that were denied by the Upper Southampton Township Zoning Hearing Board reflect the shortcomings of the plans without consolidation and without rezoning of TMP #48-17-37 from CC to R-2. Contingent upon approval or disapproval of the rezoning, the plans will have to be revised and resubmitted with corrected area and bulk requirement charts as well as corrected lot configurations if consolidated. It should be noted that this review does not support or offer an opinion on the merits of the proposed rezoning application.

2. **Nursing home (Use 23)**—A Special exception was granted to permit the nursing home (Use 23) on TMP #48-20-43 in the R-2 Low Density Residential District. If the lot consolidation and rezoning are not granted, the plans will have to be submitted to display a new layout for the building and access drive that reflects the bulk and area requirements for the R-2 District.

3. **Access management**—The subdivision and land development ordinance (SALDO) Section 160-33.E notes that a development that is proposed on an existing arterial should consider reducing the number of access points on major streets. In addition, the Upper Southampton Township Comprehensive Plan Update (2010), Chapter 7, Transportation discusses Street Road, east of Second Street Pike as an area where there are frequent curb cuts and recommends consolidating access points to decrease conflict areas and increase safety. Both properties to the east and west of the subject site have existing drives close to the shared, common property lines creating an opportunity for shared access and reduction of curb cuts on Street Road. The township should consider requiring shared access when reviewing this land development.

4. **Natural resource restrictions**—The site is predominantly wooded and contains wetlands and areas of steep slopes. The submitted plan set does not display natural resources, such as steep slopes and woodlands. Zoning ordinance Section 185-20 defines and sets the permissible encroachment standards for each natural resource that is protected. The plans should be revised to document and show the full extent of the site’s natural resources and how compliance is achieved through a natural resource compliance chart.

Zoning ordinance Section 185-20.D.(6)(d)[1] notes a 100-foot required wetland margin measured from the outer limit of the delineated wetland boundary. No more than 20 percent of the wetland margin is to be altered, regraded, filled, piped, diverted, or built upon for wetland areas greater than ¼-acre located on lots of 5 acres or more. The plans display some areas where the wetland margin is impacted by proposed development. The plans should clarify the extent of impact to the wetland margin and if it complies with the ordinance requirement.
5. Trees on wooded lots
   a. The lot appears to be wooded and the site layout plan should indicate all trees which are to be saved, the tree protection zone boundary, and the method by which the protection will occur in accordance with zoning ordinance Section 185-20.E(2). The site plan should be revised accordingly.
   b. Zoning ordinance Section 185-20.E(3) requires a zoning permit for trees to be removed that are greater than 10 inches in caliper 4 feet above the grade. The township should ensure compliance with this requirement.

6. Replacement Trees—The planting section of the SALDO Section 160-51.L, M, N and O lists several requirements that need to be addressed. The requirements are noted below:
   - Section 160-51.L: removal of trees 20 inches or greater above the ground level are subject to regulation by the Shade Tree Commission.
   - Section 160-51.M: cutting or removal of a tree only by written permit from the Shade Tree Commission.
   - Section 160-51.N: all trees subject to the regulations that are proposed for removal or retention and those affected by grading shall be noted on the preliminary plans.
   - Section 160-51.O: each tree that is removed over the minimum size for which a permit is required shall be replaced and the replacement tree location and species shall be indicated on the preliminary plan.

The site is wooded and it appears that many trees will be removed. The plans do not indicate tree sizes, trees for removal and retention, and replacement tree locations. The plans should be updated with accurate information regarding tree removal and replacement.

7. Sidewalks—SALDO Section 160-42.A requires a minimum width of 6 feet for a combination sidewalk and curb along streets. The township should ensure that the sidewalk and curb combination along the Street Road frontage is at least 6 feet.

8. Grading—it appears that the top and bottom edges of some slopes associated with the bio-retention areas lie within 5 feet of the property line and right-of-way. SALDO Section 160-47.F requires 5 feet of clearance. The plans should be corrected accordingly.

9. 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 must be submitted for this proposed 98,298 gross-square-foot nursing home comprising 136 beds. We recommend that the planning module be submitted at the preliminary plan stage to coordinate land development review with the planning module review.
This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the July 6, 2016, 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.

JSI:jk

cc:    Columbia/Wegman Acquisition II, LLC
       G.L. Bowen Properties, LLC
       Michael Yanoff, Esq., Friedman Schuman
       John Anderson, Cornerstone Consulting Engineers & Architecture, Inc.
       Donald E. Williams, Esq., Township Solicitor
       Joe Golden, Township Manager (via email)
       Larry Young, P.E., TriState Engineers
MEMORANDUM

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

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Preliminary Plan of Land Development for Knowles Avenue Holdings, LLC
         TMP #48-12-120
         Applicant: Knowles Avenue Holdings, LLC
         Owner: Goldsteins’ Rosenberger’s Raphael-Sacks, Inc.
         Plan Dated: April 20, 2016
         Date Received: May 19, 2016

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 one 10,000 square foot contractor’s office building and one 10,000-square-foot warehouse building and 61 parking spaces. The 4.90-acre site is served by public water and sewerage facilities.

Location: On the south side of Knowles Avenue approximately 400 feet east of Jaymore Road.

Zoning: LI Limited Industrial District allows warehousing, contractor offices and other industrial type uses on a minimum of 2-acre lots.

Present Use: Vacant.

COMMENTS

1. Industrial uses: warehousing (Use 52) and contractors’ office (Use 55)—The use regulations for both warehousing and contractor’s office require that the provisions of the outside storage and display (Use 60) are complied with and met. The township should ensure that the Use 60 provisions that discuss the location, screening and area of an outdoor storage area are in compliance.
2. **Vehicular circulation and gravel area**—There is a large gravel area on the plan noted for contractor vehicles that is slightly graded to direct storm water surface flow into an inlet. It is uncertain of the exact activities that will take place on the gravel area. We recommend the township engineer determine if the area can sustain prolonged use by heavy equipment and/or storage of various materials. Ruts and furrows can form and impact drainage patterns as well as create erosion and maintenance issues, therefore the long term functioning of the gravel area should be evaluated.

The township should understand the number of vehicles, vehicle sizes and weights, and types of vehicles that the future user will be utilizing throughout the site and require a vehicular circulation pattern and turning movement diagram. This will help understand the overall operations and function of the gravel area, storage bins, parking, storing of materials, and the two proposed buildings.

3. **Adjacent use compatibility**—The plans display a 25-foot access easement that runs through an existing shared entrance drive and parking lot on the property to the north of the subject tract. The shared easement provides an alternate means for potential trucks and vehicles to access the proposed warehouse building in the rear of the property. The structure on the adjacent tract contains a child care use as well as office use. It appears the parking, drop-off, and pedestrian ingress and egress associated with the child care use is located on the opposite site of the access easement. The township should ensure that there is adequate separation between the two uses to avoid potential safety conflicts.

The gravel area is noted as 1.83 acres in size. Due to the large expanse of gravel, it appears that the storage bins can potentially be sited on the other side of the gravel area adjacent to the southern property line while maintaining space for vehicular maneuverability. By doing so, noise and truck movements can be separated and away from the building with the child care use.

4. **Natural resources**—The submitted plan set does not display natural resources, such as steep slopes and woodlands. Zoning ordinance Section 185-20 defines and sets the permissible encroachment standards for each natural resource that is required to be protected. It appears there may be some areas of steep slopes and woodlands on the site that need to be documented and displayed on the plan as well as a natural resource compliance chart.

5. **Trees on wooded lots**—The lot appears to be wooded and the site layout plan should indicate all trees which are to be saved, the tree protection zone boundary, and the method by which the protection will occur in accordance with Zoning ordinance Section 185-20.E(2). The site plan should be revised accordingly.

Zoning ordinance Section 185-20.E(3) requires a zoning permit for trees to be removed that are greater than 10 inches 4 feet above the grade. The township should ensure compliance with this requirement.

6. **Off-street parking**—Zoning ordinance Section 185-47 specifies the parking for Use 52 (warehousing) as requiring one off-street space for every 400 gross-square-foot area. The zoning table on Sheet C1.1, Record Site Plan notes one off-street parking space per 500 square
feet. The chart and plan and should be modified to reflect the correct square footage and number of required spaces.

7. **Off-street loading**—A storage warehouse exceeding 6,000 square feet is required to have at least one off-street loading space at the side or rear portion of the building per Zoning ordinance Section 185-50. The plan should be revised to indicate an off-street loading space that conforms to the design and layout requirements of the ordinance.

8. **Parking setback**—Subdivision and land development ordinance (SALDO) Section 160-41 requires a minimum of 20 feet of open space between the curb line of any parking area and the outside wall of a nonresidential (commercial or industrial) building. A lesser distance is permitted on the side and rear of the building if the building has a fire-suppression system and is approved by the Fire Marshal. The plan shows proposed parking within 20 feet of both buildings and should be revised accordingly.

9. **Street trees**—The landscape and lighting plan, Sheet C.6.0 displays five street trees along the frontage of Knowles Avenue. According to the landscape requirements chart, the total of five trees is based on 200 linear feet of frontage that does not include the driveway access widths. Street tree calculations typically are based on the total length of street frontage, therefore the street tree total would increase by two to seven total. In addition, if there are constraints along the frontage, such as underground utility lines or limited frontage due to the entry drives, SALDO Section 160-51.B states that the street trees can be planted in an informal arrangement. The township should determine the proper number of street trees needed to comply with the ordinance.

10. **Buffer strip**—There are several different land uses surrounding the subject tract that include office, child care, funeral home, retail warehouse, and a children’s dance school. The landscape requirements chart on Sheet C.6.0 notes that planting for the buffer strip is satisfied by the existing plant material along the property edges. The township should determine if buffer strips are necessary per SALDO Section 160-51.I and if the existing landscaping will satisfy that requirement following clearing and construction. Also, at a minimum, the township should consider adding buffer strip planting along the northern property boundary to screen the gravel storage area from the office and child care use.

11. **Replacement trees**—The planting section of SALDO (Section 160-51.L, M, N and O) lists several requirements noted below:

   - **Section 160-51.L:** removal of trees 20 inches or greater above the ground level are subject to regulation by the Shade Tree Commission.
   - **Section 160-51.M:** cutting or removal of a tree only by written permit from the Shade Tree Commission.
   - **Section 160-51.N:** all trees subject to the regulations that are proposed for removal or retention and those affected by grading shall be noted on the preliminary plans.
   - **Section 160-51.O:** each tree that is removed over the minimum size for which a permit is required shall be replaced and the replacement tree location and species shall be indicated on the preliminary plan.
The site is heavily wooded and it appears that many trees will be removed. The plans do not indicate tree sizes, trees for removal and retention, and replacement tree locations. The plans should be updated with accurate information regarding tree removal and replacement.

12. **Sidewalks**—SALDO Section 160-65.A requires sidewalks to be constructed on one side of all frontage streets. Sidewalks are located on the frontage across from the subject tract and on the adjacent property to the north. Existing sidewalk continues east along Knowles Avenue to 2nd Street Pike and links to several shopping centers. In order to provide safe pedestrian access, the plans should be revised to include sidewalk and driveway crossings and a sidewalk connection along the access drive into the site.

13. **Internal circulation, access, and loading**—The submitted plan should clearly demonstrate safe and compliant car and truck access ways, clearances, and turning radii to the satisfaction of the townships codes and ordinances.

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 20,000-square-foot office/warehouse land development. We recommend that the planning module be submitted at the preliminary plan stage to coordinate land development review with the planning module review.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the July 6, 2016, 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.

JSI:dc

cc: Frank Pellegrino, Knowles Avenue Holdings, LLC
Goldsteins’ Rosenberger’s Raphael-Sacks, Inc.
Robert Cunningham, P.E., Holmes Cunningham Engineering, LLC
Larry Young, P.E., TriState Engineers, Township Engineer
Joe Golden, Township Manager (via email)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Warwick Township Board of Supervisors
   Warwick Township Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Preliminary Plan of Subdivision for 1447 Almshouse Road
   TMP #51-6-8
   Applicant: Jamp Development LLC, c/o Matthew Piotrowski
   Owner: New Life Christian Center
   Plan Dated: May 20, 2016
   Date Received: May 31, 2016

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 2.31-acre parcel into three single-family detached residential lots. Lots 1 through 3 will be 27,286; 30,576; and 27,381 square feet, respectively. All lots are to be served by public water and sewer service.

Location: Northern side of Almshouse Road, approximately 300 feet northwest of its intersection with Meetinghouse Road.

Zoning: The RR Restricted Residential District permits single-family detached dwellings with a minimum lot area and lot width of 20,000 square feet and 100 feet, respectively, when served by public water and sewer supply. If not served by public water and sewer supply, the minimum lot area shall be 40,000 square feet.

Present Use: Vacant (gravel parking area).

COMMENTS

1. Tree protection—Tree Protection Note #2 on Drawing No. C1.1 of the plan submission states that all existing trees to be preserved should be protected with tree protection fencing that shall be installed at the dripline of protected trees unless conditions warrant the fence to be located within the limits of branching. Drawing No. C3.1 includes a Tree Protection
Fencing Detail, which contains a note indicating that the tree protection fencing shall “extend to dripline or as indicated on drawings.” Section 163-51.1.A(1) of the subdivision and land development ordinance (SALDO) states that grade changes and excavations shall not encroach upon the tree protection zone, which shall be established as a distance of 20 feet from the trunk of the tree, or the dripline, whichever is greater.

Any disturbance within the dripline of a tree is likely to cause injury or eventual death of the tree. Therefore, Tree Protection Note #2 and the Tree Protection Fencing Detail should be revised to be consistent with Section 163-51.1.

2. **Seepage pits**—For all lots, proposed seepage pits that collect stormwater from the downspouts are to be located in the front yards. Drawing No. C2.1 includes a Seepage Bed and Downspout Detail. Note #6 includes a notation on the proper operation and maintenance of these seepage pits. The township should consider whether operation and maintenance manuals should be provided to the lot owners, and that any turnover of the properties be subject to disclosure about the seepage pits and their ongoing maintenance responsibilities.

The seepage pits are located under a portion of the driveways and adjacent areas. In the event that a property owner wished to provide landscaping over or near the seepage pits, we recommend that the plan include a description of appropriate plantings (e.g., grass, perennials, or shrubs) for the limited portion of the seepage pits located along the edge of the driveways.

3. **Street tree location**—As shown on the Utility Plan (Drawing No. C2.0), proposed street trees on Lots 1 and 2 will be located approximately 3 to 4 feet from the proposed water lines. We generally recommend that street trees be planted a minimum of 10 feet from a utility line to avoid interference as the trees mature and allow space for any necessary utility line repair.

4. **Site triangle**—Section 163-35.D of the SALDO requires a clear-sight triangle to be provided at each point where a private driveway intersects a public street. Therefore, the plan should be revised to include a site triangle for each proposed driveway.

DAS:dc

cc: Jamp Development LLC, c/o Matthew Piotrowski
Robert Cunningham, P.E., Holmes Cunningham Engineering LLC
Michele Fountain, P.E., CKS Engineers, Inc., Township Engineer (via email)
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)
## Bucks County Planning Commission
### Planning Module Reviews
#### July 06, 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Development</th>
<th>BCPC Number</th>
<th>Tax Parcel Number</th>
<th>PaDEP Code Number</th>
<th>Plan Review Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bensalem Township</td>
<td>Indian River Transport</td>
<td>8592-C</td>
<td>2-30-11</td>
<td>1-09004-359-3J</td>
<td>0201-60015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bensalem Township</td>
<td>Edward's Court Subdivision</td>
<td>10395-C</td>
<td>2-33-58, -82 &amp; -82-1</td>
<td>1-09004-358-3J</td>
<td>0201-60018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warwick Township</td>
<td>Sailor</td>
<td>12017</td>
<td>51-1-7 &amp; -7-1</td>
<td>1-09951-196-3J</td>
<td>0201-60019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middletown Township</td>
<td>Alexander Elmwood Minor Subdivision</td>
<td>12098</td>
<td>22-8-150</td>
<td>1-09003-381-3J</td>
<td>0201-60024</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
June 3, 2016

John Hornick
Bohler Engineering
1600 Manor Drive, Suite 200
Chalfont, PA 18914

RE: Indian River Transport
PaDEP Code # 1-09004-359-3J
BCPC #8592-C
Bensalem Township, Bucks County

Dear Mr. Hornick:

We have received a copy of the planning module\(^1\) concerning the proposal to construct a 15,047-square-foot building expansion. The facility is to be used to clean the empty tanks of tanker trailers that are used to transport "food grade" liquid products. Wastewater flows (5,000 gallons per day or 20 EDUs of "wash water") will flow through a sewer lateral to the existing force main on-site.

The proposed revision is consistent with the *Bucks County, Pennsylvania, Sewage Facilities Plan, 1970*, as the proposal is within a public sewerage area. However, the submission has not included a copy of Component 3 Sewage Collection and Treatment Facilities and documentation confirming compliance with the state historic preservation act.

The County Planning Agency Review, Component 4B, is attached for inclusion with the planning module application to DEP. If the municipality approves the planning module and 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.

---

\(^1\) 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, Sewage 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.
Should you have any questions, please contact me.

Sincerely,

Michael A. Roedig
Senior Planner

MAR:dc

Attachment

cc: Eric Ponert, Philadelphia Water Department
    Genevie Kostick, BCDH
    Ron Gans, O’Donnell & Naccarato
    Loretta Alston, Bensalem Township Department of Building and Planning
    Elizabeth Mahoney, PaDEP
    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
Indian River Transport

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

1. Date plan received by county planning agency. April 12, 2016
2. Date plan received by planning agency with areawide jurisdiction
   Agency name
3. Date review completed by agency June 3, 2016

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 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?
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

☐ ☒ 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 N.A.

☐ ☒ 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: Senior Planner
   Signature: [Signature]
   Date: June 3, 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.
June 14, 2016

John Richardson  
Penns Park Corporate Office  
P.O. Box 487  
Penns Park, PA 18943

RE: Edward’s Court Subdivision  
PaDEP Code # 1-09004-358-3J  
BCPC #10395-C  
Bensalem Township, Bucks County

Dear Mr. Richardson:

We have received a copy of the planning module¹ concerning the proposal to subdivide 4.3281 acres into 9 single-family dwelling lots, ranging from 0.3009 to 0.4959 acres. Wastewater flows will increase by 1,500 gallons per day (for a total of 2,250 GPD or 9 EDUs) and will be collected and conveyed to the Northeast Philadelphia Water Pollution Control Plant via the Bucks County Water and Sewer Authority’s 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. However, Component 3. Sewage Collection does not include signatures authorizing collection and treatment capacity in Section G. Proposed Wastewater Disposal Facilities and Section J. Chapter 94 Consistency Determination. Documentation confirming compliance with the state historic preservation act, while indicated to be attached in the packet, has not been included in the copy of the planning module packet submitted to our office for review.

The County Planning Agency Review, Component 4B, is attached for inclusion with the planning module application to PaDEP. If the municipality approves the planning module and 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.

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
John Richardson  
June 14, 2016  
Page 2  

Should you have any questions, please contact me.

Sincerely,

Michael A. Raedig  
Senior Planner

MAR:dc

cc:    Eric Ponert, Philadelphia Water Department  
      Genevie Kostick, BCDH  
      Ron Gans, O'Donnell & Naccarato  
      Loretta Alston, Bensalem Township Department of Building and Planning  
      William Cmorey, Bensalem Township Manager  
      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**  
Edward's Court Subdivision

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

1. Date plan received by county planning agency. **May 6, 2015**
2. Date plan received by planning agency with areawide jurisdiction
   
   Agency name
3. Date review completed by agency **June 14, 2016**

### 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?
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 N/A</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: Michael Roedig
   Title: Senior Planner
   Signature: [Signature]
   Date: June 14, 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.
June 13, 2016

Kristin Holmes, Partner
Holmes Cunningham Engineering
350 E. Butler Avenue
Suite 106
New Britain, PA 18901

RE: Sailor Property Subdivision Planning Module
PaDEP Code #1-09951-196-3J
BCPC #12017
TMP #51-1-7 and -1-7-1
Warwick Township, Bucks County, PA

Dear Ms. Holmes:

We have received a copy of the planning module\(^1\) regarding the 7 lots (1 existing single-family dwelling unit and 6 new single-family dwellings) that are to be served by public water and sewer. The total sewerage flow from the proposed subdivision equals 1,890 gallons per day or 7 EDUs (equivalent dwelling units). The proposal will create an extension of the existing Warwick Township Sewer and Water Authority (WTWSA) collection system with flows conveyed through the East Branch Interceptor and ultimately treated in the Fish Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant, which is owned and operated by WTWSA.

The Act 537 Sewage Facilities Plan for Warwick Township (1995) is the official Act 537 Plan for this portion of Warwick Township. The Plan indicates that the site is located outside the area intended to be served by public sewer. The planning module’s alternative analysis indicates that traditional on-lot sewerage disposal (septic system) is not practical for a development with lots of this size. The analysis also indicates it would not be practical to construct a new individual package wastewater treatment facility because the proposed flow is so low, and an unnecessary financial burden would be placed on the municipality.

Since the property is outside the mapped Fish Creek WWTP sewer service area, the applicant identified other properties within the mapped area that have been purchased by Warwick Township since the adoption of the current Act 537 Plan Phase III, Part A (June 1996) and are used for open space. The applicant contends that since these open space parcels were originally planned for sewer services, a review of the zoning designation for open space parcels may be conducted to determine the number of EDUs that would be allocated and are not being used. Subsequently, an analysis was conducted for TMP #51-3-89-4 (owned by Warwick Township), which is zoned C3 Commercial/Multifamily Residential District and comprises 2,605 acres. Based upon their zoning

---

\(^1\)Under the revised Chapter 71 of the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection’s Title 25, Rules and Regulations, the planning module is a revision to the Warwick 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
analysis, this parcel would yield 9 lots (or 9 EDUs) utilizing Use B1A (Single-Family Semidetached) and B1B (Two-Family Detached) uses, which are both permitted in the C3 district. Since the proposed development requires 7 EDUs, the applicant concludes there is adequate allocation from TMP #51-3-89-4 to be used towards this development.

According to the project narrative, WTWSA has provided documentation showing the assignment of sewer allocation to this project will not adversely impact the properties currently in the planned sewer service area. However, the letter from the WTWSA dated March 30, 2016, states, “the Warwick Township Water and Sewer Authority (WTWSA) will provide public water service to the project currently known as Sailor Subdivision. WTWSA has the capacity and required pressure to accommodate the proposed subdivision.” While this may be a typographical error, it is unclear if public sewer service can be accommodated for the site.

If the information cited in project narrative concerning the allocation of EDUs and the alternative analysis is deemed feasible and appropriate, it would appear that the proposed facility may be a reasonable alternative. Township and DEP officials should determine if the alternative analysis is sufficient.

Additionally, we note that the applicant has not provided sufficient documentation to confirm that the project is consistent with DEP’s Technical Guidance, Implementation of the PA State History Code. Therefore, the planning module should provide the appropriate documentation.

If the municipality approves the planning module and 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 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,

[Signature]

David A. Sebastian
Senior Planner

DAS:dc

Attachment

cc: Genevie Kostick, BCDH
    Elizabeth Mahoney, PaDEP
    Gail Weniger, Township Manager, Warwick Township
    Act 537 file
    Warrington Township (Adjacent municipality)
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
Sailor Subdivision

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

1. Date plan received by county planning agency. **May 11, 2016**
2. Date plan received by planning agency with areawide jurisdiction
   Agency name
3. Date review completed by agency **June 13, 2016**

**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.)?
   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 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?

10. Does this proposal meet the zoning requirements of the ordinance? **N/A**
    If no, describe inconsistencies
Yes  No  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 attached 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?
   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: David A. Sebastian
   Title: Senior Planner
   Signature: [Signature]
   Date: June 13, 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.
June 3, 2016

Joseph Hamill
JF Hamill Land Surveying & Consulting LLC
3636 Hulmeville Road
Bensalem, PA 19020-4449

RE: Alexander Elmwood Minor Subdivision Planning Module
PaDEP Code #1-09003-381-3J
BCPC #12098
TMP #22-008-150
Middletown Township, Bucks County, PA

Dear Mr. Hamill:

We have received a copy of the planning module regarding the proposed connection of a single family residence (1 EDU or 250 gallons per day) to the existing Bucks County Water and Sewer Authority (BCWSA) sanitary sewer system. Wastewater will be conveyed by the BCWSA system to the Neshaminy Interceptor and treated at the Philadelphia Water Department’s (PWD) Northeast Philadelphia Water Pollution Control Plant.

The Bucks County, Pennsylvania, Sewerage Facilities Plan (1970) is the official Act 537 Plan for Middletown Township. An update to the Township’s Act 537 Plan was submitted to our office for review in early 2016. The plan indicates public sewer facilities for the site, and therefore, the proposal to connect to public sewers is consistent with the official Act 537 Plan and update.

The BCWSA certifies that it has sanitary sewer collection capacity. The project is included in the BCWSA Neshaminy Interceptor Corrective Action Plan and Connection Management Plan with flow release in 2016. The PWD certifies there is adequate capacity within the City of Philadelphia’s conveyance and treatment facilities to receive and treat the sewage flows. The additional waste load will not create a hydraulic or organic overload or a five-year protected overload.

Sufficient documentation confirming compliance with the state historic preservation act is indicated to be attached in the packet. However, only a copy of the “Project Review Form,” as submitted to the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission, has been included in the packet sent to our office.

---

1 Under the revised Chapter 71 of the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection’s (PaDEP) Title 25, Rules and Regulations, this planning module is a revision to the Bucks County, Pennsylvania, Sewerage Facilities Plan. Therefore, the Bucks County Department of Health (BCHD) and Bucks County Planning Commission (BCPC) 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 3 and 4; transmittal letter; plans; narrative; copies of the BCHD and BCPC review letters) should be sent to Elizabeth Mahoney, Sewage Planning 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,

Cathy Gauthier
Planner

CIG:dc

Attachment

cc:   Eric Ponert, PWD
      Genevie Kostick, BCHD
      Elizabeth Mahoney, PADEP
      Larry Young, PE, TriState Engineers, Township Engineer
      Stephanie Teloi Kuhls, 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
Alexander Elmwood Minor Subdivision

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

1. Date plan received by county planning agency. June 1, 2016
2. Date plan received by planning agency with areawide jurisdiction
   Agency name
3. Date review completed by agency. June 3, 2016

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.)?
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?
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>X</td>
<td>11. Have all applicable zoning approvals been obtained? N/A</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>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>16. Has a waiver of the sewage facilities planning requirements been requested for the residual tract of this subdivision?</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></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>18. Name, Title and signature of person completing this section:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Name: Cathy Gauthier</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|     |    | Title: Planner Signature: [Signature]
|     |    | Date: June 3, 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.
AGENDA

1. Call to Order

2. Pledge of Allegiance

3. Approval of Minutes of July 6, 2016

4. Executive Director’s Report – Written Report is enclosed

5. Staff Presentation: Butler Avenue Main Street Study
   Planner, Matt Walters

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. 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, JUNE 1, 2016**
   Upon motion of Mr. Stone, seconded by Mr. Pellegrino, with the vote being 6-0 the motion carried to approve the minutes of the June 1, 2016, meeting as presented.

4. **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR’S REPORT**
The Executive Director’s Report was submitted to the board with the packet prior to the meeting.

Mr. Brahler began his presentation by telling us that every two years the DVRPC Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) updates their list of projects. The TIP list is a regionally agreed upon prioritized list of all federally funded transportation projects, non-federally funded significant projects and state funded capital projects. Mr. Brahler said that five counties (Bucks, Montgomery, Chester, Delaware and Philadelphia), along with PennDOT, decide on the projects. The process takes approximately eight to ten months.

Mr. Brahler stated that TIP is a requirement of the Fixing America’s Surface Transportation Act (FAST Act). The current list contains approximately 370 projects within the five counties with over $5.3 billion in funding for the projects over the next four years. Those projects include about $2.5 billion for the highway systems and about $2.8 billion for projects involving public transportation. Of the $5.3 billion, Bucks County is slated to receive over $335 million over the course of the next four years. Those funds are directed towards 51 projects in Bucks County.

Mr. Brahler said that of the 51 projects about $200 million will be going to two large projects: I-95/PA Turnpike Interchange and US Route 1 bridges and expansion.

Mr. Brahler said that one of the smaller scale projects will be the Portzer Road/Old Bethlehem Pike intersection in the townships of Milford and Richland. The funds earmarked for this project will be used to install a roundabout alleviating the alignment and congestion issues.
Mr. Brahler also told us that the Levittown Train Station will be leveled and rebuilt. The layout will be completely different so that the road will not be going through the station. There will be parking improvements, stormwater improvements, high level platforms, cover from the weather, a bridge from one side to the other and all will be ADA compliant.

Mr. Brahler told us of the Langhorne Yardley Road improvements to begin at its intersection with Woodbourne Road and at Bridgetown Pike. They will be receiving additional funds which will alleviate some of the congestion at these two intersections. This project will be approximately $5 million.

Mr. Brahler said that the Oxford Valley Road/Lincoln Highway intersection realignment project that has been on the drawing board for a while, will be beginning. The project will cost approximately $10 million.

Mr. Brahler informed us that there are 21 bridges on the TIP list for improvements. Mr. Brahler said that because Bucks County does such a good job maintaining our bridges only 5 of the slated bridges for repair are county owned.

Mr. Brahler stated that he has only highlighted a few of the many projects that will be going on. To get a more detailed view, access to the list and detailed information is on the DVRPC website with interactive maps and project color coding.

Mr. Brahler informed us that the TIP projects are to be approved at the next DVRPC Board meeting on July 28, 2016. From there the approved list goes to the PA Department of Transportation and then to the Federal Highway Administration for final approval. The approved TIP should take effect on October 1, 2016.

Mr. Brahler opened the floor to questions. Mr. Goodnoe wanted to know if the TIP project funding correlated to the new $5 car registration fee. Mr. Brahler replied that it did not. The funds received from the $5 registration fee are county funds that will be specifically designated by the county commissioners. Mr. Kisselback asked if Bucks County was in competition with other counties for the TIP funds. Mr. Brahler replied yes and no, the counties are not in competition but the projects are in competition. The funding is not like a grant program. Mr. Pellegrino asked how the work on the projects is initiated. Mr. Brahler said that once a project manager is assigned, the work begins. Mr. Kisselback questioned how a project is identified. Mr. Brahler stated that projects come in from all different avenues and that even individual municipalities can bring a project to light. Mr. Stone asked what level of documentation would be needed to bring in a project. Mr. Brahler replied that it will be easier to find funding for the project if the municipality has all their information together, such as traffic studies, concept design, etc. Mr. Wydro asked if there are priority projects associated with the list and if there are timelines for the projects. Mr. Brahler replied that there isn’t a priority associated with the list. The timelines associated with the projects are individually detailed and usually associated with the acquisition of permits.

6. **ACT 247 REVIEWS**

The reviews of July 6, 2016, were mailed to the board for their review prior to the meeting. Upon motion of Mr. Stone, seconded by Mr. Goodnoe, the motion carried to approve the July 6, 2016 Act 247 reviews.
7. **OLD BUSINESS**  
   There was no old business.

8. **NEW BUSINESS**  
   There was no new business.

9. **PUBLIC COMMENT**  
   There was no public comment.

10. **ADJOURNMENT**  
    Mr. Wydro adjourned the meeting at 2:20 PM.

Submitted by:  
Debra Canale, Staff Secretary
I-95-Turnpike Connection and Impact on Bucks County – We secured a grant to study the potential effect of this road improvement. I did some brainstorming on this with people inside and outside the County. We feel that we need a good understanding of what the potential can be for Lower Bucks County, and we need some expertise from an economic perspective on what types of activities may be attracted to a new interchange area.

Middletown Township Intersection improvements – We met with Middletown officials on improvements to Langhorne-Yardley Road and Woodbourne Road. As we discussed, they need to take a sliver of land from Core Creek Park in order to create the correct alignment for Woodbourne Road. There is a process for this, which will take about a year, because the park land was purchased with federal funds which requires approval from all levels of government. We will provide a few more details on the nature of the land required and the required replacement land.

Grange Fair – Staff is gearing up for the annual Grange Fair, where we have several displays in the County tent.

Household Hazardous Waste Collection Events – We held our largest event of the season on one of the hottest days of the summer last Saturday, July 23. More than 1000 cars dropped off hazardous waste.

Hazard Mitigation Plan – The update of our PEMA-mandated hazard Mitigation Plan is in draft form and will be ready for consideration by the Commissioners in August. We will present this to the BCPC board before final adoption.

CCAP Planning Directors – I attend the Planning Directors of Pennsylvania a few times a year and will attend on Friday where they are discussing statewide initiatives by PennDOT and state regulations and how they affect economic development efforts.

County Commissioners Association of Pennsylvania Annual Meeting – I will be attending the annual meeting on behalf of the County Commissioners, as well as attending the Land Use and Environment Committee.
BCPC Activity Report

Community Planning and Municipal Economic Development Initiative

The Planning Commission staff helps townships and boroughs in several ways: we attend local planning commissioner meetings to provide advice and guidance, and we prepare plans and ordinances in cooperation with local representatives. We are in our fourth year of providing municipal assistance through the Municipal Economic Development Initiative (MEDI), and several of the activities below are in that category and are so noted.

We attended the Sellersville Borough Planning Commission, Dublin Borough Planning Commission, and the Hilltown Township Planning Commission meetings.

Preparing Plans – The Borough Planning Commission continued their review of the final draft of the New Britain Borough Main Street Plan (part of our MEDI program). Staff is assessing what additional desktop publishing changes could be made to the final draft.

We are preparing the complete draft of the Cross Keys Land Use and Transportation Plan and hope to finish the draft in August.

Preparing Ordinances – We continued an assessment of changes needed to the Newtown Area Joint Zoning Ordinance related to Planned Residential Development use requirements and definitions and requirements associated with water and sewer facilities.

Trails Program – We met with the Plumstead Township Board of Supervisors and Park and Recreation Committee to discuss the proposed trails to be included in the township’s trail master plan.

The County has also contracted with Michael Baker International for the design and engineering of the Upper Southampton Township portion of the Newtown Rail Trail.

In addition to special studies and plans, we continue to prepare, under contract, Comprehensive Plans for Northampton Township, Lower Makefield Township, and Hilltown Township.

We met with Warrington Township to discuss the upcoming comprehensive plan effort, conservation zoning, open space, and potential rezoning. Staff began preparing revisions to comprehensive plan chapters.

The Warminster Township Economic Development Committee met to discuss responses from the business survey.

The Staff continued to work on the Richboro Village Master Plan MEDI project. Revised designs for public space and roundabout landscaping were produced. GIS staff is also currently developing mapping of key village locations and photographic simulations of opportunity areas.
Providing Planning Information and Coordinating with other Agencies

The planning commission staff provides information and assistance to the many people who call us for help. This includes topics such as demographic and socioeconomic data, development proposals, BCPC reports, local zoning, and municipal regulations. Some of this work results from our mandated functions (reviewing proposed developments and reviewing various permit applications), some from other groups that need information, and some from residents who need guidance. Staff continued review of the DVRPC’s draft 2013 employee estimates as a precursor to the draft 2045 employee forecasts.

Act 247 and 537 Review Activity

14 Subdivision and Land Development Proposal
0 Sketch Plans
7 Municipal Plans and Ordinances
3 Sewage Facility Planning Modules
2 Traffic Impact Studies

Transportation

BCPC Transportation Planning staff is responsible for working with PennDOT, DVRPC, SEPTA, TMA Bucks, and other groups to ensure that our transportation and funding needs are addressed. We also keep up with the various PennDOT funding avenues and grant programs. This month, we coordinated with Quakertown Borough for the Multimodal Transportation Funding Program and attended a meeting with DVRPC to discuss the Transportation Community and Development Initiative.

We participate in the development of the regional Transportation Improvement Program. This month, we responded to public comments related to the draft TIP and met with Middletown Township officials to discuss the Langhorne-Yardley Road/Woodbourne Road Improvement Project.

Geographic Information Systems (GIS)

GIS has become a central function in Bucks County government, with our GIS staff providing the overall management for a system that involves not only BCPC but also Emergency Communications and 9-1-1, Board of Assessment, Health Departments, and others. We help to keep the county tax map parcel records and road centerlines updated.

The GIS data is increasingly used by people outside the county, either through our very popular public viewer, or through our GIS Consortium of municipalities.

Updates of GIS data are provided to our Consortium members by request. This month the townships of Lower Makefield and Warminster, as well as Chalfont Borough, were provided an update of their GIS data. County GIS is still developing a GIS Open Data Portal web site that when completed members will be able to access their municipal data sets for both downloading and mapping.

The Southeastern Pennsylvania Shared Services GIS project is a collaborative effort of the counties of Bucks, Berks, Chester, Delaware, Montgomery, and the City of Philadelphia. The group meets monthly and is developing a cloud hosted infrastructure to support a centralized and shared regional GIS database. Our July meeting was held at the Chester County Government Services Center in West Chester PA. Montgomery County will be hosting the August meeting at the Emergency Management Training Center Complex in Conshohocken PA.
Robert E. Moore

Posted: Wednesday, July 27, 2016 11:33 am

Robert E. Moore of Doylestown, Pa. passed away Tuesday, July 19, 2016. He was 73.

Born in Philadelphia, Robert was the son of the late Elizabeth Harman and Robert Earl Moore.

He was preceded in death by his loving wife of 45 years, Judith A. Moore.

Robert is survived by his sister, Roberta Pauza (Robert) of Brigantine, N.J.; sisters-in-law, Susan Ducharme (Gerald) of Naples, N.Y. and Betty Brick (Edgar) of Newtown, Pa.; and brother-in-law, Tom Tillson (Mina) of Kimberling City, Mo. as well as many nieces and nephews.

Robert joined the U.S. Air Force in 1961 and was sent to Indiana University to learn Russian. His job with the Air Force involved intercepting communications from Russian aircraft in the Soviet Air Force. After serving his country, Robert earned Bachelor's and Master's degrees in Geography from Temple University. He then began his career with the Bucks County Planning Commission, where he worked for 29 years, serving as Executive Director for more than 20 years.

Under Robert's direction, the Bucks County Planning Commission received many professional awards, such as: State of Pennsylvania Award from Governor Richard Thornburgh (1981), the National Award for Design Excellence (1981), Neographics Gold Award (1986), American Planning Association's National Planning Award (1992), the Achievement Award Excellence in Architecture and Design from the Central Bucks Chamber of Commerce (1992), Pennsylvania Planning Association's Education Award (1995), the Outstanding Planning Award (1996 & 1997) and the American Society of Landscape Architects Merit Award.

In recognition of Robert's contributions to the county, the Board of County Commissioners proclaimed Thursday, May 20, 1999 as 'Robert E. Moore Day' throughout Bucks County.
Following Robert's career with Bucks County, he served as District Administrator for Pennsylvania State Senator Joe Conti. In addition, Robert was an adjunct professor at Bucks County Community College, where he lectured classes in State and National Political Science, World Geography and American Geography.

Bob was known for his sense of humor and 'telling it like it is.' His greatest joy was traveling with his wife Judy. They especially liked taking cruises; particularly river cruises throughout the United States. Bob also was fond of cooking and 'talking to anyone who will listen.' For the past several years, Bob, along with Judy, volunteered at the Doylestown Hospital. He worked at the Lobby Information Desk and would tell everyone he loved that job because he got to 'tell people where to go.' Bob and Judy were named Volunteers of the Month in May 2014.

A celebration of life in honor of both Judy and Bob will be held Saturday, July 30th at the Westwyk Community Center. Please join us anytime between 4 and 6 p.m. to share stories and remember the lives of two wonderful people. In lieu of flowers, memorial gifts can be made to the Doylestown Hospital online at Giving Opportunities (www.doylestownhealth.org/giving-opportunities) or at Doylestown Health Foundation, 595 West State Street, Doylestown, PA 18901.
<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>1-16-ASA2</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors</td>
<td></td>
<td>Agricultural Security Area: Renewal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bensalem Township</td>
<td>2-16-2R1</td>
<td>Township Council</td>
<td></td>
<td>Zoning Ordinance Amendment: Monument Display Overlay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Southampton Township</td>
<td>21-16-1</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors</td>
<td></td>
<td>Zoning Ordinance Amendment: Establishment of New Uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Britain Township</td>
<td>26-16-CP1R</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors</td>
<td></td>
<td>Comprehensive Plan Update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Britain Township</td>
<td>26-16-CR1</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors</td>
<td>(26-1-49)</td>
<td>Institutional Land Development: 483 Square-feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penndel Borough</td>
<td>32-16-1</td>
<td>Borough Council</td>
<td></td>
<td>Zoning Ordinance Amendment: Establishment of New Uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warminster Township</td>
<td>49-16-1</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors</td>
<td></td>
<td>Zoning Ordinance Amendment: Establishment of New Uses and Various Other Requirements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEMORANDUM

TO: Bedminster Township Board of Supervisors
   Bedminster Township Planning Commission

FROM: Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Request for Seven Year Renewal of the Agricultural Security Area

Received: June 30, 2016
Hearing Date: August 12, 2016

In accordance with the provisions of Act 43 of 1981, the Agricultural Security Act as amended, this proposal has been sent to the Bucks County Planning Commission for review. The review that follows was prepared by the staff and endorsed by the Bucks County Planning Commission at a meeting held on August 3, 2016.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Requested Action: Renew the Agricultural Security Area (ASA) of Bedminster Township. Act 43 of the Agricultural Security Area Law requires that municipal ASAs be reviewed and renewed every seven (7) years.

COMMENTS

Bedminster Township last renewed its Agricultural Security Area (ASA) in 2009. Since that time, additional properties have been added. Several properties from the surrounding municipalities of Dublin Borough, and East Rockhill and Haycock townships are also included in the ASA, which totals a little more than 5,900 acres.

Act 43 of the Agricultural Security Area Law requires that a parcel within an ASA contain at least 50 percent soils classified in the Natural Resources Conservation Service’s land capability classification as Class I through IV. A parcel should also contain 10 acres or more, or have an anticipated yearly gross income of at least $2,000 from the agricultural production of crops, livestock and livestock products. Participating farmers are entitled to special consideration from local and state government agencies and other nuisance challenges, thus encouraging the continuing use of land for productive agricultural purposes.
Nearly all land contained in Bedminster is comprised of Class I through IV soils\(^1\) based upon the Natural Resources Conservation Services land capability classification. Our office had previously reviewed parcels proposed for inclusion in the township’s ASA and found that they met the ASA requirements.

We commend Bedminster Township for undertaking a thorough review of its ASA to ensure an accurate listing of parcels. We note that Act 43 requires that 30 days before the commencement of the seven year review, notice of the review shall be published in a newspaper and posted in five places (within, adjacent to, or near the ASA area), as well as be provided in writing to all persons owning land currently designated in the ASA. Therefore, prior to renewing the ASA, we recommend that township officials ensure such requirements were fulfilled.

We would appreciate being notified of the Board of Supervisors’ decision regarding this matter.

CIG:dc

c: Richard Schilling, Township Manager  
Patricia McVaugh, Township Secretary  
Peter Nelson, Grim, Biehn & Thatcher, Solicitor  
Richard Harvey, Bucks County Agricultural Land Preservation Program

---

\(^1\) A system of grouping soils primarily on the basis of their capability to produce common cultivated crops and pasture plants without deteriorating over a long period of time.
MEMORANDUM

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

FROM: Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Proposal to Amend Zoning Ordinance—Monument Display Overlay
         Applicant: Bensalem Township Mayor and Council
         Received: July 1, 2016
         Hearing Date: July 25, 2016

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 August 3, 2016.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposed Action: Amend Article I, Section 232-6 of the Bensalem Township Zoning Ordinance, by adding definitions for “monument display” and “visual communication technology.” Amend Article VI “Overlays” of the Bensalem Township Zoning Ordinance by adding “Division 5: Monument Display Overlay.”

Proposed Provisions: The amendment permits “monument displays” in the H-C1 Highway Commercial District, L-I Light Industrial District, BP Business and Professional District, G-C General Commercial District, and IN Institutional District. Monument displays, which may include on-premises or off-premises commercial advertising, must be located and primarily directed toward vehicular traffic on U.S. Route 1 or Street Road. Other ordinance provisions include standards for maximum active area, setbacks, maximum height, illumination, automatic changeable message or copy, operation and maintenance, landscaping, architectural requirements, and permit application procedure.

This submission is a second revision of BCPC #2-16-2. This second revision includes the following further changes:

- Available time for municipal, civic, and emergency messaging shall constitute a minimum of one full slot of advertising to be displayed every two minutes. The previous version (BCPC #2-16-R) used a standard of 25 percent of the available messaging time.
- Monument display maximum height shall be 40 feet (20 feet in the previous version) from grade to the highest point of the structure.
• No monument display shall be located within 500 feet of a static billboard or within 1,000 feet of a digital billboard or another monument display. The previous version included static billboards in the 1,000-foot prohibited distance.

• A traffic impact study is required to analyze the impact of the monument display on traffic, including a signed and sealed certification form a traffic engineer that the display will not interfere with sight lines and is in compliance with PennDOT standards.

• The residential districts that monument displays are required to have a minimum setback of 250 feet from are identified.

• Lighting from the message module shall not exceed 0.3 foot-candles over the ambient light, as measured from the sign’s face. This standard has been simplified to allow equivalent measurement, regardless of time of day or light conditions.

• “Lighting inspector” has been changed to “lighting engineer.”

• Monument displays shall not change message or copy on the active area more than once every 8 seconds (12 seconds in the previous version).

• Monument displays within 300 feet of a residential use or a residential district shall be turned off between 12 am and 6 am. The previous version required monument displays viewed from Street Road to be turned off between 11:30 pm and 6 am. Monument displays more 300 feet from a residential use or a residential district may operate 24 hours per day. The previous version required monument displays viewed from Route 1 to be allowed to operate 24 hours per day.

COMMENTS

Editorial—Section 232-349(a)8.d states “Lighting form the message module shall not exceed three-tenths (0.3) foot-candles over the ambient light, as measured form the sign’s face.” Both instances of “form” should be changed to “from.”

Section 232-349(a10.a.ii. states “If the monument display is three hundred (300) or more of a residential use or a residential district, the monument display may be operated 24 hours per day.” The word “feet” should be added after “(300)” and the word “from” should replace “of.”

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

We would appreciate being notified of Township 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.

MAR:dc

cc: Lauren Gallagher, Esq., Rudolph, Clarke, ILLC, Municipal Solicitor
Ron Gans, O’Donnell & Naccarato, Township Solicitor
William Cmorey, Township Manager (via email)
CONFIDENTIAL — NOT FOR RELEASE

August 3, 2016
BCPC #21-16-1

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—Establishment of New Uses
         Applicant: Board of Supervisors
         Received: June 17, 2016
         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 August 3, 2016.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposed Action: Amend the zoning ordinance to establish new use classifications relating to medical marijuana dispensary uses, medical marijuana grower/processor uses, sober living facilities, alternative therapy providers, and massage therapy centers and amend regulations relating to smoke shops/smoking parlors. The ordinance will provide new definitions and standards for the new uses.

Proposed Zoning Provisions:

Proposed Use 22A, Alternative Therapy Provider, would be permitted as a special exception in the C-1 Light Commercial District and the C-2 Heavy Commercial District. The special exception criteria include, and are not limited to:

- All therapists must be licensed.
- Treatment rooms shall be a minimum of 50 square feet floor area.
- Operations from 7am-10pm.
- No person under the age of 18 may enter.
- No eating or drinking on premises.
Proposed Use 22B, Massage Therapy Center, would be permitted as a special exception in the C-1 Light Commercial District and the C-2 Heavy Commercial District. The special exception criteria include, and are not limited to:

- All therapists must be licensed.
- Treatment rooms shall be a minimum of 50 square feet floor area.
- Operations from 7am-10pm.
- No person under the age of 18 may enter.
- No eating or drinking on premises.

The hookah bar/lounge use would be included under Use 46, smoke shop/smoking parlor and permitted as a special exception in the C-1 Light Commercial District and the C-2 Heavy Commercial District. The special exception criteria include:

- Operating hour closed 2am-11am, provided that operations of any smoking parlor located within 300 feet of a residential property must cease operations between 11pm-10am.
- No discernable noise or vibration beyond property line.
- No alcoholic beverages served or consumed on premises.
- Planted buffer, fence or sound barrier when located within 300 feet of a residential property.

Proposed Use 47A, Medical Marijuana Dispensary, would be permitted as a special exception in the C-2 Heavy Commercial District. The special exception criteria include, and are not limited to:

- Operate in compliance with Department of Health regulations and maintain valid proof of registration.
- One acre minimum lot size.
- Setback 1,000 feet from a residentially zoned property or parcels containing a public, private, or parochial school, day-care center, place of worship, public park, or community center.
- Setback 2,500 feet from another dispensary or a medical marijuana grower/processor.
- Operate entirely within an indoor, enclosed, and secure facility with limited hours from 9am-9pm.
- No emission of dust, odors, vapors, or fumes.
- No use of medical marijuana permitted on the premises.
- Minimum facility size shall be 2,000 gross square feet in total floor area.
- Maintain monitored security staff 24 hours a day and 7 days a week.

Proposed Use 47B, Medical Marijuana Grower/Processor, would be permitted as a conditional use in the I Industrial District. The conditional criteria include, and are not limited to:

- Operate in compliance with Department of Health regulations and maintain valid proof of registration.
- Two acre minimum lot size.
- Setback 1,000 feet from parcels containing a public, private, or parochial school, and day-care center.
- Setback 2,500 feet from another grower/processor or a medical marijuana dispensary.
• Operate entirely within an indoor, enclosed, and secure facility with limited hours from 9am-9pm.
• No emission of dust, odors, vapors, or fumes.
• No retail sales or use of medical marijuana permitted on the premises.
• Maintain monitored security staff 24 hours a day and 7 days a week.

Use 3A, Sober Living Facility, shall only be located in a detached dwelling and permitted as a special exception in R-4 Residential District, C-1 Light Commercial District, and the C-2 Heavy Commercial District.

Specific off-street parking requirements would be added for these new uses.

Existing Zoning Provisions:

Use 46, Smoke Shop/Smoking Parlor is defined as a retail facility offering limited sales of tobacco, tobacco products, and other smoking accessories, and/or offering private areas for the consumption of tobacco or tobacco products on site.

Use 44, Limited Personal Service is defined as a retail facility offering massages, psychic readings, body piercing, branding or tattooing of persons, and similar uses. The following requirements shall be met:

a) The service must be performed in sanitary conditions and in compliance with all federal, state and local regulations, rules and laws regulating such practices.

b) The place of service shall be a minimum of 1,000 feet from the nearest public or private school.

c) The limited personal service provider shall display notices as required by Pennsylvania law regarding the necessity of parental consent before any procedure is performed on a minor.

COMMENTS

Many of the zoning provisions proposed will be required to comply with the Fair Housing laws and Americans with Disabilities Act, the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act and FDA regulations, and the State’s Medical Marijuana Act as well as with the PA Municipalities Planning Code. Therefore, we are relying on the township to ensure that the proposed regulations are consistent with these laws and any other applicable laws prior to enactment. We offer the following comments for township officials to consider:

1. **Medical marijuana uses**—Chapter 8 Dispensaries, Section 802(a)(3) of the Medical Marijuana Act requires that a dispensary not be located within 1,000 feet of a property line of a public, private or parochial school or day-care center. There are no similar setback requirements for a grower/processor within the Medical Marijuana Act.

In addition to the setbacks from public, private, or parochial schools and day-cares, the proposed ordinance amendment requires that a dispensary not be located within 1,000 feet from residentially zoned property, place of worship, public park, or a community center. The additional setback requirement from all residentially zoned property may have a limiting impact on locating a dispensary within the existing C-2 District within the township. The C-2 District is predominately located on both sides of Street Road and both sides of Bustleton Pike south of the intersection with Street Road. Residentially zoned properties border both
sides of the C-2 District along Street Road and Bustleton Pike, thereby creating limited area where a dispensary can be located.

2. **Sober Living Facility**—The proposed Sober Living Facility is to be permitted as a special exception in the R-4, C-1, and C-2 districts in a detached dwelling with associated parking requirements. The Pennsylvania legislature is considering three bills to require certification of recovery house and establish state requirements for the use. We recommend that the township be aware of the progress of the bills and consider amending the zoning ordinance to be consistent with any standards from any pertinent future legislation.

   a. **Reference to Fair Housing Act**—We recommend that a community not regulate housing or living arrangements for people with disabilities, or protected classes, any differently than that required for other housing. This stems from our understanding and concerns about imposing more strict regulations on the protected classes defined by the Fair housing Act.

   We are unsure why Sober Living Facility has a threshold of five or more individuals. This threshold may be based on the proposed definition of family retaining the limitation of “...a group of not more than five persons...” It is possible that fewer than five people could reside in a recovery house, halfway house, or sober living facility.

   To clarify what is intended by the term ‘sober living facility’, and prevent misinterpretation, we recommend that the following reference to the Fair Housing Act be added to the end of the definition: “… This term does not include roomers, boarders, lodgers, members of a family [except those protected as suffering from a “handicap” under the provisions of Sections 3602(h) and 3604 of the Fair Housing Act] or any use otherwise defined, described or regulated in this Ordinance.”

3. **Massage therapy definition and Use 44, Limited Personal Service**—The limited personal service use under the retail and service uses category is defined as a retail facility offering massages, psychic readings, body piercing, branding or tattooing of persons, and similar uses. The offering of retail massages may be in conflict with the new use definition of massage therapy. In addition, there is a list of criteria that is associated with a massage therapy center that does not apply to Use 44. The township may wish to modify the Use 44 definition so that there is no misinterpretation on the retail service of a massage and the distinction between Use 22B, massage therapy center and Use 44, limited personal service is clear.

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.

**JSI:dc**

cc: Michael Savona, Esq., Eastburn and Gray, Township Solicitor  
    John McMenamin, Township Manager (via email)
MEMORANDUM

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

FROM: Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Proposal for Comprehensive Plan Update
Applicant: Board of Supervisors
Received: July 11, 2016
Hearing Date: To be scheduled

In accordance with the provisions of Sections 301.3 and 302 of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, this proposal has been sent to the Bucks County Planning Commission for review. The review which follows was prepared by the staff and endorsed by the Bucks County Planning Commission at a meeting held on August 3, 2016.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposed Action: Adopt an Update to the 2005 New Britain Township Comprehensive Plan. This submission is a revised draft of a plan that was previously reviewed by the Bucks County Planning Commission on June 1, 2016.

COMMENTS

We reviewed the revised plan and have no additional comments. We believe that the township should adopt the plan since it is consistent with the comprehensive plan preparation requirements of Section 301 of the PA Municipalities Planning Code. Several of our previous comments have been addressed. Other previous comments could be addressed through further study after the adoption of the plan.

We would appreciate being notified of the decision of the board of supervisors regarding this matter. If the plan is adopted, please send us a copy within 30 days as required by Section 306(b) of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Code.

JSI:dc

cc: Peter Nelson, Esq., Grim, Biehn & Thatcher, Township Solicitor
Eileen Bradley, Township Manager (via email)
Devan Ambron, Township Zoning Officer (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 for Veteran’s Park
TMP #26-1-49
Applicant: New Britain Township
Owner: County of Bucks
Plan Dated: April 22, 2016
Last Revised: June 1, 2016
Date Received: June 29, 2016

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 August 3, 2016.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposal: Construct new park improvements on a portion of a 31.45-acre tract. Improvements and amenities include a gazebo, tot lot, fifteen parking spaces, and a 6-foot-wide bituminous trail. Water and sewer not proposed.

Location: Western corner of intersection of New Galena and Walter roads, approximately 345 feet east of the intersection of Crescent Drive and Walter Road.

Zoning: CR Conservation and Recreation District permits Use E1, public recreation facility on a 2-acre minimum lot size.

The New Britain Township Zoning Hearing Board granted the following variances on June 16, 2016:

Section 302.L1.b.1 & 27-402.b to allow a non-residential accessory gazebo structure to have a front yard setback less than the minimum required front yard setback of 100 feet.
Section 27-2400.c to alter, regrade, fill, and build upon 1,492 square feet of floodplain (alluvial) soils, where such disturbance is prohibited except as permitted by the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection.

Present Use: Park, recreation, agriculture, and protected open space.

COMMENTS

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

   - **Section 22-403 & 404**
     From preliminary plan submission and review procedure and final plan submission and review to allow the application to be processed as a “waiver of land development.”

   - **Section 22-700.1.**
     From providing strict compliance with the township’s design standards and allow the improvements to be installed in accordance with generally accepted engineering practices and applicable guidelines.

   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. **Consistency with the Bucks County Comprehensive Plan**—The proposed improvements are consistent with the *Bucks County Comprehensive Plan* (2011) to create trails and points of interest within the county as referenced in Chapter IV, Principle 2: Preserve and Expand Parks, Open Space, and Agricultural resources.

3. **Consistency with New Britain Township Comprehensive Plan**—The township is currently updating its comprehensive plan that was adopted in 2005 and the proposed improvements appear to be consistent with both the existing comprehensive plan and the draft update. Both plans encourage the improvement and expansion of the township open space and park assets and amenities. In addition, goals, objectives, and policies focus on preserving natural resources and creating trail linkages and greenways through neighborhoods and parks. Therefore, the proposed park improvements are consistent with the township’s comprehensive plan.

4. **Master Trail and Greenway Plan**—The overall trail plan within the *Tri-Municipal Master Trail and Greenway Plan* (2010) displays a proposed off-road trail along the tract frontages of New Galena and Walter roads. Per subdivision and land development ordinance Section 22-707.1.A.(1), pedestrian walkways and recreational trails that provide access through residential developments or connect to recreational facilities are required. The township should incorporate and implement elements of the adopted Master Trail and Greenway Plan. Also, the off-road trail would link to several residential neighborhoods adjacent to the park.
This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the August 3, 2016 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.

JSI:dc

cc: Erik Garton, P.E., Gilmore & Associates
    Eileen Bradley, Manager, New Britain Township (via e-mail)
    William M. Mitchell, Executive Director, Bucks County Parks & Recreation
    Michael A. Klimpl, Bucks County Solicitor
    Kevin S. Spencer, Bucks County Director of Operations
MEMORANDUM

TO: Penndel Borough Council
Penndel Borough Planning Commission

FROM: Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Proposal to Amend the Zoning Ordinance—Establishment of New Uses
Applicant: Penndel Borough Council
Received: July 1, 2016
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 August 3, 2016.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposed Action: Amend the zoning ordinance by establishing use classifications and regulations for Medical Marijuana Dispensary, Medical Marijuana Grower/Processor, Sober Living Facility, Alternative Therapy Provider, Massage Therapy Center, Hookah Bar/Lounge, Tobacco Stores, E-Cigarette/Vaporizer Stores, and Tavern.

Proposed Zoning Provisions: Chapter 405, Zoning, would be amended by adding new terms, definitions, uses and regulations as follows:

Proposed Use 23.1. Sober Living Facility, which includes recovery houses and halfway houses, would be permitted as a special exception in the Professional District, Retail Commercial District, Service Commercial District, and Metropolitan Business District. This use includes facilities where four (4) or more individuals reside together - either voluntarily or by court order - as an interim environment between rehabilitation facilities/hospitalization and reintegration to independent living.

Proposed Use 23.2. Alternative Therapy Provider, would be permitted as a special exception in the Professional District, Retail Commercial District, Service Commercial District, and Metropolitan Business District. It does not include: a hospital; nursing home; medical clinic; the office of a physician, surgeon, physical therapist, chiropractor, or osteopath currently licensed as such by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; barbershops or practices licensed by the Department
of Cosmetology; or any athletic program of accredited junior and senior high schools or colleges in which a massage is administered by a trainer within the scope of such athletic program.

Proposed Use 30.2. Medical Marijuana Dispensary, would be permitted as a special exception in the Retail Commercial District, Service Commercial District, and Metropolitan Business District. The special exception criteria include, and are not limited to:

- Operate in compliance with Department of Health regulations and maintain valid proof of registration.
- One acre minimum lot size.
- Setback 1,000 feet from a residentially zoned property or parcels containing a public, private, or parochial school, day-care center, place of worship, public park, or community center.
- Setback 2,500 feet from another dispensary or a medical marijuana grower/processor.
- Operate entirely within an indoor, enclosed, and secure facility with limited hours from 9am-9pm.
- No emission of dust, odors, vapors, or fumes.
- No use of medical marijuana permitted on the premises.
- Minimum facility size shall be 2,000 gross square feet in total floor area.
- Maintain monitored security staff 24 hours a day and 7 days a week.

Proposed Use 30.3. Tobacco Store, includes a business for which more than 50 percent of the gross floor area is dedicated to the display and retail sale of tobacco products. This use would be permitted as a special exception in the Retail Commercial District, Service Commercial District, and Metropolitan Business District. The special exception criteria include, and are not limited to:

- Setback 300 feet from a school (public or private), family day care home, child care facility, youth center, community center, recreational facility, park, church or religious institution, hospital, or other similar uses where children regularly gather.
- Posted signage stating that minors may not enter the premises unless accompanied by a parent or legal guardian.
- Distribution of free or low-cost tobacco, tobacco products or tobacco paraphernalia, as well as coupons for said items, is prohibited.

Proposed Use 30.4. e-Cigarette/Vaporizer Store, includes an establishment for which more than 50 percent of the gross floor area is dedicated to the storage, mixing, display and/or sale of e-cigarettes/vaporizers, nicotine-enriched solutions and/or liquid products that are manufactured for use with e-cigarettes/vaporizers. The use would be permitted as a special exception in the Retail Commercial District, Service Commercial District, and Metropolitan Business District. The special exception criteria include, and are not limited to:

- Setback 300 feet from a school (public or private), family day care home, child care facility, youth center, community center, recreational facility, park, church or religious institution, hospital, or other similar uses where children regularly gather.
- Setback 500 feet from another e-cigarette/vaporizer store.
• Posted signage stating that minors may not enter the premises unless accompanied by a parent or legal guardian.
• Distribution of free or low-cost tobacco, tobacco products or tobacco paraphernalia, as well as coupons for said items, is prohibited.
• Self-service e-cigarette product or paraphernalia displays are prohibited.

Proposed Use 35.1. Tavern, includes an establishment that primarily serves alcoholic beverages to the general public for on-premises consumption, is licensed by the Pennsylvania Liquor Control Board, and where food sales account for less than 55 percent of the establishment’s gross income. This definition includes, but is not limited to, beer gardens, bars, bar rooms, pubs, cocktail lounges, saloons, taprooms, and nightclubs. This use does not include any type of Adult Business activity as defined in this ordinance and would be permitted as a special exception in the Professional District, Retail Commercial District, Service Commercial District, Industrial District, and Metropolitan Business District. The special exception criteria include, and are not limited to:

• No operations between the hours of 2:00 a.m. and 11:00 a.m.
• No noise or vibration discernible along any property line.
• Operations shall be conducted within a completely enclosed building. Doors and windows shall remain closed during hours when entertainment is presented. Outdoor seating areas are permitted in conjunction with establishments that include restaurant services.
• Security, licensed under the laws of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, is required if the maximum permitted occupancy of the tavern exceeds 100 persons.
• Setback 200 feet from any property line which adjoins a Residential 1, Residential 2, or Residential 3 district for any tavern that proposes to operate after 11:00 p.m.

Proposed Use 55.1 Medical Marijuana Grower/Processor, would be permitted as a special exception in the Industrial District. The special exception criteria include, and are not limited to:

• Operate in compliance with Department of Health regulations and maintain valid proof of registration.
• Two acre minimum lot size.
• Setback 1,000 feet from parcels containing a public, private, or parochial school, and day-care center.
• Setback 2,500 feet from another grower/processor or a medical marijuana dispensary.
• Operate entirely within an indoor, enclosed, and secure facility with limited hours from 9 am - 9 pm.
• No emission of dust, odors, vapors, or fumes.
• No retail sales or use of medical marijuana permitted on the premises.
• Maintain monitored security staff 24 hours a day and 7 days a week

Proposed Use 71. Massage Therapy Center, would replace massage parlor and be permitted as a special exception in the Metropolitan Business District. The special exception criteria include, and are not limited to:

• All therapists must be licensed.
• Treatment rooms shall be a minimum of 50 square feet floor area.
• Operations from 7am-10pm.
• No person under the age of 18 may enter.
• No eating or drinking on premises.

Proposed Use 77. Hookah Bar/Lounge, would be permitted in the Metropolitan Business District and as a special exception in the Professional District, Retail Commercial District, and Service Commercial District. The special exception criteria include:

• Operating hour closed 2 am - 11 am, provided that operations of any smoking parlor located within 300 feet of a residential property must cease operations between 11 pm - 10 am.
• No discernable noise or vibration beyond property line.
• No alcoholic beverages served or consumed on premises.
• Planted buffer, fence or sound barrier when located within 300 feet of a Residential 1, Residential 2, or Residential 3 districts.

Existing Zoning Provisions: Use 30 Retail Shop includes the sale of tobacco products and is permitted by right in RC District and as a special exception in the Service Commercial District. Use 71. Massage Parlor is permitted by right in the Metropolitan Business District.

COMMENTS

Many of the zoning provisions proposed will be required to comply with the Fair Housing laws and Americans with Disabilities Act, the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act and FDA regulations, and the State’s Medical Marijuana Act as well as with the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code. Therefore, we are relying on the borough officials to ensure that the proposed regulations are consistent with these laws and any other applicable laws prior to enactment. We offer the following comments for borough officials to consider:

1. Sober living facility
   a. Reference to Fair Housing Act—We recommend that a community not regulate housing or living arrangements for people with disabilities, or protected classes, any differently than that required for other housing. This stems from our understanding and concerns about imposing more strict regulations on the protected classes defined by the Fair Housing Act.

   Section (4) of the proposed amendment indicates that a sober living facility (including recovery houses and halfway houses) is where four (4) or more individuals reside together for the purpose of recovering from drug, alcohol, and/or substance abuse, and which serves as an interim environment between rehabilitation facilities/hospitalization and reintegration to independent living. Under this definition, three or fewer individuals residing together in a sober living environment would not have to apply for special exception approval.
It is unclear as to why four individuals was chosen as the threshold for the number of people constituting a sober living facility use. It appears that this number may be based on the zoning ordinance’s definition of family which states in part that, “It shall be a rebuttable presumption that four or more persons living together in a single dwelling unit, who are not related by blood, adoption or marriage, do not constitute the functional equivalent of a traditional family.” Instead of listing a specific number of people to clarify the definition of Sober Living Facility, we recommend that a reference be made to the Fair Housing Act. The following sentence could be added to the end of the proposed definition:

“A Sober Living Facility does not include roomers, boarders, lodgers, or members of a family (except those protected as suffering from a “handicap” under the provisions of sections 3602(h) and 3604 of the Fair Housing Act), or any use otherwise defined, described or regulated in the ordinance.”

b. **Pending legislation**—Since the Pennsylvania legislature is considering several bills that would require certification of a recovery house and establish state requirements for the use, we recommend that borough officials monitor the progress of the bills. If enacted, the sober living facility provisions should be reviewed and updated as necessary to ensure consistency with any new legislation for the use.

2. **Medical marijuana uses**—Section 802(a)(3) of Act 16 requires that a Medical Marijuana Dispensary be not be located within 1,000 feet of a property line of a public, private or parochial school or day care center. Section 6.2(a)[4] of the amendment also proposes to require a 1,000-foot setback from these uses as well as residentially-zoned properties, places of worship, public parks and community center. The 1,000 foot setback is also intended to be applied to a Medical Marijuana Grower/Processor in Section 8.4(a)[4].

In addition, in Section 6.2(a)[4] of the proposed amendment, a 2,500 foot separation distance is required between dispensaries and grower/processors. Likewise, Section 8.4(a)[4] requires the same separation distance between growers/processors and dispensaries.

These setback and separation requirements proposed by the amendment will most likely preclude such uses from locating anywhere in Penndel.

3. **Product threshold considerations**—Tobacco is proposed to be deleted from the product list for Use 30 Retail shop. The sale of tobacco would be provided for in new Use 30.3 Tobacco store. A tobacco store is considered an establishment for which more than 50 percent of the gross floor area is dedicated to the display and retail sale of tobacco products. Similar language is provided for Use 30.4 e-Cigarette/Vaporizer store.

It appears that in circumstances where 50 percent or less of gross floor area is dedicated to the sale or display of tobacco or e-cigarette products, they would be considered incidental and permitted as part of the primary retail use and not need special exception approval. We note that gross floor area could include restrooms, office, storage and service areas, etc., comprising one-half or more of a business’s overall floor area. Therefore, to help distinguish between uses, we suggest additional criteria be considered by borough officials. Such provisions could
be related to the placement of products, the amount of sales of the product, or the area of “retail space” devoted to the sale and display of products.

4. **Parking and buffer standards**—We recommend that parking standards be provided for each use, or that reference be made to parking requirements that would apply. Landscaping and buffering standards to reduce impacts related to parking, noise, and yard areas may also be beneficial to include in the special exception criteria.

5. **Editorial comments**—In Section 5(1) of the proposed amendment for Use 30 Retail shop, we believe the term “applications” should be changed to appliances. We also believe that the reference to Medical Marijuana Dispensary in Section 8.(4)(a)[3] should be Grower/Processor instead.

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/TAK:dc

cc: Michael Savona, Esq., Eastburn & Gray, Municipal Solicitor
    Marie Serota, Borough Council Secretary (via email)
    Kali C. Sodano, Borough Council President (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—Establishment of New Uses and Various Other Requirements
Applicant: Board of Supervisors
Received: June 17, 2016
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 August 3, 2016.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposed Action: Amend the township zoning ordinance to provide definitions and standards for marijuana dispensary and grower/processor uses, sober living facilities, alternative therapy facilities, massage therapy, hookah bars/lounges, and taverns. Clarify and revise standards for bus shelters, revise design regulations, transit oriented development and mixed use development regulations, repeal the Floodplain Conservation District and other miscellaneous regulations.

Proposed Zoning Provisions:

The following criteria will be added to Section 1602.D.24b for Massage Therapy Center, which would be permitted by special exception in the C-1 and C-2 Commercial Districts:

- All therapists must be licensed.
- Treatment rooms must be 50 square feet or more.
- No one under 18 may enter.
- No eating or drinking.
Section 2021 Bus Shelters will be amended to include the following use regulations:

- The use shall be permitted within front yard setbacks and buffer areas only on established bus routes. Bus shelters may be located within the public right-of-way when authorization is granted by the controlling agency.
- Bus shelters shall be adequately illuminated.
- Signage must meet specific standards.
- Except on arterial streets, no advertising, signs, placards or other printed matter shall be permitted to be displayed on the exterior or interior of a bus shelter, except information pertaining to the applicable bus route.
- Bus shelter sign maximum standards established not to exceed four by six feet.
- Bus shelter permitted in front yards, public rights of way, and buffers only on established bus routes.
- Adequately illuminated.
- Advertising sign not to exceed four feet by six feet
- No closer than 1,500 feet from other shelter.

Section 2304.2 Sign Location obstruction, bus shelter signs are permitted in the right-of-way.

The following criteria will be added to Section 1602.E30b for Hookah/bar lounge, which would be permitted by special exception in the C-1 and C-2 Commercial districts:

- Operating hours: closed 2am-11am.
- No noise or vibration.
- No alcoholic beverages.
- Planted buffer fence or sound barrier when located adjacent to a residential district.

The following criteria which will be added to Section 1602.E81 for Medical Marijuana Dispensary, which would be permitted by special exception in the C-1 and C-2 Commercial districts:

- One acre lot minimum lot size.
- Operate in compliance with Department of Health.
- Proof of registration.
- At least 1,000 feet from a residentially zoned parcel or parcels contain school, day care center, place of worship, public park, or community center. At least 2,500 feet from another dispensary or grower/producer.
- Located indoors in an enclosed secure facility.
- Approved by township police chief.
- No dust, odors, vapors, or fumes.
- No use of marijuana.
- At least 2,000 square feet in size.
The following criteria which will be added to Section 1602.E82 for Medical Marijuana Grower/Processor, which would be permitted by special exception in the C-1 and C-2 Commercial districts and in the I- Industrial and I-O- Industrial Office districts:

- 2 acre lot minimum lot size.
- At least 1,000 feet from a parcel or parcels containing school or day care center. At least 2,500 feet from another dispensary of grower/producer.
- Located indoors enclosed secure facility.
- At least 2,500 feet from another dispensary of grower/producer.
- Located indoors enclosed secure facility.

The Sober Living Facility use is permitted as a special exception in the C-1 and C-2 Commercial districts.

The following use regulations for Taverns will be added to Section 1602.E30a:

- A tavern shall be closed between 2 am and 11 am.
- No noise or vibration beyond property line.
- All operation within closed building.
- Private security must be provided if occupancy exceeds 100 persons.

Section 201 Definitions, Gross Floor area definition will be revised to specify that cellars, unenclosed porches, attics not used for human occupancy or any floor space in residential districts shall not be included as gross floor area Section 201 Definitions Gross floor area standards do not presently specify uninhabited space.

The use Agriculture and Use 3a Single Family Detached buffer will be added as permitted uses to the Section 501 R-2 Residential District.

Section 503 Mixed Use Development will be revised to add Use 10 Place of Worship and Use 12 Library or museum, as permitted uses. Place of worship, library or museum and indoor commercial entertainment will be changed from conditional use to permitted use.

Section 1602.B.9. Transit Oriented Development (TOD) use regulations will be revised to permit TOD within 1,000 feet of an existing or proposed commuter rail station and on parcels designated as TOD district on zoning map. (The township zoning map does not designate a TOD district). Section 1602.B.9 (20) will be revised to require that residential uses be no less than 70 percent, and nonresidential no less than 30 percent of gross building square footage. Open space shall be no less than 30 percent of total tract area. (Present standards require that residential uses be no less than 80 percent and nonresidential no less than 20 percent of gross building square footage and open space no more than 30 percent of total tract area.)

Section 1602.H. Use 72 Residential accessory building or structure establishes a minimum setback of 15 feet for swimming pools from the primary structure or other buildings. (Swimming pools are not addressed presently.)
Part 17 Floodplain Conservation District will be repealed since the township adopted a standalone Floodplain Management ordinance in 2015.

Special setback Section 2019 requires minimum building setback from resource protected lands. Present standards do not identify specific resources but the amendment will specify resources such as wetlands and forested area.

Part 22 Off Street Parking and Loading will be revised to add requirements for Sober Living and Alternative Therapy, Tavern/Nightclub and Hookah Bar/Lounge, Medical Marijuana dispensary and Grower/Processor.

Section 2204 Parking Tractor trailers, Commercial Vehicles and Major Recreation Equipment will be revised to require that no tractor trailer truck or trailer be stored or parked for more than 48 hours in the R-1, R-2, R-3, R-4, CCRC, CCRC-2 or AQC zoning districts unless stored within an enclosed building or at least 100 feet from a property line.

Sections 2302.2 (Signs in nonresidential districts) and 2304.2 (Signs Location Obstruction) will be revised to address regulations for bus shelter signs.

COMMENTS

Many of the zoning provisions proposed will be required to comply with the Fair Housing laws and Americans with Disabilities Act, the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act and FDA regulations, and the State’s Medical Marijuana Act, as well as, with the PA Municipalities Planning Code. Therefore, we are relying on the township to ensure that the proposed regulations are consistent with these laws and any other applicable laws prior to enactment. We offer the following comments for township officials to consider:

1. Medical marijuana use—Chapter 8 Dispensaries 802(a)(3) of the Medical Marijuana Act requires that a dispensary not be located within 1,000 feet of a property line of a public, private or parochial school or day care center. There are no setback requirements for a grower/processor.

Proposed special exception criteria for Medical Marijuana Dispensary in Section 1602.E. 81.(a)(iv) requires that the use be more than 1,000 feet from a residentially zoned property, or a parcel containing a public, private or parochial school, day care center, public park or community center. Section 1602.E.82(a)(iv) requires that a grower/processor operation shall be 1,000 feet from a school or day care center. A dispensary and grower/processor may also not be closer than 2,500 feet from another dispensary or processor.

A dispensary is permitted in the C-1 and C-2 districts and a grower/processor in the I and I-O districts. There appears to be no areas in the C-1 and C-2 districts which meet the 1,000 foot setback for a dispensary. There are areas within the I- Industrial and I-O- Industrial Office District in which a grower/processor may be located beyond the 500 foot setback. These areas are within the center of the Louis Drive Industrial Park, Franklin Corporate Center and NATC. Because the amendment requires a 2,500 distance between dispensaries and grower/processor operations very little if any area would be available for another facility.
The state law does not specify a separation distance between a dispensary and grower/processor operation but the township proposed 2,500 foot separation appears to be onerous and may be a de facto exclusion of a second use.

We recommend that the township consider permitting a dispensary in the I and I-O districts and delete or lessen the separation distance between the two uses.

2. **Bus shelter illumination**—Section 2021.B. Bus Shelters, requires that bus shelters be adequately illuminated. The amendment provides no objective standards for illumination. We recommend that standards be provided to prevent distraction to drivers.

3. **Tavern/Nightclub**—The Tavern use is referred to as Tavern in much of the amendment but Section 2200 Parking requirements Use 30a is referred to as Tavern/Nightclub. The definition of the term proposed in Section 201 includes Nightclub. We recommend that the term of Tavern or Tavern/Nightclub be used throughout.

4. **Sober Living Facility**
   a. **Reference to Fair Housing Act**—We recommend that a community not regulate housing or living arrangements for people with disabilities, or protected classes, any differently than that required for other housing. This stems from our understanding and concerns about imposing more strict regulations on the protected classes defined by the Fair Housing Act.

   We are unsure why Sober Living Facility has a threshold of six or more individuals. This threshold may be based on the proposed definition of family retaining the limitation of “...no more than five individuals...” It is possible that fewer than six people could reside in a recovery house, halfway house, or sober living facility.

   To clarify what is intended by the term ‘sober living facility’, and prevent misinterpretation, we recommend that the following reference to the Fair Housing Act be added to the end of the definition: “...This terms does not include roomers, boarders, lodgers, members of a family [except those protected as suffering from a “handicap” under the provision of the Sections 3602(h) and 3604 of the Fair Housing Act] or any use otherwise defined, described or regulated in the Ordinance.”

   b. **Pending legislation**—The proposed Sober Living Facility is to be permitted by special exception. The Pennsylvania legislature is considering three bills to require certification of recovery houses and establish state requirements for the use. We recommend that the township be aware of the progress of the bills and consider amending the zoning ordinance to be consistent with any pertinent standards from any future legislation.
5. **Editorial comments**

- Sections 1100C, and 1200.B specify uses permitted by special exception. The sections presently indicate that the following uses are permitted “none.” The proposed amendment will permit a number of uses such as Medical Marijuana Dispensary and Hookah Bar/Lounge by special exception. The proposed amendment should specify that the word “none” will be removed.

- Table of Contents—The new uses Tavern, Sober Living, Medical Marijuana should be added to the zoning ordinance Table of Contents.

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:dc

cc: Michael Savona, Esq., Eastburn and Gray, PC, Municipal Solicitor
    Greg Schuster, Municipal Manager (via email)
    Judith Stern Goldstein, Boucher & James Engineers, Township Planner (via email)
### Bucks County Planning Commission
#### Subdivision and Land Development Reviews
#### June 27, 2016 to July 22, 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>BCPC Number</th>
<th>Tax Parcel Numbers</th>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Submission Level</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bristol Township</td>
<td>11311-A</td>
<td>(5-20-4, -5, -5-1 &amp; -5-2)</td>
<td>Royal Farms</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Commercial Land Development: 17,718 Square-feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doylestown Township</td>
<td>9469-A</td>
<td>(9-4-63 &amp; -63-1-1)</td>
<td>Sablosky</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Lot Line Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilltown Township</td>
<td>12172</td>
<td>(15-29-124-8)</td>
<td>Reichstine</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>3 Single-family Lots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Makefield Township</td>
<td>11719-A</td>
<td>(20-31-4)</td>
<td>Jennings Tract</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1 Single-family Lot 1 Open Space Lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middletown Township</td>
<td>12173</td>
<td>(22-31-59)</td>
<td>Stonehaven</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>10 Single-family Lots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hope Borough</td>
<td>5755-A</td>
<td>(27-8-3)</td>
<td>Crews Tract</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>3 Single-family Lots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hope Borough</td>
<td>10577-A</td>
<td>(27-3-7)</td>
<td>The Overlook at Aquetong Creek</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>6 Semi-detached Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quakertown Borough</td>
<td>12174</td>
<td>(35-2-13-1)</td>
<td>MedExpress</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Commercial Land Development: 4,950 Square-feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warminster Township</td>
<td>12171</td>
<td>(49-17-42)</td>
<td>Longstreth Redevelopment</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>35 Single-family Lots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warminster Township</td>
<td>10002-R</td>
<td>(49-24-15-12)</td>
<td>Ann's Choice</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>Institutional Land Development: 61 Continuing Care Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warminster Township</td>
<td>10002-Q</td>
<td>(49-9-534)</td>
<td>Home 2 Suites</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Commercial Land Development: 64,000 Square-feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipality</td>
<td>BCPC Number</td>
<td>Tax Parcel Numbers</td>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>Submission Level</td>
<td>Proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrightstown Township</td>
<td>5076-F</td>
<td>(53-2-103)</td>
<td>Dacey Tract</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>3 Single-family Lots</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 of Marketplace at Neshaminy
        TMP #2-1-37; 2-1-37-1; 2-1-37-4; 2-1-37-5; 2-1-37-6; 2-1-37-7; 2-1-38
        Applicant: Maurice Zekaria, c/o Paramount Realty Services, Inc.
        Owner: Same
        Plan Dated: June 8, 2016
        Date Received: June 10, 2016

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 10,691-square-foot building (Retail A) and 16,862-square foot building (Retail B–F and Restaurant A) on a 40.66-acre site. The site is served by public water and sewerage.

Location: West of the intersection of Lincoln Highway (Route 1) and Rockhill Drive.

Zoning: H-C1 Highway Commercial District permits major shopping center uses on a minimum lot area of 15,000 square feet with a minimum lot width of 75 feet. Individual lots or parcels which are created for the purpose of establishing separate ownership shall not be required to comply with the lot area, lot width, building area and yard requirements of the district, provided the following conditions are met:

1. The overall tract, lot or parcel being developed as a major shopping center complies with the lot area, lot width, building area, and yard requirements of Section 232-409.

2. A cross-easement agreement is recorded with the Final Plan providing for reciprocal rights for the individual lots or parcels relating to ingress and egress, utilities, stormwater management, maintenance of common areas and, unless the parking requirements for the individual lot or parcel are met on that lot or parcel, and parking on that lot or parcel is not required by any other lot or parcel to meet the requirements of this section, the common use of parking areas.
3. Each individual lot or parcel contains a minimum of 0.75 acres or one or more buildings containing in the aggregate a minimum of 25,000 square feet.

Present use: Shopping Center.

COMMENTS

1. **US Route 1 Improvement Project**—We note that according to the Draft DVRPC FY2017–2020 Transportation Improvement Program for Pennsylvania, the existing ramp from northbound US Route 1 to Rockhill Drive is proposed to be realigned and expanded onto TMP #2-1-38 in the vicinity of the existing detention basin. This project is titled Route 1 Improvement - South (Section RC1) (MPMS# 93444). We encourage the applicant to coordinate this proposal with PennDOT to ensure that the proposed improvements to the detention basin do not conflict with the overall goals of the US Route 1 Improvement Project.

2. **Parking and circulation**—The plan shows parking spaces along the main northwest-southeast driveway between Retail A and the intersection of the main driveways that extend from Rockhill Drive and Neshaminy Boulevard. The applicant has provided four additional parking spaces and meets the requirement of Section 232-586 for parking. However, the proposed restaurant use will likely generate a high parking demand and cause patrons to use parking spaces across the main driveway from the proposed Retail B–F and Restaurant A development. This will require pedestrians to negotiate traffic that is travelling along the main driveway to and from Target and Retail A. In addition, potential conflicts will occur between vehicles exiting the spaces and vehicles travelling along this driveway. We recommend the plan be revised to reduce these circulation conflicts.

   The proposed access drive at the northwestern corner of Retail B is offset from the existing opposing parking lot aisle, which will create conflicting turning movements. This intersection should be realigned when reconfiguring the parking and circulation layout. In addition, the circulation system should be clarified at the intersection of the access drive at Retail F and the main access drive along the LA Fitness parking area. It is unclear what stop controls exist or would be provided at the ends of the LA Fitness parking lot aisles.

   We also suggest the township examine its parking requirements to determine whether the amount and design of parking for this type of development is appropriate. We believe that redevelopment of shopping centers, such as the Marketplace at Neshaminy, will continue to occur in Bensalem Township and other parts of Bucks County, due to rising regional incomes and continued reinvestment in existing suburban areas. The township has an opportunity to ensure better development outcomes by requiring developers to meet carefully crafted design standards that are aimed at increasing pedestrian safety (such as by requiring pedestrian islands and crosswalks), improving site circulation, and reducing site imperviousness.

3. **Loading space**—The plan does not show a loading space for the proposed buildings. Section 232-587 of the zoning ordinance requires that the space for off-street loading and unloading shall be in addition to the required off-street parking spaces and aisles.
4. **Planting strip**—The buildings do not show the required planting strip. Section 201-112(d) of the subdivision and land development ordinance requires a planting strip with an average width of 10 feet and minimum width of 7 feet between the edge of the parking area and the outside wall of the nearest building.

5. **Stormwater management maintenance**—The plan proposes above-ground and underground detention to manage the site’s stormwater runoff. Section 192-66 of the Bensalem Township Water Quality Ordinance requires a BMP Operations and Maintenance plan, which describes how the stormwater BMPs will be operated and maintained, including who will be responsible for maintaining the facilities and what those operation and maintenance responsibilities will be. An operations and maintenance plan will allow regular scheduled maintenance tasks to be included in annual planning. We recommend the applicant’s engineer prepare a detailed operation and maintenance manual for the person or persons responsible for inspection and maintenance in order to ensure proper care of the facilities. This ensures that in the future facilities operate as intended and continue to function over the long run.

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 must be submitted for this land development. We recommend that the planning module be submitted at the preliminary plan stage to coordinate land development review with the planning module review.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the August 3, 2016, 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:dc

cc: Maurice Zekaria, c/o Paramount Realty Services, Inc.
    Brian Conlon, Langan Engineering
    Ron Gans, Municipal Engineer, O'Donnell & Naccarato
    Loretta Alston, Bensalem Dept. of Building and Planning
    William Cmorey, Township Manager (via email)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Bristol Township Council  
Bristol Township Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Preliminary Plan of Land Development—Royal Farms Store #154  
TMP # 5-20-4, -5, -5-1, -5-2
Applicant: Two Farms, Inc.  
Owner: William Golden, III  
Plan Dated: June 30, 2016  
Date Received: July 1, 2016

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 three parcels totaling 9.59 acres and redevelop the site by demolishing three existing structures and constructing three new commercial buildings totaling 12,438 square feet and a 5,280-square-foot service station canopy. The proposed buildings consist of: a 5,371-square-foot Royal Farms convenience store; a 4,000-square-foot restaurant with drive-through; and a 3,067-square-foot bank. A total of 234 parking spaces is proposed for the site. The plan indicates what appears to be a proposed access easement through adjacent TMP 5-20-5 in which a driveway is shown to access Ford Road. Public water and sewer facilities are intended to serve the development.

Location: Along the western side of Veterans Highway (Route 413), approximately 200 feet north of the intersection of Route 413 and Ford Road.

Zoning: C Commercial District permits a variety of commercial uses on a minimum lot area of 5,000 square feet with a minimum lot width of 50 feet at the building setback line. Maximum building coverage and maximum impervious surface ratio for sites in this district are 35 and 70 percent, respectively. Use D15 Service Station is permitted by conditional use approval in the C District. Uses D3 Financial Establishment and D5 Fast-Food Restaurant are permitted by right in the C District.
M-1 Light Manufacturing District (TMP #5-20-4) permits manufacturing, research, warehousing, and similar uses on a minimum lot area of 10,000 square feet with a minimum lot width of 100 feet at the building setback line.

The site is also located within the TC Town Center (Overlay) District along the Route 413 corridor. Overlay district provisions permit development in accordance with the underlying district but require compliance with Zoning Ordinance Section 205-54 Standards for Development.

Present Use: Restaurant; automobile showroom.

COMMENTS

1. **Conditional use**—Section 205-36.C of the zoning ordinance requires conditional use approval for Use D15 Service Station. There is no indication on the plan as to whether conditional use approval has been applied for and/or granted for the proposal. This issue should be resolved before action is taken on the proposed land development. (See Comment #2 noting use requirements for Service Station that have not been met.)

2. **Use D15 Service Station requirements**—The current proposal does not meet the following requirements for Use D15 Service Station in Section 205-16.D.(15):
   
   a. **Maximum size of convenience store**—Section 205-16.D.(15)(h)[2] of the zoning ordinance permits the sale of convenience-type products as an accessory use provided the sale of such products is limited to a maximum floor area of 2,000 square feet. However, it appears that the 5,371-square-foot structure that is part of the proposed service station will consist of retail use. The plan should be revised to comply with the ordinance requirement.

   b. **Arterial roadway frontage**—Section 205-16.D.(15)(l) of the zoning ordinance permits service station use only on lots having frontage along two arterial roadways. Roadway classifications are delineated in the Street Hierarchy section of the Township of Bristol Comprehensive Plan (June 2008). The 9.59-acre lot has frontage only along Route 413, which is an arterial roadway. Proposed access onto Ford Road, which is classified as a collector roadway, is shown through a proposed access easement.

3. **Requested variances**—Notations on Plan Sheet 3 of 34 indicate that the applicant is requesting variances from the following zoning ordinance sections:

   - 205-16.D(3)(a) a stacking lane serving a minimum of 6 vehicles per drive-through teller window
   - 205-108.J disturbance of wetlands margin in excess of 20 percent (*plan incorrectly states, “disturbance in excess of 80 percent”*)
   - 205-109.C.(3) no structure, sign, commercial activity, or parking is permitted within the required 30-foot buffer yard (*plan incorrectly references Section 205-19.C.(3)*)
   - 205-159.D no off-premises sign shall be located within 100 feet of a residential district
   - 205-165.A.(1) one free-standing sign permitted per lot
   - 205-165.A.(1)(a) a maximum freestanding sign area of 60 square feet
205-165.A.(1)(b) a maximum freestanding sign height of 12 feet
205-165.A.(2)(a) building signage to a maximum of 100 square feet

If not already addressed, these issues should be resolved before action is taken on the proposed land development.

4. **Requested waivers**—According to information on the plan, the applicant is requesting waivers from various requirements in the subdivision and land development ordinance (SALDO). We note that our copy of the township’s subdivision and land development ordinance contains different section numbers than those listed on the plan for the requested waivers. In addition, it is not clear what some of the requested waivers are for based on the listed description. These discrepancies should be resolved to ensure the correct ordinance section numbers and descriptions are listed.

According to information listed on Plan Sheet 3 of 34, the applicant is requesting waivers from the following sections of the subdivision and land development ordinance:

- **22-404(2)(B)** currently 400 feet of land development
- **22-511.(6)(B)** the maximum number of stacking room for 6 vehicles is 132 feet
- **22-511.(7)(A)** if two or more parallel drive-through lanes are provided, they shall each be a minimum of 10 feet wide
- **22-523.(B)(6)** no structure, stormwater management facility, utility, storage of material, parking facility, or other site amenity shall exist within the buffer which will inhibit the installation of required plant materials

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.

5. **Zoning discrepancy**—Note #7 on Plan Sheet 3 of 34 indicates that, “The zoning shown on this plan was taken from the township zoning map prepared by Gilmore and Associates, and there appears to be some differences when compared to the zoning information on record for each parcel at Bucks County Board of Assessment Appeals Office.” The plan indicates that TMP #5-20-4, identified as “Premises B”, has recorded zoning of C Commercial. According to our records, TMP #5-20-4 is zoned M-1 Light Manufacturing. Plan Sheet #2 of 34 does list zoning data for the M-1 District as well as for the C Commercial District. This discrepancy should be resolved.

6. **Site capacity calculations**
   
a. **Complete calculations**—Section 205-107 of the zoning ordinance requires the submission of site capacity calculations with all applications for subdivision and land developments. Sheet 2 of 35 shows only steps B, C, and E of the required calculations. The plan should be revised to provide all applicable steps of the site capacity calculations.
b. **Woodland acreage within wetlands**—Section 205-107.B of the zoning ordinance requires a 50 percent protection ratio for woodlands that are not associated with another environmentally sensitive resource and an 80 percent protection ratio for woodlands that are associated with another environmentally sensitive resource. Information provided in the Natural Resource Analysis chart included on Plan Sheets 2 of 34 and 4 of 34 indicate that 1.670 acres of woodlands on the site are subject to the 50 percent protection factor (exclusive of other environmentally sensitive resources.) However, much of this wooded area overlaps delineated wetlands. The plan should be revised to clearly indicate the amount of woodlands that is associated with the existing wetlands, as well as the amount of woodlands not associated with another environmentally sensitive resource.

7. **Wetlands**—As shown on Plan Sheet 5 of 34, the proposed Limit of Disturbance shown for the site extends into delineated wetlands areas. Section 205-108 of the zoning ordinance requires 100 percent protection for wetlands. This section prohibits any alteration, regrading, filling, piping, or building upon wetlands except for minor road crossings where design approval is obtained from the Township, where state and federal permits have been obtained, and where no other reasonable access is available.

8. **Setback from natural resource areas**—Section 205.130.C of the zoning ordinance requires that, on lots that include land with resource restrictions, the minimum building setbacks be measured from the limit of the resource protected lands rather than from the lot lines so that the required minimum yard be free from resource protected land. While relief has been requested to disturb much of the wetlands margin protection area, the plan should be revised to show the required setback measured from the edge of the wetlands margin in accordance with this ordinance requirement.

9. **Proposed height**—Within the C Commercial District, Section 205-37.G of the zoning ordinance permits a maximum height of 50 feet, provided that for each foot of height above 35 feet, the buffer yard as required by Section 205-109, shall be increased by one foot. Information on plan sheet 3 of 34 indicates that a building height of 38 feet is proposed for the site. This would result in an additional three feet to the required 30-foot buffer between the proposed development and adjacent residential use. The plan should be revised to indicate the required 33-foot yard along the site’s western border.

10. **Standards for development along Route 413**—Per Section 205-51 of the zoning ordinance, the standards for development contained in Section 205-54 of the ordinance would apply to the site since the lot has frontage along Route 413. The plan should be revised to comply with the following required standards:

   a. **Landscaping**—Section 205-54.A of the zoning ordinance requires street trees to be provided every 30 feet along Route 413 within the TC Overlay District. This section also requires that where parking areas are located between the street and the proposed principal building, plant materials shall be installed at the edge of the parking area closest to the street which shall be at least 3 feet in height when planted and shall meet the landscape requirements of the township subdivision and land development ordinance. Based upon a street frontage distance of approximately 775 feet, 26 street trees should be provided. The plan should be revised to indicate compliance with this ordinance requirement for the site.
b. **Parking and pedestrian circulation**—Section 205-54.B.(3) of the zoning ordinance requires that the parking layout provide pedestrian circulation throughout the parking area. The pedestrian circulation system should be shown on the plan. The plan should be revised to address this ordinance requirement.

c. **Lighting**—According to the Lighting plan and Lighting details shown on plan sheets 12 and 13 of 34, the freestanding lighting fixtures proposed for the site would have a height of 21.5 feet (19-foot pole attached to a 30-inch-high base). Section 205-54.C. of the zoning ordinance permits a maximum height of 25 feet for up to 25 percent of the lighting fixtures required on the site. All other fixtures shall not exceed 15 feet in height. The plan should be revised to indicate compliance with this zoning ordinance requirement.

d. **Signs**—Section 205-54.D.(4) of the zoning ordinance requires that freestanding signs shall not exceed a height of 8 feet and shall be mounted to the ground and landscaped to the satisfaction of the Council. This requirement should be considered in conjunction with the variance requested by the applicant for relief from the maximum sign height of 12 feet noted in Comment #3 above.

11. **Driveway access to Ford Road**—The plan delineates a strip of land which appears to be a proposed access easement through adjacent TMP #5-20-5. A proposed driveway accessing Ford Road is shown on this land. For clarity, it is recommended that the plan be revised to clearly indicate the applicant’s intentions regarding this land.

12. **Ford Road**—The applicant should investigate the feasibility of including a left turn lane for the full movement access drive proposed for Ford Road. A left turn lane along Ford Road would improve safety and capacity at this proposed intersection.

13. **Parking**

   a. **Required parking for Service Station (Royal Farms convenience store)**—According to the parking requirements listed on the plan, a total of 25 spaces is required for the proposed Royal Farms service station convenience store; however, the plan indicates that 125 spaces are provided for this use. The proposed number of parking spaces provided for this use seems excessive. It is recommended that the township officials and applicant discuss anticipated parking needs for the site, and that consideration be given to reducing the number of spaces, which will thereby reduce impervious surface, so as to reasonably accommodate future parking needs.

   b. **Parking distance from building**—Section 177-41.F of the subdivision and land development ordinance requires a minimum distance of 15 feet of open space between the curbl ine of any uncovered parking area and the outside wall of the nearest building. The plan shows parking as close as 5 feet to the side of the proposed Royal Farms building closest to Ford Road.

   c. **Location along access drives**—The plan shows several areas where parking spaces are located directly along main drives from Route 413 (e.g., 33 parking spaces along the access aisle directly behind the Royal Farms store, and 21 spaces along the access aisle in the western portion of the parking lot.) This layout poses safety concerns over potential conflicts between vehicles traveling along the main drives and vehicles
attempting to maneuver into or out of the parking spaces. The parking layout should be redesigned to eliminate these potential conflicts.

d. **Parking lot landscaping**—Section 509.q of the subdivision and land development ordinance requires that street trees be provided at the rate of not less than two trees for every 10 parking spaces, which shall be in addition to any other requirements for buffering or landscaping. Information on Sheet 10 of 34 indicates that such trees shall be planted in a manner as to afford maximum protection from the sun for parked vehicles. Based on a total of 234 parking spaces, a total of 47 trees would be required throughout the parking area.

14. **Sidewalk**—Sections 177-35.A and 177-66.A of the subdivision and land development ordinance require sidewalks on one side of abutting streets unless determined unnecessary by Council. The plan should be revised to comply with this requirement.

15. **Clear sight triangles**—The plan should be revised to indicate the required clear sight triangles in accordance with Section 506.d of the subdivision and land development ordinance.

16. **Sight distance**—The plan should indicate the sight distance requirements for all driveways in accordance with the Pennsylvania Code, Title 67, Transportation, Chapter 441 “Access To and Occupancy of Highways by Driveways and Local Roads,” as referenced in Section 177-40.B of the subdivision and land development ordinance.

17. **Truck circulation plan**—In order to adequately review site circulation, it is recommended that a truck circulation plan be provided.

18. **Loading areas**—Section 205-122 of the zoning ordinance contains off-street loading requirements for nonresidential uses. Also, Section 177-55.L of the subdivision and land development ordinance contains additional requirements for loading areas, including required minimum dimensions. The plan identifies one loading area within the drive-through lane for the proposed restaurant use. The plan should be revised to indicate compliance with these ordinance requirements.

19. **Proposed trees**—Due to the presence of the emerald ash borer (EAB) in Bucks County, the 15 *Fraxinus pennsylvanica* ‘Lanceolata’ (green ash) trees proposed on Sheet 10 of 34 should be replaced with another type of canopy tree from the township’s tree list. The EAB is very destructive and once ash trees are infested, they will die without continuing insecticide treatment. Additionally, township officials should remove the *Fraxinus* species from municipal tree lists and consider developing a strategy for ash trees located in municipal parks and other public property.

   Also, the plan indicates that 9 *Quercus palustris* (pin oak) trees are proposed. We have been alerted that bacterial leaf scorch, which is an infectious chronic disease, is affecting red oaks and pin oaks in southeastern Pennsylvania. Township officials should monitor planting plans to ensure that the red oak and pin oak are not overplanted, to avoid the risk of infection and eventual loss of these trees.

20. **Tree protection fencing**—Section 177-91.D.(17) of the subdivision and land development ordinance requires preliminary plan submissions to identify proposed tree lines, the tree protection zone, and the location of proposed protection fencing. Plan Sheet 22 of 34 shows the limit of disturbance extending past the proposed tree line, into the woodlands intended to
be protected. The plan should be revised to delineate the location of the tree protection fencing along all areas of existing trees intended to remain on the site. The limit of disturbance should not extend past the proposed tree protection fencing.

21. **Trash receptacles**—Section 304.D.D5 of the zoning ordinance requires that receptacles be provided outside fast food restaurants for patron use. The plan should be revised to indicate the location of the proposed receptacles to show compliance with this ordinance requirement.

22. **Stormwater management**—The plan shows a proposed underground stormwater basin in the southeastern portion of the site. 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 basin. 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 on the site, in this case, the property owner.

23. **Fire lanes**—Section 177-M of the subdivision and land development ordinance requires that for nonresidential developments, fire lanes shall be established as required by the Fire Prevention Board, pursuant to the provision of the Fire Prevention Code. The plan does not identify any proposed fire lanes. The governing body, along with the fire marshal, should ensure this issue is adequately addressed.

24. **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.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the August 3, 2016, 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:dc

cc: Two Farms, Inc.  
Robert E. Blue Consulting Engineers, P.C.  
Kurt Schroeder, P.E., Gilmore & Associates, Township Engineer  
Randy Flager, Esq., Flager & Associates, Township Solicitor  
William McCauley, Bristol Township Managing Director (via email)  
Colleen Costello, Bristol Township Department of Licenses and Inspections (via email)  
Thomas Scott, Township Zoning Officer (via email)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Doylestown Township Board of Supervisors
    Doylestown Township Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Preliminary Plan for Lot Line Change for Sablosky

Proposal: Subdivide and convey 15,718 square feet from TMP #9-4-63 to TMP# 9-4-63-1-1 to form lot areas of 40,096 and 58,264 square feet, respectively. Each parcel contains an existing single-family dwelling unit served by on-lot water and sewage disposal facilities. An existing shed will be relocated to TMP #9-4-63.

Location: Northeast side of the intersection of Limekiln Road and Sandy Ridge Road.

Zoning: R-1 Residential District permits a single-family detached dwelling on a minimum lot size of 40,000 square feet with at least a 150-foot lot width at the building setback line.

Present Use: Single-family residential.

COMMENTS

1. **Stipulation of Counsel agreement**—Section 1.A of the February 1, 1999, Stipulation of Counsel agreement states in part, “That there shall be no further subdivision of any of the three lots created pursuant to this Decision and that the deeds for the said new lots shall each contain a covenant against any further subdivision.” The provision continues to indicate that the covenant shall specifically authorize the township and any neighboring property owner to enforce such covenant.

July 11, 2016

BCPC #9469-A
The term “Subdivision” is defined in part by the Pennsylvania Municipal Planning Code and township subdivision ordinance as Section 153-11 “the division or redivision of a lot, tract or parcel of land by any means into two or more lots, tracts, parcels or other divisions of land including changes in existing lot lines …” Therefore, municipal officials should determine whether the proposal for a lot line change is permitted pursuant to the deed and covenant restrictions.

2. **Side lines**—Subdivision ordinance Section 153.A.(4) indicates that wherever practical, the side lot lines of a lot shall be set at right angles or radial to the the right-of-way line. At the required building setback line, the side yard slants at a 45 degree angle to create about a 25-foot jog in the side property line. We note that the proposed property line also cuts through the middle of the rear garden. If the side lot line was continued straight back from the right-of-way, the garden would be located entirely on the subject parcel and the area designated for a future septic area would be setback farther from the property line. Township officials should determine if the side yard arrangement is acceptable as proposed.

3. **Bikeway**—Section 153-24.B(e) of the subdivision ordinance classifies Limekiln Road as a community collector street. Subdivision ordinance Section 153-24.K indicates that pedestrian and bicycle requirements are to be based on the street hierarchy table (Attachment 2). A “Multi-use Trail—8 feet wide” is indicated for community collectors on the table. The Township’s Bike and Hike Plan also illustrates a proposed trail along the roadway. Therefore, municipal officials should consider the need for pedestrian and bike improvements along this road frontage, and if necessary, the plan should be revised accordingly.

4. **Plan notes**—An asterisk should be placed on the Zoning Table noting the existing 10.4 foot nonconforming setback for the “Accessory Structure - Detached Garage Setback.” In addition, a signature block should be added prior to plan approval, in accordance with Section 153-21.E of the subdivision land development ordinance.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the August 3, 2016 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:de

cc: Sean and Theresa Sablosky
Kristen Holmes, P.E., Holmes Cunningham, LLC
Mario Canales, Pickering, Corts & Summerson, Township Engineer
Stephanie Mason, Township Manager (via email)
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 Reichstine
         TMP #15-29-124-8
         Applicant: Katherine Reichstine
         Owner: Thomas G., Jr. and Katherine Reichstine
         Plan Dated: June 10, 2016
         Date Received: June 24, 2016

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 10.2176-acre site into three residential lots. An existing single-family dwelling, barn, and shed will remain on Lot 1, which will be 3.1453 acres. Lots 2 and 3 will both be 3.0 acres and contain proposed single-family dwellings. Individual on-lot water and sewage facilities will serve the site.

Location: On the east side of Bypass Road, approximately 1,600 feet south of its intersection with Dublin Road.

Zoning: Rural Residential (RR) District permits single-family detached dwellings on lots of 3 acres minimum when not served by public water.

On February 27, 2015 the Hilltown Township Zoning Hearing Board granted relief from Section 160-51 of the zoning ordinance to permit a flag lot.

Present Use: Residential.

COMMENTS

1. *Fraxinus americana*—The landscape plan on Sheet SP-3 shows that *Fraxinus americana* (white ash) trees are proposed as a street tree. This species is not included on the township’s Plant
List found in Appendix K of the subdivision land development ordinance. Due to the discovery of the emerald ash borer (EAB) in Bucks County, the proposed *Fraxinus americana* (white ash) trees should be replaced with another type of tree from the township’s Plant List. The EAB is very destructive and once ash trees are infested, they will die without continuing insecticide treatment. A great deal of information about the insect and its control is available on the EAB national website http://www.emeraldashborer.info/index.cfm and the Penn State University site http://ento.psu/extension/trees-shrubs/emerald-ash-borer/factsheets.

2. **Lot depth to width ratio**—Section 140-27.B(11) of the subdivision and land development ordinance requires that residential lot depth shall not be less than one nor more than three times the lot width. Lot 2 exceeds the maximum lot depth to width ratio.

3. **Dedication of recreation land**—Section 140-59 of the subdivision and land development ordinance requires all residential subdivisions to provide for public dedication of land suitable for park and/or recreation use unless the applicant agrees to a fee in lieu of, as outlined in Section 140-63. The plan does not indicate how recreation land will be provided. We recommend that the plan be reviewed by the Hilltown Township Park and Recreation Board to provide an assessment of the area’s recreational needs and give an opinion as to the suitability of either a land dedication or a fee in lieu for this subdivision.

4. **Editorial comment**—On Sheet SP-3 the lot numbers for the site capacity calculations are incorrect. These calculations should be revised to correspond to the correct lot numbers.

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 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 August 3, 2016, 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: Katherine Reichstine  
    Scott McMackin, P.E., Cowan Associates, Inc.  
    C. Robert Wynn, P.E., Township Engineer (via email)  
    Donald D. Delamater, 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: Final Plan of Subdivision—Jennings Tract
          TMP #20-31-4
          Applicant: Lower Makefield Township
          Owner: Joseph T. Jennings
          Plan Dated: May 5, 2016
          Date Received: July 19, 2016

We understand that the subject plan has received final plan approval from the Lower Makefield Township Board of Supervisors. In accordance with the provisions of Section 502 of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, plans for the proposal should be sent to and reviewed by the Bucks County Planning Commission. In addition, Section 513 of the MPC requires review by the county prior to recording the plat. To meet the BCPC obligations as set forth by the MPC, the professional staff of the BCPC prepared the following review.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposal: Subdivide a 9.8-gross-acre parcel into two lots. Proposed Parcel A consists of 3.0 acres of open space that will be owned by Lower Makefield Township. Proposed Parcel B consists of 6.38 acres (and 0.415 acres of existing right-of-way to be dedicated) and contains an existing single-family dwelling. Public water and sewer facilities serve the existing dwelling.

Location: At the northern corner of the intersection of Taylorsville Road and McKinley Avenue. A portion of the site borders the Delaware Division of the Pennsylvania Canal.

Zoning: The R-RP Residential-Resource Protection District permits single-family detached dwellings on a minimum net lot area of 3 acres with a minimum lot width at the front building line of 250 feet.

Present Use: Residential, land with natural resources.
COMMENTS

After reviewing the subject plan, we find no major issues to address regarding the proposal.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the August 3, 2016, 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:dc

cc: Joseph T. Jennings
    Mark Eisold, Boucher & James, Municipal Engineer
    Terry Fedorchak, Township Manager (via email)
    Yardley Borough (adjacent municipality)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Middletown Township Board of Supervisors
   Middletown Township Planning Commission
FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission
SUBJECT: Preliminary Plan of Subdivision for Stonehaven 10 Lot Residential Subdivision
   TMP #22-31-59
   Applicant: Stonehaven Langhorne, LLC
   Owner: James and Barbara Russell
   Plan Dated: February 15, 2016
   Date Received: June 24, 2016

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 6.4-acre parcel into 10 lots for the construction of nine single-family detached dwellings. The lots range in size from 12,389 square feet to 20,886 square feet and will be served by a private cul-de-sac. Lot 10 contains an existing dwelling, and a new garage with access from the cul-de-sac is proposed on the lot. 1.004 acres of open space will be provided and a detention basin is proposed on a separate 0.803-acre lot. Public water and sewer facilities are intended to serve the units.

Location: South side of Langhorne Yardley Road, just north of Maple Drive.

Zoning: The parcel is split zoned with the RA-3 Residence District along the front portion of the site and R-1 Residence District to the rear.

The Zoning Hearing Board granted zoning ordinance variances from Section 500-603 to allow lots in the portion of the site within the RA-3 Zoning District to comply with the R-1 area and bulk requirements, from Section 500-2601.D.(2) to allow more than 50 percent of woodlands to be disturbed, and from Section 500-2601.D.(2)(a) to allow less than the required woodland replacement trees.

The R-1 District permits single-family detached dwellings on a minimum lot area of 12,000 square feet when the amount of open space provided equals or exceeds the total area by which the lots are reduced below the 15,000 square feet district requirement and not less than one acre in size. A maximum density of 2.3 dwellings per acre is permitted.

Present Use: Residential.
COMMENTS

1. **Roadway improvements**—Due to the proximity of the existing house to Langhorne Yardley Road, it is unlikely that any street improvements will occur. The plan does not indicate any waivers requested from, or modification to, the subdivision and land development ordinance’s required street improvements (i.e., cartway width, curbing and sidewalks). Therefore, the plan should be revised accordingly, and if any waivers are requested, the applicant should state in full the grounds and facts of unreasonableness or hardship on which any request for a waiver is based and the minimum modification necessary in accordance with the requirement of Section 512.1(b) of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code.

We note that existing features are located within a portion of Lot 10 that is located between the existing property pins and proposed monuments. It is presumed the monuments represent the required 40-foot right-of-way line from Langhorne Yardley Road’s center line. It does not appear that the area is being offered to the township at this time, and the structures are intended to remain, with no plans for street improvements contemplated. If this is the case, we suggest an acceptable right-of-way width be determined and a waiver from the subdivision and land development ordinance right-of-way requirements be requested by the applicant as necessary. The plan should also be revised to clearly indicate the ownership and maintenance responsibility of the area between the property pins and monuments.

2. **Cul-de-sac considerations**—According to Section 411.7.F(1) of the subdivision and land development ordinance, cul-de-sac streets are prohibited except at the discretion of the Board of Supervisors. The 26-foot-wide cul-de-sac is proposed to be owned and maintained by a homeowners association. Plan Sheet 1 of 13 indicates “no parking-fire lane” signs are proposed on both sides of the cul-de-sac. Since it does not appear that on-street parking will be permitted on the cul-de-sac, compliance with the spillover parking requirements should be indicated in accordance with subdivision and land development ordinance Section 411.6.

We also suggest that consideration be given to the inclusion of a planted island in the cul-de-sac bulb. A planted island or defined parking area in the bulb could help define the travel lane, provide additional parking for spillover parking, and reduce the expanse of unnecessary asphalt. Landscaping would add an aesthetically pleasing amenity to housing situated on a cul-de-sac.

3. **Bikeway and crosswalk**—Subdivision and land development ordinance Section 427.2 requires that bikeways be provided in all subdivisions unless waived by the Board of Supervisors. Since the tract is situated across Langhorne Yardley Road from the township’s Community Park, the need for a bikeway or connection should be discussed. We recommend that a pedestrian/bicycle crosswalk be provided at the new intersection to connect residents of the development to the existing facilities at the park.

4. **Existing Driveway**—A portion of the existing driveway for Lot 10 is intended to remain and take access on the cul-de-sac. Section 4151.A of the subdivision and land development ordinance requires that driveways be located no less than 40 feet from any street intersection. One access point on this existing circular driveway will be within 25 feet of the intersection and the angles will be less than 90 degrees, creating an awkward entry arrangement. We recommend that the driveway be further modified, by locating it farther away from the site’s main intersection and providing a 90 degree angle at its intersection with the cul-de-sac. Ideally, the driveway should have only one access point on the cul-de-sac and be relocated across from the driveway on Lot 1.
5. **Lighting**—A light pole is shown on the plan at the cul-de-sac entranceway. Section 507 of the subdivision and land development ordinance requires that a plan for street lights acceptable to the township be provided. Township officials should determine if additional lighting should be provided given the 90 degree bend in the cul-de-sac.

6. **Stormwater management maintenance**—The plan states that the homeowners association shall own and have perpetual maintenance responsibility for the stormwater management facilities. The township should consider whether the applicant should provide the homeowners association with an operation and maintenance manual detailing regular maintenance tasks and a schedule to ensure long-term management of the site’s stormwater runoff. Additionally, the township should consider the impact on residents if the underground detention facilities proposed in the private street need to be opened up for maintenance. It could be disruptive to the lots with adjacent driveways and residents' vehicular movements or service vehicle movements.

7. **Open space**—In accordance with Section 423.3 of the subdivision and land development ordinance, all land held for open space should be designated on the plans. The plans are required to contain the statement, “Open space place may not be separately sold, nor shall such land be further developed or subdivided.” In addition, the plan should designate the use of open space and the type of maintenance to be provided.

Sheet 4 indicates that Open Space 2 is protected woodland. This area could effectively function as an extension of the rear yards of Lots 3-6. Any intended restrictions on the use of the protected woodland area should be made clear to lot owners, e.g., clearing of understory, whether access is permitted, etc.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the August 3, 2016, 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:dc

cc:  John McGrath, Stonehaven Langhorne, LLC
    Larry Young, P.E., TriState Engineers, Township Engineer
    Stephanie Teoli Kuhls, Township Manager (via email)
    Patrick Duffy, Zoning Officer (via email)
MEMORANDUM

TO: New Hope Borough Council
   New Hope Borough Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Final Plan of Subdivision for Crews Tract
         TMP #27-8-3
         Applicant: Thomas J. and Ruth A. Crews
         Owner: Same
         Plan Dated: March 18, 2016
         Date Received: July 12, 2016

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 3.7-acre tract into three single family lots. Lot 1 will be 1.002 net acres and contains an existing dwelling. Lot 2 will be 1.001 net acres and Lot 3 will be 1.242 net acres and dwellings are proposed for both Lots 2 and 3. The site will be served by individual on-lot wells and public sewer.

Location: The southeast corner of the intersection of South Sugan Road and Fairview Avenue.

Zoning: R-1 Low Density Residential District requires a minimum lot area of 40,000 square feet for single-family detached dwellings. A 150-foot minimum lot width, and minimum 35-foot front yard, 15-foot side yards and 50-foot rear yards are also required.

Present Use: Residential/wooded

COMMENTS

1. Incorrect citation—Sheet 6 of 9 refers to Solebury Township regulations regarding stormwater management. This citation should refer to the New Hope Borough stormwater management regulations.
2. **Tree protection zone**—Sheet 7 of 9 contains the erosion control plans. The erosion and sedimentation legend indicates a symbol for the tree protection zone as required by Section 5.25.B of the subdivision and land development ordinance. However, no tree protection zones are shown on the map.

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 must be submitted for this proposed land development.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the August 3, 2016, 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:dc

cc: Thomas H. and Ruth A. Crews  
Crews Surveying, LLC  
Craig D. Kennard, P.E., Gilmore & Associates, Borough Engineer  
John Burke, Borough Manager (via email)
MEMORANDUM

TO: New Hope Borough Council
New Hope Borough Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Preliminary Plan of Subdivision for The Overlook at Aquetong Creek
TMP #27-3-7
Applicant: 170 Old York Road, L.L.C.
Owner: Winter May Melson
Plan Dated: July 6, 2016
Date Received: July 11, 2016

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 60,289.42-square-foot (1.384-acre) site into 3 two-family dwelling units. The site will be served by public water and sewer. The existing commercial/residential buildings on the site will be demolished.

Location: The southern portion of Old York Road, approximately 490 feet east of its intersection with Route 179.

Zoning: RB—Borough Residential District requires a minimum lot area of 6,500 square feet for two-family dwelling units. A minimum lot width of 60 feet, minimum front yard of 25 feet, minimum rear yard of 40 feet and minimum side yards of 10 feet are also required.

Present Use: Vacant Commercial/Attached Dwelling Unit

COMMENTS

1. Waivers requested—The applicant has requested a total of 8 waivers from the subdivision and land development ordinance. In addition, 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.
2. **Form of ownership**—Site plan note #16 on Sheet 2 refers to a condominium agreement in regards to maintaining the clear site triangles. In addition, when the plan was submitted at the sketch plan stage (plan dated January 27, 2016), site plan note #21 stated that a condominium agreement would be set up to address the ownership and maintenance of the common areas. The subject plan does not indicate whether a condominium association is proposed to be responsible for ownership and maintenance of common areas.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the August 3, 2016, 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:dc

cc: Keith C. Boyd, 170 Old York Road, L.L.C.
    Evan Sowers, P.E., The H&K Group Engineering & Environmental Services Division
    Craig D. Kennard, P.E., Gilmore and Associates, Borough Engineer
    John Burke, Borough Manager (via email)
    Dennis H. Carney, Solebury Township Manager (via email)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Quakertown Borough Council
    Quakertown Borough Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Preliminary Plan of Land Development—MedExpress

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: Redevelop a 0.795-acre (34,633-square-foot) site by demolishing an existing structure and constructing a 4,950-square-foot building to be used for a MedExpress medical office. A total of 34 parking spaces is proposed. Public water and sewer facilities are intended to serve the development.

Location: Along the western side of South West End Boulevard (Route 309), approximately 280 feet south of the intersection of West End Boulevard (Route 309) and Route 313/Route 663.

Zoning: HC Highway Commercial District permits Medical Office by right on a minimum lot area of 12,000 square feet, a minimum lot width of 80 feet measured at the front yard setback line, a maximum building coverage of 40 percent, and a total impervious coverage of 90 percent.

Present Use: Retail commercial.

COMMENTS

1. **HC Highway Commercial District requirements**—Sections 311.6 and 311.7 of the zoning ordinance contain area and dimensional requirements applicable to development within the HC Highway Commercial district. These requirements include minimum lot area, minimum lot width, maximum building coverage, maximum impervious surface coverage, maximum building height, and required front, side, and rear yards. The plan should be revised to list the zoning district requirements and to indicate compliance with those requirements.
2. Parking

a. **Parking spaces near Route 309**—A row of five parking spaces is shown perpendicular to the access aisle near the site entrance. The location of these parking spaces near the driveway entrance/exit on Route 309 raises a concern over the possibility of conflicts between vehicles maneuvering into and out of the spaces and vehicles entering the site from Route 309. Consideration should be given to relocating these parking spaces farther from the Route 309 driveway entrance to create a safer circulation system.

In addition, the plan does not propose a walkway in front of these five parking spaces which will likely result in individuals who park in these spaces walking along the vehicular moving aisle to reach the building. If the spaces are not relocated, we strongly recommend the construction of a walkway along the northern edge of the spaces to provide a safe pedestrian connection to the building.

b. **Parking calculations**—Zoning ordinance Section 601.1.A. and Table 6.1 Off-Street Parking Requirements require four off-street parking spaces per doctor and one off-street parking space for each employee for medical office uses. The plan indicates that 34 parking spaces are proposed but does not show calculations to determine the number of spaces that would be required. The plan should be revised to provide the parking calculations so that compliance with the parking requirement in Table 6.1 of the zoning ordinance can be verified.

c. **Parking space detail**—The plan should be revised to provide a detail of the proposed parking spaces so that compliance with the required parking space dimensions in Section 603.B.(1) of the zoning ordinance can be verified.

3. Buffer yard—Section 404.4 of the zoning ordinance requires a 20-foot buffer yard between the proposed nonresidential use and adjacent residential homes. Section 404.4.C.(1) requires that each buffer yard shall include a planting screen of trees, shrubs, and/or plant materials extending the full length of the lot line. It is noted that an existing row of trees exists along the rear lot line which borders a residential neighborhood. The existing trees, however, do not meet the 20-foot width requirement. The plan should be revised to comply with the buffer requirement.

4. **Clear sight triangle**—The plan should indicate compliance with Section 404.3.B.3 of the zoning ordinance, which requires a clear sight triangle of 30 feet where driveways intersect streets.

5. **Building setback line**—A symbol for “Building Setback Line” is shown within the legend on both Plan Sheets 4 of 8 and 6 of 8. However, the building setback line is not delineated on the site. The plan should be revised to show this information.

6. Landscaping

a. **Invasive exotic plant**—The Landscaping Plan on Sheet 5 of 8 indicates that Japanese barberry shrubs (*Berberis thunbergii*) are proposed for the site. This species has been classified as an invasive exotic plant in Pennsylvania by the Department of Conservation and Natural Resources (DCNR). [http://www.dcnr.state.pa.us/forestry/invasivetutorial/List.htm](http://www.dcnr.state.pa.us/forestry/invasivetutorial/List.htm). Therefore, we
recommend that the plan be revised to provide an appropriate substitution from the plan listing in Appendix B of the zoning ordinance (Appendix B Hedges/Shrubs Suitable for Parking Lot Screening).

b. **Discrepancy**—Information in the Planting Schedule on Plan Sheet 5 of 8 indicates that 13 Japanese barberry shrubs are planned for the site; however, only 9 are shown on the plan. The plan should be revised to eliminate the discrepancy over the number of shrubs.

7. **Tree protection fence**—A tree protection fence detail is provided on Plan Sheet 7 of 8. The detail shows a 4-foot high snow fence to be placed at the drip line of the tree to be protected or a minimum of 6 feet from the tree trunk. For the maximum benefit of the tree(s) to be preserved, it is recommended that the protection fencing be placed at the dripline or a minimum of 15 feet from the trunk of the tree, whichever is greater. The tree protection fence detail and the location of the tree protection fence on the site should be revised to indicate the recommended standard in order to assure maximum protection of existing trees to be retained on the site.

8. **Location of refuse areas**—Section 314.1.7.F of the zoning ordinance requires that the storage of refuse shall be provided inside the building or within an outdoor area enclosed by either walls or opaque fencing. Any outdoor refuse area shall be entirely screened by a fence or enclosure which is at least six feet high. Plan Sheet 8 of 8 includes a trash enclosure detail; however, the plan does not indicate the location of a refuse collection area. If an outdoor refuse collection area is intended, the plan should be revised to indicate the location of the collection area and compliance with this ordinance requirement.

9. **Plan information**—The same symbol is shown for both the tree protection fence and the silt fence on Plan Sheet 6 of 8. The tree protection detail contained on Plan Sheet 7 of 8 indicates that tree protection fencing will consists of a 4-foot high snow fence, which is different from the silt fence. To avoid confusion, it is recommended that the plan be revised to differentiate between both types of fencing on Plan Sheet 6 of 8.

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 53 Planning Module must be submitted for this proposed land development.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the August 3, 2016, 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: dc

c: Eric Dietz, Med Express  
John W. Kornick, P.E., K2 Consulting Engineers, Inc.  
Cowan Associates, Inc., Municipal Engineer  
Scott McElree, Borough Manager (via email)  
Doug Wilhelm, Borough Zoning Officer (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 Subdivision for Longstreth Redevelopment
TMP #49-17-42
Applicant: County Builders, Inc.
Owner: Longstreth Investment, L.P.
Plan Dated: June 20, 2016
Date Received: June 23, 2016

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 14.74-acre parcel into 35 single-family detached lots. Open space of 2.43 acres is proposed. The site is served by public water and sewer.

Location: Approximately 150 feet east of the intersection of Roberts and Marian roads and approximately 1,500 feet east of York Road.

Zoning: R-2 Residential District permits Single-Family Detached Buffered Development on sites of 10 acres or more as a conditional use. The minimum lot size is 9,000 square feet. A minimum of 20 percent of site area must be preserved for open space. The township Board of Supervisors granted conditional approval for a Single-Family Detached Buffered Development on June 16, 2016.

Present Use: Vacant-former Longstreth Elementary School.

COMMENTS

1. **Waivers requested**—The plan submission indicates that the applicant is requesting waivers from the following subdivision and land development ordinance requirements:

   - Section 526: To not submit a Traffic Impact Study.
   - Section 523.4: Street trees every 40 feet within ultimate right-of-way.
   - Section 523.7: To provide fewer detention basin landscaping trees and shrubs.
   - Section 523.8: To not replace trees over 3-inch caliper on site.
In accordance with the requirement of Section 512.1.(b) of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code (MPC), the applicant has submitted a rationale for the Traffic Impact Study waiver request. For the rest of the waiver requests 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 township planning commission and board of supervisors should determine if granting the waivers is appropriate.

In addition, the plan was submitted as a preliminary/final plan. Section 301 of the subdivision and land development ordinance requires separate preliminary and final plan submissions for a major subdivision. If a waiver of Section 301 is desired, the submission should comply with Section 512.1.(b) of the MPC as noted above, and the township should determine if the submission is sufficient to be reviewed only once.

2. Open space issues

   a. Designation—The plan (Drawings C1.1 and C1.2) shows several areas adjacent to designated (hatched) open space which do not appear to be part of residential lots but are not identified as open space: an area between Lots 31 and 32 and between Lots 27 and 28. The applicant’s engineer has stated that these parcels do not comply with the open space design requirements of zoning ordinance Section 2102.B.4, so they do not count towards required open space. There also are non-hatched/non-buffer areas behind Lot 7, between Lots 4 and 5, and beside Lot 23. The plan should clearly designate, and indicate the area of, all open space whether or not it counts as required open space based on design standards.

   We note that Site Plan Note 19 on the Record Plan (Drawing C1.1) indicates that the hatched areas depict required open space and says to refer to the recorded subdivision plan for information regarding the limits of the homeowners association area. However, it is unclear where this information is provided on the plan.

   b. Open space location—Much of the proposed open space is fragmented, located in the corners of the site behind lots and in the center of the site surrounded by lots. Given the fact that stormwater management facilities are permitted on a portion of the required open space, the development should make the most of the remaining open space for the use of residents. The open space should be better arranged to maximize its usefulness for recreation and should be clearly delineated from adjacent lots (see Subpoint c.).

   The schools in Warminster have served as public recreation nodes for residents. As the schools close and are redeveloped, the public recreation spaces cease to exist. Open space in the new developments is private and there is nothing close by for existing residents. The township should ensure that active and passive recreation opportunities are maximized on the site for new residents and that sufficient recreation facilities are provided in the area for existing residents.

   c. Open space boundaries—Open space areas should be clearly delineated from adjacent lots so that there is no encroachment on common open space by private lot
owners. Additionally, 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. The plan shows some plantings as demarcation but, for example, the side and rear yard of Lots 28, and along Lots 29-30 and Lots 32-33 show few plantings. We recommend that plantings or, preferably, fencing be provided along all open space that abuts individual lots so that residents don’t use public open space as an extension of their yards, and to provide privacy for adjacent lots from the tot lot and other recreation activities.

d. **Recreation facility completion**—The plan shows open space for recreation including a tot lot and walking trail. We recommend that the township require that the tot lot and walking trail be constructed before lots are sold to ensure that the recreation amenities are completed and available to the new residents.

3. **Grading**—Section 518.6 of the subdivision and land development ordinance 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 in order to permit the normal rounding of the edge without encroaching on the abutting property. The 274 contour line on the southern boundary of the site adjacent to Tax Parcel #49-17-55 appears to be within 3 feet of the parcel line. The plan should be revised to show grading more than 5 feet from the property line.

The side/rear yard of Lot 24 shows a grade of approximately 20 percent. A significant portion of the yard space of this lot will have steep slopes and have little usable yard space. We recommend that the side and rear yards be revised to provide more usable yard space.

4. **Buffer plantings**—Buffer yards are to be planted and are proposed to be graded to serve as stormwater swales. Section 523.5.B of the subdivision and land development ordinance states that no stormwater facility or other site amenity shall exist within the buffer which will inhibit the installation of required plant materials. We recommend that the township engineer determine if the buffer materials and stormwater conveyance can be accommodated in the required planted buffer yards.

5. **Trees over 24 inches in caliper**—Subdivision and land development ordinance Section 602.3.C requires that any tree over 24 inches in caliper shall be 100 percent protected, whether located within the woodland areas or standing alone. The plan shows removal of numerous large trees but does not indicate the size of the trees. The plan should indicate the size of the trees to be removed so that compliance with the protection requirement can be verified.

6. **Emergency access**—The plan shows an emergency access to Marian Road. It appears that this access will be constructed as a trail with a 2-inch wearing course which may not accommodate the loads of an emergency vehicle. We recommend that the township engineer determine if this trail design is sufficient for the purpose intended.

7. **Snow storage**—Note 4 of the Conditional Use Adjudication and Order (Drawing C1.1) states that the homeowners association shall be responsible for snow removal along the private roads in the development and ensure no snow is pushed or placed on or along a township road or public lands. We recommend that the plan show designated areas for snow storage.
8. **Open space, stormwater facility maintenance schedule**—The plan states that the homeowners association will maintain the open space which includes recreation and stormwater management facilities. We recommend that the plan be revised to include a maintenance schedule for the facilities to ensure that they work effectively over the long term and to avoid unnecessary maintenance expenses from neglect.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the August 3, 2016, 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:dc

cc: Kevin Reilly, County Builders, Inc.
    Robert Cunningham, P.E., Holmes Cunningham LLC
    John VanLuvanee, Eastburn & Gray, PC
    Craig D. Kennard, P.E., Gilmore & Associates, Township Engineer
    Judith Stern Goldstein, Boucher & James, Township Planner (via email)
    Greg Schuster, Municipal 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 Christ’s Home Child Development Center
   TMP #49-9-39
   Applicant: Christ’s Home
   Owner: Same
   Plan Dated: June 24, 2016
   Date Received: June 29, 2016

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 16,518-square-foot institutional building on a 52.14-acre parcel. The site contains numerous institutional buildings comprising the Christ’s Home for Children and is served by public water and sewer.

Location: Between York, Norristown, and Street roads, with frontage on York and Norristown roads.

Zoning: R-1 Resident District permits Use 21 Youth Services by conditional use. The minimum lot size for the use is 20,000 square feet.

Present Use: Institutional.

COMMENTS

1. Conditional use—Section 401.C of the zoning ordinance permits Youth Services as a conditional use, in accordance with Part 25 of the ordinance. The plan cannot be approved until conditional use approval is granted.
2. **Waiver requested**—The site plan indicates that the applicant is requesting waivers from the following subdivision and land development ordinance requirements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section 304</td>
<td>To permit Preliminary/Final combined submission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 404.2</td>
<td>To permit different location map scale.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 406.2.F</td>
<td>To not provide a location map.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 505</td>
<td>To improve Norristown and York roads.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 512.7</td>
<td>To permit a parking area without planting strip.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 512.11</td>
<td>To permit parking lot pavement specification revisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 513.1</td>
<td>To permit sidewalks without a 3-foot planting strip.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 521.1B</td>
<td>To not require accounting for future use of undeveloped area for stormwater pipe sizing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 526.5</td>
<td>To not require specified buffers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   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.

   We note that a waiver is requested to Section 526.5 of the subdivision and land development for relief from buffers. This ordinance section actually relates to time of submission for Traffic Impact Studies. Buffer requirements are found in Section 523. We recommend that the waiver reference be corrected.

3. **Additional requirements for Youth Service Use**—Section 403 of the zoning ordinance requires that the Youth Services use and property in the R-1 District be subject to a Master Plan agreement with the township. The township should determine if the proposed use and building are consistent with the master plan agreement.

4. **Parking spaces**—Plan shows 121 parking spaces for the 16,158-square-foot building. The zoning ordinance does not include a parking standards for Use 21 and the plan notes parking requirements will be determined by the Board of Supervisors based on facility design and use. The applicant should assure the township that the proposed number of spaces is appropriate and sufficient to the proposed use.

5. **Off-street loading**—Section 2203 of the zoning ordinance requires that suitable and safe off-street loading be provided for every facility where the use exceeds 6,000 square feet. Loading docks, truck accessways, clearances, and turning radii shall be shown on all land development or zoning permit applications. The sketch plan showed a loading area in the rear of the building. The applicant’s engineer has indicated to our staff that loading will be infrequent and will be done from the existing access driveway on the eastern side of the proposed building to serve an all-purpose room. The township should determine whether this is acceptable.

6. **Tree protection**—The Existing Conditions/Demolition Plan (Sheet 6) shows several large trees along the north side of the site drive opposite the proposed building. The driplines of those trees extend onto the subject site and the Grading Plan (Sheet 7) proposes grading within the dripline area. Subdivision and land development ordinance Section 530 states that tree protection areas shall be shown on the landscape plan and grading plan and that grade changes
and excavations shall not encroach upon the Tree Protection Zone (TPZ). Section 530.3.A.2 requires that the TPZ 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.

To comply with the ordinance requirements, we recommend that the plan be revised to show a tree protection fence around the dripline of the trees and eliminate proposed grading within that tree protection area.

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 must be submitted for this proposed land development.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the August 3, 2016, 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:dc

cc: John Bryant, Christ’s Home  
Craig D. Kennard, P.E, Gilmore & Associates, Municipal Engineer  
Eric A. Britz, P.E., Bohler Engineering  
Gregg Schuster, Township Manager (via email)  
Judith Stern Goldstein, Boucher & James Engineers, Township Planner (via email)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Warminster Township Board of Supervisors
   Warminster Township Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Revised Final Plan of Land Development for Ann’s Choice
         TMP# 49-24-15-2
         Applicant: Ann’s Choice, Inc.
         Owner: Same
         Plan Dated: May 26, 2016
         Date Received: June 22, 2016

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 a 2-story (61,245 square feet) continuing care building containing 61 continuing care units. A skyway will connect the proposed building to an existing residential building to the southwest. The site contains a total of 1,990 dwelling units and 325 skilled nursing/assisted living units. Public water and sewer serve the site.

Location: Eastern side of Johnsville Boulevard and approximately 1,500 feet east of its intersection with Jacksonville Road and adjacent to Ivyland Borough.

Zoning: CCRC Continuing Care Retirement Community District permits continuing care retirement community, independent apartment units, assisted living units and skilled nursing units on minimum tract sizes of 75 acres.

Present Use: Residential

COMMENTS

1. Declaration of Restrictive Covenants, Agreements, and Easements—Development on the site is encumbered by deed restrictions placed by the Warminster Campus L.P. The restrictions address a number of issues including design and landscaping. The applicant should ensure that the plan meets all the requirements of the stipulation.
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 must be submitted for this proposed land development.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the August 3, 2016, 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:dc

cc:   D. Yeager, Ann’s Choice, Inc. c/o Erickson Living Development
      Craig D. Kennard, P.E., Gilmore & Associates, Municipal Engineer
      Eric A. Britz, P.E., Bohler Engineering
      Gregg Schuster, Township Manager (via email)
      Judith Stern Goldstein, Boucher & James Engineers, Township Planner (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 Franklin Corporate Center Lot 13- Home 2 Suites
         TMP #49-9-534
         Applicant: Sigma Hospitality Warminster LP
         Owner: Franklin Street Associates
         Plan Dated: April 25, 2016
         Date Received: June 16, 2016

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 64,000-square-foot hotel on a 9.027-acre parcel (the Franklin Corporate Center). The parcel contains an existing 62,820-square-foot hotel, 7,700-square-foot office, 3,110-square-foot bank, and 8,834-square-foot bank building. Public water and sewer serve the site.

Location: Southwestern side of Veterans Way approximately 600 feet west of its intersection with Johnsville Boulevard. The Franklin Corporate Center also is bordered by Street Road.

Zoning: I-O Industrial/Office District permits hotels, offices, retail shops, and other uses on lots of 1 acre or greater.

Present Use: Commercial-Office, bank, day care, hotel.

COMMENTS

1. Waivers requested—The site plan indicates that the applicant is requesting waivers from the following subdivision and land development ordinance requirements:

   Section 510.4.C  To permit 75-foot wide driveway opening instead of 35-foot.
   Section 512.6    To permit 18 parking spaces in a row without an island instead of 12 spaces.
   Section 524.F    To allow lights to remain on at night.
Section 523.6.A  For relief of hedge planting requirements to maintain consistency with existing plantings.

Section 604.5.A.2  Sidewalk along Veterans Way in lieu of recreational trail.

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. **Plan submission**—The plan was submitted as a “Preliminary/Final,” however, Section 301 of the subdivision and land development ordinance states the presentation of a Preliminary Plan and Final Plan shall each be considered a separate submission. A waiver would have to be requested and the township should determine if the submission is sufficient to be reviewed only once.

3. **Sidewalks**—Section 809.1 of the subdivision and land development ordinance requires that sidewalks be constructed on one side of all frontage streets and both sides of all other streets within the subdivision or land development. The plan provides sidewalks along Street Road and Veterans Way but not along the site frontage on Johnsville Road where there is a sidewalk on the opposite side. We recommend that a sidewalk be provided along Johnsville Road to accommodate pedestrians such as employees arriving to the site by bus and for hotel guests.

4. **Traffic impact study**—A traffic impact study should be completed for this proposal in accordance with Section 404.7 of the subdivision and land development ordinance which requires a Transportation Impact Study for any proposed land development or revision of existing land use anticipated to generate 100 or more trips per day. The plan proposes a use which would generate more than 100 trips per day and is a revision to an approved plan.

5. **Refuse collection**—If outdoor refuse collection is intended, the plan should be revised to indicate the proposed location of the dumpsters and the required screening in compliance with Section 527.11 of the subdivision and land development ordinance.

6. **Declaration of Restrictive Covenants, Agreements, and Easements**—Development on the site is encumbered by deed restrictions placed by the Erickson Communities, which sold the land to the applicant. The restrictions address a number of issues including design and landscaping. The applicant should ensure that the plan meets all applicable requirements.

7. **Crosswalks**—The plan shows existing crosswalks connecting sidewalks across driveways in several locations. The plan shows a proposed sidewalk along Veterans Way which is bisected by driveways in two locations. There is also a driveway between the sidewalks connecting Veterans Way and the proposed hotel. We recommend that crosswalks be provided in these locations to enhance pedestrian safety.

8. **Naval Air Warfare Center District**—The Warminster Township Comprehensive Plan (2004) advocates establishment of a special character district to recall the history and accomplishments of the Naval Air Warfare Center. The plan recommends use of icons, such as aircraft-related items, and landscaping to identify the site and establish a unified character. We recommend that the applicant and township planning commission discuss how to reflect the character of the base in the proposed development.
9. **Signage**—We recommend that sign details be shown for any proposed signs to ensure that they meet the zoning ordinance requirements for area, height, etc., in Part 23 of the zoning ordinance.

10. **Parking lot design**—Use of parking stalls in the parking area southeast of the proposed hotel building opposite the main entrance requires backing into traffic headed to and coming from the adjacent Holiday Inn. Conflicts between through traffic and parking maneuvers may occur. We recommend that the parking area be redesigned to separate circulation from parking functions.

11. **Proposed trees**—The plan proposes four *Sophora japonica* (scholar tree) trees along parking spaces and sidewalks. This tree drops flower petals, fruits, pods, and leaves which can be a nuisance when planted near parking and sidewalks. We recommend specifying another type of shade tree in these areas. Additionally, *Liriodendron tulipifera* (tulip tree), which is proposed around parking areas, becomes very large and is somewhat weak wooded, making it susceptible to damage in high winds or snow or ice storms. It requires a large area to grow and is not appropriate as a parking lot tree.

12. **Stormwater management**—The plan does not contain a stormwater management report. It appears that the stormwater is to flow directly into the overall stormwater management system for the Franklin Corporate Center. The applicant should provide verification to the township that there is sufficient capacity in this system to handle the increased stormwater runoff.

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 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 August 3, 2016, 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:dc

cc: Pinank Patel, Sigma Hospitality Warminster LP
    Mark M. Thompson, P.E., Taylor Wiseman & Taylor
    Craig D. Kennard, P.E., Gilmore & Associates, Township Engineer
    Greg Schuster, Municipal Manager (via email)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Wrightstown Township Board of Supervisors
   Wrightstown Township Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Preliminary Plan of Subdivision for Dacey
          TMP #53-2-103
          Applicant: Michael and Kathleen Dacey
          Owner: Same
          Plan Dated: May 27, 2016
          Date Received: June 21, 2016

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 an 8.6-acre site into three residential lots. An existing two-story, single-family dwelling, a garage, and two outbuildings will remain on Lot 1, which will be 6.201 acres. Lots 2 and 3 will be 1.228 and 1.267, respectively, and will each contain a proposed two-story, single-family dwelling. Individual on-lot water and sewage facilities will serve the site.

Location: The parcel has access to both Jericho Valley Road and Windy Bush Road, approximately 560 feet from the intersection of these two roads.

Zoning: The parcel is zoned CR-I Country Residential/Low Density District which permits single-family detached dwellings with a minimum lot area of 1 acre.

Present Use: Residential.

COMMENTS

1. **Curbs and sidewalks**—Township officials should determine if curbs and sidewalks should be provided along Windy Bush Road on future plan submissions in accordance with Sections 22-520.1 and 22-520.6 of the subdivision and land development ordinance. While there are no sidewalks along Jericho Valley Road and Windy Bush Road in proximity to the subject site, we note that the site is across from the Anchor Crossing shopping center and less than a quarter of a mile from the commercial and office uses at the intersection of Windy Bush Road and Route 413. Curbs have not been provided along Jericho Valley Road and Windy Bush Road, although drainage swales have been provided for storm drainage.
2. **Clear sight triangles**—Clear sight triangles are required by Section 22-524.1.B of the subdivision and land development ordinance.

3. **Park and recreation land**—The applicant should indicate how the park and recreation land requirement of Section 22-531.1.B(1)(a) of the subdivision and land development ordinance will be met.

4. **Stormwater management**—The applicant should include information about all maintenance and operation practices for the bioretention berm on Lots 2 and 3. The information would include any anticipated maintenance procedures, both short- and long-term. This will allow regular scheduled maintenance tasks to be included in annual planning.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the August 3, 2016 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: Michael and Kathleen Dacey  
Adam D. Crews, Crews Surveying, LLC  
Mario Canales, P.E., Pickering, Corts &Summerson, Inc., Township Engineer  
Joe Pantano, Township Manager (via email)
### Bucks County Planning Commission
### Planning Module Reviews
### August 03, 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Development</th>
<th>BCPC Number</th>
<th>Tax Parcel Number</th>
<th>PaDEP Code Number</th>
<th>Plan Review Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quakertown Borough</td>
<td>Independent Living Community</td>
<td>10911-B</td>
<td>35-9-15-2</td>
<td>1-09811-054-3J</td>
<td>0201-60021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bensalem Township</td>
<td>Livengrin Foundation Expansion</td>
<td>11697-A</td>
<td>2-33-96</td>
<td>1-09004-363-3J</td>
<td>0201-60025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warwick Township</td>
<td>Haaz</td>
<td></td>
<td>51-10-28-1</td>
<td>1-09951-194-3S</td>
<td>0201-60026</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
July 8, 2016

Mr. Thomas R. Knab, Project Designer
Renew Design Group
121 North Main Street
Suite 301
Souderton, PA 18964

RE: Independent Living Community – 105 E. Mill Street
PaDEP Code #1-09811-054-3J
BCPC #10911-B
TMP #35-9-15-2
Quakertown Borough, Bucks County, PA

Dear Mr. Knab:

We have received a copy of the planning module\(^1\) for the residential land development consisting of 22 age-restricted multifamily dwelling units and a clubhouse at 105 E. Mill Street. Proposed is a sewer connection/tap-in to serve the development with public sewer service via the Licking Run Interceptor with eventual treatment and disposal at the Borough of Quakertown Wastewater Treatment Facility.

The Act 537 Sewage Facilities Plan for Quakertown Borough, Bucks County, Pennsylvania (1994), which is the official sewage facilities plan for Quakertown Borough, indicates that the site is within a public sewer service area. The proposal is consistent with the borough’s official sewage facilities plan. However, we note that documentation confirming that the project is consistent with DEP Technical Guidance 012-0700-001 Implementation of the PA State History Code has not been provided.

If the borough approves the planning module and 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, Sewage Planning Supervisor, 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 Quakertown Borough official 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]

Lisa M. Wolff
Community Planner

LMW:dc

Attachment

cc: Scott McElree, Quakertown Borough Manager
    Scott Borger, Director of Wastewater, Quakertown Sewer Department
    Genevieve Kostick, BCDH
    Elizabeth Mahoney, PaDEP
    Act 537
**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  
Independent Living Community - 105 Mill Street

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

1. Date plan received by county planning agency. May 19, 2016

2. Date plan received by planning agency with areawide jurisdiction  
   
   Agency name  

3. Date review completed by agency July 8, 2016

**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  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?  
   | ☒   | 10. Does this proposal meet the zoning requirements of the ordinance? N/A  
   | ☒   | If no, describe inconsistencies  
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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

☐ ☑ 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: Lisa Wolff
Title: Planner
Signature: [Signature]
Date: 7/8/2016

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.
July 5, 2016

Mr. Robert F. Irick
Irick, Eberhardt, & Mientus, Inc.
Suite 3
2771 Geryville Pike
Pennsburg, PA 18073

RE: Livengrin Foundation Expansion
PaDEP Code # 1-09004-563-3J
BCPC #11697-A
Bensalem Township, Bucks County

Dear Mr. Irick:

We have received a copy of the planning module\(^1\) concerning the proposal to construct a 16,600-square-foot detox accommodations/counseling building and a 3,936-square-foot first responders treatment building on a 40.29-acre site. The detox accommodations/counseling building will have 22 detox beds, with each bed estimated to generate 89 gallons per day (GPD) or 8 EDUs. The first responders treatment building will require 2 EDUs. Wastewater flows will increase by 2,458 GPD (10 EDUs) and will be collected and conveyed to the Northeast Philadelphia Water Pollution Control Plant via the Bucks County Water and Sewer Authority’s 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. However, documentation from the Pennsylvania State Historic Preservation Office indicates a high probability that archeological resources are located in the project area, but the activities described in the proposal should have no effect on such resources. Should the scope of the project be amended to include additional ground disturbing activity, the office should be contacted immediately and a Phase I Archaeological Survey may be necessary to locate all potentially significant archaeological resources.

The County Planning Agency Review, Component 4B, is attached for inclusion with the planning module application to PaDEP. If the municipality approves the planning module and 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.

\(^1\) 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.
Should you have any questions, please contact me.

Sincerely,

Michael A. Roedig
Senior Planner

cc: Eric Ponert, Philadelphia Water Department
    Genevie Kostick, BCDH
    Ron Gans, O'Donnell & Naccarato
    Loretta Alston, Bensalem Township Department of Building and Planning
    William Cmorey, Bensalem Township Manager
    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
Livengrin Foundation Expansion

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

1. Date plan received by county planning agency.  June 23, 2016
2. Date plan received by planning agency with areawide jurisdiction  
   Agency name
3. Date review completed by agency  July 5, 2016

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  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?

☐  ☒ 10. Does this proposal meet the zoning requirements of the ordinance?  N/A
   If no, describe inconsistencies
### 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? 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 N/A</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:** Michael Roedig
- **Title:** Senior Planner
- **Signature:** [Signature]
- **Date:** July 5, 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.
July 26, 2016

Vincent W. Fioravanti, P.E.
618 B Street Road
Southampton PA, 18966

RE: Edward Haaz Single-Family Wastewater Discharge Plant
PaDEP Code # 1-09951-194-3S
TMP # 51-10-28-1
Warwick Township, Bucks County, PA

Dear Mr. Fioravanti,

We have received a copy of the planning module\(^1\) regarding the proposed construction of a single-family wastewater discharge plant, on a single property of 1.34 acres, to replace an existing failed septic system.

The projected sewage from the single family residence will be 400 gallons per day. The sewage will be discharged from a small flow package treatment plant into the Neshaminy Creek by utilizing a dry stream channel, which will cross county-owned open space adjacent to the creek.

The Act 537 Sewage Facilities Plan for Warwick Township, 1995 is the official Act 537 Plan for this portion of Warwick Township. The plan indicates that this property is outside the area intended to be served by public sewer. The planning module’s alternative analysis indicates that the property is not suitable for connection to public sewer, nor is it suitable for on-lot storage or disposal. As a result, a small-flow package treatment plant was recommended by the Bucks County Health Department in a letter dated October 29, 2015.

The proposal to construct a small-flow package treatment plant is consistent with the official Act 537 Plan, since this plan indicates that the subject site is outside an area to be served by public sewer. The plan recommends that properties located outside of a sewer service area utilize on-lot systems, and where on-lot disposal is not suitable, that each site be evaluated individually for alternatives such as a small-flow or package treatment facility.

---

\(^1\)Under the revised Chapter 71 of the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection’s Title 25, Rules and Regulations, the planning module is a revision to the Warwick 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
The County Planning Agency Review, Component 4B, is attached for inclusion with the planning module application to DEP. If the municipality approves the planning module and revises the official sewage facilities plan, the completed (signed) resolution and required supporting data (Components 3s 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.

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

Sincerely,

Christopher N. Dochney
Planner

CND:dc

Attachment

cc: Genevie Kostick, BCDH
    Elizabeth Mahoney, PaDEP
    Gail Weniger, Manager, Warwick Township
    Kyle Seckinger, Zoning Officer, Warwick Township
    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**
Edward Haaz Single-Family Wastewater Discharge Plant

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

1. Date plan received by county planning agency: **June 29, 2016**
2. Date plan received by planning agency with areawide jurisdiction
   - **Agency name:**
3. Date review completed by agency: **July 26, 2016**

**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.)?
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 plan and 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
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

☐  ☒  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: Christopher N. Dochney
   Title: Planner
   Signature: [Signature]
   Date: July 26, 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.
BUCKS COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING

AGENDA

1. Call to Order

2. Pledge of Allegiance

3. Approval of Minutes of August 3, 2016

4. Executive Director’s Report – Written Report is enclosed

5. Staff Presentation: Cross Keys Study Update
   Dave Sebastian, Senior Planner; Rich Brahler, Senior Transportation Planner; and
   John Ives, 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
BUCKS COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES OF MEETING
AUGUST 3, 2016

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

STAFF PRESENT: Richard G. Brahler, Jr.; Lynn T. Bush; Debra Canale; Christopher N. Dochney; Paul W. Gordon, John S. Ives; David P. Johnson; Timothy A. Koehler, Charles T. McIlhinney; Michael A. Roedig; David A. Sebastian; Matthew M. Walters; Maureen Wheatley

GUESTS: James Boyle, Reporter, The Intelligencer

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, JULY 6, 2016
   Upon motion of Mr. Goodnoe, seconded by Mr. Kisselback, with the vote being 8-0 the motion carried to approve the minutes of the July 6, 2016 meeting as presented.

4. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR’S REPORT
   The Executive Director’s Report was submitted to the board with the meeting packet prior to the meeting.

   Ms. Bush introduced Mr. Christopher N. Dochney, the Bucks County Planning Commission’s new Planner. Mr. Dochney spoke of his undergraduate degree in architecture and sociology and his master’s degree from Rutgers in city and regional planning. He stated that he has spent the last five years as a Senior Planner for a private firm in New Jersey. He is happy to be finding his way here in Pennsylvania. The Board welcomed him.

   Ms. Bush informed us that the Transportation Improvement Project list presented by Mr. Richard Brahler at the last meeting was adopted by the DVRPC and will now go to PENNDOT for final approval. Ms. Bush was excited to announce that as a part of the TIP, Bucks County will receive almost $1.9 million for the engineering, designing and building of a portion of the Greenway Trail along the Neshaminy Creek from Central Park in Doylestown through to Warrington.

   Ms. Bush noted her meeting with Middletown Township officials on the intersection improvements that will be occurring on Langhorne-Yardley Road and Woodbourne Road. The township has paid for the engineering of these improvements, which can speed up the process. However, due to the need for taking a sliver of land from Core Creek Park to achieve the correct alignment, it could take about a year. The park land was purchased with federal funds which requires approval from all levels of government with final approval by the National Park Service.
Ms. Bush stated that she invited the staff today to see the New Britain Borough presentation. The conclusion of this project is approaching and we are seeing some real action happening within the Borough with the sidewalks being constructed along Butler Avenue and demolition about to begin on the former Knoell property. Additionally, several other properties along Butler Avenue have been purchased by developers. Ms. Bush also noted her meeting with Dr. Maria Gallo, the new president of Delaware Valley University. Dr. Gallo is completely on board with the ‘Main Street/College Town’ design we are proposing for New Britain Borough and looks forward to enhancing the University’s relationship with New Britain Borough.

Ms. Bush recognized the passing of Mr. Robert E. Moore, former Executive Director of the BCPC for more than 20 years. She noted his significant contributions to Bucks County and the Planning Commission.

Mr. Goodnoe asked if the TIP was approved as it was presented to the BCPC Board last month. Ms. Bush replied essentially yes, with just a few adjustments. Mr. Johnson stated that there was shifting of funds from projects that were earmarked but would not be going through for various reasons, to projects that would are ready to move forward.

5. **PRESENTATION: NEW BRITAIN BOROUGH – BUTLER AVENUE MAIN STREET STUDY –**
   **MATTHEW WALTERS, PLANNER**

Ms. Bush introduced Mr. Walters stating that he presented this to New Britain Borough early this summer and it was very well received by the officials and residents.

Mr. Walters stated that this project began about three years ago at a town hall meeting attended by borough officials and over 100 residents. There were numerous factors affecting the borough at the time: they had just formed a Community and Business Committee; the Knoell factory had been closed for several years and developers were interested in the property; Delaware Valley College was pursuing University status; and the Route 202 Parkway had just opened which took traffic off Butler Avenue. The Borough recognized its potential, especially considering its great neighborhoods, open space, historic buildings, schools, the college, and a perfect location within the county. With the key idea being to foster the University-Borough relationship and create Butler Avenue as a Main Street, the Borough began to coordinate with the local business community, seek out new businesses and, to work with the BCPC develop a revitalization plan.

Mr. Walters said that the business community of New Britain was seeking more pedestrian traffic, community activities and events on Butler Avenue, they are concerned with retaining their current businesses and attracting new ones that are willing to work with the ‘Main Street/College Town’ feel they are going for. They would like to see on street parking, the train stations emphasized and maintained, and continued cooperation from the borough.

Mr. Walters spoke of the residents of New Britain Borough and what is important to them. They are looking for strong local businesses, more sidewalks and trails, and an improved unified appearance of Butler Avenue with respect to the residential neighborhoods.

Mr. Walters said from the meetings with New Britain Borough three themes were clear: the need to foster and build the University/Borough relationship; to create a ‘Main Street’ corridor along Butler Avenue by updating the land use regulations and focusing on walkability; and, working with and supporting local businesses.
Mr. Walters showed us the current land use map of New Britain Borough. The major uses are commercial, residential and government with a relatively even 30 percent in each category. The concentration of commercial uses are at either end of the borough with the center being mostly residential.

Mr. Walters explained that by using the ESRI Business Analyst Tools to develop the Market Analysis of the New Britain area, he found that although the current population of New Britain is approximately 3,000, if you use the drive time analysis the population grows to almost 173,000 within the zero to ten minute drive time. Using the ESRI business tools, he was able to identify the potential opportunities that would fit into the ‘Main Street’ feel the Borough is looking for, such as full and limited service restaurants, specialty food services and drinking establishments, home furnishing stores, clothing and accessory stores, sporting goods, hobby and musical instrument stores, florists, office supply, stationery and gift stores and other miscellaneous retailers.

Mr. Walters stated that New Britain Borough established a Vision Statement which states that the Butler Avenue corridor will reach its full economic and functional potential by establishing well-balanced land use composition, devising development and redevelopment that is sensitive to the existing neighborhoods and historic resources and the local character is enhanced by any new development. There should be a synergy between the commercial area and the University. The transportation network should be safe and efficient with connections to the regional trails network. The Butler Avenue corridor should have an identity and a sense of place.

Mr. Walters told us that the vision of New Britain Borough will be achieved by constructing physical improvements such as streetscaping, access management and redevelopment of underutilized properties. It will also be achieved by enacting policies such as the Mixed Use Overlay Ordinance, establishing design guidelines and other zoning and subdivision amendments, and creating a marketing and branding campaign.

Mr. Walters explained that some of the many benefits of streetscaping are that it can establish safe boundaries for pedestrians, promote walkability and improve curb appeal, it can connect multiple destinations, complement revitalization efforts and will help create a sense of identity and place. Streetscaping can also enhances property values of the residents of New Britain Borough.

Mr. Walters then showed us some examples of ideal streetscaping identifiers such as, period lighting, parallel parking, flags, wide sidewalks, benches and pedestrian crosswalks. He also showed us examples of access management of existing businesses and how it can make them much more visually appealing and safer to motorists and pedestrians.

Mr. Walters reminded us of his presentation a few months ago when he presented the Mixed Use Overlay District New Britain Borough was establishing in the Delaware Valley University section of Butler Avenue. The Borough will be redeveloping the underutilized land, infill developing and redeveloping of former industrial and commercial sites and continuing to contribute to the Main Street character of Butler Avenue.

Mr. Walters stated that in order to achieve the Main Street feel, the Borough has added dimensional and design requirements for the mixed use overlay, such as maximum building height and maximum setbacks from Butler Avenue. Additionally, the first floor along Butler Avenue must be a nonresidential use, and public space is required. To further create Butler Avenue as a
Main Street all parking should be behind principal buildings and development must contribute to the streetscape with walkways, landscaping and street trees, outdoor sidewalk lighting, benches, bike racks and access management. All new buildings should be compatible with existing architectural scale and style and any franchise design/architecture is discouraged.

Mr. Walters stated that in trying to go beyond the design guidelines, Ms. Bush, Mr. Sebastian and Mr. Koehler have been developing a ‘standardized’ set of design guidelines that will integrate into existing ordinances, with building guidelines that provide appropriate architectural examples and site development guidelines that will assist in site planning with building placement and orientation, examples of public spaces and amenities, the development’s relationship to its surrounding properties, circulation, parking, and service areas, along with examples of landscaping and design elements and accessory features. The guidelines will assist the developer to have a better understanding of what the Borough will be looking for.

Mr. Walters explained the Butler Avenue study area is broken down into three sections: Town Center which begins at Bristol Road and extends to include the shopping center; the Historic Village section, which is mostly residential with a few businesses and also includes the New Britain Baptist Church; and, the University Village section, which extends from Beulah Road to New Britain Road and includes Delaware Valley University.

Mr. Walters showed the existing conditions of each of the three distinct sections of the Borough and the potential improvements, including gateway and traffic improvements that would bring about the ‘Main Street’ concept to Butler Avenue.

The floor was then opened for questions. Mr. Tomlinson questioned as to who would pay for the improvements to the shopping center. Mr. Walters replied that a representative from the shopping center was a member of the steering committee and that some improvements have already been made. He said that future improvements could be funded through grants or the property owner.

Mr. Wydro questioned as to whether they were considering changing the location of the rail station to be closer to the shopping center. Mr. Walters, Mr. Johnson and Ms. Bush were all in agreement that SEPTA would not be considering any new stops or stations on the rail line.

Mr. Goodnoe asked if there was a Historic Architectural Review Board active in New Britain. Mr. Walters said that there is a Historic Commission but not an official Historic Architectural Review Board. There are provisions for historic preservation in the zoning ordinance, however.

Mr. Nyman asked if there were any proposed pedestrian crossings not at an intersection. Mr. Walters stated that all the recommended pedestrian crossings were at intersections with traffic lights.

Mr. Wydro and the board thanked Mr. Walters for his presentation.

6. **ACT 247 REVIEWS**

The reviews of August 3, 2016, were mailed to the board for their review prior to the meeting. Upon motion of Mr. Nyman, seconded by Mr. Pellegrino, the motion carried to approve the August 3, 2016 Act 247 reviews.
7. **OLD BUSINESS**
   There was no old business.

8. **NEW BUSINESS**
   There was no new business.

9. **PUBLIC COMMENT**
   There was no public comment.

10. **ADJOURNMENT**
    Mr. Wydro adjourned the meeting at 2:50 PM.

    Submitted by:
    Debra Canale, Staff Secretary
Hazard Mitigation Plan – County Commissioners adopted the 2016 Hazard Mitigation Plan, which is a state requirement. Our Hazard Mitigation Plan is prepared by the County but must be adopted by all 54 municipalities. All municipalities have been involved in some way in its preparation. The plan identifies the main hazards facing Bucks County (flooding, severe weather, winter storms) and highlights ways in which we are prepared to respond.

State Transportation Commission – The State Transportation Commission met in Falls Township this month. This statewide group guides transportation policy and adopts the Twelve-Year Plan. Commissioner Charley Martin is a member. There was a tour of the work being done on the I95-PA Turnpike connection and then a review of the other big projects in Pennsylvania. The most interesting discussion was about autonomous cars and what PennDOT is looking at to prepare for the self-driving vehicles.

County Commissioners Association of Pennsylvania – I attended the CCAP Annual Meeting on behalf of Bucks County in early August. Topics that are of statewide interest to us included the problems with recycling electronics and regulations associated with water and stormwater. I drafted, and the CCAP membership adopted, a new policy for CCAP to lobby for changes in the Covered Devices Recycling Act which has put us in this bind with the disposal of TVs and monitors. There was also discussion about water and stormwater management regulations which I will cover with you at the meeting.

Patterson Farm – Rich Harvey and I are working with Lower Makefield Township to permanently preserve the Patterson Farm and include it in the county’s list of preserved farms. We are getting close to making that happen.

Grange Fair – BCPC had a display again this year. Those of us who manned the table at the fair noticed that almost all the questions were directed to the exhibit we put together on our trails initiatives. People were overwhelmingly supportive of trails and mentioned how much they love the Montgomery County trails.
BCPC Activity Report

Community Planning and Municipal Economic Development Initiative

The Planning Commission staff helps townships and boroughs in several ways: we attend local planning commissioner meetings to provide advice and guidance, and we prepare plans and ordinances in cooperation with local representatives. We are in our fourth year of providing municipal assistance through the Municipal Economic Development Initiative (MEDI), and several of the activities below are in that category and are so noted.

We attended the Hilltown Township Planning Commission meetings.

Preparing Plans – The Borough Planning Commission continued their review of the final draft of the New Britain Borough Main Street Plan (part of our MEDI program). A draft of model design guidelines was prepared and will be incorporated as an appendix to the plan. We expect the Borough Planning Commission to recommend plan approval in September and the Borough Council to follow in October. Staff is assessing what additional desktop publishing changes could be made to the final draft.

We are preparing the complete draft of the Cross Keys Land Use and Transportation Plan and hope to finish the draft in August.

The Staff continued to work on the Richboro Village Master Plan MEDI project. Revised designs for public space and roundabout landscaping were produced. GIS staff is also currently developing mapping of key village locations and photographic simulations of opportunity areas.

We met with the Dublin Borough Planning Commission to discuss draft amendments to their zoning and subdivision and land development ordinances. We will provide suggestions to address their concerns at the next meeting.

The staff is also working on revisions to the draft Quakertown Borough—Summary of Parking Inventory based on updated information recently received by the Borough’s Economic Development Consultant.

In addition to special studies and plans, we continue to prepare, under contract, Comprehensive Plans for Northampton Township, Lower Makefield Township, and Hilltown Township.

We met with Warrington Township to discuss an overview of the current comprehensive plan, citing portions of the plan that remain pertinent, are no longer relevant, need revision, or must be more thoroughly evaluated from a policy stand-point.

Preparing Ordinances – We continued an assessment of changes needed to the Newtown Area Joint Zoning Ordinance related to Planned Residential Development use requirements and definitions and requirements associated with water and sewer facilities.

Trails Program – We continued to work on the design and engineering of the Upper Bucks Rail Trail and have finalized the details for a public meeting in October to review the plans.

The County has also been awarded a Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality grant from DVRPC for the purpose of designing and constructing a portion of the Neshaminy Creek Greenway extending from...
Central Park in Doylestown Township, to the intersection of Easton Road and Kelly Drive at the Doylestown/Warrington townships line.

Providing Planning Information and Coordinating with other Agencies

The planning commission staff provides information and assistance to the many people who call us for help. This includes topics such as demographic and socioeconomic data, development proposals, BCPC reports, local zoning, and municipal regulations. Some of this work results from our mandated functions (reviewing proposed developments and reviewing various permit applications), some from other groups that need information, and some from residents who need guidance. Staff continued review of the DVRPC's draft 2013 employee estimates as a precursor to the draft 2045 employee forecasts.

Act 247 and 537 Review Activity

- 12 Subdivision and Land Development Proposal
- 5 Sketch Plans
- 6 Municipal Plans and Ordinances
- 2 Sewage Facility Planning Modules
- 1 Traffic Impact Studies

Transportation

BCPC Transportation Planning staff is responsible for working with PennDOT, DVRPC, SEPTA, TMA Bucks, and other groups to ensure that our transportation and funding needs are addressed. We participate in the development of the regional Transportation Improvement Program. This month, we attended the State Transportation Commission Meeting where the TIP received approval from the state.

The County is currently pursuing two trail development initiatives. The Upper Bucks Rail Trail will connect the Lehigh Valley’s Saucon Rail Trail with the borough of Quakertown by converting a currently unused portion of SEPTA rail line to a trail through Springfield and Richland townships. Staff provided assistance to the project consultant and PA DEP, as well as working through leasing issues with SEPTA. The County has hired a consultant to design the Newtown Rail Trail. Staff processed the consultant contracts, as well as the grant funding contracts related to the project. The current project will construct the portion of the Newtown Rail Trail in Upper Southampton Township that will connect with the Pennypack Trail in Montgomery County. Both of these trails are part of the Circuit, which is envisioned as a 750-mile regional trail network.

Geographic Information Systems (GIS)

GIS has become a central function in Bucks County government, with our GIS staff providing the overall management for a system that involves not only BCPC but also Emergency Communications and 9-1-1, Board of Assessment, Health Departments, and others. We help to keep the county tax map parcel records and road centerlines updated.

The GIS data is increasingly used by people outside the county, either through our very popular public viewer, or through our GIS Consortium of municipalities.

Updates of GIS data are provided to our Consortium members by request. This month the township of Upper Makefield requested and was provided an update of their GIS data. County GIS is still developing a GIS Open Data Portal web site that when completed members will be able to access their municipal data sets for both downloading and mapping.

The Southeastern Pennsylvania Shared Services GIS project is a collaborative effort of the counties of Bucks, Berks, Chester, Delaware, Montgomery,
and the City of Philadelphia. The group meets monthly and is developing a cloud hosted infrastructure to support a centralized and shared regional GIS database. Our July meeting was rescheduled and held at the Bucks County Emergency Operations Center in Ivyland. Montgomery County will be hosting the August meeting at the Emergency Management Training Center Complex in Conshohocken PA.
<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 Township</td>
<td>9-16-1</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors</td>
<td></td>
<td>Zoning Ordinance Amendment: Floodplain Regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nockamixon Township</td>
<td>30-16-1</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors</td>
<td></td>
<td>Zoning Ordinance Amendment: Establishment of New Uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nockamixon Township</td>
<td>30-16-CR1</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors</td>
<td>(30-11-143)</td>
<td>Land Acquisition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perkasie Borough</td>
<td>33-16-3</td>
<td>Borough Council</td>
<td></td>
<td>Zoning Ordinance Amendment: Brewery Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Southampton Township</td>
<td>48-16-3</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors</td>
<td></td>
<td>SALDO Amendment: Shade Tree Comm. Reference &amp; Zoning Ordinances Amendment: Shade Tree Comm. Reference &amp; Zoning Amendment Procedure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yardley Borough</td>
<td>54-16-WS1</td>
<td>Borough Council</td>
<td></td>
<td>Act 537 Update</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEMORANDUM

TO: Doylestown Township Board of Supervisors
Doylestown Township Planning Commission

FROM: Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Proposal to Amend the Zoning Ordinance—Floodplain Regulations
Applicant: Board of Supervisors
Received: August 22, 2016
Hearing Date: October 4, 2016

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 September 7, 2016.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposed Action: Amend the floodplain-related provisions in the zoning ordinance (Chapter 175) to provide consistency with the township floodplain ordinance (Ordinance No. 374) adopted in accordance with the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) standards.

Proposed Zoning Provisions: Article XIX Floodplain District will be deleted in its entirety. Section 175-9 Terms Defined will be amended to delete the terms flood fringe, flood, and one hundred year flood; revise the definition of floodway; and add a definition for base flood and watercourse. Section 175-10 will be revised to replace the FW Floodway, FF Flood Fringe, and FA General Floodplain overlay districts with a new FP Floodplain District (overlay). Section 175-11 will be revised to replace the last sentence with language that references the most recent flood insurance rate maps issued by FEMA.

Environmental protection standards for floodplains in Section 175-27.D(1)(a) and (b) will be amended by referencing the Special Flood Hazard Areas shown on the flood insurance rate maps, reducing the floodplain protection ratio to 95 percent, and adding a reference to the adopted floodplain ordinance and the flood insurance rate maps. Section 175-27.D(7)(a) pertaining to the Riparian Corridor Conservation District will be revised to reference the identified floodplain instead of the one hundred year floodplain. In addition, several sections of Article XIXA pertaining to the Riparian Corridor Conservation District will be revised to reference the identified floodplain or base flood event instead of the one hundred year floodplain.
COMMENTS

We recognize that the zoning amendment is intended to provide consistency with FEMA and other municipal land use ordinances floodplain standards. Prior to adoption, we recommend that township officials consider the following comments:

1. **Floodplain environmental protection standards**—Section 6. Flood Plains. of the amendment resolution proposes to reduce the floodplain protection ratio from 100 percent to 95 percent in Section 175-27.D(1)(b) of the zoning ordinance. We recommend that the protection ratio remain as 100 percent to maximize protection of the floodplain consistent with the performance standards of the Bucks County Natural Resources Plan (1999) and the strategies and actions of the Bucks County Comprehensive Plan (2011).

2. **Editorial comments**—The section chapter reference in Section 1. Definitions of the amendment resolution should be corrected from 179-9 to 175-9.

   The reference to the deletion and provision for subsection (c) in Section 6 Flood Plains of the resolution should be clarified. According to the zoning ordinance we have on record for this section, there is not currently a subsection (c). Therefore, we believe subsection (b) is intended to be deleted and replaced with the provisions proposed in both Section 6 and 7 of the amendment resolution.

   Also, the typographically error of the word ‘filing’ in the first line of Section 175-27.D(1)(b) should be corrected to ‘filling.’

   In addition, we note that Section 175-103.3A(2) of the existing zoning ordinance would still contain the term one-hundred-year floodplain. Township officials should ensure that adjustments throughout the zoning ordinance are made to reflect the revised terminology. Likewise, floodplain terms in the subdivision and land development ordinance should be examined to ensure consistency among land use documents.

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:dc

cc: Mario Canales, P.E., Pickering Corts, & Summerson, Township Engineer
Jeffrey P. Garton, Esq., Begley, Carlin & Mandio, LLP, Township Solicitor
Stephanie J. Mason, Township Manager (via email)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Nockamixon Township Board of Supervisors
    Nockamixon Township Planning Commission
FROM: Bucks County Planning Commission
SUBJECT: Proposal to Amend the Zoning Ordinance—Establishment of New Uses
Applicant: Board of Supervisors
Received: August 23, 2016
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 September 7, 2016.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposed Action: Amend the zoning ordinance to establish new use classifications relating to medical marijuana dispensary use and medical marijuana grower/processor use. The ordinance will provide new definitions and standards for the new uses.

Proposed Zoning Provisions: Proposed Use E-22, Medical Marijuana Dispensary would be permitted in the C Commercial District, VC Village Center District, and the VC-1 Village Center-1 District. Proposed Use G-23, Medical Marijuana Growing/Processing Facility would be permitted in the I Industrial District and the LI Industrial District.

The following regulations apply to both uses:

- Owned and operated in compliance with all applicable laws and regulations, including the Medical Marijuana Act and federal memoranda regarding medical marijuana.
- Setback 1,000 feet from the property line of a public, private, or parochial school, and a day-care center.
- Shall be clearly identified as such in its signage.
- Shall be subject to quarterly inspections by the township zoning officer or other township representative.
- Follow strict permit application requirements.
- Provide specific information to the Pennsylvania State Police.
COMMENTS

The zoning provisions proposed will be required to comply with the State’s Medical Marijuana Act as well as with the PA Municipalities Planning Code. Therefore, we are relying on the township to ensure that the proposed regulations are consistent with these laws and any other applicable laws prior to enactment. We offer the following comment for township officials to consider:

- **Parking, loading and buffer standards**—We recommend that parking and loading standards be provided for each use, or that reference be made to parking and loading requirements that would apply as required in zoning ordinance Sections 234-30 and 234-33. Landscaping and buffering standards similar to other uses as established in zoning ordinance Section 234-30 to reduce impacts related to parking and noise may also be beneficial to include.

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.

JSI:dc

cc: Jordan B. Yeager, Esq., Curtin & Heefner, LLP, Township Solicitor
    Keith DeLuca, Township Manager (via email)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Nockamixon Township Board of Supervisors
   Nockamixon Township Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Proposal for Township Land Acquisition—A portion of the Shively Estate Property
         TMP #30-11-143
         Applicant: Nockamixon Township
         Received: August 15, 2016
         Hearing Date: Not indicated

In accordance with the provisions of Sections 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 September 7, 2016.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposal: Subdivide an 18.263-gross-acre tract into two lots, consisting of 13.158 gross acres (Lot 1) and 5.105 gross acres (Lot 2). Lot 2 is to be acquired by Nockamixon Township for future municipal use and Lot 1 by a private entity. A shared access driveway off Easton Road is proposed. No construction is proposed at this time. Individual on-lot water and sewage facilities will serve the new lots.

A simultaneous review in accordance with the provisions of Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code (Section 502) regarding issues concerning the subdivision and future land development are addressed in correspondence BCPC #12182.

Location: Western side of intersection of Brownstone and Easton roads, approximately 980 feet north of the intersection of Frogtown and Easton roads.

Zoning: The I Industrial District allows for industrial activities such as light manufacturing, office parks, and warehousing in areas with direct access to Route 611 with a minimum lot area of 3 acres.

Present Use: Vacant dwelling, municipal storage, and agriculture.
COMMENTS

The Nockamixon Township Comprehensive Plan (2005) notes in Chapter 6, Community Facilities that there are major deficiencies with the existing township office and road crew headquarters. Space is limited for both public meetings as well as for storage of records and hinders efficient operations. Acquiring a new facility for township offices was stated as a need within the next 10 years. The acquisition of Lot 2 for township purposes is consistent with the township comprehensive plan. We endorse the acquisition of this land for township purposes to help accommodate their growing needs and operations. We recommend that the township consider the following issues:

1. **Buffer yards**—The R Residential District and single-family detached residential use border the subject lot on three sides. Therefore, the township should consider planting adequate buffer landscaping per zoning ordinance Section 234-30. It will help alleviate potential visual and sound impacts.

2. **Existing municipal salt storage area**—The plan notes an existing municipal salt storage area on the subject lot. If the township will be continuing or expanding this operation, they should consider enclosing it with a fence to provide security to the property per zoning ordinance Section 234-35.E.(1).

We would appreciate being notified of the Board of Supervisors’ decision regarding this matter.

JSI:de

cc: Estate of Mary Shively, c/o Robert Shively
    Keith Deluca, 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—Brewery Use
         Applicant: Borough Council
         Received: August 22, 2016
         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 September 7, 2016.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposed Action: Amend the zoning ordinance to add a definition for Brewery and permit the use in the C-2 General Commercial, I-1 Planned Industrial, and I-2 Light Industrial districts.

Proposed Zoning Provisions: A brewery is permitted in the C-2 General Commercial, I-1 Planned Industrial, and I-2 Light Industrial districts, subject to the area and dimensional requirements of the respective zoning districts.

Existing Zoning Provisions: The ordinance does not include a specific brewery use.

COMMENTS

We have several concerns that should be addressed by the borough prior to adoption of the proposed amendment, in order to be consistent with the existing ordinances and comprehensive plan.

1. **Brewery use regulations**—The proposal defines Brewery, but it does not include use regulations for the new Brewery use. As defined, the proposed Brewery use appears to be a manufacturing use that would be appropriate in an industrial district, but not necessarily appropriate in the C-2 General Commercial District, particularly the portion of the C-2 within the TC Town Center Overlay District.

   It appears that a brewery currently would be permitted in the I-1 and I-2 districts under the existing G(4) Manufacturing use, which is described as, “Facilities for the production, processing, cleaning, testing, and distribution of materials, goods, foodstuffs, and products.” It is unclear why a separate Brewery use under the proposed definition would be necessary.
The new use is proposed as a retail and consumer service use (E) use, which generally would be appropriate in the TC Overlay and other C-2 districts. However, the amendment makes no provision for food service, a tasting room, or other characteristics that would differentiate the Brewery use from a manufacturing-type use that could be a large-scale operation better suited for industrial districts. If the intent is to permit a smaller-scale, consumer service type of establishment in the borough, the use description and use regulations should reflect the activities that are to be permitted. Use regulations should address issues such as whether outdoor dining/service are permitted and if so, if regulations should be established to mitigate impacts on nearby residential uses regarding hours of operation, prohibiting amplified music or sound, prohibiting the carrying of open containers of alcoholic beverages outside the delineated outdoor dining area, etc. [As an editorial note, we suggest that the borough consider establishing standards for outdoor dining as an accessory use that would apply to any business wishing to provide outdoor eating and food service.] Parking and traffic considerations also should be addressed.

We believe that such use regulations are “liquor neutral” per the regulations and authority of the Pennsylvania Liquor Control Board and the Compton v. ZHB of Pennsbury Tp. case cited in the preamble to the proposed amendment because they do not address when, where, or how liquor is sold.

The borough also could consider creating two separate uses: a smaller-scale retail/consumer services-oriented use in the C-2 Districts and the Brewery (or existing Manufacturing) use in the I-1 and I-2 districts. As proposed, there is the potential for parcels in the I-2 or C-2 districts to be assembled to allow for a large-scale operation that would not be consistent with the character of the Town Center District or the intent of the Town Center as stated in the borough’s comprehensive plan (as noted in Comment 2). Another option would be to permit the use by conditional use so reasonable conditions could be established depending on the nature, scale, and location of the proposal so that the facility would not be intrusive on the existing neighborhoods.

It appears that the area and dimensional criteria of the Table of Dimensional Requirements for Any Other Principal Structure or Use for the respective zoning districts apply to the new Brewery use. The borough may need to consider if specific area and dimensional requirements should be applied to this use.

2. **Comprehensive plan considerations**—The intent of the new use will have a bearing on where it should be permitted, based on consistency with the Borough of Perkasie Comprehensive Plan Update (2014). The Plan states that creating a more dynamic shopping, dining, cultural, and entertainment experience, not only in the Town Center, but in other commercial areas, is instrumental to the borough’s economic development vision. The Plan recommends promoting primarily retail uses and minimizing non-retail uses to foster a vibrant Town Center.

A smaller-scale retail/consumer service-type business would be appropriate for the C-2 Districts within and outside of the Town Center Overlay District. Allowing the proposed Brewery use in those districts could result in a large-scale manufacturing facility that is not consistent with the intent of the comprehensive plan. Additionally, permitting retail businesses in industrial districts in the northern part of the borough, for example, could detract from and
create competition for the Town Center and other existing commercial centers of the borough, contrary to the borough’s economic development vision as detailed in the comprehensive plan.

3. **Parking Spaces by Use**—A parking standard should be determined for the new Brewery use and it should be added to Section 186-61.C(5) Required Parking Spaces by Use, for Retail and Consumer Service Uses. The standard should be based on indoor and outdoor use areas, if applicable. In addition, the current numbering of that section should be revised, from Section 186-61.C(5)(c) Eating Place (with or without drive-through service) through Section 186-61.C(5)(t) Tavern.

We also note that when the E(3) Eating Place use was amended (Ordinance Number 980 on December 1, 1014) to revise the phrase “(with or without drive-through service)” to “(without drive-through service except in C-1 District as conditional use)”, that change was not made to Section 186-61.C(5)(c). This inconsistency should be corrected.

4. **Table of Uses by District**—The Table of Uses by District should be amended to include the proposed new Brewery use under E. Retail and Consumer Service Uses, and to indicate if a Brewery is permitted (P) or not permitted (N) in each zoning district.

5. **Proposed section number**—The zoning ordinance section number for the new use should be corrected in two places in the proposed amendment. In SECTION 1.B, Section 186-13 should be revised as 186-18 in the first and fourth lines.

6. **Numbering of uses**—The proposal designates the new Brewery use as E(3) and indicates that the current use E(3), Eating Place (without drive-through service except in C-1 District as conditional use), and the 15 subsequent E uses shall be renumbered.

We strongly recommend that the Brewery use be designated as E(19), which would follow E(18) Tavern. An alternative would be to designate Brewery as use E(3.1) which would place it between E(3) Eating Place and E(4) Entertainment, Adult Uses. Either option would leave the existing numbering intact and eliminate the need to renumber 16 existing E. Retail and Consumer Service uses throughout the ordinance.

As proposed, the amendment should be revised to indicate that this renumbering also is necessary throughout the zoning ordinance where any of the existing E(3) through E(18) uses appears. For example, the following existing E uses would have to be renumbered in the district regulations:

- a. **R-2 Residential District**—
  Section 186-20.D.1.c.E(7) Funeral Home or Mortuary

- b. **A Apartment District**—
  Section 186-20.E.1.a.E(6) Entertainment and Recreational Facilities, Outdoor, Nongovernmental
  Section 186-20.E.1.c.E(7) Funeral Home or Mortuary

- c. **C-1 Business Professional District**—
  Section 186-20.F.1.a E(15) Planned Commercial Development
  Section 186-20.F.1.c E(4) Entertainment, Adult Uses
d. C-2 General Commercial District—
Section 186-20.G.1.a.E(3) Eating Place Place (without drive-through service except in C-1 District as conditional use)
Section 186-20.G.1.a.E(6) Entertainment and Recreational Facilities, Outdoor, Nongovernmental
Section 186-20.G.1.a.E(7) Funeral Home or Mortuary
Section 186-20.G.1.a.E(10) Hotel or Motel
Section 186-20.G.1.a.E(14) Motor Vehicle Sales or Rental
Section 186-20.G.1.a.E(15) Planned Commercial Development
Section 186-20.G.1.a.E(16) Retail Shop
Section 186-20.G.1.a.E(17) Service Business
Section 186-20.G.1.a.E(18) Tavern
Section 186-20.G.1.b.E(9) Mixed Use
e. I-1 Planned Industrial District—
Section 186-20.H.1.a.E(8) Kennel
Section 186-20.H.1.b.E(10) Motel or Hotel
f. I-2 Light Industrial District
Section 186-20.I.1.a.E(6) Entertainment and Recreational Facilities, Outdoor, Nongovernmental
Section 186-20.I.1.a.E(8) Kennel
Section 186-20.I.1.a.E(14) Motor Vehicle Sales or Rental
Section 186-20.I.1.a.E(15) Planned Commercial Development
Section 186-20.I.1.a.E(16) Retail Shop
Section 186-20.I.1.a.E(17) Service Business

Additionally, in zoning ordinance Article VIII Off-Street Parking and Loading, the required parking spaces by use would have to be revised for Sections 186-61.C.(5)(c) Eating Place through 186-61.C.(5)(r) Tavern. If, as recommended, the new Brewery use is designated use E(19), the only revision required would be to add a Section 186-61.C(5)(s) Brewery, with the proposed parking standard (see Comment 3).

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.

MW:dc

cc: Nate Fox, Begley, Carlin & Mandio, Borough Solicitor
Andrea Coaxum, Borough Manager (via email)
Brandy McKeever, Code Enforcement Administrator (via email)
Tracy Tackett, Tackett Planning Associates, Borough Planner
MEMORANDUM

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

FROM: Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Proposal to Amend the Subdivision and Land Development and Zoning Ordinances—Deleting References to the Shade Tree Commission and Replacing with Township Engineer and other Various Minor Modifications.
Applicant: Board of Supervisors
Received: August 30, 2016
Hearing Date: October 4, 2016

In accordance with the provisions of Sections 304, 505, 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 September 7, 2016.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposed Action: Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (SALDO)—Amend various sections as follows:

Sections 160-17, 21, and 25 Delete reference to “Shade Tree Commission” and replace it with “Reserved” where appropriate.
Section 160-38.E Delete current subsection and replace with new text that references that an island within the center of a new cul-de-sac may be required at the Township’s discretion.
Section 160-51 Delete entire section and replace with the same requirements with two additional requirements that include trees not to be planted within the street right-of-way and trees to be planted between 8 feet and 15 feet from the street right-of-way.

Zoning Ordinance—Amend various sections as follows:

Section 185-5.D Delete reference to “Shade Tree Commission” and replace it with “Township Engineer.”
Sections 185-60.E.(1), E.(2), F.(3) Delete reference to “Shade Tree Commission” and replace it with “Township Engineer.”
Section 185-95

Delete entire section and replace with similar standards for the enactment of amendments to the zoning ordinance and map. Proposed additions include plan requirements for an amendment to the zoning map that include a map/plan of the proposed land to be rezoned, a statement regarding community impacts, and a map/plan that shows the general design and layout of the proposed uses.

COMMENTS

The proposed amendments appear to be consistent with the ordinance amendment procedures as prescribed in Section 609 of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code. However minor, we have the following comments for consideration by the Township before the amendments are adopted:

1. **General language**—There are two proposed text modifications that reference approval or required by the Township or at the Township’s discretion (SALDO Sections 160-38.E and 160.51.L). The township may wish to be more specific and either add Board of Supervisors or Township Engineer as the ones who will approve or require a standard or condition.

2. **Approved tree varieties list**—We recommend that Zelkova serrata ‘Green Vase’ trees be removed from the approved varieties list in SALDO Section 160.51.I. The ‘Green Vase’ cultivar has weak branch angles and is susceptible to wind damage. We recommend replacing that cultivar with ‘Halka’ which is superior in form and long term branch strength, to avoid problems in the future as the trees mature.

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 Sections 505(b) and 609(g) of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code.

JSI:jmk

cc: Donald E. Williams, Esq., Township Solicitor
    Joe Golden, Township Manager (via email)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Yardley Borough Council
Yardley Borough Planning Commission

FROM: Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Proposal for an Update to the Official Act 537 Sewage Facilities Management Plan
Applicant: Yardley Borough
Received: August 8, 2016
Hearing Date: Not set

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 its meeting on September 7, 2016.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposed Action: Update the Act 537 Sewage Facilities Plan to address the present and future wastewater facilities needs of the Borough and areas in Lower Makefield Township that contribute flows to the Yardley Borough Sewer Authority’s sanitary sewer system. Flows from the Borough and portions of Lower Makefield Township are conveyed to and treated at the Morrisville Municipal Authority (MMA) treatment plant.

Proposed Provisions: The Yardley Borough Sewer Authority (YBSA) owns and operates the existing municipal sanitary sewerage system in the Borough. Essentially, the entire Borough is served by existing public sewer facilities. The YBSA sewer system also serves portions of Lower Makefield Township and conveys flows from discharge points into the Borough’s system through the Borough to a Delaware Avenue pumping station. Sewage treatment is provided by the MMA.

The Act 537 plan update indicates that certain conveyance sewers are operating at or near maximum capacity during peak flow events. Specifically, the Buck Creek Interceptor, Brock Creek Interceptor, and conveyance sewers from Longshore Avenue to the pump station are identified as needing additional capacity to serve existing and projected future flows. Information regarding Lower Makefield Township is presented in the plan to document the Township’s sewer service area that flows into the Borough, and its capacity needs of the joint use sewage facilities. The YBSA adopted a Connection Management Policy that permits connection of only those projects for which capacity commitments have been issued, or for which capacity has been formally requested, as of May 24, 2012.
The Plan indicates that most of Yardley Borough is generally developed at this point in time, areas of Lower Makefield Township that convey sewage flows to Yardley Borough are experiencing growth. Based on anticipated development projects for both Yardley Borough and Lower Makefield Township, the plan projects that approximately 550 additional equivalent dwelling units (EDUs) will be connected to the YBSA system by 2020 and a total of 822 EDUs within the next 20 years. To accommodate the planned connections, capacity in the conveyance sewers is proposed to be increased.

Alternatives that were considered to address the capacity need were limited to conventional expansion of capacity of the conveyance facilities and no action. The no action alternative was determined to be unsatisfactory because it does not provide for the sewage management needs of the Borough and Lower Makefield Township through the 5-year planning period.

The selected alternative is the construction of new conveyance sewers (bypass relief sewers) parallel to existing conveyance sewers and/or reconstruction of existing conveyance sewers with larger diameter sewers. The additional capacity gained from this alternative is expected to be adequate for the 20-year planning period.

The capital cost associated with the selected alternative is projected to be approximately $2,960,000. Yardley’s cost share will be approximately $460,000 (15.5 percent of the total cost). LMT will be responsible for the remaining costs.

The YBSA, Lower Makefield Township, Lower Makefield Sewer Authority have entered into a “Sewage Transportation Agreement” for the planning, design, and construction of joint use sewage facilities that serve both Yardley Borough and portions of Lower Makefield Township

COMMENTS

The Act 537 Sewage Facilities Management Plan recommendation to construct new conveyance sewers may enable the Yardley Borough and Lower Makefield Township to ensure capacity for new development and redevelopment over the next 20 years. The continued use of public sewer service in the study area is consistent with the Borough’s and Township’s existing Act 537 Plans and generally consistent with the comprehensive plans of both municipalities and the Bucks County Comprehensive Plan. We offer the following comments for consideration:

1. **Future capacity needs**—Table 1 Planning Area Future Development/Projected Sewer Connections lists the EDUs and flow figures for the 5-year planning period based on the data provided by the 2015 Chapter 94 Reports prepared by both sewer authorities. The same figures for the 20-year planning period are based on the 20-year projected sewer allocations provided in the 2015 Sewage Transportation Agreement among the two authorities and Lower Makefield Township. The 5-year figures for Yardley Borough reflect flows from developments that are proposed or under construction along with an amount for miscellaneous growth. We note that the 20-year figures do not indicate what parcels or potential developments would be associated with the EDUs and flows. Likewise, there is no indication of what developments or parcels suitable for development are associated with the 5-year and 20-year EDU and flow figures for Lower Makefield Township.
Based on a cursory build-out analysis of proposed residential and nonresidential developments and developable lands our office prepared for Lower Makefield Township, approximately 470 EDUs will need to be served within the planning area of Lower Makefield Township tributary to the YBSA system. According to Table 1, approximately 507 EDUs (based on flow figures) are projected.

We recommend that consideration be given to revising the plan to be more specific in how the future land development and projected sewer connections are calculated and identify the projected EDUs and flows by the collection systems (e.g., Brock Creek Interceptor, Buck Creek Interceptor, and Longshore Avenue conveyance sewers) that would serve them.

2. **Infiltration and inflow (I/I) analysis**—Attachment D Sewage Pump Station of the plan (third paragraph on the first page) states that, “The average flows of the past 4 years have been relatively consistent and demonstrate a reduction in flows from 2011 which can be attributed to the reduction of I/I entering the system.” Since the plan contains no other statements or analysis regarding I/I in the collection and conveyance system, we recommend that the municipalities and sewer authorities further evaluation of I/I reduction measures as part of the alternative analysis.

After the plan is approved by the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection, we request that the Borough send our office a final copy of the Act 537 plan update for our files.

TAK:de

c: Brian M. Brochon, Gilmore & Associates, Inc.
    Elizabeth Mahoney, Sewage Planning Supervisor, Watershed Management, PaDEP
    Genevie Kostick, Bucks County Department of Health
    Yardley Borough Sewer Authority
    Lower Makefield Township Sewer Authority
    Tom Beach, P.E., Remington Vernick & Beach Engineers, Borough Engineer
    John Boyle, Borough Manager (via email)
    Jordan B. Yeager, Esq., Curtain & Heefner, Borough Solicitor
    Lower Makefield Township

---

1 Developable lands identified in the draft Lower Makefield Township comprehensive plan that the staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission has been involved in preparing for the Township.
**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
Draft Act 537 Sewage Facilities Management Plan, Yardley Borough

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

1. Date plan received by county planning agency. **August 8, 2016**
2. Date plan received by planning agency with areawide jurisdiction
   *Agency name*
3. Date review completed by agency **September 7, 2016**

### 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.*)?

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? None known to this agency.

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*
### SECTION C. AGENCY REVIEW (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>11. Have all applicable zoning approvals been obtained?</td>
<td>NA</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>
<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>NA</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>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>
<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: Timothy A. Koehler  
Title: Director of Planning Services  
Signature:  
Date: September 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>BCPC Number</th>
<th>Tax Parcel Numbers</th>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Submission Level</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bensalem Township</td>
<td>12175</td>
<td>(2-45-31-1)</td>
<td>VIP Wireless</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Industrial Land Development: 19,390 Square-feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chalfont Borough</td>
<td>4918-D</td>
<td>(7-4-4-1 &amp; 4-3)</td>
<td>Chalfont View</td>
<td>RP</td>
<td>54 Single-family Lots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doylestown Township</td>
<td>7150-A</td>
<td>(9-9-58)</td>
<td>Enclave at Town’s Edge</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>12 Multifamily Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falls Township</td>
<td>12179</td>
<td>(13-4-92)</td>
<td>Peruzzi Mazda</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Commercial Land Development: 7,400 Square-feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falls Township</td>
<td>12181</td>
<td>(13-13-9)</td>
<td>149 Fallsington Tullytown Road</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>1 Leasehold Lot Commercial Land Development: 382 Square-feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falls Township</td>
<td>6304-A</td>
<td>(13-47-42)</td>
<td>Dollar General</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Commercial Land Development: 7,489 Square-feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haycock Township</td>
<td>12183</td>
<td>(14-7-190, -7-195 &amp; -10-82)</td>
<td>Jaeger &amp; Vessey, Jamutowski &amp; Shoup</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Lot Line Changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milford Township</td>
<td>7700-C</td>
<td>(23-2-162)</td>
<td>Bauman Road Subdivision</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>11 Single-family Lots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Britain Township</td>
<td>11112-F</td>
<td>(26-5-2)</td>
<td>Quad/Graphics</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Industrial Land Development: 120,000 Square-feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nockamixon Township</td>
<td>12182</td>
<td>(30-11-143)</td>
<td>Shively Estate Property</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>1 Single-family Lot 1 Municipal Lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richland Township</td>
<td>7963-B</td>
<td>(36-5-96)</td>
<td>195 Milford Square Pike</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>2 Single-family Lots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Southampton Township</td>
<td>12176</td>
<td>(48-16-155)</td>
<td>D1 Baseball Academy</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Commercial Land Development: 15,525 Square-feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warminster Township</td>
<td>12177</td>
<td>(49-9-43)</td>
<td>Lidl</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Commercial Land Development: 35,962 Square-feet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Bucks County Planning Commission
#### Subdivision and Land Development Reviews

**July 25, 2016 to August 26, 2016**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>BCPC Number</th>
<th>Tax Parcel Numbers</th>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Submission Level</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Warrington Township</td>
<td>10876-C</td>
<td>(50-25-19)</td>
<td>High Grove Manor Lot 2</td>
<td>RP</td>
<td>Commercial Land Development: 9,386 Square-feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warrington Township</td>
<td>11731-A</td>
<td>(50-4-85)</td>
<td>Victory Gardens</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>2 Commercial Lots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warrington Township</td>
<td>4828-C</td>
<td>(50-26-64)</td>
<td>Keene Tract</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>3 Single-family Lots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warwick Township</td>
<td>6469-K</td>
<td>(51-13-10-18)</td>
<td>RGB ADN Enterprises, LP Lot #17</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Industrial Land Development: 4,500 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 Land Development for VIP Wireless
        TMP #2-45-31-1
        Applicant: VIP Wireless, c/o Greg Berger
        Owner: 1366 (One) Ford Road, LLC, c/o Daniel Snyder
        Plan Dated: July 3, 2016
        Date Received: July 19, 2016

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 19,380-square-foot addition to an existing 20,225-square-foot warehouse on a 1.84-acre site. The site is served by public water and sewerage.

Location: Along the north side of Ford Road, 1,000 feet east of its intersection with Bridgewater Road.

Zoning: L-I Light Industrial District permits warehousing and storage uses on a minimum lot area of 15,000 square feet with a minimum lot width of 75 feet. The Bensalem Township Zoning Hearing Board granted the following variances from the zoning ordinance at a hearing held on May 5, 2016:

Section 232-533(2) to permit a maximum building area of 49.2 percent of the lot area, which exceeds the required 35 percent.

Section 232-533(3)b.1 to permit a side yard of 2 feet, instead of the required minimum of 20 feet. The addition would extend the existing nonconforming side yard.

Present use: Warehouse.
COMMENTS

1. **Waivers requested**—The applicant is requesting waivers from Sections 201-104(b), 201-110(a), and 201-111(a) of the subdivision and land development ordinance, which require curbs and sidewalks along all streets and that street rights-of-way and cartway widths be improved to the standards of the subdivision and land development ordinance.

   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. **Parking lot curbing**—The parking lot does not appear to be completely curbed. The plan does not show curbing along the east side of the driveway that accesses the rear parking lot, along both sides of the front loading area, and between the end of the front concrete walk and retaining wall at the front drive. Section 201-112(i) of the subdivision and land development ordinance requires all nonresidential parking areas and access driveways to be paved and curbed.

3. **Shade trees**—The plan does not show shade tree plantings. Section 106(b)(10) of the subdivision and land development ordinance requires ten trees per acre of gross site area plus one tree for every five parking spaces.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the September 7, 2016 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:dc

cc: VIP Wireless, c/o Greg Berger
    1366 (One) Ford Road, LLC, c/o Daniel Snyder
    Eastern/Chadrow Associates, Inc.
    Ron Gans, Municipal Engineer, O’Donnell & Naccarato
    Loretta Alston, Bensalem Dept. of Building and Planning
    William Cmorey, Bensalem Township Manger (via email)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Chalfont Borough Council  
    Chalfont Borough Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Revised Preliminary Plan of Subdivision for Chalfont View  
    TMP # 7-4-4-1; 7-4-4-3  
    Applicant: KTMT LIG I, L.P.  
    Owners: Lenape Valley Swim & Tennis Club, Inc. and Redevelopment Authority of the County of Bucks  
    Plan Dated: April 22, 2016  
    Last Revised: July 22, 2016  
    Date Received: July 22, 2016

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 16.014-acre parcel into 54 single-family detached dwelling lots. Open space of 29,680 square feet (4.48 percent of site area) 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 small-lot village houses on lots of a minimum of 7,000 square feet and village houses on lots of 10,000 square feet as part of a Planned Village Development on tracts of 10 acres or more as a conditional use. A minimum of 4 percent of the Planned Village Development base site area shall be open space.

Present Use: Commercial and recreational.

COMMENTS

1. **Waivers requested**—The site plan indicates that the applicant is requesting waivers from the following subdivision and land development ordinance 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. Borough official should determine if the rationale provided is sufficient.

2. Zoning data—The plan’s Zoning Data table on Sheet 1 indicates the required area and dimensional requirements, but does not indicate how the proposed subdivision meets these requirements. The table should be revised to indicate compliance with these requirements.

3. Recreation land—Section 22-714 of the subdivision and land development ordinance requires that recreation land be provided for residential subdivisions with 50 to 99 units. Land for two playfields and two tot lots shall be provided. The minimum area for a playfield is 25,000 square feet with a grade not exceeding 2 percent. The plan shows a 24,006-square-foot open space parcel (Open Space Lot A) in the center of the proposed subdivision with a small portion graded at 2 percent or less and the remainder with greater slopes up to 35 percent. No playfields or tot lots are shown. The plan should be revised to provide the necessary recreation land and facilities.

Section 22-714.13 of the subdivision and land development ordinance permits donation of a fee in lieu of land for recreation. A memo from the applicant’s engineer dated August 8, 2016 indicates that the developer may offer a fee in lieu of recreation land. However, there is nothing on the plan indicating interest in paying a fee in lieu. We recommend that the plan be revised to note a fee in lieu will be offered if that is the intention.

4. Requested stormwater management waivers—A waiver request letter indicates that the following waivers are requested from the Stormwater Management Ordinance:

- Section 26-322.2C(5)(a) To permit 2 feet from basin bottom to bedrock or high water table.
- Section 26-325.3C(5)(b) To permit HDPE pipe instead of concrete pipe.
- Section 26-325.3C(10) To permit 2 foot minimum cover over storm sewer.
Section 26-325.3D(7)  To permit 3:1 side slopes rather than 4:1.
Section 26-325.3D(9)  To permit bioretention basin bottom slope of 2 percent to promote infiltration.

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.

5. **Stormwater maintenance responsibilities**—The plan shows that an existing stormwater basin serving adjacent Chalfont Greene will also serve the proposed development. A memo from the applicant’s engineer dated August 8, 2016 states, “Chalfont View will be responsible for maintenance of the basin and open space next to the basin.” We recommend that the ownership and maintenance responsibility be clearly stated on the plan.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the September 7, 2016 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:dc

cc:    KTMT LIG I, L.P.
       R.L. Showalter Associates Inc.
       Patrick DiGangi, P.E., CKS Engineers, Municipal Engineer
       Sandra Zadell, Municipal Manager (via email)
       Bob White, Bucks County Redevelopment Authority
MEMORANDUM

TO: Doylestown Township Board of Supervisors
    Doylestown Township Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Final Plan of Land Development for Enclave at Town’s Edge
    TMP #9-9-58
    Applicant: Lower State Associates, LLC
    Owner: Same
    Plan Dated: May 30, 2014
    Last Revised: July 22, 2016
    Date Received: August 1, 2016

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: Demolish an existing farmhouse on a 3.0978-gross-acre tract and construct a 12-unit condominium building with 24 parking spaces. The existing barn is proposed to be converted into a recreational structure. Three areas of open space totaling 0.548 acre are indicated. The units will be served by public water and sewer facilities.

Location: The site is situated on the southeasterly side of Lower State Road between New Britain Road and Memorial Drive.

Zoning: R-4 Residential District permits a variety of housing uses including single-family detached semi-detached, attached, two-family semi-detached and multifamily. Two-family Semi-detached (use B-5) is allowed on a gross site area of 3 acres, and a maximum net density of 6 dwellings per acre and maximum impervious surface ratio of 45 percent. A minimum of 20 percent open space is also required for the development.

Present Use: Residential.
COMMENTS

Prior to final plan approval, the township should ensure that the plan meets all conditions of preliminary plan approval as provided in the letter dated July 21, 2016. The plan should not be approved until all issues are resolved. In addition, the TMP# referenced on plan Sheet 1 in Point 1 under the Net Buildable Site Area Calculation should be corrected from 9-48-58 to 9-9-58.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the September 7, 2016, 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:jk

cc: Travis Hutchison, Lower State Associates, LLC
Sharon Dotts, P.E., Gilmore & Associates, Inc.
Mario Canales, Pickering, Corts & Summerson, Township Engineer
Stephanie Mason, 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 Peruzzi Mazda Building Addition
         TMP #13-4-92
         Applicant: Peruzzi Family Limited Partnership
         Owner: Same
         Plan Dated: July 20, 2016
         Date Received: August 4, 2016

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 7,400-square-foot, single-story addition to an existing car dealership building on the property. The proposed addition will be located to the rear, and both sides of the existing building. The existing parking lot will be reconfigured, and new paved areas behind the building are proposed. The project is to be served by public water and public sewer.

Location: South side of Lincoln Highway (Business 1) in between Commerce Boulevard and N. Oxford Valley Road.

Zoning: Highway Commercial (HC) District permits a range of commercial uses, including showrooms for the sale of new and used automobiles, on lots with a minimum area of 40,000 square feet. Building coverage and impervious surface coverage are not permitted to exceed 30 percent and 70 percent, respectively.

In August of 2000, a special exception was granted by the Zoning Hearing Board to allow for the property to be used for sale of vehicles, per zoning ordinance Section 209-23.C. Variances were also granted from Section 209-23.H.(2) to permit parking within 5 feet of a property line, and from Section 209-23.H(3)(b) to permit outside display of vehicles within a setback area.

Present Use: Automobile sales.
COMMENTS

1. **Variance requested**—The site plan indicates that the applicant is requesting variances from the following requirements of the zoning ordinance:

   - Section 209, Attachment 7, Table 4
     Permit the required buffer yard to be measured along with the required yard rather than in addition to the yard setback area.
   - Section 209, Attachment 7, Table 4
     Permit 88 percent lot coverage where a maximum of 70 percent lot coverage is permitted. This is an increase of 3 percent from the existing conditions on the site.

   No final action should be taken on this application until issues regarding requested variances have been resolved.

2. **Waivers requested**—The site plan indicates that the applicant is requesting waivers from the following subdivision and land development ordinance (SALDO) requirements:

   - Section 191-8
     Permit both preliminary and final approval at the same time.
   - Section 191-31.A
     Permit no curbing or sidewalks on Lincoln Highway.
   - Section 191-39.G
     Permit no sidewalks on Lincoln Highway.
   - Section 191-48
     Permit no street trees on Lincoln Highway.
   - Section 191-78.C(2)
     Permit an aerial photo in lieu of the required survey.

   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. **Buffer yard**—A buffer of 25 feet is proposed to the south, and a setback of approximately 5 feet exists to the west. The proposal includes new paved areas behind the building to the south, which will intensify the use of the property adjacent to the single-family residences along Austin Drive. Additional landscaping or screening may be warranted in this area. No changes appear to be proposed on the western boundary of the property, which includes a stone area and a chain link fence. Buffer plantings may be warranted in this area as well if the fence and stone area are not sufficient to act as a buffer from the residences to the west.

4. **Landscaping**—No landscaping plan has been submitted. Section 209-42.B(3) of the zoning ordinance requires that for all parking areas a minimum of the equivalent of one parking space for every 30 parking spaces be landscaped with ground cover, trees or shrubs. Section 191-37.G(4) of the SALDO requires that within a parking area, 1 tree be planted for every 6 parking spaces. The plan should comply with the landscaping requirements.

5. **Parking**—While the overall parking meets the minimum requirements of Section 209-42 of the zoning ordinance, it is unclear how many parking spaces will be devoted to customers or employees, and how many spaces will be used as vehicle displays. It is also unclear how many existing parking spaces are to remain. The record plan notes some existing spaces which are specifically labeled either “to remain” or “to be removed”, while many other spaces are simply
labeled as existing. There are several parking spaces in the northeast corner of the parking area which appear to be blocked by other spaces. It is unclear whether these spaces are intended to be used only as vehicle display spaces. The plan should clarify the intended parking and vehicle display arrangement.

6. **Lighting**—No lighting plan has been provided. If there will be any changes to the existing lighting of the property, the plan should be revised to show how it will comply with Section 191-38 of the SALDO.

7. **Signage**—No signage plan or architectural drawings have been provided. If there will be any new signage on the building addition, the plan should be revised to show how it will comply with Section 209-45 of the zoning ordinance.

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 must be submitted for this proposed land development.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the September 7, 2016 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.

CND:dc

cc: Rick Borie, Peruzzi Family Limited Partnership  
Mark Havers, P.E., Pickering, Corts, & Summerson Surveyors and Engineers  
Edward Murphy, Wisler Pearlstine  
James Sullivan, P.E., 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: Preliminary Plan Land Development for 149 Fallsington-Tulleytown Road
   TMP # 13-13-9
   Applicant: Cellco Partnership d/b/a Verizon Wireless
   Owner: LM Acres, LLC
   Plan Dated: August 8, 2016
   Date Received: August 11, 2016

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 telecommunications facility on a 19.7-acre industrial property. The facility will include a 115-foot-high monopole tower with 12 panel antennas mounted to the top of the tower, and a 50-foot by 50-foot equipment compound at the base of the tower. The project will not require either water or sewer service.

Location: East side of Fallsington-Tulleytown Road, at the intersection with Penn Valley Road, and west of Route 13.

Zoning: LR Low Density Residential District does not permit telecommunications facilities. A variance was granted on November 10, 2015 by the Zoning Hearing Board to permit the use. Two additional dimensional variances were granted at that time; one to allow the antennas to be 14 inches in width, and one to allow the base of the tower to be 50.5 feet from the property line. The approval of the variances was conditioned upon the applicant constructing a tree monopole.

Present Use: Industrial.

COMMENTS

1. Tree monopole—The decision of the Zoning Hearing Board (ZHB) to grant a variance was specifically conditioned upon the applicant constructing a 'tree monopole'. The elevation of
the monopole tower illustrated on Sheet A-1 of the drawings does not appear to be a ‘tree monopole’.

2. **Waivers requested**—The site plan does not indicate that the applicant will be requesting any waivers from the subdivision and land development ordinance (SALDO). A review of the plans indicates that several waivers may be required.

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. **Driveway**—Section 191-36.A of the SALDO requires that a clear sight distance triangle be shown on the plans at the intersection of the driveway and the street. It does not appear that visibility is impaired, however, no clear sight triangle is shown on the plans.

4. **Curbing**—Section 191-36.D of the SALDO requires that all driveways be curbed. No curbing is shown along the proposed asphalt driveway.

5. **Lighting**—No lighting plan has been provided. If there are any changes intended to the existing lighting of the property the plan should be revised to show how it will comply with Section 191-38.A of the SALDO which requires that all parking areas and driveways be adequately illuminated.

6. **Sidewalks**—Section 191-39.G of the SALDO requires that all land development which has frontage on a street provide a sidewalk. No sidewalk is existing or proposed along the frontage of Fallsington-Tulleytown Road.

7. **Street trees**—Section 191-48.A of the SALDO requires that all land development provide street trees where suitable street trees do not exist. No street trees are shown on the plans, however, the township should determine if the existing trees alongside Fallsington-Tulleytown Road are adequate to meet the street tree requirement.

8. **Landscape buffer**—The plan should indicate the type of evergreen trees proposed in the landscape buffer so that consistency with Section 191-A8.I of the SALDO can be ensured.

9. **Steep slopes**—Section 191-52.1.B(3) of the SALDO provides regulations for the disturbance of steep slopes. It appears that the proposed compound and landscaping buffer may potentially impact an area with a slope of 25 percent on the property.

10. **Site capacity calculations**—Section 191-52.1.C of the SALDO requires that site capacity calculations be provided with all land development applications. No such calculations have been provided.

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 must be submitted for this proposed land development.
This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the September 7, 2016 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.

CND:dc

cc: Celéco Partnership d/b/a Verizon Wireless
    Nicholas A. Cuce, Jr., Riley Riper Hollin & Colagreco
    LM Acres, LLC
    CMC Engineering
    James Sullivan, P.E., 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: Sketch Plan of Land Development for Dollar General
TMP # 13-47-42
Applicant: Morrisville DG, LLC
Owner: Marek Tchorewski & Anthony Malinowski
Plan Dated: August 3, 2016
Date Received: August 22, 2016

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 7,489-square-foot, single-story Dollar General retail store on a 77,479-square-foot (1.77 acre) lot. One curb cut and 33 off-street parking spaces will be provided. The project is to be served by public water and on-site sewer.

Location: East side of Old Bristol Pike, approximately 200 feet south of the intersection with Penn Valley Road.

Zoning: Neighborhood Commercial (NC) District permits a range of commercial uses including variety stores, clothing stores, and grocery stores, on lots with a minimum area of 20,000 square feet. Building coverage and impervious surface coverage are not permitted to exceed 30 percent and 70 percent, respectively. However, major chain stores, variety stores, and discount stores are listed as prohibited uses in the NC District.

Present Use: Vacant.

COMMENTS

1. Proposed use—Section 209-22.B(1) of the zoning ordinance lists a variety store as a permitted use in the NC District, however Section 209-22.J(1) lists variety stores, discount stores, and major chain stores as prohibited uses in the district.

According to township officials, a use variance will be required. No final action should be taken on a future application until issues regarding the use have been resolved.
2. **Waivers requested**—The sketch plan does not indicate that the applicant will be requesting any waivers from the subdivision and land development ordinance (SALDO). A review of the sketch plan indicates that several waivers may be required.

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. **Site capacity calculations**—Section 191-52.1.C of the SALDO requires that site capacity calculations be provided with all land development applications. Future plan submissions should include site capacity calculations.

4. **Landscaping**—Section 209-22.F(5) of the zoning ordinance requires that all areas not used by buildings or parking areas be suitably landscaped. Section 209-42.B(3) of the zoning ordinance requires that for all parking areas a minimum of the equivalent of one parking space for every 30 parking spaces be landscaped with ground cover, trees or shrubs. Section 191-37.G(4) of the SALDO requires that within a parking area, 1 tree be planted for every 6 parking spaces. Future plan submissions should provide the required landscaping.

5. **Buffer**—Section 209, Attachment 7, Table 4 of the zoning ordinance requires that a buffer screening of 25 feet be provided in addition to the required side or rear yard setback where the property is adjacent to a residential use. There is a residential area immediately to the east of the site. The sketch plan appears to indicate that existing plants and vegetation will remain within this required buffer area. Section 209-38.1 of the zoning ordinance provides standards for buffers. The township should determine if the existing vegetation provides an adequate buffer between the residences and the proposed commercial use.

6. **Sidewalks**—Section 191-39.G of the SALDO requires that all land development which has frontage on a street provide a sidewalk. No sidewalk is existing or proposed along the frontage of Old Bristol Pike. Future plans should comply with the sidewalk requirement.

7. **Street trees**—Section 191-48.A of the SALDO requires that all land development provide street trees along the property frontage. Future plans should provide street trees.

8. **Parking**—Section 191-37.B of the SALDO requires that an open space area of at least 15 feet in width be provided between any parking area and a building wall. The parking area is proposed to be approximately 5 feet from the northern and western building walls.

9. **Loading**—Section 209-42.I of the zoning ordinance requires that adequate loading space be provided. No specific number of loading spaces are required. No loading areas are noted on the sketch plan. The township should determine if any designated loading area for the building may be warranted.

10. **Dumpster screening**—Section 209-38.1.G of the zoning ordinance requires that all dumpsters be screened by either fences or landscaping.
11. **Driveway**—Section 209-43.1.D of the zoning ordinance and Section 191-36.A of the SALDO require that a clear sight distance triangle be shown on the plans at the intersection of the driveway and the street. It does not appear that visibility is impaired, however a clear sight triangle should be shown on the future plans.

12. **Lighting**—All lighting should comply with Section 209-40 of the zoning ordinance, and Section 191-38 of the SALDO.

13. **Signage**—All signage should comply with Section 209-45 of the zoning ordinance.

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 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 September 7, 2016 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.

CND:dc

cc:  Mark Bush, Morrisville DG, LLC  
     Marek Tchorewski & Anthony Malinowski  
     Justin H. Ross, P.E., Larson Design Group  
     James 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: Final Plan of Lot Line Change for Jaeger & Vessey, Jarnutowski, & Shoup

TMPs: #14-7-195 and #14-7-190 and #14-10-82
Applicant: Charles Jaeger & Adele R. Vessey, Michael C. & Patricia Jarnutowski, and Ransom F. Shoup II & Peggy L. Shoup
Owners: Charles Jaeger & Adele R. Vessey, Michael C. & Patricia Jarnutowski, and Ransom F. Shoup II & Peggy L. Shoup
Plan Dated: May 3, 2016
Date Received: August 19, 2016

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: The plan proposes a series of lot line changes and conveyances among three existing lots so that the resultant lot areas are as follows:

TMP #14-7-195 (Lot 1)—55.57 acres gross/55.15 acres net (existing: 55.33 acres gross);
TMP #14-10-82 (Lot 2)—14.61 acres gross/14.49 acres net (existing 14.50 acres gross);
TMP #14-7-190 (Lot 3)—3.35 acres gross (existing 3.70 acres gross).

The areas to be conveyed are not indicated on the plan; however, the lot lines will be adjusted as follows:
A portion of TMP #14-7-190 and a portion of TMP #14-10-82 are to be conveyed to TMP #14-1-195 (Lot 1), a portion of TMP #14-7-195 is to be conveyed to TMP #14-10-82 (Lot 2), and a portion of TMP #14-7-195 is to be conveyed to TMP #14-7-190 (Lot 3).

TMP #14-7-195 has frontage on East Sawmill Road. Existing TMP #14-10-82 appears to be landlocked and the conveyance from TMP #14-7-195 would provide frontage on East Sawmill Road. TMP #14-7-190 is landlocked, but has access to East Sawmill Road via an existing 25-foot-wide access easement on adjacent TMP #14-7-189.
No new lots will be created. No development exists on the lots or is proposed on this submission. The plan indicates that residential use is intended and individual on-lot water and sewage facilities are intended to serve the site.

Location: The site is located approximately 400 feet south of the intersection of Cedar Lane and East Sawmill Road.

Zoning: RP Resource Protection District permits a single-family detached dwelling use on a minimum lot size of 2 acres.

Present Use: Vacant

COMMENTS

1. **Conveyance areas**—We recommend that the amount of the areas to be conveyed be indicated on the plan, to provide clarity.

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 must be submitted for this proposed subdivision.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the September 7, 2016 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: jmk

cc: Charles Jaeger and Adele R. Vessey
    Michael C and Patricia Jarnutowski
    Ransom F. and Peggy L. Shoup
    All County & Associates
    C. Robert Wynn Associates, Inc., Municipal Engineer
    Chris Bauer, Township Secretary/Treasurer (via email)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Milford Township Board of Supervisors
   Milford Township Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Sketch Plan of Subdivision for Bauman Road Subdivision
          TMP #23-2-162
          Applicant: Rocky Mountain Properties, LLC (c/o Aaron Good)
          Owner: Same
          Plan Dated: July 25, 2016
          Date Received: July 14, 2016

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 40.2-acre site into 11 single-family detached residential lots. Lots will range in size from 2.0234 to 9.3744 (gross) acres. All lots are to be served by individual on-lot water and sewerage systems.

Location: Southeast of West Swamp Road and northwest of Bauman Road, approximately 1,000 feet northeast of their intersection. Access will be proved to both roads.

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

Present Use: Agricultural

COMMENTS

1. **Hydric soils**—The sketch plan identifies the soil symbol (CwB), which represents Croton silt loam. According to representatives from the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA), Natural Resource Conservation Service, CwB soils are ‘highly probable’ to be a hydric soil, which are an indicator of wetlands. Section 504.i(1) of the zoning ordinance requires an on-site investigation shall be conducted to determine if wetlands are present on the site when the site contains hydric soils or an area with predominance of wetland vegetation.
Future plan submissions should satisfy this requirement as deemed appropriate by the township.

The definition of hydric soils found in Section 237 of the zoning ordinance is based upon the outdated 1975 report by the USDA, Soil Conservation Service. Township officials should amend Section 237 to update the definition of hydric soils to be consistent with USDA’s current definition.

2. **Street and stormwater drainage facilities**—Given the length of the site’s frontage along West Swamp and Bauman roads, future plan submissions should ensure that the street improvements requirements in Section 603.d and storm sewer system requirements in Section 610 of the subdivision and land development ordinance are satisfied.

3. **Shared driveway**—Lots 8 and 9 are proposed as lane lots with separate driveways. The individual driveways are about 850 and 750 feet in length, respectively. The four driveways serving Lots 7 through 10 intersect Bauman Road within about 220 feet of one another. To reduce the number of access points within this span of Bauman Road and reduce the amount of impervious surface onsite, we recommend that a shared driveway be provided to serve Lots 8 and 9.

If a shared driveway is utilized, an access easement and maintenance agreement should be established so that if the shared driveway is in need of replacement or repair, the individual property owners are aware of their individual responsibilities.

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 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 September 7, 2016 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.

DAS:dc

cc: Aaron Good, Rocky Mountain Properties, LLC
Ott Consulting Inc.
Kevin Wolf, Andersen Engineering, Inc., Township Engineer
Jeffrey Vey, 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 for Quad/Graphics
         TMP #26-5-2
         Applicant: Naplin One Limited Partnership
         Owner: Quad/Graph Marketing, LLC
         Plan Dated: July 28, 2016
         Date Received: July 29, 2016

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 120,000-gross-square-foot warehouse on a 16.646-gross-acre lot. (Lot 2). Public water and sewer service the site.

Location: County Line Road, between Walnut Street and Schoolhouse Road.

Zoning: I Industrial District permits manufacturing and wholesaling activities on lots of 3 acres or more.

Present Use: Agriculture

COMMENTS

1. **Variance requested**—According to the plan, the following variance is being requested from the New Britain Township Zoning Hearing Board:

   Section 27-1702.a to permit a use in the I Industrial District to exceed 35 feet in height. Forty feet is proposed.

   No action should be taken on this submittal until the zoning issue is resolved to the satisfaction of the township.
2. **Waivers requested**—The site plan indicates that the applicant is requesting waivers from the following subdivision and land development ordinance (SALDO) requirements:

- **Section 22-505.3.C.(4)**: Requiring a community impact assessment report be prepared for industrial developments consisting of 50,000 square feet or more of total area.

- **Section 22-704.4**: Requiring that nothing shall be placed, planted or set within the area of an easement and the area shall be kept as lawn or in a natural state.

- **Section 22-706.1.B**: Requiring curbs to be installed along the property frontage of every existing street abutting a proposed subdivision and/or land development.

- **Section 22-708.2.B**: Requiring that all parking stall striping shall be double-lined.

- **Section 22-712.4.J**: Requiring that all portions of the detention basin bottom shall be sloped towards the outlet structure at a minimum slope of 2 percent.

- **Section 22-712.5.E**: Requiring that storm sewer shall be reinforced concrete pipe with a minimum diameter of 15 inches or equivalent.

- **Section 22-712.13.A.(2)**: Requiring stabilized access to the basin be no steeper than 12 horizontal to one vertical (8.33 percent).

- **Section 22-714.4.C**: Requiring light standards shall be located in planting islands or planting strips within parking areas.

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.

Two of the waiver requests should be corrected on the plans:

1) Section 22-505.C should be revised to Section 22-505.3.C.(4).

2) Section 22-104.4.C should be revised to Section 22-714.4.C.

3. **Traffic impact analysis**—Zoning ordinance Section 27-2500.a.4 requires a traffic impact study for an industrial development consisting of 50,000 square feet or more of total floor area. The zoning officer has indicated that per the applicant, a traffic impact study is underway and will be submitted under a separate cover.

4. **Access easement**—There are three proposed access entrances into the subject site from the existing drive that services the Quad/Graphic commercial printing facility building. Vehicular
access easement documentation should be secured for the three proposed ingress and egress points prior to township approval.

5. **Runoff into riparian buffer Zone 1 and conservation easement**—The subsurface drainage conveyance piping drains both bio-retention basins #1 and #2 outlets within the Zone 1 riparian buffer area. The plans display a headwall with riprap outlet protection that will help dissipate flow velocity. Zoning ordinance Section 27-2400.1.(c) notes that concentrated flows must be converted to sheet flow or subsurface flows prior to entering Zone 1 for proposed stormwater management facilities. The township should determine if the potential runoff entering the Zone 1 area complies with the intent of the ordinance or the plans should be revised accordingly.

In addition, the plans note a conservation easement has been established for the West Branch Neshaminy Creek Tributary 3. The township should determine adherence and compliance to the requirements established for the existing conservation easement that is displayed on the plans and noted as conservation easements #5 and #6.

6. **Planting island**—The Landscape Plan (Sheet 8 of 26) displays one landscape island without shade trees although shade trees are required per SALDO Section 22-713.3.A. There is no proposed lighting fixture within the island and for planting consistency, shade trees should be added to the plans since it appears there is no reason to omit the trees.

7. **Proposed tree**—The landscape plan (Sheet 8) proposes 11 Zelkova serrata ‘Green Vase’ trees. The ‘Green Vase’ cultivar has weak branch angles and is susceptible to wind damage. We recommend replacing that cultivar with ‘Village Green’ or ‘Halka’ which are superior in form and long term branch strength, to avoid problems in the future as the trees mature.

8. **Retaining wall**—The retaining wall that separates the parking area from the conservation easement that encompasses the West Branch Neshaminy Creek Tributary 3 and riparian areas appears to be 6 to 9 feet in height. Due to the wall height and proximity of the wall to several parking spaces, the township should consider a fence or guard rail on top the wall to protect both pedestrians and vehicles.

9. **Park and recreation land**—SALDO Sections 22-715.1 and 2.C.(2) require nonresidential land development to dedicate park and recreation area to the Township (2,500 square feet per 4,000 square feet of building area) or meet alternatives such as fee-in-lieu or others as outlined in Section 22-715.G. The township should determine if this section is applicable. The submission should comply with these requirements.

10. **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 must be submitted for this proposed land development.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the September 7, 2016 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.

JSI:dc

cc: Allan I. Nappen, Naplin One Limited Partnership  
Quad/Graph Marketing, LLC  
Ronald E. Klos, Jr., P.E., Bohler Engineering  
Craig Kennard, P.E., Gilmore & Associates, Township Engineer  
Eileen Bradley, Township Manager (via e-mail)  
Montgomery Township (adjacent municipality)
MEMORANDUM

TO:  
Nockamixon Township Board of Supervisors  
Nockamixon Township Planning Commission

FROM:  
Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT:  
Preliminary Subdivision Plan for Shively Estate Property  
TMP #30-11-143  
Applicant: Nockamixon Township  
Owner: Estate of Mary Shively  
Plan Dated: July 27, 2016  
Date Received: August 15, 2016

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 an 18.263-gross-acre tract into two lots, consisting of 13.158 gross acres (Lot 1) and 5.105 gross acres (Lot 2). Lot 2 is to be acquired by Nockamixon Township for future municipal use and Lot 1 by a private entity. A shared access driveway off Easton Road is proposed. No construction is proposed at this time. Individual on-lot water and sewage facilities will serve the new lots.

A simultaneous review in accordance with the provisions of Sections 304 and 502 of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, has been conducted in correspondence BCPC #30-16-CR1.

Location: West side of the intersection of Brownstone and Easton roads, approximately 980 feet north of the intersection of Frogtown and Easton roads.

Zoning: The I Industrial District allows for industrial activities such as light manufacturing, office parks, and warehousing in areas with direct access to Route 611 with a minimum lot area of 3 acres.

Present Use: Vacant dwelling, municipal storage, and agriculture.
COMMENTS

1. **Waivers requested**—The applicant is requesting waivers from the following subdivision and land development ordinance (SALDO) requirements:

   - **Section 196-411** Requiring an Environmental and Cultural Impact Assessment Report.
   - **Section 196-506, 512, & 513** Requiring street improvements, including cartway widening, curb, and sidewalk.
   - **Section 196-515** Requiring landscaping and street trees.
   - **Section 196-519** Requiring adequate water supply to service the lots.

   The applicant has submitted an accompanying letter stating the grounds and facts of unreasonableness or hardship on which the request for the waivers are based as per requirement of Section 512.1(b) of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code.

2. **Buffer yards**—Zoning ordinance Section 234-30 requires a buffer yard along the outer boundary of a land development intended for nonresidential or nonagricultural uses which involve new construction and which directly abut a residential district or residential use. The township should determine if the buffer planting requirements be implemented prior to the individual land development submittals for both Lots 1 and 2 since the R Residential District and several single-family houses border the tract to the north, south, and west.

3. **Existing municipal salt storage area**—Zoning ordinance Section 234-35.E.(1) requires that all outdoor storage facilities for fuel, raw materials and products stored outdoors be enclosed by a fence adequate to provide security for the property. An existing salt storage area is noted on proposed Lot 2 and, if the use continues, the township should ensure compliance and adjust the plans accordingly on future land development submittals.

4. **Existing nonconforming structures**—Proposed Lot 2 contains two nonconforming structures (vacant dwelling, garage/storage building) that are located within the minimum 50-foot front yard setback. Future submissions should note the nonconformity, in accordance with zoning ordinance Section 234-86.

5. **Adjacent drive/parking encroachment**—It appears that a portion of the drive/parking area located on the adjacent property (TMP #30-11-142) to the north encroaches within Lot 2. The township should determine if access easement agreements or removal of the drive/parking area are necessary. Easements should be shown on future submissions for Lot 2.

6. **Driveways accessing arterial roads**—The plan displays a shared access drive that services both lots. The *Nockamixon Township Comprehensive Plan* (2005) classifies Easton Road as an arterial designed to carry large volumes of traffic. SALDO Section 196-511.D notes that driveways accessing arterial roads for uses other than single-family residential dwellings shall be designed with the following additional regulations:
a. Acceleration and deceleration lanes must be constructed along the arterial road.

b. A separate left turn lane shall be constructed along the arterial road at all proposed driveway entrances except driveways classified as minimum use in accordance with PennDOT [67 Pa.Code,] Chapter 441 regulations.

c. Signalization may be required if traffic volumes or geometric conditions meet warrant requirements as established by PennDOT. The applicant shall be responsible for all costs associated with signalization including traffic studies, plan preparation, permit application, and installation.

d. Paving radii at driveway entrance for nonresidential uses shall be increased to accommodate anticipated truck traffic as deemed necessary.

The township should determine the extent of improvements necessary and the plans should be revised accordingly.

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 must be submitted for this proposed subdivision. We recommend that the Planning Module be submitted at the preliminary 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 September 7, 2016 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.

JSI:dc

cc: Estate of Mary Shively, c/o Robert Shively  
Keith Deluca, Township 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 for 195 Milford Square Pike
TMP # 36-5-96
Applicant: John Slifer
Owner: Richard Miller
Plan Dated: July 20, 2016
Date Received: August 1, 2016

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 1.77-acre (gross, 1.51 acres net) residential parcel into two residential lots. Proposed Lot 1 (0.93 acres gross, 0.79 acres net) will consist of a new single-family detached dwelling to be constructed on the location of an existing mobile home (to be removed) and a detached garage (to remain). Proposed lot 2 (0.84 acres gross, 0.71 acres net) will consist of an existing single-family detached dwelling and garage. Both proposed lots will have frontage on Milford Square Pike. The lots will be served by public sewer and on-lot water.

Location: Northwest side of Milford Square Pike, approximately 450 feet southwest of the intersection with West Broad Street (State Route 663).

Zoning: The property is zoned Suburban Residential Medium (SRM) District. Single-family detached exemption (Use B1A) is permitted on a site with a minimum area of 20,000 square feet, maximum density of 2.0 units per acre, and maximum impervious surface ratio of 0.2.

Present Use: Residential.
COMMENTS

1. **Waivers requested**—The site plan indicates that the applicant is requesting waivers from the following subdivision and land development ordinance (SALDO) requirements:

   - Section 22-515, and 22-610 curbing is not proposed.
   - Section 22-518 and 22-609 sidewalks are not proposed.
   - Section 22-605.4 no street improvements are proposed.
   - Section 22-702.C(2) no features within 400 feet of any part of the land to be subdivided have been shown on the plans.

   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. **Tree protection**—Based on aerial photos, it appears that there are several trees around the existing mobile home which may be disturbed by the proposed grading and construction of a new dwelling on the property. Existing trees which are greater than 12 inches in caliper are required to be shown on the plans, per Section 22-702.C(6) of the SALDO. The plans do not indicate the location of any existing trees on the property.

3. **Parking**—Section 27-405 of the zoning ordinance requires 3 parking spaces for a 3-bedroom dwelling, and 4 parking spaces for a dwelling of 4 bedrooms or more. It appears that adequate parking is provided for both lots on the existing driveways and in the garages. However, the plan should indicate the number of bedrooms in each dwelling and the number of parking spaces on each lot.

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 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 September 7, 2016 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.

CND:jk

cc: John Slifer, Applicant
    Todd R. Myers, PLS, Cowan Associates, Inc., Applicant’s Surveyor
    Mike Schwartz, P.E., Gilmore & Associates, Township Engineer (via email)
    Paul Stepanoff, Township Manager (via email)
MEMORANDUM

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

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Sketch Plan of Land Development for D1 Baseball Academy
         TMP #48-16-155
         Applicant: D1 Baseball
         Owner: One (1100) Industrial Highway Associates
         Plan Dated: July 6, 2016
         Date Received: July 22, 2016

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 an accessory 40-foot high, 15,525 square foot dome to expand the multipurpose sports training use (Use 21) on the subject site. The 2.10-acre site is served by public water and sewerage facilities.

Location: On the south side of Industrial Boulevard approximately 1,900 feet east of Second Street Pike.

Zoning: Limited Industrial (LI) District is intended to encourage and provide for industrial development necessary to the economy of the township and region on a minimum 2-acre lot size.

Present Use: Institutional (indoor baseball training).

COMMENTS

1. Parking in front yard—The table of dimensional requirements, zoning ordinance Section 185-22 notes that parking in the front yard is prohibited. There are existing parking spaces located within the front yard setback and future plans should be revised to note an existing nonconformity.
2. **Rear yard**—The table of dimensional requirements, zoning ordinance Section 185-22 notes a 100-foot rear yard setback when abutting a residentially zoned district. The rear of the subject lot abuts the R-2 Low Density Residential District. The proposed dome appears to comply with the setback, however the chart of dimensional requirements should be revised on future plans to reflect the 100-foot requirement.

3. **Building height**—The submitted sketch plans note the peak height of the proposed dome is 40 feet high. The table of dimensional requirements for the LI District requires a maximum building height of 35 feet or three stories. However, zoning ordinance Section 185-42 states that the height limitation does not apply to church spires, belfries, cupolas, monuments, silos and domes not used for human occupancy. It is common that baseball training domes are made of fabric and we recommend the township get clarification on the proposed dome structure to ensure it is meeting the intent of the ordinance.

4. **Building spacing**—The sketch plan displays 11 feet between the two structures and it is unclear what the ground surface is between the two structures. Future plans should indicate if there is asphalt, gravel, or grass and landscaping between the structures as well as the extent of asphalt/paving on the site. The Fire Marshal should review the plans to ensure safe and barrier free emergency access within the property limits.

5. **Side yard**—The existing building does not conform with the side yard setback requirement of 20 feet and is labeled as an existing nonconformity on the plans. The proposed dome structure is located within the minimum side yard requirement of 20 feet and is creating a nonconforming situation. The township should ensure compliance with zoning ordinance Section 185-68 regarding the extension of a nonconforming structure or use or the proposed structure should be moved to comply with the side yard setback.

6. **Natural resources**—Other than the delineation of the 100-year floodplain and two wooded areas, slopes, soils, wetlands and other natural resources are not depicted on the plans. Future plans should provide sufficient natural resource information in order to ensure compliance with zoning ordinance Section 185-20 and indicate that the impacts are not exceeding the maximum permissible encroachment coverage calculations.

7. **Internal circulation and access**—Future submitted plan should clearly demonstrate safe and compliant car, truck, and emergency vehicle access ways, clearances, and turning radii to the satisfaction of the township’s codes and ordinances.

   In addition, pedestrian circulation should be clearly delineated on future plans. The plan shows an 8-foot wide sidewalk along the existing building that stops a few feet from the proposed dome. It is unclear if the sidewalk leads to the entrance into the dome. Pedestrian entry and exit into the proposed dome should be demarcated on all future submissions.

8. **Off-street parking aisle**—Subdivision and land development ordinance (SALDO) Section 160-41.E requires a 25-foot aisle for 90-degree parking with two way travel. The plans display a 24-foot aisle which should be revised accordingly on future plan submissions. In addition, the parking stalls adjacent to the existing building are oversized and should be corrected to reflect the proper dimensions of 9 feet x 18.5 feet (per SALDO Section 160-41.E) which will create a compliant aisle width for two way traffic.
In the rear of the lot, west of the proposed dome, an aisle of 26.39 feet separates 13 parking spaces from the edge of the dome structure. The plans do not note what the dome is constructed of, and if needed, measures to protect the dome structure edge from vehicles pulling out from the parking spaces or driving by should be included on future submissions.

9. **Stormwater**—The stormwater management system shall be designed and constructed in accordance with SALDO Section 160-67. The limits of all asphalt and hardscape areas should be included on future submissions.

10. **Buffer**—Zoning ordinance Section 185-60.B(1) requires a 50-foot buffer yard between the LI District and the R-2 District. The buffer width should be displayed on future plans and the township should determine if the existing wooded area provides the adequate screening to fulfill the intent of the required plantings per zoning ordinance Section 160-60.D.

11. **Landscaping**—The landscaping and planting requirements shall be designed and constructed in accordance with SALDO Section 160-51.

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 must be submitted for this proposal. 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 September 7, 2016, 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.

JSI:dc

cc: Mr. Robert Steinhart, One (1100) Industrial Highway Associates
Vincent W. Fioravanti, P.E., Fioravanti, Inc.
Larry Young, P.E., Tri-State Engineers and Land Surveyors, Inc., Township Engineer
Joe Golden, 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 of Land Development for Lidl
   TMP #49-9-43
   Applicant: Lidl US, LLC c/o Scott Logan
   Owner: Ravid Warminster, LLC
   Plan Dated: July 28, 2016
   Date Received: July 27, 2016

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 35,962-square-foot commercial (supermarket) building on a 7.14-acre site. An existing 56,561-square-foot supermarket building will be removed. The site is served by public water and sewer.

Location: Western side of York Road opposite Archbishop Wood High School and the intersection with Roberts Road.

Zoning: C-2 Commercial District permits retail shops, offices, service businesses, banks, saving and loan associations and other uses on lots of 1 acre or more.

Present Use: Commercial (Vacant supermarket)

COMMENTS

1. **Sidewalks**—Section 809 of the subdivision and land development ordinance requires that sidewalks be constructed on one side of all frontage streets and both sides of all other streets within the land development. The plan shows an existing sidewalk between the Warminster Plaza and the intersection with Roberts Road. There is no sidewalk north to the Christ Home property. The plan should be revised to show the required sidewalk.
2. **Trail from Christ Home**—An existing paved trail on the adjacent Christ Home site (TMP #49-9-39) ends along the northeastern property line of the subject parcel. We recommend that the applicant consider providing a path connection that would interconnect with the proposed building and to the intersection with York and Roberts roads. Providing pedestrian access will enhance accessibility on the site.

A proposed planted area is shown on the landscaping plan adjacent to the Christ Home path. If a connecting path is provided, we recommend that that landscaping be revised.

3. **Additional site development**—The plan shows a large vacant area north of the proposed building which may be available for further development. We recommend that the applicant and township consider future development potential and impacts such as parking and traffic.

4. **Street trees**—Section 523.4, Street Trees, of the subdivision land development ordinance requires that street trees shall be planted along all streets except where the township agrees that suitable street trees are already in place. One street tree shall be planted for every 40 lineal feet of street frontage and may be planted in groupings. The plan shows a frontage along York Road of 839 feet which would require 21 street trees. The plan shows only 14. The plan should be revised to show the required number of street trees.

5. **Plan stage**—The plan was submitted as a preliminary/final plan. Section 301 of the subdivision and land development ordinance requires separate preliminary and final plan submissions for a major subdivision. If a waiver of Section 301 is desired, the submission should comply with Section 512.1.(b) of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code and the township should determine if the submission is sufficient to be reviewed only once.

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 must be submitted for this proposed land development.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the September 7, 2016, 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:dc

cc: Lidl US, LLC c/o Scott Logan  
Kevin McCarty, Bohler Engineering  
Craig D. Kennard, P.E., Gilmore & Associates, Township Engineer  
Greg Schuster, Municipal Manager (via email)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Warrington Township Board of Supervisors
   Warrington Township Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Revised Preliminary Plan of Land Development for High Grove Manor Lot 2
          TMP #50-35-19
          Applicant: Blue Apple Trade Attn: Sanad Al Muqatash
          Owner: KTMT HGM, LP Attn. Mike Tulio
          Plan Dated: July 29, 2016
          Date Received: August 4, 2016

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 4,346-square-foot commercial building with a 5,040-square-foot canopy over eight fuel dispensers on a 1.413-acre parcel. A total of 9,386 square feet is proposed. Public water and sewer will serve the site.

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. The Loop Road Overlay district permits motor vehicle service station uses on lots of one acre or more.

Present Use: Vacant

COMMENTS

1. Traffic impact study—Section 2503 of the zoning ordinance requires that a transportation impact study be submitted for all preliminary plan applications for all commercial land developments. Also, the Planning Commission, may require any land development to be accompanied by a traffic impact study.
The proposed plan is a revision to an approved plan which contained a 2,957-square-foot convenience store and 3,376-square-foot canopy with six fuel dispensers. The subject plan is for a 4,346-square-foot building and 5,040-square-foot canopy with eight fuel dispensers. The proposed building is 1,389 square feet, or 32 percent, larger than the previously approved building and the canopy is 1,664 square feet, or 49 percent, larger than the previously proposed canopy. The number of parking spaces is also 10 more than the previous plan. We recommend that the township determine if a revised transportation impact study should be completed.

2. **Corridor Overlay District**—The site is within the Route 611 Corridor Overlay District. Section 330 of the subdivision and land development ordinance requires that specific design standards be met for development along the corridor.

   a. **Required information**—Section 330.3 requires that information and drawings listed below be submitted for review as part of the subdivision or land development review process. This information has not been provided.

      i. Description of use or uses proposed
      ii. Architectural drawings of proposed building(s) showing all sides of the proposed building(s), with information on building materials and colors
      iii. Photographs of how the new development will relate to the existing surroundings

   b. **Design**—Section 330.4.B. A Design of Establishments, requires that modifications be made to any prototypical design to ensure that it conforms to the standards of building design, landscaping, parking, lighting and signs for developments within the Corridor Overlay District.

   c. **Roof design**—Section 330.4.A. requires pitched roofs for buildings. Flat roofs are prohibited except where there is a partial or pent roof that extends along all sides of the building. We also recommend that the gas pump canopy mirror that of the building with a pitched roof. Flat canopy roofs often serve as additional branding which may not be appropriate for the area.

   d. **Parking setback**—Section 330.4.D of the subdivision and land development ordinance requires that parking areas be set back at least 25 feet from the ultimate right-of-way of any public street. The plan shows a parking setback of only 15 feet, but it should be revised to show the required setback.

3. **Route 611 Corridor Study**—The Route 611 Corridor Study includes the subject parcels as part of the Warrington Village Center Reach. The study has no specific recommendations for this site but the recommended development pattern along Easton Road is for commercial buildings fronting on the road with parking in the rear or side of buildings. The proposed building and use are not consistent with the Corridor Study.

4. **Gas pump/store layout**—The plan shows a gas station proposed on Lot 2 with gas pumps and a canopy on the Easton Road frontage and the store in the rear. Site design and building layout is more important now that the canopy is 49 percent larger and the store is 32 percent larger than the previous submission. We recommend that the township and applicant consider
revising the plan by placing the building along the street frontage and the canopy in the rear to reduce the building mass along the street frontage. In addition, we recommend that the following specific design guidelines be considered for the proposal:

- Reflect local architecture—Roof form, window proportions, material colors, and details should fit within local context and with the requirements and intent of the Corridor Overlay District;
- Provide sidewalk connections to the store from Easton Road and from the loop road;
- Design all sides of the store with windows and other details to avoid blank walls;
- Design the gas pump canopy roof to have a peak in the middle to replicate roof styles in the adjacent village of Warrington;
- Coordinate the roof designs of the gas pump canopy and the store;
- Use recessed non-glare lighting under the canopy and around the site;
- Provide a monument style sign integrated with a planter or landscaping;

The above photograph shows a gas station/convenience store in Rhinebeck, NY which exemplifies many of the design features described.

5. **Parking design**—Section 310.4 of the subdivision and land development ordinance requires that no one single parking line shall exceed 12 cars. Lines exceeding 12 cars shall be separated by a planting strip equal to the width of one parking stall. The parking row to the south of the proposed structures contains 14 spaces. The plan should be revised to show no more than 12 spaces in a row.

6. **Signs**—The plan does not provide any information about proposed commercial signage. The plan should be revised to show sign details to ensure compliance with Part 22 of the zoning ordinance.

---

1 The above guidelines adapted from Duchess County New York, Greenway Guidelines (http://www.co.dutchess.ny.us/CountyGov/Departments/Planning/ggcsgp.pdf)
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 must be submitted for this proposed land development.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the September 7, 2016, 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:jmk

cc: Blue Apple Trade Inc. Attn: Sanad Al Muqatash
    Robert W. Gundlach, Jr. ESQ.
    T and M Associates
    Tom Zarko, CKS Engineers, Township Engineer
    Barry Luber, 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 Victory Gardens
TMP #50-4-85
Applicant: Victory Gardens Inc.
Owner: Eureka Stone Quarry, Inc.
Plan Dated: July 15, 2016
Date Received: July 22, 2016

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 leasehold portion of a 304.23-acre tract for manufacture of mulch. The use is to be relocated from Winding Brook Farm on Bristol Road. Water and sewer provision is undetermined at this time.

Location: West side of Lower State Road approximately 3,200 feet northeast of its intersection with County Line Road.

Zoning: PI2 Planned Industrial District permits manufacturing of, processing, treatment of materials, including wood, on lots of 2 acres or more.

Q Quarry District permits quarrying and/or digging of stone and related elements and agricultural uses in accordance with the Surface Mining and Conservation and Reclamation Act.

Present Use: Vacant

COMMENTS

1. **Setbacks**—Zoning ordinance Section 1305, which references Section 1205.E of the zoning ordinance, requires a side yard setback of 15 feet, total composite of yard width of 40 feet, and rear yard setback of 50 feet in the PI-2 District. The plan shows a storage container and office trailer approximately 5 feet from the southwestern property line and a fire safety pump house 5 feet from the northwestern property line. The preliminary plan should show the required setbacks and relocation of any structure within the required yards.
2. **Buffer yards**—Zoning ordinance Section 1306, Screening and buffering for the PI-2 District, requires that a 30-foot-wide buffer planting be provided along each side or rear lot line. A 15-foot buffer including sidewalks and access ways shall also be provided along each street line. Future plans should show buffering along the side and rear lot lines and sidewalk along the street line.

Zoning ordinance Section 1806 requires a 100-foot wide buffer in the Q Quarry District. The plan shows a 75-foot wide front yard setback but no side or rear setback or buffers. Future plans should provide the required buffer yards, planting and sidewalks in accordance with Section 1806.

3. **Parking**—Section 2102.C. of the zoning ordinance requires three parking spaces for every four personnel for the largest shift, plus one space for each company vehicle for industrial uses. Future plans should provide the required parking.

4. **Plan information**—Section 503.4 of the subdivision and land development ordinance (SALDO) requires that existing tract and adjacent tract zoning information be shown on the plan. The plan does not provide the required zoning information. The location map indicates that the parcel lies within two zoning districts but this is not addressed on the site plan. A preliminary plan should include the required information so that compliance with the SALDO and zoning ordinance requirements can be determined.

5. **Street trees**—Section 325.E Street Trees, requires that street trees be planted along existing streets where they do not exist. The plan does not show street trees. Future plans should provide street trees along Lower State Road.

6. **Traffic Impact Study**—Section 2503 Transportation Impact Study applicability requires that all industrial applications shall have a transportation impact study submitted with a preliminary plan.

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 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 September 7, 2016 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:jk

cc: Mike Butler, Victory Gardens Inc.
    Eric Clase, P.E., Gilmore & Associates
    Tom Zarko, CKS Engineers, Municipal Engineer
    Barry Luber, 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 Keene Tract
         TMP #50-26-64
         Applicant: Webb Building Group
         Owner: Paul & Laura Keene
         Plan Dated: March 31, 2016
         Last Revised July 20, 2016
         Date Received: July 22, 2016

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 3.53-acre parcel (TMP #50-26-64) into 3 single-family detached lots: Lot 1 – 47,445; Lot 2 – 42,379; and Lot 3 – 41,561 square feet. Portions of adjacent TMPs #50-26-64-1 (6,125 square feet) and #50-26-64-2 (5,850 square feet) will be conveyed to TMP #50-26-64 to become part of the proposed lots. A portion of TMP #50-24-64 will be combined with TMP #50-24-64-2 resulting in a 58,725-square-foot building lot, and a portion of the existing lane of TMP #50-24-64 will be combined with TMP #50-26-64-1 to create a lot area of 52,591 square feet. The site shall be served by public water and sewer.

Location: Western side of Kelly Road approximately 400 feet northeast of its intersection with Bristol Road.

Zoning: R-1-C Residential District permits single-family detached dwellings on lots of 40,000 square feet or more when served by public water and sewer.

Present Use: Vacant and residential (existing dwelling on TMP #50-26-64-2)
COMMENTS

1. **Lot dimensions**—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 1/2 in depth to one in width is generally accepted as a proper maximum. The proposed new lots would be 120 feet wide and 400 feet deep.

2. **Shared driveways**—The plan shows three proposed single-family detached lots with individual driveway access to Kelly Road. The existing tax parcels #50-26-64-1 and #50-26-64-2 will also take access to Kelly Road via a shared driveway. We support the shared driveway concept and recommend that Lots 1 and 2 take access by way of the shared driveway to lessen impervious surface, minimize construction and maintenance costs, and lessen the number of curb cuts along Kelly Drive.

   However we note that Section 318 of the subdivision and land development ordinance requires that the top or bottom of slopes be a minimum of five feet from the property or right of way lines. This issue should be addressed.

3. **Shared driveway maintenance**—The driveway will be shared by at least two lots and will require maintenance, including snow plowing. We recommend that the plan provide a note about maintenance agreement for the driveway easement area.

4. **Stormwater management**—The plan does not show any area for stormwater management. The preliminary plan should show stormwater management area and facilities in accordance with the township Act 167 stormwater managing ordinance and Section 319 of the subdivision and land development ordinance.

5. **Deed consolidation**—We recommend that the township solicitor review the deeds to ensure that there are no remaining nonconforming parcels created.

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 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 September 7, 2016 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:dc

cc:  Brian J. Webb, Webb Building Group  
     Jason T. Smeland, P.E., Lenape Valley Engineering  
     Thomas F. Zarko, P.E., CKS Engineers, Inc., Municipal Engineer  
     Barry Luber, Municipal Manager (via email)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Warwick Township Board of Supervisors
    Warwick Township Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Preliminary Land Development for (RGB ADN Enterprises)
            TMP # 51-13-10-18
            Applicant: RGB ADN Enterprises, LP
            Owner: Same
            Plan Dated: June 21, 2016
            Date Received: July 6, 2016

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 4,500-square-foot, single-story industrial building to be used for contracting use on the 1.78-acre site. The western most section of the site contains a 200-foot buffer area, which is deed restricted as open space. The project will connect to public water and public sewer.

Location: Campus Drive, which is the west side of Mearns Road, north of West Bristol Road in Lot 17 of the Warwick Business Campus.

Zoning: The property is zoned LI – Limited Industrial District, which permits use H-13 Industrial Park and H-5 Contracting by right. The site is an existing lot within an industrial park development. The H-13 Industrial Park use regulations, which require a minimum lot size of 1 acre, minimum lot width of 145 feet at the building line, maximum building height of 35 feet, 40 foot setback from an internal road, and maximum impervious coverage ratio of 80 percent, apply to use H-5.

Present Use: Vacant; lot in existing industrial park.
COMMENTS

1. **Waivers requested**—The site plan indicates that the applicant is requesting waivers from the following subdivision and land development ordinance (SALDO) requirements:

   - Section 163-13 Statement of impacts on educational facilities, traffic impact study, and traffic impact assessment.
   - Section 163-24.B.2.a.1 To permit a drawing at a scale of 1” = 30’.
   - Section 163-24.C.2 Not showing features within 400’ of site.

   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. **Building placement**—Section 195-16.H(13)(c)[2][a][iii] of the zoning ordinance requires that no building in an industrial park development be located within 500 feet of a residential use or district. The property is adjacent to the RA Residential- Agricultural District directly to the south, and the placement of the building is approximately 310 feet from this district boundary line.

3. **Site capacity calculations**—The plan should provide site capacity calculations as required by zoning ordinance Section 195-61.B.

4. **Parking**—Section 195-79.L of the zoning ordinance requires that off-street parking for all business vehicles be located on a side of the building away from any adjacent residences. The plan provided shows a parking area on the south side of the property for equipment, which is adjacent to the residences to the south, although a 200-foot buffer/deed restricted space is proposed between the residential district and the parking area.

   Zoning ordinance Section 195-16.H(5)(b) states that all materials and vehicles shall be stored within a building or enclosed area visually screened by a solid vegetation barrier, or a solid fence. The plan indicates a chain link fence with slats will surround the parking area. The township should determine whether this fence is adequate to meet the intent of the ordinance. The plan should indicate what type of equipment or vehicles will be parked or stored on the crushed stone parking area, and show how the parking for the eight company vehicles, and vehicular circulation will be coordinated. Parking lot landscaping should be provided (See Comment #8).

5. **Landscaping plan**—A landscaping plan should be provided as required by Section 163-24.B(2)(d)[7] of the SALDO.

6. **Street trees**—Sections 163-51.A(1) and (2) of the SALDO require that street trees be planted immediately outside the right-of-way lines on all streets at a minimum 60 feet apart, or an equivalent number planted in an informal arrangement. The plan should be revised to provide the required number of street trees.
The existing conditions plan shows a single tree along Campus Drive, but the proposed site plan (Sheet 1) does not show this tree. The tree also is shown on Sheets 3-5, however sanitary sewer and water lines are proposed through the area of the dripline. It is unclear if the tree is proposed to remain. Section 163-51.1 of the SALDO provides tree protection requirements. If the tree is to remain, the two proposed utility lines should be shifted out of the dripline of the tree and tree protection fencing should be provided as required.

7. **Parking lot landscaping**—Section 163-51.B(2)(a) of the SALDO requires that in all parking areas, there must be at least one tree for every six spaces. There are nine parking spaces proposed in the paved parking area, but there are no trees proposed within the parking area. Section 163-51.B(2)(c) of the SALDO requires that all parking areas be surrounded along their perimeter with screen plantings. No screen plantings are provided along the perimeter of the parking area. The plan should be revised to address these requirements.

8. **Buffer yard requirements**—As the site is an industrial use, and is adjacent to the RA Residential-Agricultural District, a buffer yard classification of ‘C’ is required according to Section 195-63.B(1) and Table 1 of the zoning ordinance. This requires a buffer area of 75 feet in width, and either a planting of a hedgerow and evergreens every 20 feet, or a row of evergreens planted every 15 feet. The plan shows a 200-foot buffer/deed restricted open space area, a 15-foot landscape easement, and 10 existing evergreen trees on the southern end of the property, which is adjacent to the residential district. The plan should provide calculations and additional buffer planting, as necessary, to indicate compliance with the buffer yard requirements. The plan should also identify the types of existing evergreen trees on the site.

9. **Lighting**—Section 195-70.A(1)(d) of the zoning ordinance requires that parking areas have a minimum level of illumination of 0.9 footcandles, and a maximum to minimum lighting ratio of 20:1. The lighting plan indicates several areas of the parking lot which will have levels of illumination at 0.6 footcandles, and the overall maximum:minimum ratio will be 25.2:1. Section 195-70.A(1)(m) of the zoning ordinance permits a maximum level of illumination of 0.2 footcandles at any property line. The lighting plan shows illumination levels of 1.0 footcandles at the eastern property line. The township engineer should comment on the suitability of the lighting plan.

10. **Garbage enclosure**—Section 195-71.B of the zoning ordinance requires that all waste disposal dumpster areas be enclosed by an adequate fence, or other enclosure to provide security for the property. A trash area is indicated on the plan, but it is not clear whether the trash area will be enclosed.

11. **Clear sight triangle**—Section 163-35.D of the SALDO requires clear sight distance at driveway intersections. It does not appear that there is any conflict, however no clear sight distance triangle is shown on the drawings.

12. **Fuel storage**—The township’s zoning ordinance has regulations for the outdoor storage of fuel. Will there be any fuel tanks or drums on the property for the use of the vehicles and/or equipment which will be stored at the site? Any fuel storage should be shown on the plan and comply with the ordinance requirements of Section 195-71 of the zoning ordinance.
13. **Signage**—No details have been provided regarding signage for the proposed use and building on the property. Any proposed business identification signage located either on the building, or on a ground or monument sign along the property frontage should be indicated on the plan and should comply with the signage standards of Article XXII of the zoning ordinance.

14. **Clarifications**—There are a few minor items on the drawings provided which appear to be inconsistent, and may require clarification:

   a. The land development plan labels the street as Campus Drive, while the Location map labels the street as Campus Road.

   b. The Luminaire Schedule and the Lighting Plan indicate a total of 8 new light fixtures, while the Luminaire Location Summary chart lists 9 new fixtures.

15. **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 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 September 7, 2016 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.

CND:dc

c: Andrew Norelli, RGB ADN Enterprises, LP
     Eastern/Chadrow Associates, Inc.
     Michele Fountain, P.E., CKS Engineers, Inc., Township Engineer (via email)
     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)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Development</th>
<th>BCPC Number</th>
<th>Tax Parcel Number</th>
<th>PaDEP Code Number</th>
<th>Plan Review Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Warminster Township</td>
<td>Longstreth Redevelopment</td>
<td>12171</td>
<td>49-17-42</td>
<td>1-09007-211-3J</td>
<td>0201-60027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richland Township</td>
<td>1465 N. West End Boulevard</td>
<td>36-3-1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1-09940-317-2</td>
<td>0201-60031</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
August 1, 2016

Robert Cunningham, P.E.
Holmes Cunningham Engineering
350 Butler Avenue
New Britain, PA 18901

RE: Longstreth Redevelopment
PaDEP Code #1-9007-211-3J
BCPC #12171
TMP #49-17-42
Warminster Township, Bucks County, PA

Dear Mr. Cunningham:

We have received a copy of the planning module[1] regarding the construction of sewage collection facilities to serve a 35 single-family detached subdivision. The site contains 14.74 acres and is located approximately 150 feet east of the intersection of Roberts and Marian Road and approximately 1,500 feet east of York Road. Wastewater, totaling 8,750 gallons per day or 35 EDU, will flow into the existing conveyance system and the Street Road interceptor to the Warminster Municipal Authority Log College Wastewater Treatment Plant.

The Final Environmental Impact Statement Horsham-Warminster-Warrington, Pennsylvania Wastewater Treatment Facilities 1980 is the official Act 537 Plan for this portion of Warminster Township. The proposal to construct public sewer conveyance facilities is consistent with the official Act 537 Plan, since this plan indicates that the site is within an area to be served by the Warminster Municipal Authority Log College Treatment Plant.

The County Planning Agency Review Component 4B is attached for inclusion with the planning module application to PaDEP. If the municipality approves the planning module and 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.

---

[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 Warminster 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,

David C. Zipf, AICP
Community Planner

DCZ:dc

Attachment

cc: Genevieve Kotsick, BCDH
    Elizabeth Mahoney, Sewage Planning Supervisor, Wastewater Management, PaDEP
    Gregg Schuster, 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
Longstreth School Redevelopment

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

1. Date plan received by county planning agency. July 22, 2016
2. Date plan received by planning agency with areawide jurisdiction
   Agency name
3. Date review completed by agency August 1, 2016

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></th>
<th></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></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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If yes, is the proposed waiver consistent with applicable ordinances.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<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 C. Zipf AICP
Title: Community Planner  Signature: 
Date: August 1, 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.
August 25, 2016

Steve Tabakelis, EIT
All County and Associates, Inc.,
P.O. Box 472
St. Peters, PA 19470

RE: Savage – 1465 N. West End Boulevard Planning Module
PaDEP Code #1-09940-317-2
TMP #36-3-1
Richland Township, Bucks County, PA

Dear Mr. Tabakelis:

We have received a copy of the planning module\(^1\) proposing to replace an existing on-site sewage disposal facility, which serves a two-family dwelling, with a new on-site facility which will serve a four-family dwelling on a single property of 2.17 acres. The projected sewage from the proposed four-family dwelling will be 1,700 gallons per day (GPD) or 5 equivalent dwelling units (EDUs).

The *Act 537 Sewage Facilities Plan for Richland Township, Bucks County, Pennsylvania* (2015) is the official plan for Richland Township. The subject site is located within the proposed new development area, in the “beyond 10-year development” sewer service area depicted in the plan. The site is also located in drainage area 1E, which does not currently have public sewer service. The plan proposes several alternatives for providing sewer service to this area, but not within the next 10 years. Therefore, the proposal appears to be generally consistent with the township’s *Act 537 Plan*.

We note that the PNDI Project Environmental Review Receipt indicates that the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service are requiring project information to be submitted to their offices and further review is necessary to resolve potential impacts. A soils analysis conducted in 2007 by Del Val Soil & Environmental Consultants, Inc., determined that the soils on the property had a limited capacity for on-site sewage disposal due to a seasonal high water table.

We also note that the property is located within the Planned Commercial (PC) Zoning District of Richland Township, which does not permit four-family dwellings as of right. No information has been provided regarding any zoning approval for the proposed project.

---

\(^1\) 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 *Act 537 Sewage Facilities Plan for Richland Township, Bucks County, Pennsylvania*. 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.
Steve Tabakelis, EIT
August 25, 2016
Page 2

The County Planning Agency Review, Component 4B, is attached for inclusion with the planning module application to DEP. If the township approves the planning module and thereby revises the official sewage facilities plan, the completed (signed) resolution and required supporting data (Components 2 and 4B; transmittal letter; plans; narrative; copies of the BCPC and BCDH review letters) should be sent to Elizabeth Mahoney, Sewage Planning Supervisor, PaDEP, Southeast Regional Office, 2 East Main Street, Norristown, PA 19401.

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

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Christopher N. Dochney
Planner

CND:dc

Attachment

cc: Genevie A. Kostick, Bucks County Health Department
    Elizabeth Mahoney, PaDEP
    Paul Stepanoff, Richland 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
Savage - 1465 N. West End Blvd

SECTION B. REVIEW SCHEDULE (See Section B of instructions)
1. Date plan received by county planning agency. August 15, 2016
2. Date plan received by planning agency with areawide jurisdiction
   Agency name
3. Date review completed by agency August 25, 2016

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 archaeological 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? See attached letter.

☒ ☐ 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 See attached letter regarding compliance with municipal zoning ordinance.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>SECTION C. AGENCY REVIEW (continued)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>11. Have all applicable zoning approvals been obtained? See attached letter.</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>X</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>X</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>X</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: Christopher N. Dochney
Title: Planner
Signature: [Signature]
Date: August 25, 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.
BUCKS COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING

Wednesday, October 5, 2016
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 September 7, 2016

4. Executive Director’s Report

5. Presentation:
   Karin Morris, Associate Director of Planning, DVRPC
   Planning for Aging Population

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
SEPTEMBER 7, 2016

MEMBERS PRESENT:  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:  Richard G. Brahler, Jr.; Lynn T. Bush; Debra Canale; Christopher N. Dochney; John S. Ives; David P. Johnson; Timothy A. Koehler; Charles T. McIlhinney; Michael A. Roedig; David A. Sebastian

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, AUGUST 3, 2016
Upon motion of Mr. Goodnoe, seconded by Ms. Pierce, with the vote being 8-0 the motion carried to approve the minutes of the August 3, 2016 meeting as presented. Mr. Dowling abstained owing to his absence at the meeting.

4. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR’S REPORT
The Executive Director’s Report was submitted to the board prior to the meeting.

Ms. Bush referred to her report on the 2016 Hazard Mitigation Plan that she, Mr. Feltes, and Mr. Koehler have been working on. The Plan is a state requirement and must be adopted by all 54 municipalities. All municipalities have been involved in some way in its preparation. The plan identifies the main hazards facing Bucks County, most notably flooding, and then highlights the ways in which we need to be prepared to respond. The Commissioners have adopted it and now it needs to be adopted by the municipalities. Ms. Bush stated that there will be a presentation on this in the near future. Mr. Kisselback asked if the Plan included manmade hazards. Ms. Bush replied that yes, there is a list of over 21 different events the plan covers.

Ms. Bush mentioned the State Transportation Commission. Ms. Bush and Mr. Brahler represented Bucks County at this month’s meeting held in Falls Township. This statewide group guides transportation policy and adopts the Twelve-Year Plan. There was a tour of the work being done on the I95-PA Turnpike connection and a review of the other big projects happening in Pennsylvania. The most interesting discussion was about autonomous cars and how PennDOT is preparing for the self-driving vehicles.

Ms. Bush told us that she attended the County Commissioners Association of Pennsylvania (CCAP) annual meeting on behalf of Bucks County in early August. Topics that are of statewide interest to us included the problems with recycling electronics and regulations associated with water and stormwater. Ms. Bush stated that she drafted, and the CCAP membership adopted, a new policy for the CCAP to lobby for changes in the Covered Devices Recycling Act.
Ms. Bush then brought up the Patterson Farm in Lower Makefield Township. Ms. Bush and Mr. Harvey have been working with the Township to permanently preserve this farm without cost to the county and are getting very close to making that happen.

Finally, Ms. Bush spoke about the display that the BCPC had at the Grange Fair. Most questions from the public were regarding our trails initiatives. People were overwhelmingly supportive of trails and mentioned how much they love the Montgomery County trails.

5. **Presentation: Cross Keys Study Update** — David A. Sebastian, Senior Planner, Richard G. Brahler, Senior Transportation Planner, and John S. Ives, Planner

Mr. David A. Sebastian, Senior Community Planner, began the presentation by saying that it has been over a year since the last presentation on the Cross Keys project. The project’s continued progression has been a group effort, not just internally, but from outside sources as well, such as, Ms. Amy Kominski, from Gilmore and Associates, who assisted with the transportation component of the plan.

Mr. Sebastian stated that the Cross Keys Study is sponsored by the Transportation and Community Development Initiative (TCDI). The TCDI is a grant program of the Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission (DVRPC). The goal of the grant is to support growth of municipalities in the Delaware Valley through initiatives that implement the region’s long-range plan, Connections 2040 Plan for Greater Philadelphia. The program targets transportation investments, linked with land use strategies that will enhance established communities to create more vital and livable neighborhoods.

Mr. Sebastian said that the Cross Keys area connects four municipalities—Doylestown Borough and Doylestown, Plumstead, and Buckingham townships, containing over 636 acres with a population of 58,462. The priority issues of this study are transportation and circulation, economic development, building upon their strengths, assets and future scenarios.

Mr. Sebastian turned over the presentation to Mr. Brahler for the Transportation and Circulation portion of the presentation. Mr. Brahler stated that transportation is a key component to economic development in the Cross Keys area. He stated that a portion of the grant was set aside to hire Gilmore and Associates to assist in the engineering and study of the traffic flow of 11 intersections along Swamp Road, Main Street and North Easton Road. The key issues are intersection and roadway congestion, a need to accommodate pedestrian and bicycle traffic, and preparing for future development.

Mr. Brahler stated that after studying the data from the traffic counts, crash data, Traffic Improvement Projects (TIP) already in the queue, signal timing, pedestrian and bicycle traffic and connector road possibilities, the potential improvements to alleviate the congestion issues would be multiple intersection improvements and modifications, an adaptive traffic signal system, the addition of one or more connector roads, and the addition of pedestrian signal upgrades.

Mr. Brahler added that the study identified a number of locations as potential for Connector Roads that would reduce congestion at the major intersections and improve pedestrian access: a new off-ramp from North Easton Road, above Sawmill Road to Southbound Easton Road; an extension off of Cross Keys Drive to Landisville Road; an extension of Landisville Road to Cross Keys Place Driveway; fourth leg of Cross Keys Place; through the private property of Anthony Sylvan Pools;
and, through the potential space for the proposed convenience store and gas station. The concerns for the addition of the connector road or roads would be gaining the cooperation of the four municipalities, the addition of one or more signals and keeping those signals at least 500 feet from the following signal.

Mr. Brahler then showed us photo simulations of the potential intersection improvements for Swamp Road/Old Easton Road that could be implemented along with the addition of a connector road. The intersection would only allow for right turns onto northbound and southbound Old Easton Road, left turns eastbound and westbound would not be allowed in this potential modification.

Mr. Brahler spoke about the challenges and potential improvements for pedestrians and bicyclists. He stated that currently there are limited dedicated bicycle facilities in the Cross Keys corridor nor is there any signage. The improvements they are proposing are shared lane markings, bike route guide signs including directional signs to point of interest locations, and a pedestrian/bicyclist signal at the intersection of Swamp and Old Easton Road. Pedestrian challenges include lack of sidewalks along Swamp Road from Sawmill Road to the Cross Keys Plaza driveway and the need for existing sidewalk repairs. However, due to the commercial nature of the corridor there isn’t a high demand for pedestrian accommodations. The improvements considered for pedestrian traffic are countdown timers at intersections, continental crosswalks and more sidewalk installation.

Mr. Sebastian then spoke about the economic development of the Cross Keys area. He stated that although the Cross Keys area functions at a very high level economically, there are ways to expand and enhance its role in the region. By analyzing the demographic trends, market analysis data, and the results of the business survey, we are able to achieve a picture of the current and forecast the future conditions of the study area.

Mr. Sebastian stated that the study revealed more than 325 commercial and industrial businesses located in the study area. With a population of 17,384 in the 5 minute drive time that balloons to 143,425 in the 15 minute drive time, and a household income of well over $100,000 in the 10 minute drive time, the demographic numbers suggest that there is a captured affluent consumer. This may provide support for additional retail and personal service opportunities.

Mr. Sebastian said that using the Environmental Systems Research Institute (ESRI) Business Analysis tool, the gap analysis examined the study area for leakages and surpluses within a 10-minute drive time. It shows that the Cross Keys area has a surplus of: auto dealers and auto part stores, lawn equipment and supply dealers, specialty food stores, office supply, stationery, and gift stores. However, some leakages that might fit well in the Cross Keys area include: furniture stores, beer, wine, and liquor stores, shoe stores, clothing stores, sporting goods, hobby, and musical instruments stores, general merchandise stores including department and other general merchandise stores, and full-service restaurants.

Mr. Sebastian referred to the survey that was sent to almost 300 businesses in the Cross Keys study area with a respectable 14 percent return, the results of which, will be incorporated into the final analysis.

Mr. Sebastian then told us the strengths and assets of the Cross Keys area are the commercial and industrial sector, the Pennsylvania Biotechnology Center, the automobile industry and the
Doylestown Airport. These sectors create a strong economic base but it will be necessary to address the needs of these areas for future growth.

Mr. Ives then presented the future of Cross Keys, with streetscape and corridor improvements, development opportunities, concept plans and the potential expansion of the biotechnology corridor. Mr. Ives stated that the way to unify North Easton Road and Swamp Road as the ‘Cross Keys’ area would be to make streetscape improvements such as trees, sidewalks, planting strips, pedestrian scaled lighting with banners, pedestrian refuge areas and gateway features at strategic locations. Streetscaping adds a positive visual charm, safety appeal, will complement redevelopment efforts, and can make a positive effect on property values.

Mr. Ives showed us photo simulation examples of the streetscape improvements. He also showed us examples of features from the Cross Keys area that could be used in the gateway features and photo simulations of the placement of the gateways.

Mr. Sebastian returned to the podium to discuss the vacant and underutilized sites. The list of properties he identified are ripe for development, redevelopment or façade improvements. He went into detail about the Provco/Pineville site, which is approximately 3 acres where Ben’s Autobody used to be, stating that it is ideal for redevelopment because it has access points on North Easton Road and Old Easton Road with the potential for a connector road. It has been officially been submitted for development as a Wawa.

Mr. Sebastian also spoke about the Sylvan Pools/Kardane site which is approximately 14 acres located in the heart of the Cross Keys area with 670 foot frontage on North Easton Road. He stated that in order to capture the vision of area, the design guidelines should be followed and that the township should consider adding additional uses or a mixed use overlay. He showed us a few photo simulations of how the site could be developed, such as shops and parking or a hotel conference center. The examples also include a connector road.

Mr. Sebastian discussed the potential for developing a Biotechnology Corridor. He stated that successful start-up companies will need to relocate as they grow. There will be a need for additional incubator space for single labs, offices, light manufacturing or warehousing areas. This area has about 280 acres that could be a significant impact on the area.

Mr. Sebastian completed his presentation saying that the next steps will be to finalize the study and present it to the four municipalities. They should use the study as a guideline and stakeholder coordination for the future.

Discussion from the BCPC Board Members and staff ensued regarding how to unify the four municipalities by possibly creating an overlay district that they could all agree on. They also discussed the large amount traffic coming from Plumstead Township and if this study had addressed those concerns. The possibility of a conference center and its necessity was discussed. Numerous board members also stated that the gateway feature on North Easton Road should be placed so as not to limit sight distance.

Ms. Pierce asked about the possibility of the historic Conti Cross Keys Inn site becoming a visitor’s center due to its location at the border of all four municipalities. Numerous staff replied that the location is being used for storage at present and there may be an issue with parking.
Ms. Bush and the Board Members thanked Mr. Brahler, Mr. Ives and Mr. Sebastian for their presentation.

6. **ACT 247 REVIEWS**
The reviews of September 7, 2016, were mailed to the board for their review prior to the meeting. Upon motion of Mr. Nyman, seconded by Mr. Dowling, the motion carried to approve the September 7, 2016, Act 247 reviews.

7. **OLD BUSINESS**
Mr. Goodnoe questioned the possibility of a slip ramp from the Pennsylvania Turnpike onto Second Street Pike. Mr. Johnson stated that there has not been any discussion about that.

Mr. Goodnoe also inquired as to the procedure for a resident to appeal a flood plain designation of their property. It was discussed amongst the staff that the resident would have to have an independent engineering study of the land and a letter of map amendment for it to be considered.

8. **NEW BUSINESS**
There was no new business.

9. **PUBLIC COMMENT**
There was no public comment.

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

Submitted by:
Debra Canale, Staff Secretary
The Executive Director's report will be presented at the meeting.
Community Planning and Municipal Economic Development Initiative

The Planning Commission staff helps townships and boroughs in several ways: we attend local planning commissioner meetings to provide advice and guidance, and we prepare plans and ordinances in cooperation with local representatives. We are in our fourth year of providing municipal assistance through the Municipal Economic Development Initiative (MEDI), and several of the activities below are in that category and are so noted.

We attended the Hilltown and Milford townships and Sellersville Borough Planning Commission meetings.

Preparing Plans – Staff received and responded to the Borough Planning Commission’s comments from their review of the final draft of the New Britain Borough Main Street Plan (part of our MEDI program). We expect the Borough Planning Commission to recommend plan approval in October and the Borough Council to follow in November. Staff is assessing what additional desktop publishing changes could be made to the final draft.

The first draft of the Cross Keys Land Use and Transportation Plan has been completed and we will be presenting to the four municipalities in the near future.

Staff continued to work on the Richboro Village Master Plan MEDI project. A first draft has been produced and is being internally reviewed. GIS staff is currently developing mapping of key village locations and photographic simulations of opportunity areas.

Work continued on the Morrisville Borough MEDI project. Staff is developing photo simulations of potential downtown improvements and designs, as well as evaluating concepts and designs for Williamson Park.

The staff is waiting for additional information from the Borough’s Economic Development Consultant in order to finalize revisions to the draft Quakertown Borough—Summary of Parking Inventory.

In addition to special studies and plans, we continue to prepare, under contract, Comprehensive Plans for Northampton Township, Lower Makefield Township, and Hilltown Township.

As part of the MEDI program, staff is working on a Nonresidential and Economic Development chapter for the update to the Hilltown Township Comprehensive Plan. The chapter will include information on businesses in the township, resident employment and occupation information, a market analysis of commercial activity, and an assessment of the areas planned and zoned for nonresidential uses. The chapter will include strategies that can be taken to help retain existing commerce and industry and to attract new businesses suitable for the township.

We met with Warrington Township to discuss an overview of the current comprehensive plan, citing portions of the plan that remain pertinent, are no longer relevant, need revision, or must be more thoroughly evaluated from a policy stand-point.

The first draft of the Plumstead Master Trail Plan has been completed and is being reviewed by their trails committee.
Preparing Ordinances – We continued an assessment of changes needed to the Newtown Area Joint Zoning Ordinance related to Planned Residential Development use requirements and definitions and requirements associated with water and sewer facilities.

Trails Program – We presented the concept for the Newtown Rail Trail to the Northampton Township BOS and residents at a well-attended meeting on September 15 and anticipate that future meetings will be held on this topic.

As reported last month, the County has been awarded a Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality grant from DVRPC for the purpose of designing and constructing a portion of the Neshaminy Creek Greenway Trail extending from Central Park in Doylestown Township, to the intersection of Easton Road and Kelly Drive at the Doylestown/Warrington townships line. We’ve met with representatives from various departments in the County, as well as Bucks County Housing Authority and the Bucks County Public Safety Training Center who are all supportive of the trail and provided us with their feedback and input. Meetings still need to be held with Bucks County Fish and Game and Doylestown Township prior to issuing an RFP for the design work.

A kickoff meeting was held with the engineering firm selected for the design and engineering work of the Upper Southampton Township section of the Newtown Rail Trail to discuss various aspects of the project and the process itself. It is anticipated that the design will require approximately 18 months to complete.

We presented an update of the County trails program to the Bucks County Park and Recreation Board at their September meeting to bring them up-to-date on county trail projects.

Providing Planning Information and Coordinating with other Agencies

The planning commission staff provides information and assistance to the many people who call us for help. This includes topics such as demographic and socioeconomic data, development proposals, BCPC reports, local zoning, and municipal regulations. Some of this work results from our mandated functions (reviewing proposed developments and reviewing various permit applications), some from other groups that need information, and some from residents who need guidance. Staff continued review of the DVRPC’s draft 2013 employee estimates as a precursor to the draft 2045 employee forecasts.

Act 247 and 537 Review Activity
12 Subdivision and Land Development Proposal
0 Sketch Plans
4 Municipal Plans and Ordinances
7 Sewage Facility Planning Modules
1 Traffic Impact Studies

Transportation

BCPC Transportation Planning staff is responsible for working with PennDOT, DVRPC, SEPTA, TMA Bucks, and other groups to ensure that our transportation and funding needs are addressed. We also keep up with the various PennDOT funding avenues and grant programs. This month, we provided all municipalities with the announcement of the Green Light Go grant funding program from PennDOT.

The Philadelphia City Planning Commission is heading up a study of the Roosevelt Boulevard Corridor. We are participants in this study because Roosevelt Boulevard/Route 1 traverses Bucks County. This month we participated in a technical
project subcommittee meeting to ensure that the needs of Bucks County’s residents are met.

**Geographic Information Systems (GIS)**

GIS has become a central function in Bucks County government, with our GIS staff providing the overall management for a system that involves not only BCPC but also Emergency Communications and 9-1-1, Board of Assessment, Health Departments, and others. We help to keep the county tax map parcel records and road centerlines updated.

The GIS data is increasingly used by people outside the county, either through our very popular public viewer, or through our GIS Consortium of municipalities.

Updates of GIS data are provided to our Consortium members by request. This month Lower Makefield Township and the Perkasie Borough Water Authority requested and were provided updates of their GIS data. County GIS is finalizing development of a GIS Open Data Portal web site that when completed members will be able to access their municipal data sets for both downloading and mapping.

The Southeastern Pennsylvania Shared Services GIS project is a collaborative effort of the counties of Bucks, Berks, Chester, Delaware, Montgomery, and the City of Philadelphia. The group meets monthly and is developing a cloud hosted infrastructure to support a centralized and shared regional GIS database. The system is currently being tested and finalized and should be operational soon. Our September meeting was held at the Delaware County Emergency Operations Center in Media PA. Montgomery County will be hosting the October meeting at the Emergency Management Training Center Complex in Conshohocken PA.
<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>7-16-1</td>
<td>Borough Council</td>
<td></td>
<td>Zoning Ordinance Amendment: Butler Avenue Gateway Commercial Overlay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perkasie Borough</td>
<td>33-16-4</td>
<td>Borough Council</td>
<td></td>
<td>Zoning Ordinance Amendment: Create I-3 Airport Industrial District &amp; New Uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perkasie Borough</td>
<td>33-16-5</td>
<td>Borough Council</td>
<td></td>
<td>Zoning Map Change: I-1, R-1A, R-1B to I-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Southampton Township</td>
<td>48-16-CR1</td>
<td>Upper Southampton Municipal Authority</td>
<td>(48-17-75-1)</td>
<td>County Review: 2,600 Square-feet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEMORANDUM

TO: Chalfont Borough Council
Chalfont Borough Planning Commission

FROM: Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Proposal to Amend the Zoning Ordinance—Butler Avenue Gateway Commercial Overlay Revisions
Applicant: Borough Council
Received: September 1, 2016
Hearing Date: October 3, 2016

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 October 5, 2016.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposed Action: To amend the Butler Avenue Gateway Commercial Overlay District to permit Fast Food restaurant by right, and provide a Mixed Use development option. The residential uses that will be permitted are Single-Family Detached, Twin, and Townhouse.

Proposed Zoning Provisions: A Mixed Use Development Option will be permitted that would include the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Minimum Lot Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1 Single-Family Detached</td>
<td>12,000 square feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3 Twin</td>
<td>4,500 square feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B6 Townhouse</td>
<td>924 square feet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The requirement for a minimum of four commercial and businesses uses would be deleted. The requirement for a mix of residential and nonresidential uses will replace it as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonresidential</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The maximum density will be 10 dwelling units per acre, and at least 25 percent green space must be provided.

Fast Food restaurant (Use E5) will be permitted by right, and Drive-through (Use H13) will be permitted by right as accessory use to Retail Shop (use E1) and Fast Food Restaurant (Use E5) and by conditional use as an accessory to Financial Establishment (Use E3).

The requirement in the current ordinance for establishing access across an adjacent parcel to connect to Moyer Road would be deleted.

Existing Zoning Provisions: Section 27-1008 of the zoning ordinance, the Butler Avenue Gateway Commercial Overlay District, permits Commercial School (C3), Day Care Center (C7), Borough Services (C9), Office (D1), Retail Shop (E1), Financial Establishment (E3), Dwelling in Combination (E22), and Drive-through uses (H13). Nonresidential Accessory Building (H5), Outdoor Eating Area (H16 - accessory to sit down restaurant only) are permitted as conditional uses. Nonresidential uses permitted include office, retail store, fast food, and financial establishment.

Development in the district must have a minimum of four permitted commercial and business uses. Permanent easements must be provided and access constructed to Moyer Road, as shown on a plan approved in 2009.

COMMENTS

The revised overlay is a complete departure from the goals and standards that the Borough has embraced for this part of the borough in its planning and zoning during the past decade. The Chalfont Borough Comprehensive Plan, the Revitalization and Transit-Oriented Development Plan, and the existing Butler Avenue Corridor Overlay District purpose and standards identify this area as a commercial gateway, with a business emphasis and some mix of uses. This is in contrast to the proposed ordinance which heavily favors residential development with minimal commercial. The commercial uses permitted are not the village-type uses envisioned by past borough plans but highway-oriented uses. We are not aware of any plans by the borough to change that vision. The borough recognizes the importance of establishing clear development goals first and then preparing ordinance to implement those goals. If the borough’s goals for this area have been changed, away from the commercial gateway in favor of a townhouse vision for this area, the borough would do well to re-examine goals and restate this vision as part of your comprehensive plan. We recommend that the borough consider the following:

1. **Comprehensive plan**—The Chalfont Borough Comprehensive Plan (2010) designates the area as Commercial and notes the rezoning of the Butler Avenue Gateway Commercial Overlay District to permit commercial and business uses. The plan (page 60) contains a description of plans for the Butler Avenue Gateway Commercial Overlay District area that states that a retail store, bank and other commercial uses are planned for these parcels. Until recently, the site contained a number of commercial uses that contributed to the economy of the borough. The proposal to permit predominantly residential uses may detract from the commercial development for the site and reduce potential ratables for the borough.

2. **Chalfont Borough Revitalization and TOD plan**—The plan was prepared in 2013 after approval for the Giant-to-Go convenience store was approved for the site. A concept sketch
shows high density mixed use development on the site with commercial and multifamily residential uses. An accessway which connects Bristol Road with Moyer Road is also shown and is required by the current Gateway overlay. (This requirement is proposed to be removed in the amendment to the gateway overlay.)

3. **District purposes**—The purposes of the Butler Avenue Gateway Commercial Overlay District, as stated in Section 27-1008.1 of the zoning ordinance, are as follows:

- Encourage innovative planning concepts which contribute to the village character and vitality of the community.
- Provide for a mix of commercial and business uses that will share infrastructure, thereby reducing congestion while promoting efficient traffic flow and increased pedestrian access.
- Establish and maintain market incentives and design guidelines that will attract new business to the community.

This proposed amendment would require at least half the development to be residential and would permit up to 90 percent to be residential. If it is the intent of the borough to make this a residential area, then the background planning and district purposes should be amended.

4. **Mixed use**

   a. **Minimum mixed use**—The mixed use option would require a minimum of 10 percent nonresidential uses. Permitting a mix of only 10 percent of one use and 90 percent of another will not result in a mixture of uses in line with the intended purposes of the Butler Avenue Gateway Commercial Overlay District. A true mixed use option would require some integration of uses, either within buildings or through integrated site design.

   Without a more balanced ratio of uses and requirement for integration within buildings, a development on the site will not establish the character intended for the site. Such a ratio could ensure that any future development would accomplish the purposes of the district as established in Section 27-1008.1. (Comment #3)

   We recommend that borough officials consider sharpening the development standards to meet the objectives and purposes it wishes to have implemented. Without them, the overlay district may develop in a manner that is more highway-oriented commercial uses (e.g., fast food restaurant with a drive through) and conventional townhouse units with little village character.

   b. **Lack of Measurable standard**—It is unclear how the prescribed mix percentages for residential and non-residential uses is calculated or applied. Are the proposed minimum and maximum percentages based upon square feet, floor area, or site area? We recommend that a measurable standard be provided for the required mix.

   c. **Residential mix and location**—Three residential use types are permitted but there is no requirement for a mix of residential types. One housing type may comprise the
entire residential component, as is shown on the sketch plan submitted, of the development, at a density of 10 units per acre. A required mix of dwelling types may result in a more village-like development on the site.

The site abuts a neighborhood of single-family detached homes. Any development of the site should be integrated with the adjoining neighborhood. If a residential mixture is required, we recommend that the amendment include a requirement for a transition area of single-family or village houses be located adjacent the abutting residential neighborhoods.

5. **Density**—The proposed residential density is 10 units per acre, while the density permitted in the adjacent R-1 district is 2.35-units per acre. The entire gateway overlay district comprises approximately 7.6-acres which would allow for a maximum of 76 units.

This density may be appropriate if future residential units on the site are located adjacent to the existing residential neighborhood to function as a transitional area between the future nonresidential area and well-designed open space is provided. Buffer yards required in zoning Section 27-514 would help as well. The appropriate integration of residential and nonresidential uses within the overlay district as well as mitigating the impacts of the nonresidential and residential uses upon adjacent lower density uses is important for the success of future development in this area.

6. **Residential uses**

   a. **Single-family detached**—The proposed residential uses include single-family detached units on lots of 12,000 square feet or more. We recommend that borough officials consider permitting Village Houses (Use B13) on lots of 10,000 square feet, since this use would contribute to the village character, as put forth in the purposes of the Butler Avenue Gateway Commercial Overlay District.

   b. **Townhouses**—The proposed standards for Townhouse (Use B6) differ from the townhouse regulations in the current zoning ordinance. Existing townhouse standards in Section 27-407 require a minimum lot width of 30 feet and minimum lot area per row of dwellings of 8,000 square feet. The proposed standards require a minimum lot width of 22 feet and minimum lot area of 924 square feet. We recommend that borough officials consider whether the proposed dimensional requirements for townhouses should be consistent with the existing requirements of Section 27-407.2.F of the zoning ordinance.

7. **Open Space**—Proposed Section 27-1008.19.D.3. Mixed Use Development option requires that a minimum of 25 percent of green space be provided. We recommend that the standards be amended to require that a minimum of 25 percent of the base site area shall be preserved as open space to maintain consistency with language used elsewhere in the ordinance. We note also that Section 27-551.2 of the current zoning ordinance prohibits stormwater detention facilities in open space.

8. **Design standards**—The overlay district calls for the creation of development with a village character in accordance with other policies in the comprehensive plan and Revitalization and
TOD plan. Residential and nonresidential uses should be regulated by design standards which ensure that this character is provided. For instance, central open spaces should be provided on-site and commercial uses should be located along the road frontage.

The VOC Village Office Commercial District contains design standards for development (Section 13064-9), which would be appropriate for the overlay district. Performance incentives for office development in the VOC district (Section 1305A(2)(b)(1)) could be used as design standards as well.

Previously-reviewed approved plans for the site contain features and designs which were negotiated. Clear standards for design which fit the character intended will ensure that the desired appearance and function is achieved.

9. **Integrated development**—Municipalities typically consider overlay districts, like the Butler Avenue Gateway Commercial Overlay District, to allow different uses and establish different requirements than the underlying district(s) in an effort to provide integrated development consistent with the intent of the overlay district. The proposed mixed use requirements for the district may be appropriate for development of the entire site comprised of parcels currently included in the overlay district; however, there does not appear to be a requirement for development of the entire district all at once. It is unclear how the requirements would apply to development of a single parcel.

There are 9 separate parcels in the district with 4 different landowners who may not choose to develop at the same time. We are aware of a sketch plan for 6 of the 9 parcels (6 of the 7 acres) which appears to involve a single developer. There are three parcels with existing uses at or adjacent to the corner of Moyer and Butler avenues which are not part of the sketch plan. Development of the outparcels individually would not be consistent with the district purpose and will not be coordinated with the rest of the district. The Gateway district would be best developed as a whole rather than piecemeal.

The ordinance should, at a minimum, contain a minimum site area requirement. Minimum site area requirements, requirements for coordinated development with integrated and shared access, and development design standards are needed to ensure that the overlay district is developed in a manner consistent with the intent of the district. This is particularly important because the proposed amendment adds residential use to the district which brings up specific concerns that do not exist with the development mix options of the current ordinance. A minimum tract area may also provide for more benefits such as a driveway across the site connecting Moyer and Bristol roads as shown in the Revitalization and TOD plan.

To accommodate the residential use in a mixed use development, and ensure integration we recommend that Section 27-1008.(6) of the zoning ordinance for the Butler Avenue Gateway Commercial Overlay District be amended to require a minimum site area. A larger tract size may also be necessary to mitigate the impacts of residential uses on adjacent single family residential uses. Specific elements such as open space, buffer yards, and screening would also be necessary to ensure compatibility between residential and nonresidential uses within the district itself, all of which require additional area.
10. **Examples**—Other nearby communities have created mixed use standards for residential and nonresidential developments and worked with developers to build successful projects. New Britain Borough is reviewing a plan for a mixed use development on the site of the former Knoell Millwork site based on a recent amendment to their mixed-use overlay district standards. Lantern Hill in Doylestown Borough is a gateway to the borough with a mix of uses built consistent with mixed use village standards. Goodnoe’s Corner and The Promenade along Sycamore Street in Newtown Township are both mixed use developments. The borough may wish to consider these developments and ordinance standards.

11. **Use Table**—The proposed amendment makes a number of changes to the list of uses permitted in the Gateway district and also the underlying CC Corridor Commercial district. We recommend that these changes also be made to Table 27-406 Table of Use Regulations, if borough officials consider adopting the proposal.

12. **Ordinance structure**—The amendment provides statements which override other ordinance sections. For instance, proposed Section 27-1008.19 states all applicants proposing the mixed use option shall meet all requirements of the Butler Avenue Gateway Commercial Overlay District *unless amended by the following.* Subsection C includes similar language: *unless otherwise identified within this section.* Section 27-104 of the Zoning Ordinance, Interpretation; Conflict with other laws, states that wherever the requirements of this chapter are at variance with the requirements of any lawfully adopted rules, regulations or ordinances applicable to this Borough or with one another, the most restrictive or that imposing the higher standards shall be controlling. This section takes care of any conflict within the ordinance and make the proposed statements unnecessary and redundant. We recommend that the referenced language be deleted.

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.

DCZ:dc

cc: Nate Fox, Municipal Solicitor  
    Sandra Zadell, Municipal Manager (via email)
CONFIDENTIAL — NOT FOR RELEASE

October 5, 2016
BCPC #33-16-4

MEMORANDUM

TO: Perkasie Borough Council
    Perkasie Borough Planning Commission

FROM: Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Proposal to Amend the Zoning Ordinance—Create I-3 District Regulations and New Uses
    Applicant: Borough Council
    Received: September 6, 2016
    Hearing Date: Not Indicated

In accordance with the provisions of Sections 304 and 609 of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code (MPC), 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 October 5, 2016.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposed Action: Amend the zoning ordinance to create an I-3 Airport Industrial District and add the following new uses: Brewery; Microbrewery, Micro-Winery, Micro-Distillery; Brewpub; Tap Room; Airport Services; Planned Industrial Development; and Flex Tech (FT) Development. A separate amendment has been proposed to rezone six parcels along Ridge Road to the new I-3 District (see BCPC review #33-16-5, dated October 5, 2016).

Proposed Zoning Provisions: The new I-3 Airport Industrial District would permit a minimum lot area of one acre, minimum lot width of 100 feet, minimum yard setbacks (in feet): front—40, side—20 each, rear—20, maximum building height of 45 feet/3 stories, and maximum impervious surface of 65 percent, plus an additional 5 percent for public improvements, e.g., walking trails, sidewalks, and roads. Reductions in existing requirements for parking, woodland protection, and setbacks are permitted.

A range of existing uses would be permitted in the I-3 District including office, bank, eating place (only in a building with other uses), motel/hotel, retail shop (only in a building with other uses), service business, recreation facilities, day care, parking garage, emergency services, utility, railway or bus station, contractor offices or shops, manufacturing, motor or rail freight terminal, printing, publishing and binding, recycling facility, research, and warehousing and distribution, among others.
Seven new uses would be created that would be permitted in the I-3 District exclusively and in no existing districts: E(19) Brewery; E(20) Microbrewery, Micro-Winery, Micro-Distillery; E(21) Brewpub; E(22) Tap Room; G(11) Airport Services; G(12) Planned Industrial Development; and G(13) Flex Tech (FT) Development. No use regulations or parking regulations are specified for the new uses.

Existing Zoning Provisions: I-1 Planned Industrial District (TMP #33-3-21) permits by right nonresidential principal uses such as manufacturing, contractor offices and shops, printing, publishing and binding, researching, warehousing and distribution, recycling facility, resource recovery facility, and recreational facility (governmental), among others, and permits by special exception motel or hotel, residential conversion, golf course, or telecommunications. Minimum lot area is one acre and maximum building height is 30 feet.

R-1A Single-family Residential District permits by right single-family detached dwelling, single-family cluster, open space preservation performance subdivision I and II, and nonresidential uses such as community center, recreational facility (governmental), religious place of worship; by conditional approval housing for elderly; and by special exception residential conversion, day care center, and school, among others. Minimum lot area is 13,500 square feet per dwelling unit for single-family detached dwelling and maximum building height is 30 feet for all uses except open space preservation performance subdivision I and II, which has a 35-foot maximum height.

R-1B Single-family Residential District permits all uses permitted in R-1A, plus two-family, twin dwelling and performance standard subdivision. Minimum lot area is 13,500 square feet per dwelling unit for single-family detached dwelling, with the same maximum building height standards as R-1A.

COMMENTS

We have several concerns that should be addressed by the borough prior to adoption of the proposed amendment, in order to be consistent with the borough’s existing ordinances and comprehensive plan.

1. **Comprehensive Plan considerations for new I-3 District uses**—The existing and proposed uses to be permitted in the new I-3 District should be evaluated based on consistency with the Borough of Perkasie Comprehensive Plan Update (2014). The Plan states that creating a more dynamic shopping, dining, cultural, and entertainment experience, not only in the Town Center, but in other commercial areas, is instrumental to the borough’s economic development vision. The Plan recommends promoting primarily retail uses and minimizing non-retail uses to foster a vibrant Town Center. The proposal to allow numerous retail and consumer service uses in an industrial area in the northern part of the borough, removed from the downtown, could create competition with the Town Center and other established commercial areas in the borough’s retail core. This is contrary to the intent of the Comprehensive Plan regarding its economic development vision.

   It appears the proposal attempts to address this issue by not permitting a freestanding eating place or retail shop, and limiting the percentage of space devoted to those uses in buildings of various sizes. An eating place or retail shop would only be permitted in a building with other uses and may not occupy more than 50 percent of total square footage of buildings of 20,000 square feet or less; 37.5 percent for buildings of 20,000 to 40,000 square feet; and 25 percent...
for buildings greater than 40,000 square feet. However, on a large business campus, that could result in a significant amount of retail-oriented uses.

Additionally, the new brewery-related uses (E(20) Microbrewery, Micro-Winery, Micro-Distillery; E(21) Brewpub, and E(22) Tap Room) are of a scale and character generally desirable for a vibrant Town Center. Those uses are proposed to be permitted only in the automobile-oriented I-3 Districts along Ridge Road rather than in the pedestrian-friendly downtown. The borough should consider permitting them in the TC Overlay and C-2 districts, if proper use regulations are specified to avoid impacts on neighboring uses, particularly residential.

The E(19) Brewery use is larger scale and primarily a manufacturing use, with a tap room and outdoor dining permitted. This use would be appropriate in an industrial district rather than downtown, since no size limit is imposed and parcels could be assembled to result in a large manufacturing facility. The borough could consider permitting this use in the existing I-1 and I-2 industrial districts although, in many cases there are residential uses adjacent to those districts, so use regulations should be in place to mitigate impacts. Another option would be to restrict all activity to indoors, with outdoor dining not permitted. (also see Comment 3)

2. Use regulations—No use regulations are proposed for any of the seven new uses. Use regulations must be adopted for the uses to provide appropriate requirements specific to the purpose and function of the use. In particular, we recommend that proposed new use G(12) Planned Industrial Development require a conceptual master plan to be submitted with any proposal, showing the relationships between the various components of the development and integration with the entire airport area in both Perkasie Borough and East Rockhill Township.

The proposed use regulation description of a Planned Industrial Development (Section 186-18.G(12)) is a group of industrial, manufacturing, office and warehousing, distribution, retail service business, and related establishments, which is planned, constructed, and managed as a total entity, where parking spaces, stormwater management facilities, access drives and circulation, lighting systems and other improvements are shared by three or more uses on one lot, or within a unified development. The purpose and intent of the new I-3 District, as stated in Section 186-20.I., is to promote and encourage a unified district for supportive/ancillary services, to capture the economic benefits of proximity to the Pennridge Airport in a manner that balances aviation safety with land uses that provide a transitional buffer of intensity to surrounding areas. The purpose is to establish a “campus-like” setting for a mix of various uses which are planned for and developed as a cohesive district, where access, infrastructure, and other improvements are coordinated by integrating uses on one or more lots.

Requiring a conceptual master plan to be submitted would help to ensure that this portion of the borough is “planned for and developed as a cohesive district, where access, infrastructure, and other improvements are coordinated by integrating uses on one or more lots.” A master plan should show the relationships between the buildings, service and parking areas, landscaped open space, access and circulation planned and designed as an integrated unit. Proposed plans for a Planned Industrial Development should be required to show road dead-ends into adjacent parcels in East Rockhill so that future development can tie into the area around the airport to ensure access and road system continuity.
Planning for a cohesive development is even more critical since the I-3 District is proposed as two areas separated by R-1A-zoned land, with each area fronting on Ridge Road and adjoining East Rockhill Township and the airport facilities to the north. Adding to the challenge is the fact that East Rockhill Township’s industrial district zoning, environmental protection requirements, and use regulations differ from the proposed I-3 District regulations. As stated in the BCPC review of the proposed zoning map change (BCPC #33-16-5, dated October 5, 2016), we recommend that the municipalities coordinate zoning for this area. Without requiring a comprehensive plan for the airport area that addresses existing and proposed development in both municipalities, this area almost certainly will develop in a disjointed, piecemeal fashion that falls short of the airport’s economic potential and exacerbates traffic and other issues in this part of the borough.

3. Brewery use—A cover letter sent with the proposal from the borough solicitor, Nathan Fox, states that the proposed amendment contains use of a brewery and micro-brewery which are similar to the subject matter of a recent review request to add the definition of brewery to the zoning ordinance in general. The borough will consider both items concurrently and any inconsistencies will be resolved through both amendment processes.

It is unclear what portions of the previous brewery proposal are intended to be considered along with the current proposed amendments. The proposal previously reviewed by the BCPC (#33-16-3, dated September 7, 2016) proposed a definition of brewery (that did not include a tasting room or outdoor dining) to be added to Section 186-5 Definitions, a brewery use E(3) to be added to Section 186-13(E) (should be “18”) Use Regulations, and brewery added as a permitted use in the C-2 General Commercial, I-1 Planned Industrial, and I-2 Light Industrial districts. In the current proposal, the brewery use E(19) has a different description and is proposed as a permitted use only in the new I-3 District. It is not clear if it also is to be permitted in the C-2, I-1, and I-2 districts as previously proposed. These conflicts should be resolved.

4. No parking requirement for new uses—No parking requirement is specified for any of the seven new uses. A parking standard should be determined for each new use and added to the Required Parking Spaces by Use, Sections 186-61.C(5) Retail and Consumer Services Uses and (7) Industrial Uses. For the uses that could include outdoor dining areas (e.g., E(19) Brewery; E(20) Microbrewery, Micro-Winery, Micro-Distillery; or E(21) Brewpub), the parking standard should be calculated based on indoor and outdoor use areas.

5. Required parking spaces by use

   a. Reduced parking requirements for existing uses—Section 186-20.L.(3)(a) of the proposed amendment reduces the existing parking requirements to one parking space per 1,000 square feet of gross floor area for three existing industrial uses (Manufacturing, Research, and Warehouse) in the I-3 District. Currently, the Manufacturing and Research uses require 3 spaces for every 4 employees or one space per 250 gross square feet, whichever is greater, plus one space for every company vehicle stored on the premises, and the Warehousing and Distribution use requires 3 spaces for every 4 employees or one space per 500 gross square feet, whichever is greater, plus one space per company vehicle. If the borough believes the existing parking requirements for those uses are excessive and the proposed regulations are
appropriate, we suggest the borough consider revising the parking standards in Section 186-61.C(7) Required Parking Spaces by Use for Manufacturing, Research, and Warehousing and Distribution, so that they would also apply in the I-1 and I-2 Industrial districts, rather than only in the I-3 District.

b. **Reduce required parking based on parking study**—Proposed Section 186-20.L(3)(b) states that Borough Council may, at its sole discretion and as part of the subdivision/land development approval process, reduce the required parking based on a parking study prepared by an appropriate professional. The study shall demonstrate that the proposed parking supply will be adequate to serve the parking needs of the proposed use. It seems the ordinance leaves much discretionary room, particularly since there are no parking requirements for the seven new uses in the proposed I-3 District. We suggest that the borough establish parking standards and criteria for evaluating parking needs.

c. **Shared/reserved parking and parking in woodlands**—Proposed Section 186-20.L(3)(c) states that Borough Council may, in its sole discretion, permit shared and/or reserved parking. It also states that, where feasible, any reserved parking shall be located in areas of woodlands in an attempt to protect such woodlands if additional parking is not required for the users. If reserved parking is provided, Borough Council shall have the right to require the reserved parking to be constructed in the future if the zoning officer confirms the need for the additional parking.

We note that the ordinance currently has provisions for shared or reserved parking in Section 186-61.] Reduction of Nonresidential Parking Requirements which permits the conditional reduction of required parking space through either joint use or reservation of land for future parking. For joint use, the applicant must demonstrate that the hours or days of peak use are such that a lower total (to 75 percent of required number) will adequately serve the uses. For reservation of parking, the plan shall lay out the total required number of spaces in conformance with impervious surface and yard requirements, with the reserved area excluding areas for required buffer yards or other requirements of the ordinance, and landscaped accordingly.

The existing regulations also require the developer to enter into a written agreement with the borough and provide a performance bond to guarantee that the developer or current or future owner will provide the additional parking spaces if Borough Council, at its sole discretion, determines that the reserved parking is necessary.

It is unclear if proposed Section 186-20.L.(3)(c) supersedes all or part of the existing requirements for development proposed in the I-3 District.

It is also unclear how these requirements would protect woodlands, since the reserve area could be developed because Borough Council has sole discretion to require the reserve parking to be developed in the future and to permit 100 percent of the woodlands to be disturbed (see Comment 6).

6. **Reduced woodland protection standards**—In the proposed I-3 District regulations, Section 186-20.L.(4)(a) under Additional Provisions reduces the woodland protection standard
to 30 percent from the 80 percent protection required if the woodland is associated with another environmentally sensitive resource, and 50 percent protection if not associated with another environmentally sensitive resource, per Section 186-57.G. In addition, the proposal states that Borough Council may, in its sole discretion, authorize a further reduction or elimination of the woodland protection ratio in exchange for the applicant installing a replacement tree for every tree removed over the permitted 70 percent disturbance, or paying a fee in lieu (to be determined by Borough Council) if replacement trees cannot be installed on the property, after taking into account the landscaping requirements.

We believe there may be merit in reducing the woodland protection standard in an industrial district, if the reduction is balanced with sound design standards and responsible mitigation techniques. We do not support permitting 100 percent of the trees on a site to be removed if an applicant pays a fee to the borough to account for the required 30 percent woodland protection. That suggests that the proposed development is too intense for the site to support, particularly given the location of the district along Ridge Road.

Woodlands help to reduce stormwater runoff, control erosion and sedimentation, and filter groundwater recharge, as well as to enhance views, provide buffers and boundaries, provide shade, and give a sense of place to sites. These are among the benefits that are lost by clearcutting a site, and they are not easily replaced by parking lot trees and minimum buffer requirements.

7. Non-adjacent parcels—In the proposed I-3 District regulations, Section 186-20.L.(4)(f) under Additional Provisions states that non-adjacent parcels, which are included in one land development application, may be combined together for purposes for completing any required calculations under the zoning ordinance. The term “non-adjacent parcels” is not defined and it is unclear what this means. How far can non-contiguous parcels be from one another to be used for calculations? Does this apply only to parcels zoned I-3? Could this include parcels in East Rockhill Township? We note that parcels in East Rockhill or in another zoning district in Perkasie cannot be calculated together. This proposed provision should be clarified.

8. Outdoor dining—In Section 186-18.E, the description for each of the proposed new uses E(19) Brewery; E(20) Microbrewery Micro-Winery, Micro-Distillery; and E(21) Brewpub states, “Outdoor dining area shall be in accordance with outdoor dining standards.” However, the zoning ordinance does not include outdoor dining standards. Therefore, standards should be established to govern outdoor eating and food service that may be accessory to these new uses, as well as to existing uses such as E(3) Eating Place (without drive-through service except in C-1 District by conditional use) or E(18) Tavern. These outdoor dining standards should be adopted at the same time as the new uses that reference outdoor dining standards.

Outdoor dining standards should address issues such as the location of outdoor eating and food service areas (they shall not interfere with safe pedestrian or vehicular traffic or be outside the building setback lines), hours of operation, lighting standards, whether to permit outdoor food preparation and outdoor bars or table service only, whether amplified music or sound is permitted, whether to prohibit the carrying of open containers of alcoholic beverages outside the delineated area of outdoor food service areas, parking, buffering, or other issues in order to address potential impacts on adjacent uses.
9. **Accessory uses**—The proposal permits no accessory uses in the I-3 District, but we recommend several that should be permitted. Use H(1) Accessory Structure or Accessory Use should be permitted because the I-3 District regulations include a maximum building height requirement of 25 feet for accessory buildings, but an accessory building is not a permitted use. Use H(5) No-Impact Home-Based Business is required by the MPC to be permitted in every zoning district. Additionally, as noted previously (see Comment 8) the borough should provide standards for outdoor dining as an accessory use, determine which principal uses it would apply to, list it as an accessory use in the zoning districts that permit the applicable principal uses, and add it to the Table of Uses by District under H. Accessory Uses as either P (Permitted) or N (Not Permitted) in each zoning district.

10. **Table of Uses by District**—The zoning ordinance’s Table of Uses by District should be amended to add a column for the new I-3 District, list the seven proposed new uses under the appropriate use category (either E. Retail and Consumer Service Uses or G. Industrial Uses), and indicate if each use is permitted (P) or not permitted (N) in each zoning district. In the table, new uses E(19) Brewery; E(20) Microbrewery, Micro-Winery, Micro-Distillery; E(21) Brewpub; and E(22) Tap Room should be added under E. Retail and Consumer Service Uses, and new uses G(11) Airport Services; G(12) Planned Industrial Development; and G(13) Flex Tech (FT) Development should be added under G. Industrial Uses.

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.

MW:dc

cc: Nate Fox, Begley, Carlin & Mandio, Borough Solicitor
    Andrea Coaxum, Borough Manager (via email)
    Brandy McKeever, Code Enforcement Administrator (via email)
    Tracy Tackett, Tackett Planning Associates, Borough Planner
    Marianne K. Morano, Manager, East Rockhill Township (Adjacent Municipality)
CONFIDENTIAL — NOT FOR RELEASE

October 5, 2016
BCPC #33-16-5

MEMORANDUM

TO: Perkasie Borough Council
   Perkasie Borough Planning Commission

FROM: Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Proposal to Amend the Zoning Map—I-1, R-1A, and R-1B to I-3 Airport Industrial District
   TMPs #33-3-20, 33-3-21, 33-7-4, 33-7-4-1, 33-7-5, and 12-9-149 (p/o)
Owner: Pennridge Development Enterprises, Inc.
Applicant: Borough Council
Received: September 6, 2016
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 October 5, 2016.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposed Action: Rezone several parcels to a new I-3 Airport Industrial District from I-1 Planned Industrial, R-1A Single-family Residential, and R-1B Single-family Residential districts. A separate amendment (see BCPC review #33-16-4, dated October 5, 2016) proposes I-3 District regulations and would create seven new uses to be permitted in the new zoning district.

The proposal is to rezone the following parcels to I-3 Airport Industrial District: TMP #33-3-21 (21.05 acres) currently is zoned I-1 Planned Industrial District; TMP #33-3-20 (approximately 1 acre) currently is zoned R-1B Single-family Residential; TMPs #33-7-4, 33-7-4-1, and 33-7-5 (approximately 9.8 acres) and the portion of TMP #12-9-149 located within Perkasie Borough (approximately 1.17 acres) currently are zoned R-1A Single-family Residential.

Location of Tract: Northern side of Ridge Road and along the municipal boundary with East Rockhill Township and the Pennridge Airport.

Proposed Zoning Provisions: The new I-3 Airport Industrial District would permit a minimum lot area of one acre, minimum lot width of 100 feet, minimum yard setbacks (in feet): front—40, side—20 each, rear—20, maximum building height of 45 feet/3 stories, and maximum impervious surface of 65 percent, plus an additional 5 percent for public improvements, e.g., walking trails, sidewalks, and roads.

Visit us at: www.buckscounty.org
A range of existing uses would be permitted in the I-3 District including office, bank, eating place (only in a building with other uses), motel/hotel, retail shop (only in a building with other uses), service business, recreation facilities, day care, parking garage, emergency services, utility, railway or bus station, contractor offices or shops, manufacturing, motor or rail freight terminal, printing, publishing and binding, recycling facility, research, and warehousing and distribution, among others.

Seven new uses would be created that would be permitted in the I-3 District exclusively and in no existing districts: E(19) Brewery; E(20) Microbrewery, Micro-Winery, Micro-Distillery; E(21) Brewpub; E(22) Tap Room; G(11) Airport Services; G(12) Planned Industrial Development; and G(13) Flex Tech (FT) Development. No use regulations or parking regulations are specified for the new uses.

Existing Zoning Districts: I-1 Planned Industrial District (TMP #33-3-21) permits by right nonresidential principal uses such as manufacturing, contractor offices and shops, printing, publishing and binding, researching, warehousing and distribution, recycling facility, resource recovery facility, and recreational facility (governmental), among others, and permits by special exception motel or hotel, residential conversion, golf course, or telecommunications. Minimum lot area is one acre and maximum building height is 30 feet.

R-1A Single-family Residential District permits by right single-family detached dwelling, single-family cluster, open space preservation performance subdivision I and II, and nonresidential uses such as community center, recreational facility (governmental), religious place of worship; by conditional approval housing for elderly; and by special exception residential conversion, day care center, and school, among others. Minimum lot area is 13,500 square feet per dwelling unit for single-family detached dwelling and maximum building height is 30 feet for all uses except open space preservation performance subdivision I and II, which has a 35-foot maximum height.

R-1B Single-family Residential District permits all uses permitted in R-1A, plus two-family, twin dwelling and performance standard subdivision. Minimum lot area is 13,500 square feet per dwelling unit for single-family detached dwelling, with the same maximum building height standards as R-1A.

COMMENTS

We recommend that Borough Council consider the following in addressing the proposal to rezone six parcels in two separate areas to a new I-3 Airport Industrial District from I-1 Planned Industrial, R-1A Residential, and R-1B Residential districts. The site is located along Ridge Road just south of the East Rockhill Township boundary and the Pennridge Airport. Both Perkasie Borough and East Rockhill Township have established a vision for this area to coordinate with each other in facilitating the development of a high-quality airport business park in the industrial districts of both municipalities. We believe the requested zoning petition will not achieve that vision, and that a more effective approach would be for Perkasie to coordinate with East Rockhill to create regulations that both municipalities would adopt. We offer the following comments as to how Perkasie could achieve its desired outcome for this area.

1. **Comprehensive Plan intent for I-1 Industrial District**—In the *Borough of Perkasie Comprehensive Plan Update* (2014) the Future Land Use Map designations are consistent with the existing zoning, because it designates the I-1 Planned Industrial District-zoned portion of the
subject site as Planned Industrial and the R-1A and R-1B Single-family Residential District-zoned parcels of the site as Low Density Residential.

The Comprehensive Plan text does not recommend zoning district changes (expansion or contraction) for the Low Density Residential-designated areas of this part of the Borough.

The Plan does not recommend rezoning the I-1 Industrial District north of Ridge Road, but recommends that the Borough take two actions for that area:

a. Coordinate with East Rockhill Township during the development of the Pennridge Development Enterprises property surrounding the Pennridge Airport, and

b. Consider allowing Uses D(1) Office, Business or Professional; D(2) Office or Clinic, Medical within the I-1 Planned Industrial District and other changes that may be necessary to facilitate the development of a proposed business park at the Pennridge Development Enterprises property.

We note that East Rockhill Township has similar objectives for this area, as indicated in their Economic Development Initiative (May, 2014). A priority issue specified in that report is, “If possible, coordinate with Perkasie Borough to promote and market a multimunicipal, high-quality business park within the industrial zoned areas of both municipalities (currently owned by Pennridge Development Enterprises, Inc.).”

If this shared vision for the airport area is to be realized, it cannot be achieved by rezoning only in Perkasie. We recommend that any rezoning of this area in Perkasie be coordinated with East Rockhill Township to create comprehensive zoning standards, possibly as an overlay district, that will result in a well-planned business park that spans both municipalities, addresses traffic concerns along Ridge Road and nearby intersections, and maximizes the economic benefits of the airport for the region. The proposed I-3 District Regulations (submitted as a separate amendment; see BCPC review #33-16-4, dated October 5, 2016) includes the D-1 and D-2 office uses recommended for the airport area in the Comprehensive Plan (per subpoint b. above) and a new G(12) Planned Industrial Park use. East Rockhill’s zoning ordinance has use regulations for office park and industrial park, but the standards should be consistent between the municipalities so that this area can develop into a cohesive, high quality airport business park that will be an asset for the region.

2. **Comprehensive Plan's intent for economic development**—In addition to the zoning recommendations specific to the existing I-1 District, the Comprehensive Plan addresses a vision for economic development in the borough. The Town Center is a key to that vision. The intent for the Town Center is to facilitate the growth of commerce and economic development while preserving the historic character and integrity of the downtown. The Borough also seeks to promote and improve the existing C-2 General Commercial District areas and the Commercial Centers (Perkasie Square Shopping Center and a portion of Glenwood Shopping Center). The intent is to provide for a wide variety of retail and personal service business uses while complementing, not competing with, businesses in the Town Center.
In addition to permitting many existing and new industrial uses, the proposed I-3 District permits numerous existing and proposed new individual retail uses that could create competition for the borough’s retail core. It is unclear how the two I-3 District areas would be integrated with the adjacent industrial-zoned land in East Rockhill, or with any connectivity to airport facilities.

Instead of rezoning the two areas of I-3 separated by R-1A-zoned area, we believe a more effective approach would be to follow the recommendation of the Comprehensive Plan and revise the I-1 District regulations to add office and other appropriate uses (e.g., a planned business park use), and other regulations that would help assure a well-planned and well-designed airport business park. This would be done in coordination with East Rockhill Township to develop standards that both would adopt to enable implementation of the shared vision. It would create a distinctive district that serves a unique purpose for the region and does not compete with existing commercial areas of both municipalities.

3. Land use and zoning—Two separate areas of the new I-3 District are proposed, with R-1A Residential zoning and single-family detached uses and the Branch Valley Fish, Game and Forestry Association property between them. To the north are East Rockhill Township and the Pennridge Airport, and the zoning is East Rockhill Township’s I-1 and I-2 Industrial Districts. Both districts permit a range of office and industrial uses, including airport and heliport and landing strip, with I-2 also permitting office park and industrial park uses. Zoning to the east is R-1A Residential and single-family detached houses in Perkasie, zoning to the south is R-1A and R-1B Residential and single-family detached land use, and zoning to the west is the remainder of Perkasie’s I-1 Planned Industrial District and an industrial use and R-1B-zoned land. Based on the adjacent zoning and land use, maintaining industrial zoning is appropriate on TMP #33-3-21. Rezoning the residentially-zoned parcels to industrial permits a greater intensity of development that could be in conflict with the existing residential properties. However, if zoned and developed as a well-planned, high-quality business park that meets prescribed standards for siting buildings with generous setbacks and buffers, and landscaping to reduce the intensity and impact of the development on adjacent residences, the site could serve as a transition between the residential areas and the airport and associated nonresidential uses.

4. Remaining I-1 District area—The subject site contains a major portion of the only area in the borough zoned I-1 Planned Industrial. A former I-1 area, the former site of Perkasie Industries on Constitution Avenue, recently was rezoned to R-3 Residential. Rezoning the site’s I-1 parcels to I-3 would leave a small area of four parcels west of the site as the only I-1 District in the borough, leaving few options for development under the I-1 permitted uses and regulations, which require a minimum lot area of one acre and 200-foot minimum lot width.

5. Exhibit “A”—The proposal states that all the proposed rezonings are shown on the Zoning Exhibit Plan attached as Exhibit “A.” The submission to the BCPC did not include Exhibit “A.”

If borough officials determine that the proposed zoning map change is appropriate for the subject site, the Comprehensive Plan should be amended when the zoning map is amended.
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.

MW:dc

cc: Nate Fox, Begley, Carlin & Mandio, Borough Solicitor
Andrea Coaxum, Borough Manager (via email)
Brandy McKeever, Code Enforcement Administrator (via email)
Tracy Tackett, Borough Planning Consultant
Marianne K. Morano, Manager, East Rockhill Township (Adjacent Municipality)
PERTINENT INFORMATION

Site Characteristics, Natural Features: Natural features on the subject site include woodlands with steep slopes. A stream and pond are located just north of the site in East Rockhill Township.

Existing Land Use: The parcels comprising the site are vacant, with single-family residential lots between several of the site’s parcels along Ridge Road, and single-family detached lots across Ridge Road to the south of the site. The Pennridge Airport runway and associated hangars and other buildings are located just north of the site in East Rockhill Township.

Surrounding Land Use:

- **North:** Industrial (Pennridge Airport)
- **East:** Residential
- **South:** Residential
- **West:** Residential

Surrounding Zoning:

- **North:** I-1 and I-2 Industrial Districts (East Rockhill Township)
- **East:** R-1A Residential District
- **South:** R-1A and R-1B Residential Districts
- **West:** R-1B Residential District and I-1 Industrial District

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 are typified by high-density land uses and mixed-use building types. 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.”


As stated in the Plan, the purpose of the Planned Industrial area is to provide for the requirements of modern industrial development that are appropriate in select areas. Future development of the Planned Industrial areas should consist of high-quality, well-planned, well-landscaped industrial/business park campus character while minimizing impacts on surrounding areas. Future development/redevelopment of the Planned Industrial area should strive to satisfy regional market preferences.

Municipal Sewage Facilities Plan: The *Perkasie Borough 537 Plan* (1999) specifies that connection to the public sewer system will continue to be the preferred method of wastewater treatment and disposal for future development.

CONFIDENTIAL—NOT FOR RELEASE
CONFIDENTIAL—NOT FOR RELEASE

MEMORANDUM

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

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Preliminary Plan of Land Development for the Authority Building Expansion
TMP #48-17-75-1
Applicant: Upper Southampton Municipal Authority
Owner: Upper Southampton Township
Plan Dated: August 29, 2016
Date Received: September 6, 2016

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 2,600-square-foot building addition to the Municipal Authority’s garage and office building and rain garden for stormwater control. The 1.31-acre site is served by public water and sewerage facilities.

Location: On east side of Street Road approximately 500 feet east of Churchville Road.

Zoning: The CC Controlled Commercial District permits nonretail commercial uses on a minimum of 1-acre lots. Utility uses are permitted in the CC district such as Use 48, supply utilities including water supply works by special exception and Use 49, sanitary utilities which is permitted by-right.

Present Use: Municipal.

COMMENTS

1. **Existing and proposed use**—It is unclear on the plan what the specific use is on the subject site. General Note #4 on Sheet 4, states that the existing and proposed use is municipal property. However, ‘municipal property’ is not a use listed on the Use Table. Zoning ordinance Section 185-16 outlines specific uses and specific regulations pertaining to each particular use. The intended use of the proposed addition should be added to future plan submissions.
2. **Zoning bulk and area requirements**—The zoning bulk and area requirements chart on the Site Plan, Sheet 3 of 8 notes the existing and proposed front yard setback at 125.84 feet. The front yard dimension is labeled 124.72 feet. Both dimensions appear to comply and the plan should be corrected to reflect the correct front yard distance. In addition, the front, side, and rear yards should be labeled on the plan for clarity.

3. **Off-street parking**—It is unclear if the proposed building addition will impact the need for additional off-street parking. The plans should be revised to include the off-street parking formula as required by zoning ordinance Section 185-47 in order to verify compliance.

4. **Buffer yard and screen planting**—Zoning ordinance Section 185-60.B notes that a buffer yard of 50-foot width shall be required in the CC district along the boundaries with the R-1 and R-2 districts. The site borders the R-1 district to the north and east and the R-2 district to the east and the plans should be revised accordingly.

5. **Rain garden**—No plant list was provided for the rain garden in the plan submission. It is common for rain gardens to incorporate native, durable vegetation into their design. The township should ensure compliance with the stormwater management ordinance (Chapter 153) and the sections and appendices that reference rain gardens.

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 2,600 square foot addition. 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 October 5, 2016 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.

JSI:dc

cc: Herbert W. Schoell, Jr., Authority Manager  
Robert M. Campbell, P.E., Senior Engineer, Pennoni Associates, Inc.  
Larry Young, P.E., TriState Engineers & Land Surveyors, Inc., Township Engineer  
Joe Golden, Township Manager (via email)
## Bucks County Planning Commission
### Subdivision and Land Development Reviews
#### August 29, 2016 to September 23, 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>BCPC Number</th>
<th>Tax Parcel Numbers</th>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Submission Level</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buckingham Township</td>
<td>5844-E</td>
<td>(6-4-69-3 &amp; -69-8)</td>
<td>Fell Road Tract</td>
<td>RP</td>
<td>2 Single-family Lot Lot Line Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doylestown Borough</td>
<td>12180</td>
<td>(8-9-87)</td>
<td>120 Athens Avenue, LLC</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>3 Single-family Lots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Makefield Township</td>
<td>9371-B</td>
<td>(20-16-73)</td>
<td>Fieldstone Harris Tract</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>2 Single-family Lots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Makefield Township</td>
<td>12079</td>
<td>(20-3-26-1)</td>
<td>Kaplan</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>2 Single-family Lots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Britain Borough</td>
<td>5168-A</td>
<td>(25-9-2)</td>
<td>Knoell Property</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>117 Multifamily Units Commercial Land Development: 19,047 Square-feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Britain Borough</td>
<td>12178</td>
<td>(25-2-1-9)</td>
<td>Bank of America</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Commercial Land Development: 27 Square-feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Britain Township</td>
<td>11892-A</td>
<td>(26-1-103.1)</td>
<td>Mode Transportation</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Office Land Development: 58,748 Square-feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newtown Township</td>
<td>7762-A1</td>
<td>(29-7-1 &amp; -7-2)</td>
<td>Laughlin</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>8 Single-family Lots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plumstead Township</td>
<td>12186</td>
<td>(34-15-31-1)</td>
<td>Chase Farm</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>2 Single-family Lots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quakertown Borough</td>
<td>12185</td>
<td>(35-4-197)</td>
<td>Feigley</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>2 Single-family Lots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warminster Township</td>
<td>12184</td>
<td>(49-19-235)</td>
<td>Warminster Express</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Commercial Land Development: 2,158 Square-feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warrington Township</td>
<td>8209-B</td>
<td>(50-10-47)</td>
<td>Lester Residence</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>2 Single-family Lots</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEMORANDUM

TO: Buckingham Township Board of Supervisors
    Buckingham Township Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Revised Preliminary Plan of Subdivision and Lot Line Change for Fell Road Tract
        TMP #6-4-69-3; 6-4-69-8
        Applicant: Elkay Property Management LLC
        Owner: Same
        Plan Dated: May 27, 2016
        Last Revised: August 29, 2016
        Date Received: September 1, 2016

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 an 8.511-gross acre tract into two single-family residential lots, consisting of 3.935
gross acres (Lot 1) and 4.266 gross acres (Lot 2). Convey a 0.504-acre portion of TMP #6-4-69-3 to
TMP #6-4-69-8 to form a 1.989-gross acre property. Individual on-lot water and sewerage
facilities will serve the new lots.

Location: Southeast side of Fell Road, approximately 430-feet southwest of its intersection with Burnt
House Hill Road.

Zoning: R-1 Residential District permits single-family detached dwellings (Use B1) by-right.

The Buckingham Township Zoning Hearing Board granted the following variances from the
zoning ordinance:

Section 3003.B to permit the minimum lot width to be measured at the rear of the Gundry
property, exceeding the requirement that it be measured at the minimum 50-
foot front yard setback, allowing both lots to comply with the area and
dimensional requirements of the R-1 Residential District and not be subject to
the lane lot requirements of Zoning ordinance Section 3004.

Section 3104.A to permit the driveway to encroach into the perimeter buffer.

Present Use: Agriculture/vacant.
COMMENTS

1. **Site capacity calculations**—The site capacity calculations chart on the Detailed Tree Survey Plan, Sheet 5 of 16 should be revised to reflect the correct area that ‘Parcel B’ has been revised to (0.194 acres). Besides the base site area, the net buildable site area and the maximum allowable impervious surface percentage should be revised on the plans.

2. **Subdivision and land development ordinance requirements**—We defer to Knight Engineering, Inc. for any issues regarding compliance and conformance with the subdivision and land development ordinance, 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 the October 5, 2016 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.

JSI:dc

cc: Elkay Property Management LLC
Sharon K. Dotts, P.E., Gilmore and Associates, Inc.
Edward F. Murphy, Esq., Wisler Pearlstine, LLP
Dan Gray, P.E., Knight Engineering
Dana S. Cozza, Esq., 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 Subdivision for 120 Athens Avenue
TMP #8-9-87
Applicant: 120 Athens Avenue, LLC
Owner: 120 Athens Avenue, LLC
Plan Dated: August 1, 2016
Date Received: August 8, 2016

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 TMP #8-9-87 (16,776 square feet) into three single-family detached dwelling lots of 5,000 square feet (Lot 1), 5,106 square feet (Lot 2), and 6,670 square feet (Lot 3). The existing dwelling is proposed to be removed. The site is served by public water and sewerage.

Location: At the south corner of the intersection of East Oakland Avenue and Church Street.

Zoning: CR-Central Residential District permits single-family detached dwellings on minimum lot areas of 5,000 square feet.

Present Use: Residential.

COMMENTS

1. **Front and side yard setbacks**—The zoning table lists the front and side yard setbacks of the dwelling on Lot 1 as existing non-conformities. However, the applicant is proposing to demolish the existing dwelling and construct a new dwelling on Lot 1. Borough officials should determine whether the proposed dwelling on Lot 1 should be required to comply with the front and side yard setback requirements of Section 502 of the zoning ordinance (Table of Dimensional Requirements).

2. **Waivers**—The site plan indicates that the applicant is requesting waivers from the following subdivision and land development ordinance and stormwater management ordinance requirements:
2. **Tree protection**—The existing 42” Oak tree on proposed Lot 2 will be disturbed by grading within the tree’s drip line. The applicant should ensure that this tree is properly protected from the proposed encroachment. Snow fencing or similar protection fencing should be provided in accordance with Section 520(e) of the subdivision and land development ordinance.

3. **Historic district**—Since the site lies within the borough’s historic district boundaries, the applicant should be made aware that a review by the Historical Architectural Review Board in accordance with the borough Historic District Ordinance, Section 4, Subsection 209, is necessary.

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 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 October 5, 2016 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: Walter Smerconish, 120 Athens Avenue Associates, LLC
    Kevin Kester, Van Cleef Engineering Associates
    Robert Solarz, P.E., Gilmore & Associates, Borough Engineer
    Karyn Hyland, P.E., Director of Building and Zoning (via email)
    John Davis, Borough 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: Final Plan of Subdivision—Fieldstone Harris Tract
        TMP #20-16-73
        Applicant: JPO – Fieldstone, L.P.
        Owner: Quaker Group Bucks Associates, Inc.
        Plan Dated: August 24, 2016
        Date Received: September 1, 2016

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 39.209-acre (gross) tract into two lots. Proposed Lot 1 consists of 21.878 acres and contains a single-family detached structure and outbuilding, and has frontage along Edgewood Road. Individual water and sewer facilities serve the existing residence on Lot 1. Proposed Lot 2 contains 16.089 acres and has access to Longacre Road. An existing structure, located on the boundary line between proposed lots, will be removed.

A note on Sheet 1 indicates that the intent of the subdivision is to separate the environmental sensitive land in the southern portion of the site from the northern portion of the site, and that no new construction is proposed with the application.

Location: Along the southern side of Edgewood Road, between its intersections with Whitehall Drive and Schuyler Drive.

Zoning: R-2 Residential Medium Density District permits single-family detached dwellings on a minimum net lot area of 34,000 square feet with minimum lot width at the building line of 110 feet, if the lot is served by on-lot private water or on-lot sewage facilities.

Present Use: Residential.
COMMENTS

1. **Requested waivers**—Notes on Sheet 1 indicate that the applicant is requesting waivers from the Lower Makefield Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance. The plan identifies only the section numbers noted below in the left column; a description of requirement in the right column has been added based on the indicated section numbers:

   178-28. (Z) (the location of wells, on-site septic systems, stormwater management facilities and similar features on and within 200 feet of any part of the land to be subdivided)
   178-28. (EE) (statements from the County Health Department or other agency with jurisdiction as to the sufficiency and acceptability of the proposed means of water supply and sanitary sewers and from the Bucks County Conservation District as to soil erosion and sedimentation control to be provided)
   178-36. (E) (certificates of approval from a licensed testing laboratory for each lot as to the quality and adequacy of the water supply proposed to be utilized by the applicant)
   178-36. (F) (feasibility report from the Bucks County Health Department where on-lot sewerage is to be provided.)
   178-50. (A - C) (all requirements under Streetlights)
   178-52. (A - D) (all requirements under Utilities)
   178-44. (A - M) (all requirements under Street Access and Driveways)
   178-47. (A - G) (all requirements under Sidewalk and Walkway Requirements)
   178-48. (A - D) (all requirements under Bikeway Requirements)
   178-81. (A - G) (all requirements under Street Trees)
   178-82. (A - C) (all requirements under Buffer Yards)

   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.

   We recommend that the township officials not waive Section 178-28.Z of the subdivision and land development ordinance which requires delineation of wells, on-site septic systems, and similar features located on the site. The locations of such features on the site should be shown to ensure the proposed lot line will not present any conflicts with existing site facilities.

2. **“Limit of Landfill” on Lot 2**—The plan shows a “Limit of Landfill” boundary line on proposed Lot 2 which indicates that a majority of Lot 2 contains landfill area. Note #9 on Sheet 1 indicates, “The limit of existing on-site landfill taken from a plan entitled “Brock Creek Landfill Closure and Meadow Restoration,” by Princeton Hydro, LLC, Sicklerville, NJ, Project 0017.098, dated May 9, 2008, in digital format.” It is recommended that the township officials be given more information and details on the nature of the landfill to determine if there are additional setbacks, regulations, and possible restrictions on future use that may apply to this site.
3. Brock Creek Greenway—The Bucks County Open Space and Greenways Plan (2011) identifies the portion of the site along Brock Creek as part of a proposed Brock Creek Greenway. Originally identified as a link park in the Bucks County Park and Recreation Plan (1986), the Brock Creek Greenway would extend from Core Creek Park to the Delaware Canal in Yardley Borough. Provided there are no restrictions preventing such use, it is recommended that the township officials discuss the merits of establishing an access easement along this stream corridor to facilitate the creation of this proposed greenway (see Comment #2 above).

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. The plan should indicate compliance with this zoning ordinance requirement.

5. Recreation land—Section 178-89.A of the subdivision and land development ordinance requires that all residential subdivision submissions to the township be required to provide for the public dedication of land suitable for park and/or recreation use. Township officials should determine if this requirement is applicable for the proposal since no new dwellings are intended.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the October 5, 2016, 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:dc

cc: JPO – Fieldstone, L.P.
    T and M Associates
    Boucher & James, Township Engineer
    Terry Fedorchak, Lower Makefield Township Manager (via email)
    Steve Ware, Planning and Zoning Administrator, Keystone Consulting Services (via email)
September 15, 2016
BCPC #12079

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 for Kaplan
    TMP #20-3-26-1
    Applicant: Larry Kaplan
    Owner: Ann Ryan Trust
    Dated Received: August 25, 2016

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 4.82-acre (gross) parcel into two lots, consisting of 3.30 net-acres (Lot 1) and 0.93 net-acres (Lot 2). Proposed Lot 1 contains an existing single-family detached dwelling and various outbuildings. A single-family detached dwelling is proposed to be constructed on proposed Lot 2. An individual on-lot well and a septic system serve Lot 1. 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 1 acre for sites in which 0 to 23 percent of the base site area contains natural resources.

Present Use: Residential.

COMMENTS

1. **Requested waivers**—The applicant is requesting waivers from the following requirements of the Lower Makefield Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance:

   - Section 178-13.B from providing an existing resource site analysis map.
   - Section 178-40.C from providing roadway widening and improvements.
Section 178-48.A from providing sidewalk and bike and hike trail improvements along Dolington Road.

178-48.A from providing reverse frontage lots.

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 and the minimum modification necessary.

2. **Split rail fence**—The plan shows a split-rail fence along the site’s north and west boundary. A note on the plan indicates that the proposed monument and boundary is shown on the plan per “deed of record”. As a result, the plan shows the fence encroaching within adjacent TMP# 20-72-68. We recommend that the fence be removed (or moved) to ensure the correct boundary between Lot 2 and TMP# 20-72-68 is clear to the new homeowner and adjacent property owner (Lower Makefield Farmland Preservation, Inc.).

3. **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. The plan should identify the resource protected lands and indicate compliance with the setback requirement from such resources.

4. **Proposed limit of clearing**—Plan Sheet 4 of 5 shows the proposed “limit of clearing” and the limit of disturbance/tree disturbance fencing. There are a few areas on the site where there is not a proposed limit of clearing shown but the limit of disturbance/tree protection fencing is shown crossing through areas of existing trees. The plan should be revised to correct this discrepancy.

5. **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. Section 178-28.EE of the ordinance also requires statements from the County Health Department or other agency with jurisdiction as to the sufficiency and acceptability of the proposed means of water supply and sanitary sewers. If not already submitted, the applicant should submit this required information to the township.

   b. **Proposed sewage facilities**—Sections 178-36.F and 178-28.DD 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. If not already submitted, the required feasibility report should be submitted to the township.
6. **Plan information**—The plan should be revised to provide corrected zoning information in the Zoning Data chart provided on Plan Sheet 1 of 5. The required minimum lot area, maximum permitted density, and required minimum lot width, should be revised to indicate zoning requirements based on 0 to 23 percent of the base site area classified as resource protection land per Sections 200-16 and 200-18 of the ordinance. In addition, the chart should indicate the proposed density based on the net buildable site area for the entire site.

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 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 October 5, 2016, 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:dc

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: New Britain Borough Council
   New Britain Borough Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Preliminary Plan of Land Development for Knoell Property
         TMP #25-9-2
         Applicant: Ashley Property Management, LP
         Owner: Ashley Property Management, LP
         Plan Dated: August 9, 2016
         Date Received: August 18, 2016

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 mixed-use residential and commercial development on a 7.42-acre site. The residential portion of the proposal includes 117 dwelling units within three buildings. Commercial uses totaling 19,047 square feet are proposed on the first floor of Buildings A and B along East Butler Avenue. Building C would be for residential use only. Public space totaling 4,680 square feet is located between Buildings A and B along East Butler Avenue. The site is served by public water and sewerage.

Location: On the north side of East Butler Avenue between North Shady Retreat Road and Barrie Circle.

Zoning: Mixed Use Overlay District permits a Mixed-Use Development on lots of a minimum of 0.5 acres. The underlying zoning district is LI Light Industrial which does not permit mixed-use development.

Present Use: Vacant industrial.
COMMENTS

1. **Architectural design review**—An architectural design review is required by Section 450-29A.F of the zoning ordinance. The applicant should provide to borough officials plans for the exterior architectural features, signs, lighting, and landscaping in accordance with Section 450-29A.F. We recommend that borough officials and the applicant consult with the draft Butler Avenue Main Street Study and the model design guidelines within the study to facilitate the architectural design review process. Although the study has not been formally adopted by Borough Council it can provide a useful foundation for the architectural review of this and other proposed development projects within the Butler Avenue corridor.

2. **Parking area circulation**—The principal means for vehicles traveling east to west within the site would be the access way that connects North Shady Retreat Road and Barrie Circle. This access way is relatively straight and provides good connectivity within the site. However, there are 16 parking spaces that would require vehicles to back into the access way where other vehicles will be entering and exiting the site. We recommend that the applicant consider either orienting the parking spaces in a north-south direction or eliminating the spaces that would back into the aisle.

3. **Trash container screening**—Section 450-37 of the zoning ordinance requires that trash container enclosures shall be screened from all adjoining properties and shall be located a minimum of 20 feet from any property line and shall not be located within any required buffer. Furthermore, Section 385-27.B of the subdivision and land development ordinance requires that outdoor collection and recycling stations be screened from view and landscaped. Subsequent submissions should depict compliance with this requirement.

4. **Street lights**—The Butler Avenue Main Street Study indicates a preference for the William and Mary luminaire and Edgewater-West Point lamp post manufactured by Spring City Electrical Manufacturing Company for street lights along Butler Avenue. The plan proposes an alternative lamp post and luminaire.

5. **Handicap spaces**—We recommend that handicap accessible spaces be provided in the parking bay nearest Building B. The nearest handicap accessible spaces are located at the northeast corner of Building A.

6. **Designated residential parking spaces**—Section 450-29A.D.1(B)(1) of the zoning ordinance requires that one parking space for each individual residential unit shall be designated for exclusive use for the unit via striped numbering on the parking space. The plan should be revised to demonstrate compliance with this requirement.

7. **Loading spaces**—Section 450-29A.D.1(B)(5) of the zoning ordinance requires a loading space of 10 feet wide by 18 feet deep for all retail uses. The plan should show how loading will be accommodated for the development and indicate if loading is restricted to certain times.

8. **Light fixture height**—Section 450-35.B of the zoning ordinance requires that lighting shall be provided by fixtures with a height not more than 15 feet in all zoning districts. The lighting plan (Sheet C7.0) indicates that mounting height for the interior site lighting will be 20 feet.
9. **Clear sight triangle**—Section 450-34 of the zoning ordinance and Section 385-16.F.3 of the subdivision and land development ordinance require that clear sight triangles be provided at driveway intersections. The plan should be revised to demonstrate compliance with these requirements.

10. **Additional pedestrian connections**—The plan shows a pedestrian spine within the parking area beginning at the western end of Building C that connects to the front of the site. We recommend that the possibility of an additional pedestrian connection be considered along the eastern side of the site. Sidewalks could be extended into the parking area within a landscaped island similar to the western side or within the buffer yard along Barrie Circle.

We also recommend that the proposed sidewalk along Barrie Circle be extended into the site at the driveway entrance.

11. **Retaining walls**—There are two lengths of retaining walls proposed for the site. The first would be a “seating wall” located within the residential courtyard behind Building A. We recommend that further construction details are provided for the seating wall. A 10.5-foot-high retaining wall is shown behind Building C. Construction details provided on Sheet C.1.1 indicate a post and rail fence is to be provided where required, but on the other plan sheets there is no indication where the fence would be provided. We recommend that the appropriate plan sheets be revised to indicate where the fence would be located.

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 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 October 5, 2016 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: Kevin Reilly, PE, Ashley Property Management, LP  
Robert Cunningham, PE, Holmes Cunningham Engineering  
John VanLuvanee, Eastburn & Gray  
Mark Hintenlang, PE, Borough Engineer  
Erik Garton, Gilmore & Associates  
Sam Bryant, Borough Manager (via email)
MEMORANDUM

TO: New Britain Borough Council
    New Britain Borough Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Preliminary Plan of Land Development for Bank of America Drive-Up ATM Kiosk
        TMP #25-2-1-9
        Applicant: Bank of America
        Owner: Federal Realty Investment Trust
        Plan Dated: November 24, 2015
        Plan Last Revised: July 8, 2016
        Date Received: August 3, 2016

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 27-square-foot drive-up ATM kiosk on the 16.6-acre site of the Town Center of New Britain Shopping Center. The proposed lease area for the structure and its associated improvements would be 2,640 square feet.

Location: The shopping center is located on the north side of West Butler Avenue between Ute Road and Lenape Drive. The proposed drive-up ATM kiosk would be located at the terminus of the main entrance drive between an existing bank and restaurant.

Zoning: The SC Shopping Center District is intended to provide for retail and service uses and office uses in a coordinated shopping center with adequate parking and which is accessible from arterial roads. The proposed use, Bank or Financial Institution, is a permitted use.

There are existing nonconformities on the site with respect to maximum impervious surface coverage, minimum front yard setback, minimum side yard setback and parking spaces.

Present Use: Shopping Center
COMMENTS

1. **Variances requested**—The site plan indicates that the applicant will be seeking variances for the zoning ordinance provisions listed below. We recommend that the plan not be acted upon by borough officials until resolution of the request for variances from the Zoning Hearing Board is received.
   
a. **Stacking spaces**—Section 450-14.B(5) of the zoning ordinance requires that a stacking area to accommodate at least six vehicles be provided for each drive-in window. The site plan shows only three stacking spaces. The site plan indicates that a variance has been requested.

b. **Parking spaces**—The proposal would remove 10 parking spaces from the existing parking area. The number of parking spaces within the existing parking area is below the required amount in accordance with Section 450-42.G(2) of the zoning ordinance. The site plan indicates that a variance has been requested.

c. **Wall signs**—Two wall signs are proposed for the kiosk. In accordance with Section 450-46.B(2)(a) of the zoning ordinance only one wall sign is permitted. The site plan indicates that a variance has been requested.

2. **Light fixture height**—Section 450-35.B of the zoning ordinance limits the height of light fixtures to not more than 15 feet. The plan indicates that the light fixtures will be 23 feet in height.

3. **Internally illuminated sign**—Sheet C8 indicates that all signs are to be internally illuminated. Section 450-46.B(3) of the zoning ordinance does not permit internally illuminated signs.

4. **Curbing**—We concur with the recommendation of the borough engineer to provide curbing for the proposed gore areas found in the July 14, 2016 review letter. We recommend that curbs be provided in accordance with Section 385-21 of the subdivision and land development ordinance.

5. **Sewage facilities**—While no sewage facilities nor sewage flow will be produced by the proposal, 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 must be submitted for this proposed land development.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the October 5, 2016 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: Andrea J. Militello, Bank of America
James Kinosian, P.E., Stonefield Engineering and Design, LLC
Mark G. Hintenlang, P.E., Borough Engineer
Sam Bryant, Borough 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: Final Plan of Land Development for Mode Transportation
TMP #26-1-103.1
Applicant: Mode Transportation, LLC
Owner: Blue Bus Holdings, LLC
Plan Dated: August 29, 2016
Date Received: September 2, 2016

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 two story 58,748-gross-square-foot professional office building on a 7.957-gross-acre lot. Public water and sewer service the site.

Location: Southwest side of Schoolhouse Road, between Trewigtown and New Galena roads.

Zoning: IO Industrial Office District permits office and industrial activities on lots of 3 acres or more. Professional office is a use permitted by right.

Present Use: Vacant

COMMENTS

Prior to final plan approval, the township should ensure that the plan meets all conditions of preliminary plan approval per Resolution No. 2016-17, adopted August 1, 2016. In addition, we have the following comments on the final plan that should be considered.

1. **Waivers**—The applicant is requesting waivers from the following subdivision and land development ordinance requirements. The conditions of preliminary plan approval indicate that consideration of these waiver requests was deferred until final plan approval:
Section 22-705.3.C  Improve the street (Schoolhouse Road) to township standards for ultimate right-of-way and cartway widths.

Section 22-705.3.G  Mill and overlay the entire width of the roadway (Schoolhouse Road) a depth of one and one-half inches.

In addition, the final plan should be revised to indicate that the “waivers requested” listed on Sheet 1 have been granted by the Board of Supervisors.

2. **Half-width right-of-way**—The Board of Supervisors of New Britain Township adopted a resolution (Resolution No. 2016-17) granting preliminary/final approval of the subject land development on August 1, 2016. Condition No. 6 of the adopted resolution notes that the applicant shall provide a half-width right-of-way over the southern property line of the subject site for a potential future road connection between Independence Lane and Schoolhouse Road. The plans do not display the half-width right-of-way and the township should address the condition of approval.

3. **Landscape Plan**—The landscape plan (Sheet 8 of 25) notes that the residential buffer requirement is not necessary because there are no adjacent properties with a residential use. The street tree chart notes that six trees will be planted within the residential buffer. It appears the six trees should be noted as planted within the landscape buffers and screens, and the plan should be revised accordingly.

   In addition, the landscape island outside of the northern corner of the proposed building appears to have a sidewalk/shade tree conflict. The plans should be revised accordingly.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the October 5, 2016 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.

JSI:dc

cc: Mode Transportation, LLC
    Blue Bus Holdings, LLC
    Craig Kennard, P.E., Gilmore & Associates
    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: Preliminary Plan of Subdivision for Laughlin
           TMP #29-7-1 and -2
           Applicant: Julie Laughlin
           Owner: Same
           Plan Dated: August 8, 2016
           Date Received: August 17, 2016

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 37.424-acre (gross) tract into eight single-family detached dwelling lots along a proposed cul-de-sac, a 15.17-acre lot with an existing conservation easement, and four open space parcels totaling 13.8566 acres. Proposed lot sizes (in net square feet) for the eight lots are as follows: Lot 1—31,839; Lot 2—31,066; Lot 3—30,566; Lot 4—30,023; Lot 5—32,348; Lot 6—30,271; Lot 7—31,669; and Lot 8—31,182. The existing 15.17-acre parcel that is covered by an existing conservation easement contains a dwelling and outbuildings, and has independent driveway access to Stoopville Road. The four open space parcels have the following areas: Open Space #1—10.3070 acres; Open Space #2—2.9576 acres; Open Space #3—0.55 acre; and Open Space #4—0.042 acre (1,832 square feet). Public water and sewerage facilities are intended for the proposed dwellings.

Location: Northeastern corner of Eagle and Stoopville roads.

Zoning: The CM Conservation Management District permits Use B-1 Single-family Detached Dwelling on a minimum gross site area of 3 acres and minimum lot area of 1 acre, subject to a maximum gross density of 0.33 dwelling units per acre. Use B-12 Single-family Detached Cluster is permitted by conditional approval on a minimum gross site area of 10 acres, minimum lot area of 30,000 square feet, maximum gross density of 0.40 dwelling units per acre, minimum open space ratio of 55 percent, and maximum impervious surface ratio of 20 percent.
The plan indicates that variances from the zoning ordinance were granted by the Zoning Hearing Board (on June 2, 2016) to permit lots with a minimum building envelope less than 15,000 square feet, permit disturbance of 25 percent of the woodlands associations where a maximum of 15 percent is permitted, and permit disturbance of 40 percent of the agricultural soils where a maximum of 25 percent is permitted.

Present Use: Agricultural.

COMMENTS

1. **Conditional use**—Use B12 Single-family Detached Cluster is permitted by conditional approval in the CM Conservation Management District by zoning ordinance Section 401.A.2.a.1. The plan should not be approved until conditional use approval has been obtained.

2. **Impervious surface on-lot**—The Zoning Data Table on Drawing C1.0 indicates that the plan proposes less than the maximum impervious surface requirements of 20 percent per site and 25 percent per lot, thereby complying with Section 401.C of the zoning ordinance. We recommend that the plan also state the additional square footage of impervious surface (below the permitted maximum) that would be available on each lot for any improvements that a lot owner may wish to make in the future such as a deck, patio, shed, and building additions.

3. **Sidewalks/trails**—The *Newtown Township Comprehensive Trail Plan* (August 10, 2016) identifies the portion of the tract along Stoopville Road as part of a connector trail segment along Stoopville Road between Eagle Road and Makefield Reserve. In addition, Section 517 of the subdivision and land development ordinance states that sidewalks shall be provided along both sides of all public streets, except that where all lots in a development have frontage at the street line in excess of 125 feet, sidewalks need not be provided unless required to furnish continuity with existing sidewalks in a neighboring tract. The plan should be consistent with the township’s trail plan and sidewalk requirements.

4. **Additional buffering requirement**—Zoning ordinance Section 401.E states that there shall be a perimeter buffer of 150 feet along the frontage of all public streets which abut the site of all Use B-12 Single-family Detached Cluster developments. The perimeter buffer shall utilize a combination of berms, trees and other plantings as deemed appropriate by the Board of Supervisors to protect the viewshed. The perimeter buffer shall not count toward the minimum open space requirements. The plan should indicate compliance with this requirement.

5. **Open space**—It should be determined if any delineation (e.g., landscaping or fencing) should be provided between the proposed Lot 1 and Open Space #3 or possibly between the detention basin and Lots 4 and 5.

6. **Snow storage**—We suggest that the plan show snow storage areas for the proposed cul-de-sac.
This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the October 5, 2016, 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:dc

cc: Julie Laughlin
Robert Cunningham, P.E., Holmes Cunningham Engineering
Edward Murphy, Esq., Wisler Pearlstine
Michele Fountain, P.E., CKS Engineers, Inc., Township Engineer
Kurt M. Ferguson, Township Manager (via email)
Micah Lewis, Assistant Township Manager (via email)
Martin Vogt, Township Zoning Officer (via email)
Kristie Kaznicki, Municipal Services Secretary (via email)
Michael Bueke, Boucher & James, Inc., Township Planner
Upper Makefield Township (Adjacent Municipality)
September 20, 2016
BCPC #12186

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 Chase Farm
         TMP #15-31-1
         Applicant: Joseph F. Chase
         Owner: Joseph F. and Joanne C. Chase
         Plan Dated: June 13, 2016
         Date Received: September 6, 2016

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 3.198-acre (gross) parcel (Lot 1) from the overall site area of 58.677 acres. Lot 1 will contain a proposed dwelling unit and be served by individual on-lot water and sewerage facilities. The site also includes a proposed conservation easement area totaling 51.062 acres (Lot 1 is not included in conservation easement). The remainder of the site not in conservation easement (4.417 acres) contains an existing dwelling unit and accessory structures and is served by individual on-lot water and sewer facilities. The proposed easement area, non-easement, and Lot 1 are to be restricted from further subdivision. No new construction is proposed at this time.

Location: Northeast corner of Durham Road (S.R. 413) and Bradshaw Road.

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

Present Use: Agricultural/residential

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.
• **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 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 October 5, 2016 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.

DAS:dc

cc: Joseph F. Chase  
TLC Surveying, Inc.  
Timothy A. Fulmer, P.E., C. Robert Wynn Associates, Inc. (via email)  
Carolyn McCreary, Township Manager (via email)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Quakertown Borough Council
Quakertown Borough Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Preliminary Plan of Subdivision for Feigley
TMP #35-4-197
Applicant: William P. Feigley
Owner: Same
Plan Dated: August 31, 2016
Date Received: September 6, 2016

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 0.74-acre (gross) parcel into two single-family detached lots. Proposed Lot 1 consists of 0.337 net acres (19,476 square feet) and contains an existing single-family detached dwelling, a detached garage, and a shed. Proposed Lot 2 consists of 0.250 net acres (10,901 square feet) and contains an existing single-family detached dwelling. Public water and sewerage serve both dwellings.

Location: Along the western side of South 10th Street, approximately 80 feet north of the intersection of South 10th and Juniper streets.

Zoning: HR High Density Residential District permits single-family detached dwellings on a minimum lot area of 5,000 square feet with a minimum lot width of 50 feet measured at the front yard setback line.

Present Use: Residential.

COMMENTS

1. Right-of-way—The plan includes a note indicating that, “An easement of the ultimate right-of-way area along South 10th Street is offered for dedication to Quakertown Borough.” Borough officials should determine if dedication of an easement of the ultimate right-of-way area rather than full dedication of the right-of-way area is acceptable.
2. **Access easement**—Both dwellings currently share access through one driveway located on proposed Lot 1. The plan shows a proposed 15-foot wide access easement along the driveway. If the proposed subdivision is approved, we recommend that the terms of the access easement be incorporated into the deeds for both lots.

3. **Street trees**—We recommend that street trees be provided on each lot along South 10th Street. Infrastructure improvements such as street trees are an investment in a community and provide a lasting benefit to the neighborhood and the entire community. In addition, improvements such as street trees help make an area a desirable place and tend to increase property values for everyone.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the October 5, 2016, 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:de

cc: William P. Feigley  
Mease Engineering, P.C.  
Cowan Associates, Inc., Municipal Engineer  
Scott McElree, Borough Manager (via email)  
Doug Wilhelm, Borough Zoning Officer (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 Warminster Express
TMP #49-19-235
Applicant: 440 West Street Road, Inc. dba Warminster Express
Owner: 440 West Street Road, Inc.
Plan Dated: June 20, 2016
Date Received: August 25, 2016

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 1,534-square-foot addition to an existing 1,840-square-foot car wash structure, and a 624-square-foot auto cashier canopy (a total of 2,158 square feet proposed) on a 1.67-acre parcel. An existing motor vehicle fueling station with canopy will be removed. Public water and sewerage serve the site.

Location: Southern side of Street Road between Sunnemead Avenue and Norwood Road and opposite the intersection with Mearns Road.

Zoning: C-2 Commercial District permits car washes on a one-acre lot as a conditional use.

Present Use: Commercial (Motor vehicle fueling station and car wash).

COMMENTS

1. Conditional Use—Section 1200.C of the zoning ordinance permits a car wash as a conditional use. The proposed expansion will almost double the size of the existing building. The township should determine if the proposed expansion of an existing car wash use requires conditional use approval.
2. **Buffer yards**—Zoning ordinance Section 2006.A Buffer Yards, requires a completely planted visual barrier or landscape screen of sufficient density and height to constitute an effective screen between any nonresidential district and any residential district or residential use. Section 2006.E. prohibits any structure, manufacturing or processing activity, or storage of materials in the buffer yard. The site abuts residential uses to the southwest across Olive Street and a residential district to the southwest and southeast. The plan shows a 25-foot-wide buffer yard along the southeast property line but no screening vegetation is shown and the proposed car wash expansion is shown within the buffer yard.

The plan also shows existing trees in the rear of the site along Olive Street but there is a gap in the western corner of the site. The applicant should provide sufficient screening vegetation.

Subdivision and land development ordinance Section 523.5.C.3 Buffer Requirements, requires a 30-foot-wide Class 2 buffer yard for nonresidential uses abutting a residential use. The buffer yard shall contain trees, shrubs and perennials. Existing vegetation located within the buffer yard shall be preserved and supplemented with the above materials. The plan does not identify a buffer yard in the southwestern side of the parcel along Olive Street which abuts residential uses. There is an existing 20-foot-wide row of white pine trees but there appears to be no shrubs or perennials. There is also a gap in the trees in the western corner of the site. The plan should be revised to show a 30-foot-wide buffer yard with complete plantings.

3. **Landscaping plan**—Subdivision and land development ordinance Section 404.4.N requires that a plan showing proposed landscaping improvements, including street tree locations and buffer strips. The plan submission does not contain a landscaping plan and shows no proposed plantings. The plan should be revised to show the required information.

Section 523.6 specifies landscaping for parking areas with more than 6 spaces. Also the plan shows a trash enclosure adjacent to the parking lot. The applicant should provide sufficient screening vegetation for the parking lot and trash enclosure on the landscaping plan.

4. **Street trees**—Section 523.4, Street Trees, of the subdivision land development ordinance requires that street trees be planted along all streets except where the township agrees that suitable street trees are already in place. One street tree shall be planted for every 40 lineal feet of street frontage and may be planted in groupings. The plan shows no street trees along Street Road.

5. **Tree protection**—Subdivision land development ordinance Section 530.2 states that tree protection areas shall be shown on the landscape plan and grading plan. We recommend that the plan be revised to show a tree protection fence on the landscape plan and grading plan.

6. **Transportation Impact Study**—Section 526 of the subdivision and land development ordinance requires that a Transportation Impact Study (TIS) be provided for any proposed land development or revision of existing land use anticipated to generate one hundred or more trips per day, based on the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) *Trip Generation Manual*, most current edition. We recommend that the applicant and township engineer determine the need for a TIS.
7. **Driveway width**—There may be issues regarding ingress and egress to/from the site due to the expanded car wash use, different circulation patterns, and the two existing wide driveway widths along Street Road. The township engineer should analyze ingress and egress and coordinate with PaDOT in a review of the required Highway Occupancy Permit.

8. **Traffic divider wall**—The plan shows a traffic divider wall separating traffic on the driveway leading to the car wash and vacuums but no detail of the wall is provided. We recommend that the plan be revised to provide information about the function of the wall and show a detail of the wall.

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 must be submitted for the proposal.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the October 5, 2016, 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:dc

cc:  Warminster Express  
Matthew Chartrand, Bohler Engineering  
Craig D. Kennard, P.E., Gilmore & Associates, Municipal Engineer  
Greg Schuster, Municipal 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 Subdivision for Lester Residence
         TMP #50-10-47
         Applicant: Phillip and Kristin Lester
         Owner: Robert and Jane Lester
         Plan Dated: August 18, 2016
         Date Received: August 19, 2016

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 16.44-acre parcel into two lots of 13.425 acres (Lot 1) and 3.012 acres (Lot 2). Lot 1 contains a portion of the Elbow Lane day camp. A 2,150-square-foot single-family detached dwelling is proposed on Lot 2. Public water and sewerage serves Lot 1 and is proposed for Lot 2.

Location: Northwestern side of Elbow Lane between Greensward North and Greensward South drives. The site also abuts the intersection of Anna and Honora streets to the southwest.

Zoning: RA Residential Agricultural District permits single-family detached dwellings on lots of 3 acres or more.

Present Use: Day camp.

COMMENTS

1. Waivers—The site plan indicates that the applicant is requesting waivers from the following subdivision and land development ordinance requirements:

   Section 328.1.E       Relief from requirement for Environmental Impact Statement
   Section 27-2503.3     Relief from requirement for Traffic Impact Study
   Appendix G            Relief from requirement for Environmental Impact Statement
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. Natural resource protection

   a. Location of tree protection fence—To prevent damage to existing trees that are to be preserved and to remain during construction, a tree protection fence should be provided. Sheet 9 of the plan shows a tree protection fence detail drawing but the location of the fence is not shown on the plan. A tree protection fence should be shown on the plan in all areas where trees are to be preserved.

   b. Conservation easement—We note that the proposed Lot 2 will contain a small lawn and significant area of wetlands and woodlands. Of the 3 acres on the site, 2.3 acres contains natural resource land required to be protected in accordance with Section 304 of the zoning ordinance. Future homeowners may wish to remove additional trees and disturb resources to enlarge the lawn area. We recommend these areas be preserved in perpetuity through deed restriction, in accordance with Section 328.3.B(2) of the subdivision and land development ordinance, and ensure the disclosure requirements of Section 509.3 are enforced.

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 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 October 5, 2016 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: dc

cc:  Phillip and Kristin Lester
     Eustace Engineering
     Tom Zarko, CKS Engineers
     Barry Luber, Municipal Manager (via email)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Development</th>
<th>BCPC Number</th>
<th>Tax Parcel Number</th>
<th>PaDEP Code Number</th>
<th>Plan Review Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bristol Borough</td>
<td>Lenape Valley Foundation</td>
<td>7092-K</td>
<td>4-4-1-4</td>
<td>1-09005-032-3J</td>
<td>0201-60028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bristol Township</td>
<td>Med-Flex, Inc.</td>
<td>5338-P</td>
<td>5-19-78-11</td>
<td>1-09001-263-3J</td>
<td>0201-60029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newtown Township</td>
<td>Villas at Newtown</td>
<td>10053-C</td>
<td>29-10-76</td>
<td>1-09935-209-3J</td>
<td>0201-60030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northampton Township</td>
<td>500 New Road</td>
<td>12103</td>
<td>31-5-40</td>
<td>1-09937-412-3J</td>
<td>0201-60032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warminster Township</td>
<td>366 Hawthorne Street</td>
<td>12089</td>
<td>49-19-124</td>
<td>1-09007-212-3J</td>
<td>0201-60033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bensalem Township</td>
<td>Subdivision - John and Laura Crespo</td>
<td>9750-A</td>
<td>2-70-4; 2-72-480 &amp; -481</td>
<td>1-09004-340-3J</td>
<td>0201-60034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newtown Borough</td>
<td>Steeple View Phase 2</td>
<td>11917-A</td>
<td>28-1-7, -9, -10-1, -20, -20-1, -20-2</td>
<td>1-09934-023-3J</td>
<td>0201-60035</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
September 23, 2016

John Richardson
Dumack Engineering
P.O. Box 487
Penns Park, PA 18943

RE: Lenape Valley Foundation Planning Module
PaDEP Code #1-09005-032-3J
BCPC #7092-K
TMP #4-4-1-4
Bristol Borough, Bucks County, PA

Dear Mr. Richardson:

We have received a copy of the planning module1 regarding the connection of a new 12,380-square-foot medical office building to the Bristol Township public sewage collection system. Sewage flows, totaling 2,800 gallons per day (12 EDUs), will flow to the Silver Lake pumping station and to the Bristol Township Sewer Authority Disposal plant for treatment.

The Bristol Township Act 537 Plan is the official Act 537 Plan for this portion of Bristol Borough. The proposal to connect to the existing collection and treatment facilities is consistent with the official Act 537 Plan, since this plan indicates that the site is within an area to be served by municipal collection and treatment facilities.

However, we note the following items that require further action:

- Component 3. Sewage Collection does not include signatures authorizing collection and conveyance and treatment capacity in Section G. Proposed Wastewater Disposal Facilities and Section J. Chapter 94 Consistency Determination.
- Documentation confirming compliance with the state historic preservation act, while indicated to be attached in the packet, has not been included in the copy of the planning module packet submitted to our office for review.
- The PNDI Project Environmental Review Receipt indicates that the Pennsylvania Department of Conservation and Natural Resources and Pennsylvania Fish and Boat Commission are requiring project information to be submitted to their offices and further review is necessary to resolve potential impacts.

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 Bristol Township Sewage Facilities Plan. Therefore, the Bucks County Department of Health (BCDH) and Bucks County Planning Commission (BCPC) are required to review and comment on the proposed plan revision.

Visit us at: www.buckscounty.org
The County Planning Agency Review, Component 4B, is attached for inclusion with the planning module application to the PaDEP. If the municipality approves the planning module and 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 BCDH and BCPC 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
    James Dillon, Borough 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  
Lenape Valley Foundation  

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

1. Date plan received by county planning agency. **July 25, 2016**

2. Date plan received by planning agency with areawide jurisdiction  
   Agency name  

3. Date review completed by agency **September 23, 2016**

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

<p>| 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 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? <strong>N/A</strong> |
| ☐ | ☐ | If no, describe inconsistencies |</p>
<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>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></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></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. N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If no, describe the inconsistencies</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: Matthew M. Walters  
Title: Community Planner  
Signature: [Signature]  
Date: September 23, 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.
September 6, 2016

Mr. Jeffrey A. Stout, P.E.
Pickering, Corts & Summerson
642 Newtown-Yardley Road
Suite 300
Newtown, PA 18940

RE: Med-Flex, Inc. Planning Module
PaDEP Code #1-09001-263-3J
BCPC #5338-P
TMP #5-19-78-11
Bristol Township, Bucks County, Pa

Dear Mr. Stout:

We have received a copy of the planning module for a medical waste treatment and transfer facility proposed at the southeast corner of Ford Road and Frost Road in Bristol Township. Wastewater flows, consisting of 2,600 gallons per day (or 11 EDUs), are proposed to flow through the existing Bristol Township system to the Falls Township collector and then to the Bucks County Water and Sewer Authority’s (BCWSA) Neshaminy Interceptor. The flows will then be conveyed to the City of Philadelphia’s system with eventual treatment and disposal at the Northeast Philadelphia Water Pollution Control Plant.

The Sewage Facilities Plan – Act 537 for Bristol Township, Bucks County, Pennsylvania (revised 1998), is the official Act 537 Plan for this portion of Bristol Township. This project has been added to the connection management plan for the Neshaminy Interceptor by all agencies. The proposal to connect to public sewer facilities is consistent with the official Act 537 Plan, since this plan indicates that the subject site is within an area to be served by public sewer facilities.

Section G.4.a of Component 3 indicates that construction activities are proposed in, along, or through existing wetlands. A plot plan showing disturbance of portions of the wetlands on site has been submitted. Per Section G.4.a of the planning module, the submission should also include information identifying whether a General Permit or a full encroachment permit will be required.

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 Bristol Township Sewage Facilities Plan. Therefore, the Bucks County Department of Health (BCDH) and Bucks County Planning Commission (BCPC) are required to review and comment on the proposed plan revision.
In addition, Section J.2 indicates that the proposed sewer extension for this project will create a hydraulic overload on the existing collection or conveyance facilities within five years. However, representatives for Bristol Township, the Township of Falls Authority, and BCWSA have signed Section J.3.b. and c. to indicate that the collection and conveyance facilities have adequate capacity and are able to provide service to the proposed development. This discrepancy should be clarified.

The County Planning Agency Review, Component 4B, is attached for inclusion with the planning module application to PaDEP. If the municipality approves the planning module and 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 BCDH and BCPC 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, 

Lisa M. Wolff
Planner

LMW:dc

Attachment

cc:  Genevie Kostick, BCDH
     Elizabeth Mahoney, PaDEP
     William McCauley, Bristol Township Managing Director
     Colleen Costello, Bristol Township Department of Building, Planning & Development
     Thomas Scott, Bristol Township Zoning Officer
     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
Med-Flex, Inc.

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

1. Date plan received by county planning agency. August 1, 2016
2. Date plan received by planning agency with areawide jurisdiction ______
   Agency name ______
3. Date review completed by agency September 6, 2016

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>
</tbody>
</table>
### SECTION C. AGENCY REVIEW (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **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
- **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?

### Name, Title and signature of person completing this section:

- Name: Lisa Wolff
- Title: Planner
- Signature: [Signature]
- Date: September 6, 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.
September 2, 2016

Jeffrey A. Stout, P.E.
Picking, Corts & Summerson
642 Newtown-Yardley Road
Suite 300
Newtown, PA 18940

RE: Villas at Newtown Planning Module
PaDEP Code #1-09935-209-3J
BCPC #10053-C
TMP #29-10-76
Newtown Township, Bucks County, PA

Dear Mr. Stout:

We have received a copy of the planning module\(^1\) regarding the proposed connection to public sewerage and public water that will serve an additional six units in three buildings at the Villas at Newtown age-restricted development. The development is located on a 1.9-acre portion of a 56.94-acre tract on the eastern side of Upper Silver Lake Road and Penn's Trail North.

Wastewater flows from this project are proposed to increase by 1,452 gallons per day (6 EDUs) and will flow through the existing Newtown Bucks County Joint Municipal Authority system to the Bucks County Water and Sewer Authority's Neshaminy Interceptor. The flows then will be conveyed to the City of Philadelphia's system to the Northeast Philadelphia Water Pollution Control Plant.

The Newtown Township Official Plan Revision (1993) is the official Act 537 Plan for this portion of Newtown Township. The proposal to connect to the public sanitary sewage system is consistent with the official Act 537 Plan, since this plan indicates that the site is within an area to be served by either public or on-site sewage disposal systems. We also note that the proposal is consistent with Newtown Township's draft Act 537 Sewage Facilities Plan Update (July 2015), which indicates that the site is in a public sewer service area.

The Neshaminy Interceptor currently is under a Connection Management Plan. The application indicates that the project has been added to the Connection Management Plan by all agencies, and documentation has been included in the application.

---

\(^1\) 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 Newtown Township Sewage Facilities Plan. Therefore, the Bucks County Department of Health (BCDH) and Bucks County Planning Commission (BCPC) are required to review and comment on the proposed plan revision.

Visit us at: www.buckcounty.org
The County Planning Agency Review, Component 4B, is attached for inclusion with the planning module application to the PaDEP. If the municipality approves the planning module and 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 BDCH and BCPC 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,

Maureen Wheatley
Senior Planner

MW:dc

Attachment

cc: Genevie Kostick, BCDH
    Elizabeth Mahoney, PaDEP
    Kurt Ferguson, Township Manager
    Kristie Kaznicki, Township Municipal Services Secretary
    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)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Villas at Newtown 6 units—Newtown Township</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date plan received by county planning agency</th>
<th>August 12, 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date plan received by planning agency with areawide jurisdiction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date review completed by agency</td>
<td>September 2, 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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 impacts</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?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If no, describe inconsistencies</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 N.A.  

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: Maureen Wheatley  
   Title: Senior Planner  
   Signature:  
   Date: September 2, 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.
September 2, 2016

John Richardson
Dumack Engineering
Penns Park Corporate Office
P.O. Box 487
Penns Park, PA 18943

RE: 500 New Road
PaDEP Code # 1-09937-412-3J
BCPC #12103
SLD #15-7
TMP #31-5-40
Northampton Township, Bucks County

Dear Mr. Richardson:

We have received a copy of the planning module\(^1\) concerning the proposal to subdivide a 0.9489-acre lot into two single-family dwelling lots. An existing dwelling connected to public sewerage is to be removed. New wastewater flows (250 gallons per day or 1 EDU) will flow by public sewerage through the Northampton, Bucks County, Municipal Authority’s (NBCMA) 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 NBCMA and BCWSA certify that they have sanitary sewer collection capacity. The PWD certifies there is adequate capacity within the City of Philadelphia’s conveyance and treatment facilities to receive and treat the sewage flows.

---

\(^1\) 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.
The County Planning Review Agency Component 4B is attached for inclusion with the planning module application to PaDEP. If the municipality approves the planning module and 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,

Michael A. Roedig
Senior Planner

cc:   Eric Ponert, Philadelphia Water Department
      Genevie Kostick, BCDH
      Dave Connell, P.E., CKS Engineers, Inc.
      Mike Solomon, Northampton Township, Director of Planning and Zoning
      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
500 New Road

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

1. Date plan received by county planning agency. August 16, 2016
2. Date plan received by planning agency with areawide jurisdiction
   Agency name
3. Date review completed by agency September 1, 2016

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
### 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>X</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>X</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>X</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>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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If yes, describe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></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>
<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 N/A</td>
<td></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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</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: Michael Roedig

Title: Senior Planner

Signature: [Signature]

Date: September 1, 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.
August 31, 2016

Robert Cunningham, P.E.
Holmes Cunningham Engineering
350 East Butler Avenue
Suite 106
New Britain, PA 18901

RE: 366 Hawthorne Street Planning Module
PaDEP Code #1-90007-212-3J
BCPC #12089
TMP #49-19-124
Warminster Township, Bucks County, PA

Dear Mr. Cunningham:

We have received a copy of the planning module\(^1\) regarding the construction of two single-family detached dwellings on a 0.48-acre site. An existing single-family dwelling connected to public sewer is to be removed. The site is located on the southern side of Hawthorne Street between Sunnemead and Madison Avenues. New wastewater flows will increase by 250 gallons per day (1 EDU) and will flow into the existing collection system and Little Neshaminy interceptor to the Warminster Municipal Authority Log College Treatment Plant.

The *Final Environmental Impact Statement Horseshoe-Warminster-Warrington, Pennsylvania Wastewater treatment Facilities 1980* is the official Act 537 Plan for this portion of Warminster Township. The proposal is consistent with the official Act 537 Plan, since this plan indicates that the site is within an area to be served by the Warminster Municipal Authority Log College Treatment Plant.

Component 3, Section G.6 indicates that sufficient documentation has not been attached to confirm compliance with the state historic preservation act. A note indicates that a Cultural Resource notice is not required per PaDEP technical guidance because the disturbance is less than 10 acres and the site is not listed on the National Register of Historic Places. However, there appears to be a structure on the property that is older than 40 years, which would require notification to confirm compliance.

---

\(^1\) 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 Warminster 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.
The County Planning Agency Review Component 4B is attached for inclusion with the planning module application to PaDEP. If the municipality approves the planning module and 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.

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

Sincerely,

[Signature]

David C. Zipf, AICP
Community Planner

DCZ:dc

Attachment

cc: Genevie Kostick, BCDH
    Elizabeth Mahoney, Sewage Planning Supervisor, Wastewater Management, PaDEP
    Greg Schuster, Township Manager
    Judith Stern Goldstein, Boucher & James
    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**
366 Hawthorne Street

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

1. Date plan received by county planning agency. **August 19, 2016**
2. Date plan received by planning agency with areawide jurisdiction
   - Agency name: Rucks County Planning Commission
3. Date review completed by agency. **August 31, 2016**

**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>
</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?
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
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th><strong>SECTION C. AGENCY REVIEW (continued)</strong></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: David C. Zipf AICP
Title: Community Planner
Signature: [Signature]
Date: August 31, 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.
September 19, 2016

Frank A. Costanzo, PE  
Van Cleef Engineering Associates  
501 North Main Street  
Doylestown, PA 18901

RE: Subdivision – John and Laura Crespo Planning Module  
PaDEP Code #1-09004-340-3J  
BCPC #9750-A  
TMP #2-70-4; 2-72-480; 2-72-481  
Bensalem Township, Bucks County, PA

Dear Mr. Costanzo:

We have received a copy of the subject planning module\(^1\) regarding the plan to subdivide 8.128 acres into 13 single-family detached dwelling lots, ranging from 12,034 to 15,673 square feet. Wastewater flows, totaling 3,250 gallons per day (13 EDUs), will be collected by a gravity sewer line, drain to the Neshaminy Interceptor, and flow to Northeast Philadelphia Water Pollution Control Plant for treatment.

The Bucks County, Pennsylvania, Sewerage Facilities Plan, 1970, is the official Act 537 Plan for Bensalem Township. The proposal is consistent with the official Act 537 Plan, since this plan indicates that the site is within a designated public sewerage area.

However, we note the following items that require further action:

- Component 3. Sewage Collection does not include a signature authorizing treatment capacity in Section G. Proposed Wastewater Disposal Facilities and Section J. Chapter 94 Consistency Determination.
- Documentation confirming compliance with the state historic preservation act, while indicated to be attached in the packet, has not been included in the copy of the planning module packet submitted to our office for review.
- The project proposes an encroachment through wetlands and Waters of the Commonwealth.

---

\(^1\) 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.
• The PNDI Project Environmental Review Receipt indicates that the Pennsylvania Department of Conservation and Natural Resources and Pennsylvania Fish and Boat Commission are requiring project information to be submitted to their offices and further review is necessary to resolve potential impacts.

The County Planning Agency Review, Component 4B, is attached for inclusion with the planning module application to the PaDEP. If the municipality approves the planning module and 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 BCDH and BCPC 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 contact me.

Sincerely,

Michael Roedig
Senior Planner

MAR:dc

Attachment

cc: Genevie Kostick, BCDH
    Elizabeth Mahoney, PaDEP
    Ron Gans, O'Donnell & Naccarato
    Loretta Alston, Bensalem Township Department of Building and Planning 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
Subdivision – John and Laura Crespo Planning Module

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

1. Date plan received by county planning agency: September 8, 2016
2. Date plan received by planning agency with areawide jurisdiction: 
   Agency name: 
3. Date review completed by agency: September 19, 2016

**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.)? 
   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: See attached letter.

3. Does this proposal meet the goals and objectives of the plan? 
   If no, describe inconsistency: See attached letter.

4. Is this proposal consistent with the use, development, and protection of water resources? 
   If no, describe inconsistency: See attached letter.

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: See attached letter.

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? N/A
    If no, describe inconsistencies: 
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<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>
</tbody>
</table>

**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

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 N/A

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 A. Roedig
   Title: Senior Planner
   Signature: [Signature]
   Date: September 19, 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.
September 23, 2016

James Matticola, P.E.
Gilmore & Associates, Inc.
65 E. Butler Avenue, Suite 100
New Britain, PA 18901

RE: Steeple View Phase 2 TND Planning Module
PaDEP Code #1-09934-023-3J
BCPC #11917-A
TMP #28-1-7, -8, -9, -10, and -10-1
Newtown Borough, Bucks County, PA

Dear Mr. Matticola:

We have received a copy of the revised planning module\(^1\) regarding the proposed connection to public sewers and public water to serve 12 buildings for residential, retail, office, and restaurant use in the Steeple View Phase 2 TND. The site is on the western side of South State Street and south of Centre Avenue, with Newtown Creek forming the western boundary of the tract.

Due to changes to the land development plan, the proposed sewage flow for Phase 2 is now estimated to be 36,147 gallons per day, equating to 150 EDUs. The previous planning module, reviewed by the BCPC on October 7, 2015, was for a proposed sewage flow of 31,803 gallons per day, equating to 132 EDUs.

Sewage flows from the site will discharge into the Newtown Bucks County Joint Municipal Authority’s (NBCJMA) local sanitary sewer in Newtown Borough, then to the Bucks County Water and Sewer Authority’s (BCWSA) Neshaminy Interceptor, and ultimately to the Philadelphia Water Department’s Northeast Water Pollution Control Plant for treatment.

The Borough of Newtown, Bucks County, PA Act 537 Plan Revision (December 2012) is the official Act 537 Plan for Newtown Borough. The proposal to connect to the public sanitary sewer system is consistent with the official Act 537 Plan, since this plan indicates that the site is within an area to be served by public sewers.

This project is included in the BCWSA Neshaminy Interceptor Corrective Action Plan (NICAP) and Neshaminy Interceptor Connection Management Plan (NICMP), with flow release in 2014.

\(^1\) Under the revised Chapter 71 of the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection’s Title 25, Rules and Regulations, the planning module is a revision to the Newtown Borough Sewage Facilities Plan. Therefore, the Bucks County Department of Health (BCDH) and Bucks County Planning Commission (BCPC) are required to review and comment on the proposed plan revision.
James Matticola, P.E.
September 23, 2016
Page 2

The submission includes a letter from the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission (PHMC) dated, May 30, 2014, regarding the site’s location in the borough’s historic district. The letter indicates that the PHMC has issued a finding of No Adverse Effect on Historic Properties, conditioned upon the project’s compliance with three conditions specified in the letter. The PHMC should be satisfied that the submission complies with the prescribed conditions.

The County Planning Agency Review, Component 4B, is attached for inclusion with the planning module application to the PaDEP. 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 BCDH and BCPC 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 contact me.

Sincerely,

Maureen Wheatley
Senior Planner

MW:dc

Attachment

cc: Genevie Kostick, BCDH
    Elizabeth Mahoney, PaDEP
    Judy Musto, Borough Secretary
    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
Steeple View Phase 2 TND (Revised)--Newtown Borough

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

1. Date plan received by county planning agency. **September 12, 2016**
2. Date plan received by planning agency with areawide jurisdiction

   Agency name

3. Date review completed by agency **September 23, 2016**

**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>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Is there a county or areawide comprehensive plan adopted under the Municipalities Planning Code (53 P.S. 10101 et seq.)?

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✔</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

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

   If no, describe inconsistency

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

   If no, describe inconsistencies:

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

   If yes, describe impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. Will any known historical or archeological resources be impacted by this project?

   If yes, describe impacts See attached letter.

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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>X</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? If no, describe which requirements are not met N/A</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>15. Are there any wastewater disposal needs in the area adjacent to this proposal that should be considered by the municipality? If yes, describe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></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>17. Does the county have a stormwater management plan as required by the Stormwater Management Act?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>18. Name, Title and signature of person completing this section:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Name: Maureen Wheatley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Title: Senior Planner Signature: Maureen Wheatley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Date: September 23, 2016</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.
Bucks County Planning Commission
Meeting

Wednesday, November 2, 2016
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 October 5, 2016
4. Executive Director’s Report
5. Presentation
   Tourism in Bucks County
   Paul Bencivengo, Vice President, Visit Bucks County
6. Act 247 Reviews
7. Old Business
8. New Business
   2017 BCPC Board Meeting Schedule
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
OCTOBER 5, 2016

MEMBERS PRESENT: Raymond (Skip) W. Goodnoe; David R. Nyman; Carol A. Pierce; Evan J. Stone; R. Tyler Tomlinson; Walter S. Wydro

STAFF PRESENT: Lynn T. Bush; Debra Canale; Timothy A. Koehler; Charles T. McIlhinney; Michael A. Roedig; David A. Sebastian; Maureen Wheatley

GUESTS: Karin Morris, DVRPC; Larry Menkes, Warminster Resident

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, SEPTEMBER 7, 2016
    Upon motion of Mr. Stone, seconded by Ms. Pierce, with the vote being 6-0 the motion carried to approve the minutes of the September 7, 2016 meeting as presented.

4. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR’S REPORT
    Ms. Bush informed us that within the Cross Keys area, along North Easton Road, Wawa has submitted a proposal for a convenience store with gas pumps. Their building plan also includes a connector road from Old Easton Road to Route 611. This was one of the connector roads that was suggested in our presentation of the Cross Keys area to alleviate some of the traffic congestion at the intersection of Old Easton Road and Swamp Road. The recent publicity has brought out some opposition from a few local businesses concerned with traffic patterns. The Buckingham Township Supervisors are behind this plan, but there are zoning issues that need to be addressed.

    Ms. Bush told us that she and Mr. Gordon attended a Northampton Township public meeting where the residents were given a chance to voice their support, questions and concerns regarding the construction of a trail connecting the Upper Southampton border to the Middletown township border. The trail would go from the end of the Pennypack Trail in Montgomery County into Newtown borough following the old Fox Chase rail line. All the municipalities are on board except Northampton. Their concerns were mostly related to crime and privacy. There will be another meeting on the same topic on October 17, 2016.

    Ms. Bush said that she attended a meeting in Tullytown regarding their economic development. She said that Tullytown was one of the last boroughs to sign up for the Economic Development Initiative assistance. Tullytown’s landfill is closing and that is going to affect their balance sheet. They are also bidding out their trash hauling services for the first time. Ms. Bush said that this is a one of a kind issue and will be a learning process for all involved.

    Ms. Bush told us she attended a lovely Community Achievement Awards meeting in Morrisville
for Landmark Towns. Several years ago Bristol, Morrisville, Yardley and New Hope made an agreement to establish a Landmark Towns Group. They received grant money and work together promoting tourism and economic development. A few of the recipients were Mr. John Burke, retiring Borough Manager in New Hope, and Mr. Rick Dalton, manager of the Delaware Canal State Park; also, Tammy Marshall and Sue Schneck were recognized for their volunteer work on behalf of the Yardley Farmer’s Market. During the ceremony they also unveiled their redesigned website: www.Landmarktowns.com.


Ms. Bush introduced Ms. Morris, saying that she requested Ms. Morris give this presentation to the BCPC after hearing it at the DVRPC. Ms. Bush believes it to be relevant to us in addressing the planning, transportation and housing needs of the aging population of Bucks County.

Ms. Morris began her presentation by explaining the German Marshall Fund of the United States. The grant was established in 1972 from Germany to thank the United States for assistance in rebuilding Europe after World War II. It is meant to strengthen transatlantic cooperation regarding regional, national, and global challenges and opportunities in the spirit of the Marshall Plan.

Ms. Morris said she used her grant to study Age-Friendly communities in the UK. She went on to tell us that the World Health Organization (WHO), in 2010, began a global policy response to the issue of aging having recognized that we are all living longer and urbanizing at a much faster rate than ever before. WHO began a Global Network of Age Friendly Cities and Communities (GNAFCC) and the AARP also has developed a network of “Age-Friendly” communities. The EPA put out the Smart Growth & Active Aging recognition program in 2007. Under Mayor Michael Nutter, Philadelphia was recognized as a PCA’s Age-Friendly Community in 2009, Mayor’s Commission on Aging established a strategic plan in 2011 and Philadelphia completed the WHO Age-Friendly Assessment in 2012.

Ms. Morris told us that for her study she went to Manchester in northern England. It is a city of about 500,000, in a region of about 2.5 million. They are currently going through a rebirth of the area and are an early adopter of aging work. They were one of the first to join the GNAFCC, and they have a full time staff in the Public Health Department. They also have a Valuing Older People Forum which meets every six weeks. Manchester has a ten year plan to try to retain people instead of them moving to the country or coasts when they have reached a certain age. They also have a more accountable two year plan *The Age-Friendly Manchester Development Plan.*

Ms. Morris also spoke of her time studying in London. London has a population of 8.6 million, they are a much more worldly population than Manchester. They have an Older People’s Strategy Group, made up of over 400 different agencies. They wrote *The Older People’s Manifesto* to give to their newly elected mayor, and they lobby the mayor on issues that arise. London has a very ambitious strategic 20 year plan, *The London Plan* (2011). The plan has specific goals for each borough and community, such as new construction with universal building plans so that homes won’t have to be adapted later to accommodate an elderly person. London also did a study of how well they are accommodating people of age – *An Age-Friendly City: How far has London Come?* (2015). London also aspires to become the first dementia-friendly capital of the world. One of every four
Hospital beds in the UK is devoted to a dementia patient with nothing else complicating their stay. They are doing studies and trying to find ways that dementia patients can age in their own homes and communities.

The WHO has created domains as a framework for an age-friendly community. The first have to do with structure – Outdoor Spaces and Buildings, Transportation and Housing. The next are social aspects of the community – Social Participation, Respect and Social Inclusion. Finally, the last ones are governmental – Civic Participation and Employment, Communication and Information, and Community Support and Health Services.

Ms. Morris described some specifics to senior outdoor spaces such as: quality sidewalks and crosswalks, places to sit, senior playgrounds, public restrooms, and age-friendly buildings and businesses. Age-Friendly supermarkets, with amenities such as carts with seats and magnifying glasses, which resulted in a 30 percent increase in revenue. She described micro-changes that can have a huge impact, such as benches that are easier to sit in and get out of, the lowering of the volume of the music played, and wider aisles.

Ms. Morris stated that being able to get out, walk and be a part of the community is a barrier against depression and vascular dementia and maintains a sense of wellbeing. In assessing a town for Age-Friendly transportation, key factors to look at are the availability and frequency, reliability and safety, affordability, comfort and their destinations. In London, 95 percent of their bus stops are wheelchair accessible, and their underground and over ground transportation systems are all equipped with elevators and are step-free. Their taxi system is 100 percent wheelchair accessible. In Philadelphia, only 7 taxis out of the 1,100 taxis available are wheelchair accessible. There are now incentives to purchase the wheelchair accessible medallions for taxis and Uber vehicles.

Ms. Morris said that a majority of the boroughs in the UK have created traffic calming zones. These zones have a 20 mile per hour speed limit, resulting in a 30 percent reduction in accidents. There is also a piloted concept of shared space streets or plazas where people and cars can be on together.

London will soon have the largest cycling super highway network. There will be 12 different routes of protected bike lanes throughout the city. The Older People’s Strategy Group, lobbied for seven parallel “Quiet Ways” to accommodate slower cycling traffic and they run parallel to the superhighways.

Ms. Morris said that the lessons she has learned from this study are that the concept of ‘Age-Friendly’ really does matter. By strategically changing the messaging that a city isn’t just for young people but for seniors will be necessary to change the image and attitudes toward seniors. Moving from policy to implementation is the next step, compiling data, maps, metrics and partnerships will be key.

Ms. Morris concluded her presentation by saying that planners are engaging more with the public health community. This will help to promote sustainable “Age-Friendly” aspects in communities, by building accessible, affordable, flexible and supportive environments for everyone.

Ms. Morris opened the floor to questions. Discussion ensued about senior playgrounds, urban versus suburban living for seniors, zoning for accessory dwellings (aka Granny Pods/In-Law
Suites) and the possibility of conducting an assessment of the amenities for seniors in Bucks County.

Ms. Bush and the Board Members thanked Ms. Morris for her presentation.

6. **ACT 247 REVIEWS**
   The reviews of October 5, 2016, were mailed to the board for their review prior to the meeting. Upon motion of Mr. Nyman, seconded by Ms. Pierce, the motion carried to approve the October 5, 2016 Act 247 reviews. Mr. Stone recused himself from BCPC Review #9371-B - Lower Makefield Township - Fieldstone Harris Tract.

7. **OLD BUSINESS**
   There was no old business.

8. **NEW BUSINESS**
   There was no new business.

9. **PUBLIC COMMENT**
   There was no public comment.

10. **ADJOURNMENT**
    Mr. Wydro adjourned the meeting at 2:45 PM.

Submitted by:
Debra Canale, Staff Secretary
Upper Bucks Rail Trail
Planning Commission organized an Open House held on October 19 on the Upper Bucks Rail Trail. It was well attended by municipal officials from Richland and Springfield, by residents, and by a few of the Northampton trail opponents.

Townships of Richland and Springfield will do routine trail maintenance (mowing, trimming, clean up, clearing branches, etc.).

Medical Marijuana
Planning Commission has been working with municipalities who wish to adopt ordinances regulating the location of medical marijuana growers/processors and dispensaries. There is a lot of misunderstanding about this; there are some zoning preemptions in the Medical marijuana law; and the rules and regulations that are to be established by the PA Department of Health will not be ready for another 18-24 months.

Meeting with Doylestown Airport and the Pennsylvania Biotechnology Center
I attended a joint meeting of these two groups to discuss their mutual interests and determine if they can cooperate on certain projects by focusing on the synergism that exists between these two entities. There is a lot of excitement about working together.

County Commissioners Association of Pennsylvania
I am now chairman of the statewide Energy, Environment, and Land Use Committee. I have been an active member since 2011 when Jim Cawley left county office.
Community Planning and Municipal Economic Development Initiative

The Planning Commission staff helps townships and boroughs in several ways: we attend local planning commissioner meetings to provide advice and guidance, and we prepare plans and ordinances in cooperation with local representatives. We are in our fourth year of providing municipal assistance through the Municipal Economic Development Initiative (MEDI), and several of the activities below are in that category and are so noted.

We attended the Hilltown and Milford townships Planning Commission meetings and the Quakertown Area Planning Committee (QAPC) monthly meeting.

Preparing Plans – The New Britain Borough Planning Commission recommended approval of the New Britain Borough Main Street Plan (part of our MEDI program) and forwarded their recommendation to the Borough Council for consideration at the November meeting. Staff will make a presentation to the Borough Council at that time.

We attended the Dublin Borough Planning Commission to wrap up draft zoning ordinance and subdivision and land development amendments. We will meet one last time with the planning commission in November to finalize the draft in preparation for Borough Council’s review and discussion later in the month.

Staff continued to work on the Richboro Village Master Plan MEDI project. GIS staff is currently developing mapping of key village locations and planning staff is developing photographic simulations of opportunity areas.

Work continued on the Morrisville Borough MEDI project. Staff is developing photo simulations of potential downtown improvements and designs, as well as evaluating concepts and designs for Williamson Park.

The staff is waiting for additional information from the Borough’s Economic Development Consultant in order to finalize revisions to the draft Quakertown Borough—Summary of Parking Inventory.

In addition to special studies and plans, we continue to prepare, under contract, Comprehensive Plans for Northampton Township, Lower Makefield Township, and Hilltown Township.

As part of the MEDI program, staff is working on a Nonresidential and Economic Development chapter for the update to the Hilltown Township Comprehensive Plan. The chapter will include information on businesses in the township, resident employment and occupation information, a summary of the responses from the township’s business survey, and an assessment of the areas planned and zoned for nonresidential uses. The chapter will include strategies that can be taken to help retain existing commerce and industry and to attract new businesses suitable for the township.

Staff prepared a proposal to assist Chalfont Borough officials in preparing an update of the borough comprehensive plan. Staff also prepared a draft Request for Proposals for a consultant to conduct a market and economic feasibility analysis.
as part of the **Bristol Township** Transportation and Community Development Initiative grant project.

**Preparing Ordinances** – We attended the regular meeting of the **Newtown Area Joint Zoning Council**. We distributed a draft joint municipal zoning ordinance amendment related to definitions and requirements associated with water and sewer facilities and are coordinating with the jointure solicitor to prepare a draft ordinance amendment regarding medical marijuana dispensaries and growing facilities.

**Providing Planning Information and Coordinating with other Agencies**

The planning commission staff provides information and assistance to the many people who call us for help. This includes topics such as demographic and socioeconomic data, development proposals, BCPC reports, local zoning, and municipal regulations. Some of this work results from our mandated functions (reviewing proposed developments and reviewing various permit applications), some from other groups that need information, and some from residents who need guidance. Staff provided recommendations on the DVRPC’s draft 2013 employee estimates as a precursor to the draft 2045 employee forecasts.

**Act 247 and 537 Review Activity**

- 19 Subdivision and Land Development Proposals
- 1 Sketch Plans
- 10 Municipal Plans and Ordinances
- 3 Sewage Facility Planning Modules
- 2 Traffic Impact Studies

**Transportation**

**BCPC Transportation Planning staff** is responsible for working with PennDOT, DVRPC, SEPTA, TMA Bucks, and other groups to ensure that our transportation and funding needs are addressed. We participate in the development of the regional **Transportation Improvement Program**. This month, we provided a tour of some of the county TIP projects to Leo Bagley, Special Assistant to the Pennsylvania Secretary of Transportation.

The County is currently pursuing three trail development initiatives. The **Upper Bucks Rail Trail** will connect the Lehigh Valley’s Saucon Rail Trail with the borough of Quakertown by converting a currently unused portion of SEPTA rail line to a trail through Springfield and Richland townships. Staff conducted an open house to provide information to the public on the status of the project. The County has hired a consultant to design the **Newtown Rail Trail**. Phase 1 of this project will result in portion of the Newtown Rail Trail in Upper Southampton Township that will connect with the Pennypack Trail in Montgomery County. We also developed the Request for Proposals for the engineering study of the proposed **Neshaminy Greenway Trail**, a Congestion Management Air Quality Program-funded trail, that will connect Doylestown’s Central Park with the county facilities in the Neshaminy Manor Complex. All of these trails are part of the **Circuit**, which is envisioned as a 750-mile regional trail network.

**Geographic Information Systems (GIS)**

GIS has become a central function in Bucks County government, with our GIS staff providing the overall management for a system that involves not only BCPC but also Emergency Communications and 9-1-1, Board of Assessment, Health Departments, and others. We help to keep the county tax map parcel records and road centerlines updated.

The GIS data is increasingly used by people outside the county, either through our very
popular public viewer, or through our GIS Consortium of municipalities.

The Consortium welcomes our newest member, Bensalem Township. This brings the total number of municipal members to 36. Updates of GIS data are always provided to our Consortium members when requested. County GIS is finalizing development of a GIS Open Data Portal web site that when completed members will be able to access their municipal data sets for both downloading and mapping.

With the November General election fast approaching GIS is providing support for the County Board of Elections. GIS technology and data was used in the voting district re-alignment in Bedminster Township. GIS also mapped several of the polling place changes in both Bristol and Lower Southampton Townships. Maps were produced to assist and inform voters at several locations.

The Southeastern Pennsylvania Shared Services GIS project is a collaborative effort of the counties of Bucks, Berks, Chester, Delaware, Montgomery, and the City of Philadelphia. The group meets monthly and is developing a cloud hosted infrastructure to support a centralized and shared regional GIS database. The system is currently being tested and finalized and should be operational soon. Our October meeting was held at the Emergency Management Training Center Complex in Conshohocken PA. The November meeting has not yet been scheduled.
Bucks County Planning Commission

Proposed 2017 Meeting Schedule

Meetings are proposed to be held on the first Wednesday, 2:00 P.M. at the Bucks County Planning Commission office in the Robert H. Grunmeier Room 1260 Almshouse Road, Doylestown, PA.

January 4
February 1
March 1
April 5
May 3
June 7
July 5
August 2
September 6
October 4
November 1
December 6
### Bucks County Planning Commission
**Other Municipal Reviews**
**November 02, 2016**

<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>Bensalem Township</td>
<td>2-16-5</td>
<td>Township Council</td>
<td></td>
<td>Zoning Ordinance Amendment: Medical Marijuana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridgeton Township</td>
<td>3-16-1</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors</td>
<td></td>
<td>Zoning Ordinance Amendment: Surface Water Setbacks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridgeton Township</td>
<td>3-16-2</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors</td>
<td></td>
<td>Zoning Ordinance Amendment: Telecommunications Facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doylestown Borough</td>
<td>8-16-3</td>
<td>Borough Council</td>
<td></td>
<td>Zoning Ordinance Amendment: Valet Parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falls Township</td>
<td>13-16-1</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors</td>
<td></td>
<td>Zoning Ordinance Amendment: Medical Marijuana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northampton Township</td>
<td>31-16-1</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors</td>
<td></td>
<td>Zoning Ordinance Amendment: Medical Marijuana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northampton Township</td>
<td>31-16-2</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors</td>
<td></td>
<td>Zoning Ordinance Amendment: Transient Dwellings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perkasie Borough</td>
<td>33-16-6</td>
<td>Borough Council</td>
<td></td>
<td>Zoning Ordinance Amendment: Signage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richland Township</td>
<td>36-16-1</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors</td>
<td></td>
<td>Zoning Ordinance Amendment: B1 &amp; B1A Exemption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warminster Township</td>
<td>49-16-2</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors</td>
<td>(49-24-26)</td>
<td>Zoning Map Change: R-1 to C-2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEMORANDUM

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

FROM: Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Proposal to Amend the Zoning Ordinance—Medical Marijuana
Applicant: Bensalem Township Mayor and Council
Received: October 31, 2016
Hearing Date: November 28, 2016

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 November 2, 2016.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposed Action: Amend the zoning ordinance to include definitions and regulatory standards for the location of medical marijuana dispensaries and medical marijuana growing/processing facilities within the G-C General Commercial District and G-I General Industrial District.

Proposed Zoning Ordinance Provisions:

The following definitions will be added to Section 232-6, Definitions:

- Department of Health
- Medical Marijuana Act
- Medical Marijuana Dispensary
- Medical Marijuana Grower/Processor

Section 232-387 (G-C General Commercial District) will be amended to include a Medical Marijuana Dispensary as a use permitted by conditional use approval. Conditions include:

- Shall provide proof of registration and maintain a valid up-to-date registration with the Pennsylvania Department of Health (DOH). If state registration is denied or revoked, all township permits also become void. Shall operate in compliance with all DOH regulations.
• Shall not be located within 1,000 feet of a public, private, or parochial school, day care center, place of worship, public park, community center, or residentially zoned property.
• Shall not be operated or maintained on a parcel within 2,000 feet of a licensed residential substance abuse diagnostic and treatment facility or other licensed drug or alcohol rehabilitation facility.
• Must operate within an indoor, enclosed, and secure facility.
• No exterior sales, drive-thru service, or sidewalk displays are permitted.
• The use cannot be advertised on television or radio, and shall be limited to the hours of 7:00 am to 10:00 pm.
• Shall submit a disposal plan to be reviewed and approved by the township.
• Shall be no emission of dust, fumes, vapors or odors which can be perceived beyond the property, and shall submit a disposal plan to be approved by the township for disposal of waste and by-products associated with medical marijuana.
• No one under the age of 18 shall be permitted on the premises, unless accompanied by a caregiver.

Section 232-546 (G-I General Industrial District) will be amended to include a Medical Marijuana Grower/Processor as a use permitted by conditional use approval. In addition to the above conditions listed for a Medical Marijuana Dispensary, conditions of approval for a Medical Marijuana Grower/Processor include:

• A security plan shall be submitted, in compliance with the Medical Marijuana Act, for review and approval by the township.
• Buildings shall be completely surrounded by an 8-foot high chain link fence, or any other type of open link fencing that allows the building to be seen from outside the fences.
• Must be located in a building and shall not be located in a trailer, cargo container, modular unit, mobile home, recreational vehicle or any other vehicle or structure capable of being moved.
• The total maximum floor area of a Medical Marijuana Grower/Processor shall not exceed 8,400 square feet.

Section 232-586(c)(3) “Parking for all other uses” shall be amended to include parking requirements for medical marijuana uses.

• Medical Marijuana Dispensary - 1 space/200 square feet of gross floor area
• Medical Marijuana Grower/Processor - 1 space/500 square feet of gross floor area

Existing Zoning Provisions: There are currently no definitions or any standards within the township’s zoning ordinance addressing medical marijuana dispensaries or growersprocessors. Recent state legislation has legalized marijuana for medical purposes under certain conditions, and this is a new use not previously contemplated by the comprehensive plan or the township when drafting the zoning ordinance.
COMMENTS

The zoning provisions proposed will be required to comply with the State’s Medical Marijuana Act as well as with the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code. Therefore, we are relying on the township to ensure that the proposed regulations are consistent with these laws and any other applicable laws prior to enactment. We offer the following comments for township officials to consider:

1. **Prohibitions/restrictions**—Section 2017(1) of the Medical Marijuana Act states that the grower/processor shall meet the same municipal zoning and land use requirements as other manufacturing, processing, and production facilities that are located in the same zoning district. Section 2017(2) states that a dispensary shall meet the same municipal zoning and land use requirements as other commercial facilities that are located in the same zoning district. As the Act is written, it is unclear if a zoning ordinance can impose restrictions and prohibitions on a medical marijuana dispensary or grower/processor that are not already imposed on any other commercial or manufacturing, processing, and production facility uses in the same zoning districts.

   For instance, the Act requires both dispensaries and grower/processors to operate within an indoor, enclosed, and secure facility, but there are no prohibitions or restrictions on exterior sales, sidewalk displays, drive-thru services, or hours of operation. Section 232-387.1.f and Section 232-546.1.f of the proposed amendment would prohibit sidewalk displays and drive-through services for a medical marijuana dispensary or grower/processor. However, within the G-C General Commercial District, which is the only zoning district that permits a dispensary, the township’s zoning ordinance permits banks which include drive-through services.

   These same sections of the proposed amendment also restrict a dispensary or grower/processor from being advertised on television or radio. The Medical Marijuana Act does not specifically prohibit dispensaries or grower/processors from advertising on television or radio, but reserves the power to restrict advertising and marketing to the Pennsylvania Department of Health. The Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code does not authorize municipalities to enact these type of restrictions through the township’s zoning powers.

   The Pennsylvania Health Department has developed temporary regulations that provide some guidance for these facilities. The township solicitor should closely evaluate the proposed amendment in light of current and future Medical Marijuana Act regulations, and determine if additional restrictions or prohibitions can be imposed that are not imposed for other similar uses in the same districts.

2. **Residential district**—The proposed amendment language reads that a medical marijuana use must be at least 1,000 feet from a “residentially zoned property,” which is unclear if this is to include any property which would permit a residence, or only those zones which are defined by the ordinance as a residential zone. Article V- Residential Districts of the zoning ordinance catalogues the township’s residential zoning districts, but does not include the MHP Manufactured Home Park, SCH Special Citizen Housing Overlay, and CCRC Continuing Care Retirement Overlay districts, which also permit residential uses.
3. **Disposal plan**—The proposed ordinance includes a provision that requires growers and grower/processors to provide a disposal plan for township approval for any medical marijuana remnants and byproducts. While the Medical Marijuana Act does require that a grower/processor or a dispensary have a system to track waste as a part of the required electronic tracking system, the Act does not require that disposal plans be submitted to each municipality. Any medical marijuana waste will be regulated by the Department of Health according to their standards, as a part of the permitting and licensing requirements to operate a medical marijuana facility.

Requiring a disposal plan be approved by the township may be troublesome if the township staff reviewing the plan does not have any expertise in medical waste or medical marijuana. Additionally, this does not provide any standards or guidance as to what an acceptable disposal plan might be, which could create uncertainty and confusion for both the applicant and reviewer.

We suggest this be treated similarly to other medical waste, such as that from a pharmacy. Pharmacies are not required to provide any sort of waste disposal plan, at least not under the provisions of the zoning ordinance, but are subject to other health, safety, and security regulations not covered within the zoning 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.

MAR:dc

cc: Lauren Gallagher, Esquire, Rudolph Clarke LLC (via email)
Ron Gans, O’Donnell & Naccarato
William Cmorey, Township Manager (via email)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Bridgeton Township Board of Supervisors
   Bridgeton Township Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Proposal for Zoning Ordinance Amendment – Surface Water Setbacks
Applicant: Bridgeton Township Board of Supervisors
Received: October 27, 2016
Hearing Date: November 9, 2016

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 November 2, 2016.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposed Action: Amend the zoning ordinance by revising the location from where required setbacks from floodplains are measured, to be consistent with current FEMA standards, and consistent with the recently adopted Bridgeton Township Floodplain Ordinance.

Proposed Zoning Ordinance Provisions: Section 202 (Definitions) of the zoning ordinance will be amended to include a new subparagraph (A.4) within the definition of lot area, and to include new language within the definition of setback line. The new section A.4 of the definition of lot area will read as follows:

4. Area of delineated floodway and the area of surface water buffers (currently known as setbacks as Section 304).

The definition of setback line will be revised as follows: (new text in bold/underlined)

Setback Line.
A. The line within a lot defining the required minimum distance between any structure to be erected or use to be developed and the adjacent future street right-of-way or exterior lot line (when the property is not abutted by a right-of-way) or from the limits of a natural resource 100% protected by the terms of this Ordinance of the Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, whichever is greater. Such line shall be measured at right angles from and parallel to the front lot line.
Section 504B of the zoning ordinance (Setbacks from Surface Waters) will be amended to include additional language in paragraph B. The amended ordinance will read as follows: (new text in bold/underlined, deleted text struck through)

504.B. Setbacks from Surface Waters.

1. No new building, off-street parking, loading or unloading area, fill, commercial or industrial storage or display area, nor any impervious surface, shall be located within any of the following: a) 75 feet from the top edge of the bank limits of the delineated floodway as defined by FEMA Firm Mapping of the Delaware River; b) 50 feet from the top of the canal and/or tow path slope of the Delaware Canal; c) 50 feet from the center limits of the delineated floodway as defined by FEMA Firm Mapping of any other major surface water (as defined below); d) 50 feet from the average water level of any natural lake or pond that retains water year-round. See the Township floodplain map in case a wider area is regulated under the Floodplain regulations. The top edge of the bank, average water level or exact location of the center of the surface water shall be determined by the Township Engineer, in case of dispute. The natural buffer created by this section may only be altered for: a) necessary perpendicular utility, street or driveway crossing; and b) any carefully limited removal of tree limbs and dead trees if filter views from dwellings are desired; and c) pedestrian bicycle and/or equestrian use; and necessary historic rehabilitation.

Any disputes regarding the measurement of the setbacks or buffer areas shall be resolved by the Township Engineer.

2. Major surface waters are defined as an established river or creek that regularly conducts surface water, and that serves as an important part of the area's ecological system. The major surface waters shall be the Delaware River, the Delaware Canal, High Falls Creek, Beaver Creek, Wildeat Hollow Creek, Hillpot Hollow Creek, and Mine Spring.

COMMENTS

The proposal as submitted appears to be consistent with the ordinance requirements as presented by the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code. We offer the following additional comments:

1. **Setback requirements**—The proposed amendment will require setbacks from the FEMA delineated floodway rather than the banks of the Delaware River, or center of any other body of water. The proposed ordinance does not change the activities or developments permitted within a floodplain, or the required distance of the setback, but only the place from where the required setback is measured. There are several municipalities in Bucks County that require riparian buffer setbacks from the top of stream banks, which could exceed the setbacks from the delineated floodways. Township officials may wish to require both types of setbacks, and assess the setback which is greater in distance. We could provide additional examples of riparian buffer setbacks to assist township officials in this effort.

2. **Regulations within definitions**—The proposed amendments as well as some of the existing ordinance language in Section 202 (Definitions) includes more than simply the definitions of specific terms. The definition for lot area includes exceptions to the measurement of minimum lot area, and residential density standards. When regulations, or exceptions from specific regulations, are noted within the definition of a term rather than within the body of the ordinance, they can often be overlooked, leading to confusion and/or inconsistent application of these standards. The township should consider limiting any language in Section 202
(Definitions) of the zoning ordinance to strictly the definition of a particular term. Exceptions to lot area standards or regulations pertaining to the measurement of minimum lot area requirements may be more appropriately located within either Section 307 (Table of lot and setback requirements) or Section 516 (Site Capacity Calculations).

3. **Exclusion of existing requirements**—The proposed amendment to Section 504.B (Setbacks from Surface Waters) reads that the new text will replace the existing text in its entirety. However, it only includes a sub paragraph 1, where the existing text has two sub paragraphs under Section 504.B. Sub paragraph 2 currently defines major surface waters, a term that is currently used in sub paragraph 1. The amended sub paragraph 1 references “… any other surface water (as defined below); …”. We believe that sub paragraph 2 should be retained or the parenthetical statement in the amended sub paragraph 1 be deleted.

4. **Editorial Comments**—
   
   a. The existing ordinance includes a definition of a “setback line” which includes sub paragraphs A, B, C, and D. The proposed ordinance language proposes to amend the definition of “setback” rather than “setback line” and includes new language in sub paragraph A only. The ordinance as written does not reference sub paragraphs B, C, or D, as to whether or not they are to be removed. The ordinance only states: “Section 202 of the Bridgeton Township Zoning Ordinance is hereby amended to as follows:” It appears that the intent is to only add new text to sub paragraph A, and not amend any other portion of the definition but this is not clear as it is written. For additional clarity, it may be beneficial to include within the text of the ordinance both the existing language in the zoning ordinance, and the proposed language of the zoning ordinance, to more clearly illustrate the proposed changes.

   b. The proposed amendment to the definition of setback reads “or from the limits of a natural resource 100% protected by the terms of this Ordinance of the Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, whichever is greater”. This should probably read “or the Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance”.

   c. Article II of the proposed ordinance, the Repealer clause section, reads that all ordinances which are inconsistent herewith are hereby appealed. This should probably be repealed.

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.

CND:dc

cc: David M. Shaflkowitz, Esq., Solicitor  
C. Robert Wynn Associates, Inc., Municipal Engineer  
Keystone Municipal Services, Township Zoning Officer
CONFIDENTIAL — NOT FOR RELEASE

November 2, 2016
BCPC #3-16-02

MEMORANDUM

TO: Bridgeton Township Board of Supervisors
   Bridgeton Township Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Proposal for Zoning Ordinance Amendment—Telecommunications Facilities
Applicant: Board of Supervisors
Received: October 27, 2016
Hearing Date: November 9, 2016

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 November 2, 2016.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposed Action: Amend the Bridgeton Township Zoning Ordinance to provide regulations for telecommunications equipment such as mini towers and distributed antenna systems (DAS) within the Right-of-Way (ROW).

Proposed Zoning Ordinance Provisions: Section 202 (Definitions) of the zoning ordinance will be amended to include new definitions for specific telecommunications equipment; Section 402.64 (Telecommunications Facility) will be amended to include new regulations for telecommunications equipment within a public ROW:

1. Facilities are permitted in areas in which all utilities are located above ground, so long as the facility is located on an existing pole. Facilities shall not be located on any existing sign.
2. Facilities shall be co-located on existing poles, such as utility poles or street light poles.
3. Design Requirements:
   • Facilities shall be no more than 6 feet in height when located on an existing pole.
   • All equipment shall be the least visibly intrusive possible.
   • Antennae and other equipment shall be treated to match the supporting structure.
4. Every facility within the ROW shall be subject to the township’s right to fix a fair and reasonable compensation fee to be paid for ROW management costs.
5. The township shall determine the time, place, and manner of construction, maintenance, repair, and/or removal of all facilities.

Visit us at: www.buckscounty.org
6. Equipment location: telecommunications facilities and accessory equipment shall be located so as not to cause conflict with vehicular or pedestrian traffic.
   - No ground mounted equipment, walls, or landscaping shall be within 36 inches of the back of the curb, or within any existing easement.
   - Ground mounted equipment that cannot be underground shall be screened.
   - Electrical cabinets shall be screened.
   - Graffiti

COMMENTS

We recognize that the proposal is consistent with the applicable comprehensive plan; however, we recommend that the township not adopt the proposal until the following concerns have been addressed:

1. **Definitions**—The proposed amendment includes a new definition for Right-of-Way, within the definition of Telecommunications Facility. The zoning ordinance already has a general definition for Right-of-Way. The new definition does not replace or revise the existing definition. Having two different definitions for the same term within the zoning ordinance can potentially cause confusion and conflicts. It is important to investigate how this will affect other aspects of zoning and also if the new definition is consistent with the subdivision and land development ordinance definition of “right-of-way.” An alternative approach may be to use the existing definition of “Right-of-Way” in Section 202, or to reference that definition within the proposed telecommunications facilities ordinance, rather than creating a new and separate definition within the definition of telecommunications facility.

The proposed change in the definition of “right-of-way” raised some questions with our staff and our County Planning Commission solicitor. We are unclear on why the concept of “regulatory interest” was added to the right-of-way definition in order to regulate the telecommunications facilities. The right to regulate is not the same as the right to use the property for a specific purpose, which is what is granted through a right-of-way. The township has a “regulatory interest” in every piece of property within its borders.

2. **Preemptory legislation**—Federal and state government have adopted legislation regulating telecommunication facilities (TF) which may supersede some of the township’s proposed and existing regulations. We recommend that the township review the Pennsylvania Wireless Broadband Colocation Act of 2012 P.L. 1501, No. 191 and Section 6409(a) of the Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act of 2012.

3. **Time, place, and manner**—Section 402.64.d.5 of the proposed amendment states the township shall determine the time, place, and manner of construction, maintenance, and repair of telecommunication facilities. There may be instances when the facility needs to be repaired, or removed in an expeditious fashion when the township cannot respond to a request quickly. The township should ensure that adequate notice will be provided and it will be receptive to scheduling activities in a reasonable amount of time. We also recommend the township require notice of any telecommunication facility maintenance, modification, etc. of any telecommunication facility by the facility owner for purposes of coordination with township operations and security.
4. **Colocation**—Section 402.64.d.2 of the proposed amendment states that telecommunication facilities shall be located on existing poles, such as utility poles or street light poles. It also states that if colocation is not technologically feasible, facilities shall be located on other existing poles that do not already act as support structures for telecommunications facilities.

It appears that the intent of this section of the amendment is to require that the first location to be considered for new telecommunications facilities in the ROW would be to collocate on an existing pole, and a secondary option would be to locate on another existing pole if colocation is not feasible. A third option, not stated in the amendment, would be the construction of a new pole for the purposes of mounting telecommunications facilities equipment. The amendment does not mention the possibility of a new pole being constructed. If it is the intent that new poles are to be prohibited, this may need to be stated directly within the amendment.

5. **Stealth technology**—Section 402.64.d.3.b of the proposed amendment states that antennae must be located using stealth technology as approved by the township. The subsection as it is written could lead to misinterpretation. “Antennae must be located using stealth technology” could be interpreted as requiring that stealth technology be used to determine the best location for antennae, not that efforts be made to conceal the appearance of the antennae.

In addition, within the wireless telecommunications industry, the use of the term ‘stealthing’ can be interpreted to mean several things: 1) as a general term to mean visually concealing or camouflaging equipment or antennae, or 2) to visually screen the antenna with a false wall constructed of materials that are radio frequency transparent, that can be made to look like brick, stone, wood, or other materials to appear as if they are a part of the building. This could be interpreted by applicants to mean that all antennae are required to be screened by a false wall.

In the case of Distributed Antenna Systems (DAS) and other telecommunications equipment which may be located on a utility pole within the ROW, requiring stealth technology to conceal equipment may be onerous. In many instances, a telecommunications facility may be only a single antenna mounted on top of the utility pole along the sidewalk. Requiring additional screening of this antenna may not only be difficult, but could potentially make the equipment more visually obtrusive by making it larger or more conspicuous, which is the opposite of the intent.

An alternative would be to consider changing this language of Section 402.64.d.3.b to read that all telecommunications facilities shall make all reasonable efforts to conceal or reduce the visual impact of antennae through use of screening, painting, decorative features, or similar techniques. We note that Section 402.64.d.3.a may already address this by stating that “All equipment shall be the smallest and least visibly intrusive equipment feasible.”

6. **Editorial Comments**—

   a. Proposed Section 402.64.d.6.d appears to be an incomplete sentence. It only reads that “any graffiti on the facilities, supporting structures.” This sentence should be completed and any proposed regulations regarding graffiti should be clearly spelled out.
b. Section 402.64.d.3.a states that antenna installations located above the surface grade in the public ROW, including, but not limited to, those streetlights and joint utility poles, shall … This likely should read “including, but not limited to, those attached to, or mounted to streetlights and joint utility poles.” It appears the intent is to regulate the antennae, and not the streetlights or utility poles themselves.

c. Article II, the repealer clause, reads that all parts of ordinances which are inconsistent with this ordinance are hereby appealed. This should read repealed.

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.

CND:dc

cc:    David M. Shafkowitz, Esq., Solicitor
       C. Robert Wynn Associates, Inc., Municipal Engineer
       Keystone Municipal Services, Township Zoning Officer
CONFIDENTIAL — NOT FOR RELEASE

November 2, 2016
BCPC #8-16-3

MEMORANDUM

TO: Doylestown Borough Council
   Doylestown Borough Planning Commission

FROM: Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Proposal to Amend the Zoning Ordinance—Valet Parking

Applicant: Borough Council
Received: October 20, 2016
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 November 2, 2016.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposed Action: Amend the zoning ordinance to add a new use, Valet Parking Lot, and include provisions for the location and operation of the use. A Valet Parking Lot would be a permitted use within the O Office, RC Retail Commercial, RC-1 Retail Commercial 1, CC Central Commercial, FC Free-Standing Commercial, CI Central Industrial, PI Planned Industrial, and TND-1 Traditional Neighborhood 1 districts.

COMMENTS

We commend the borough for taking an active approach to parking management within the borough. We recognize that the proposal is consistent with the applicable municipal ordinances; however, we recommend that the borough consider the following issue prior to its adoption:

• Relationship to other parking requirements—Section 406.39.1.E of the proposed amendment states that a Valet Parking Lot may occupy an existing approved parking area in common with a required parking area for one or more existing or proposed uses if the total spaces required for the existing or proposed use is still provided and not reduced below the minimum spaces required. The proposed amendment further allows for the Zoning Officer to reduce the number of spaces required for an existing or proposed use sharing its common parking area with a Valet use for the specific hours of operation of the Valet Use.
Section 802.7.B, Location of Parking Spaces sets forth provisions for off-street parking spaces to be located within 300 feet of the lot on which the principal use is located and no more than 6 off-site parking spaces. It is unclear whether the proposed amendment would contradict the requirements of Section 802.7.B. To avoid confusion, a provision within proposed Section 406.39.1 may be needed that would supersede the requirements found in Section 802.7B. We recommend that this issue be resolved prior to borough officials from taking action on the proposed amendment.

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:dc

cc: Jordan B. Yeager, Esq., Curtin & Heefner, LLP, Borough Solicitor
    John H. Davis, Borough Manager (via email)
CONFIDENTIAL — NOT FOR RELEASE

November 2, 2016
BCPC #13-16-1

MEMORANDUM

TO: Falls Township Board of Supervisors
Falls Township Planning Commission

FROM: Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Proposal to Amend the Zoning Ordinance—Medical Marijuana
Applicant: Board of Supervisors
Received: October 6, 2016
Hearing Date: November 7, 2016

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 November 2, 2016.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposed Action: Amend the zoning ordinance to include definitions and regulatory standards for the potential location of medical marijuana dispensaries, and medical marijuana growing/processing facilities within the Highway Commercial (HC), Farming and Mining (FM), and Materials Processing and Manufacturing (MPM) zoning districts of the township.

Proposed Zoning Ordinance Provisions:

The following definitions will be added to Section 209-5 (Definitions):

- Department of Health
- Medical Marijuana Act
- Medical Marijuana Dispensary
- Medical Marijuana Grower/Processor

Section 209-23.C (Highway Commercial District) will be amended to include a Medical Marijuana Dispensary as a use permitted by special exception. Section 209-26 (Farming and Mining District), and Section 209-30 (Materials Processing and Manufacturing District) will be amended to include a Medical Marijuana Grower/Processor as a use permitted by special exception. These three sections will include the following conditions for both the Medical Marijuana Dispensary and Medical Marijuana Grower/Processor uses:
• Shall provide proof of registration and maintain a valid up-to-date registration with the Pennsylvania Department of Health (DOH). If state registration is denied or revoked, all Township permits also become void. Shall operate in compliance with all DOH regulations.
• Shall not operate on the same site as a facility for growing and processing marijuana, and shall not be located within 1,000 feet of a public, private, or parochial school, day care center, place of worship, public park, community center, or residentially zoned property.
• Must operate within an indoor, enclosed, and secure facility.
• No exterior sales, drive-thru service, or sidewalk displays are permitted.
• The use cannot be advertised on television or radio, and shall be limited to the hours of 9:00 am to 9:00 pm.
• Shall be no emission of dust, fumes, vapors or odors which can be perceived beyond the property, and shall submit a disposal plan to be approved by the township for disposal of waste and by-products associated with medical marijuana.
• No one under the age of 18 shall be permitted on the premises, unless accompanied by a caregiver.
• No use of medical marijuana shall be permitted on the premises.
• Shall submit a security plan, in compliance with the Medical Marijuana Act, for review and approval by the Township.

Sections 209-26 and 209-30 will also be amended to include the following condition for Medical Marijuana Grower/Processor:

• Minimum lot area of 2-acres.

Section 209-42 (Off-Street Parking) shall be amended to include parking requirements for medical marijuana uses.

• Dispensary- 1 space/200 square feet of gross floor area
• Grower- 1 space/500 square feet of gross floor area
• Grower/Processor- 1 space/500 square feet of gross floor area

Existing Zoning Provisions: There are currently no definitions or any standards within the township’s zoning ordinance addressing medical marijuana dispensaries or growers/processors. Recent state legislation has legalized marijuana for medical purposes under certain conditions, and this is a new use not previously contemplated by the comprehensive plan or the township when drafting the zoning ordinance.

COMMENTS

The zoning provisions proposed will be required to comply with the State’s Medical Marijuana Act as well as with the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code. Therefore, we are relying on the township to ensure that the proposed regulations are consistent with these laws and any other applicable laws prior to enactment. We offer the following comments for township officials to consider:
1. **Prohibitions/restrictions**—Section 2017(1) of the Medical Marijuana Act states that the grower/processor shall meet the same municipal zoning and land use requirements as other manufacturing, processing, and production facilities that are located in the same zoning district. Section 2017(2) states that dispensary shall meet the same municipal zoning and land use requirements as other commercial facilities that are located in the same zoning district. As the Act is written, it is unclear if a zoning ordinance can impose restrictions and prohibitions on a medical marijuana dispensary or grower/processor that are not already imposed on any other commercial or manufacturing, processing, and production facility uses in the same zoning districts.

For instance, the Act requires both dispensaries and grower/processors to operate within an indoor, enclosed, and secure facility, but there are no prohibitions or restrictions on exterior sales, sidewalk displays, drive-thru services, or hours of operation. Section 209-23.C(d), Section 209-26.B1(1)(e), and Section 209-30.J(1)(e) of the proposed amendment would prohibit sidewalk displays and drive-through services for a medical marijuana dispensary or grower/processor. However, within the HC (Highway Commercial) district, which is the only zoning district that permits a dispensary, the township’s zoning ordinance permits banks which include drive-through services.

These same sections of the proposed amendment also restrict a dispensary or grower/processor from being advertised on television or radio. The Medical Marijuana Act does not specifically prohibit dispensaries or grower/processors from advertising on television or radio, but reserves the power to restrict advertising and marketing to the Pennsylvania Department of Health. The Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code does not authorize municipalities to enact these type of restrictions through the township’s zoning powers.

Currently, the Pennsylvania Health Department is developing temporary regulations that may provide guidance for these facilities in the future. The township solicitor should closely evaluate the proposed amendment in light of current and future Medical Marijuana Act regulations, and determine if additional restrictions/prohibitions can be imposed that are not imposed for other similar uses in the same districts. If township officials determine that additional restriction/prohibitions can be imposed, they should consider Comments 2 through 5 below.

2. **Residential district**—The proposed amendment language reads that a medical marijuana use must be at least 1,000 feet from a “residentially zoned property”, which is unclear if this is to include any property which would permit a residence, or only those zones which are defined by the ordinance as a residential zone. Section 209-5 (Definitions) of the zoning ordinance defines a *residential district* as the following districts: LR, NCR, LMR, MR, MHR, HR, HR-TH, AQ, and MHC. This definition excludes the OSP, HD, IN, and RD districts, all which permit by right some form of residential development. This may need to be clarified.

3. **Minimum site area**—The proposed ordinance permits a medical marijuana grower/processor on a site of a minimum of 2 acres in size. The FM District requires a minimum tract area of 10 acres, and no minimum lot area, so the 2-acre minimum would not impose a greater restriction, however it may cause some confusion as to which standard would apply. Section 209 Attachment 8, Table 5 indicates a minimum of 10-acre tract size, and no listing of a minimum lot size, while the proposed ordinance says a minimum lot area of 2 acres...
would be required. The township’s zoning ordinance indicates that when two standards conflict, the standard with greater restrictions would apply (Section 209-3). This would essentially render the 2-acre minimum null, as the 10-acre minimum would apply instead. What is the intent of the 2-acre minimum, when the FM District already has a greater standard? If it is the intent that a 2-acre minimum lot size be the standard, it may need to be expressly stated that the 2-acre minimum will supersede the area and dimensional requirements of Section 209, Attachment 8, Table 5.

In addition, the MPM District requires a minimum tract area of 50 acres, and a minimum lot area of 5 acres. The same issue may apply regarding the 2-acre minimum lot size for a grower/processor, although there are several properties in the MPM district which are greater than 50 acres.

4. Disposal plan—The proposed ordinance includes a provision that requires growers and grower/processors to provide a disposal plan for township approval for any medical marijuana remnants and byproducts. While the Medical Marijuana Act does require that a grower/processor or a dispensary have a system to track waste as a part of the required electronic tracking system, the Act does not require that disposal plans be submitted to each municipality. Any medical marijuana waste will be regulated by the Department of Health according to their standards, as a part of the permitting and licensing requirements to operate a medical marijuana facility.

Requiring a disposal plan be approved by the township may be troublesome if the township staff reviewing the plan does not have any expertise in medical waste or medical marijuana. Additionally, this does not provide any standards or guidance as to what an acceptable disposal plan might be, which could create uncertainty and confusion for both the applicant and reviewer.

We suggest this be treated similarly to other medical waste, such as that from a pharmacy. Pharmacies are not required to provide any sort of waste disposal plan, at least not under the provisions of the zoning ordinance, but are subject to other health, safety, and security regulations not covered within the zoning ordinance.

5. Editorial comments

a. Section 209-26 and Section 209-30 are not consistent in terminology of the proposed use. Section 209-26 permits a medical marijuana grower, while Section 209-30 permits a medical marijuana grower/processor. Both sections should permit a grower/processor in order to maintain consistency. We have spoken to the township solicitor and it is our understanding that this is a typographical error which will be fixed. Section 209-42 (Parking) should also be fixed so that there is only a medical marijuana grower/processor.

b. Very few other special exception uses have a lengthy list of conditions cited within Article IV, District Regulations (Sections 209-11 through 209-33.4) section of the zoning ordinance. Perhaps the township should consider creating a new subsection within the special exceptions section of the zoning ordinance (Section 209-50) for medical marijuana, and referencing that section rather than spelling out each regulation
within each zoning section, as they are each nearly identical. This is done for Wireless Communications equipment (Section 209-50.2) and other special exception uses. This could simplify the ordinance and make it read with more consistency.

c. The placement of the new medical marijuana language within each zoning section is not consistent. Section 209-23 (HC District) already contains a subsection for special exceptions, and a new paragraph is added to that existing subsection. Section 209-26 (FM District) does not already contain a subsection for special exceptions. A new section is inserted as B-1 to be special exceptions. And for Section 209-30 (MPM), which also does not contain a special exception subsection, a new section J is added. Where new subsections are being added, in one instance the subsection is inserted as B-1, where in the other the subsection is inserted after all other subsections with a new letter J. Perhaps B-1 should be inserted as a new letter G.

d. For 209-30, there already is a subsection ‘J’. This new section should be a subsection ‘L’, as that is the next available letter.

e. Paragraph (a) for both Section 209-26 (FM) and 209-30 (MPM) reads that “a medical marijuana grower/processor may not operate on the same site as a facility used for growing and processing medical marijuana.” This is likely an error and intended to read that a “medical marijuana grower/processor may not be located on the same site as a medical marijuana dispensary.”

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.

CND:dc

cc: Lauren Gallagher, Esquire, Rudolph Clarke LLC (via email)
Thomas A. Bennett, Zoning Officer/CCEO Falls Township (via email)
Jim Sullivan, T&M Associates, Township Engineer
Peter Gray, Township Manager (via e-mail)
CONFIDENTIAL — NOT FOR RELEASE

MEMORANDUM

TO: Northampton Township Board of Supervisors
    Northampton Township Planning Commission

FROM: Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Proposal to Amend the Zoning Ordinance—Medical Marijuana

Applicant: Northampton Township Board of Supervisors
Received: October 3, 2016
Hearing Date: November 16, 2016

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 November 2, 2016.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposed Action: Amend the township zoning ordinance by adding definitions, uses, and standards for medical marijuana dispensaries and grower/processors, which are to be permitted by conditional use approval in the I-1 Planned Industrial/Office District.

Proposed Zoning Provisions: The proposed amendment will add the following definitions to Part 2, Definitions: “Department of Health,” “Medical Marijuana Act,” “Medical Marijuana Dispensary,” and “Medical Marijuana Grower/Processor.” Section 27-602.B(6) is amended to add “Medical Marijuana Dispensary” and “Medical Marijuana Grower/Processor” to be permitted by conditional use approval. Part 11, Supplemental Regulation, is amended to add off-street parking requirements for the Medical Marijuana Dispensary and Medical Marijuana Grower/Processor uses as follows:

- Dispensary—1 parking space per 200 square feet of gross floor area
- Grower/Processor—1 parking space per 500 square feet of gross floor area

Conditional use requirements for a Medical Marijuana Dispensary or Medical Marijuana Grower/Processor include:

- Proof of registration with the Department of Health.
- A minimum lot size of 2 acres.
• A 1,000-foot setback from schools, day care centers, places of worship, public parks, and community centers.
• Hours of operation shall be from 9 am to 9 pm.
• The use must operate entirely within an indoor, enclosed, and secure facility.
• No exterior sales and no sidewalk displays.
• No drive-thru services.
• No radio or television advertisements.
• A security plan that would demonstrate how the facility will maintain effective security and control, as required by Section 1102 of the Medical Marijuana Act.

Existing Zoning Provisions: There are currently no definitions or any standards within the township’s zoning ordinance addressing medical marijuana dispensaries or growers/processors.

COMMENTS

The zoning provisions proposed should comply with the State’s Medical Marijuana Act as well as with the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code. Therefore, we are relying on the township to ensure that the proposed regulations are consistent with these laws and any other applicable laws prior to enactment. Prior to adoption, we offer the following comments for consideration:

1. **Prohibitions/restrictions**—Section 2017(1) of the Medical Marijuana Act states that the grower/processor shall meet the same municipal zoning and land use requirements as other manufacturing, processing, and production facilities that are located in the same zoning district. Section 2017(2) states that dispensary shall meet the same municipal zoning and land use requirements as other commercial facilities that are located in the same zoning district. As the Act is written, it is unclear if a zoning ordinance can impose restrictions and prohibitions on a medical marijuana dispensary or grower/processor that are not already imposed on any other commercial uses or manufacturing, processing, and production facility uses in the same zoning district.

   For instance, the Act requires both dispensaries and grower/processors to operate within an indoor, enclosed, and secure facility, but there are no prohibitions or restrictions on exterior sales, sidewalk displays, or drive-thru services. Proposed Section 27-602.B(6)(e) of the proposed amendment would prohibit sidewalk displays and drive-through services for medical marijuana dispensary or grower/processor. However, within the I-1 Planned Industrial/Office District, which is the only zoning district that permits a dispensary or grower/processor, the township’s zoning ordinance does not restrict any use (commercial or industrial) from exterior advertising or possessing drive-thru facilities.

   Section 27-602.B(6)(e) also restricts a dispensary or grower/processor from being advertised on television or radio. The Medical Marijuana Act does not specifically prohibit dispensaries or grower/processors from advertising on television or radio, but reserves the power to restrict advertising and marketing to the Pennsylvania Department of Health. The Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code does not authorize municipalities to enact these type of restrictions on television or radio advertising through the township’s zoning powers.
Currently, the Pennsylvania Health Department is developing temporary regulations that may provide guidance for these facilities in the future. The township solicitor should closely evaluate the proposed amendment in light of current and future Medical Marijuana Act regulations and determine if additional restrictions/prohibitions can be imposed that are not imposed for other similar uses in the same districts. If township officials determine that additional restrictions/prohibitions can be imposed they should consider Comment 2 below.

2. **Disposal plan**—The proposed ordinance includes a provision that requires growers and grower/processors to provide a disposal plan for township approval for any medical marijuana remnants and byproducts. While the Medical Marijuana Act does require that a grower/processor or a dispensary have a system to track waste as a part of the required electronic tracking system, the Act does not require that disposal plans be submitted to each municipality. Any medical marijuana waste will be regulated by the Department of Health according to their standards, as a part of the permitting and licensing requirements to operate a medical marijuana facility.

Requiring a disposal plan be approved by the township may be troublesome if the township staff reviewing the plan does not have any expertise in medical waste or medical marijuana. Additionally, this does not provide any standards or guidance as to what an acceptable disposal plan might be, which could create uncertainty and confusion for both the applicant and reviewer.

We suggest this be treated similarly to other medical waste, such as that from a pharmacy. Pharmacies are not required to provide any sort of waste disposal plan, at least not under the provisions of the zoning ordinance, but are subject to other health, safety, and security regulations not covered within the zoning 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.

MAR:dc

cc: Robert Pellegrino, Township Manager (via email)
    Michael Solomon, Township Director of Planning and Zoning
    Joseph Pizzo, Township Solicitor
MEMORANDUM

TO: Northampton Township Board of Supervisors
    Northampton Township Planning Commission

FROM: Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Proposal to Amend the Zoning Ordinance—Transient Dwellings

Applicant: Northampton Township Board of Supervisors
Received: October 3, 2016
Hearing Date: November 16, 2016

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 November 2, 2016.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposed Action: Amend the township zoning ordinance to permit transient dwellings in the I-1 Planned Industrial/Office District by special exception.

Proposed Zoning Provisions: The proposal will amend Part 2, Definitions by adding definitions of “Transient Dwelling” and “Lessor” and revising the definition of “Family.” Section 27-602.C(6) is amended to add Subsection (3) to permit Transient Dwellings by special exception, subject to the requirement that all rentals and number of lessees for each unit must be reported to the Township Zoning Director.

COMMENTS

The proposed ordinance appears aimed at “recovery houses” or other group living arrangements that permit individuals to access shelter and food until they are able to recover from addiction problems or other life-altering setbacks. We recommend the township address the following comments in its consideration of the proposal:

1. Definitions—The proposed ordinance defines a “family” as “one person, or two or more persons related by blood, foster relationship, marriage or adoption, and in addition, any domestic servants or gratuitous guest thereof, or a group of not more than five persons who need not be so related, and in addition, domestic servants or gratuitous guests thereof, who are living together in a single, nonprofit and nontransient dwelling unit and maintain a common household with single cooking facilities. A roomer, boarder, lodger, or other transient person shall not be considered a member of the family.” The proposed ordinance
defines a “transient dwelling” as “a dwelling unit in which between six and sixteen person who are not considered a family live together and maintain a common household with single cooking facilities.”

We are concerned over the lack of a clear rationale for permitting five unrelated individuals living together to be defined as a family, but not permitting six to sixteen unrelated individuals living together to be defined as a family. We recommend the township avoid defining transient dwellings on the basis of the number of individuals and focus on the temporary living arrangements, regardless if the residents are related or unrelated. For example, such a definition could be “housing provided for transient persons, defined as occupants for less than (designated time period) consecutive days.” To further distinguish it from bed and breakfasts, hotels, motels, and boarding houses, the definition could define the use based on nonprofit status, common cooking areas, and housekeeping duties. The township could rely on standards for building occupancy in the township’s building code, if they exist, so that no upper limit would have to be included in the definitions.

2. **District intent and dimensional requirements**—A residential use is not an appropriate use for the I-1 Planned Industrial/Office District. Section 27-601 of the zoning ordinance (Specific Intent) states:

   It is the intention of Northampton Township for this district to be a thriving business and technology center to further enhance the local and regional economy. It is further a goal and objective to provide adequate sites for selected industrial uses which will not cause adverse environmental impacts. It is further the specific intent to encourage development that is compatible, unified, and coordinated for all members of the center.

The I-1 Planned Industrial/Office District requires the following dimensions for permitted uses:

- Minimum overall site area for planned industrial office use: 10 acres.
- Minimum lot area for individual principal buildings within the above site: 2 acres.
- Minimum lot width at building setback line: 200 feet.
- Minimum lot width at the street right-of-way line (for cul-de-sacs only): 75 feet.
- Maximum building coverage: 30 percent of lot area.
- Maximum impervious surface ratio: 70 percent of lot area.
- Minimum setback for principal or accessory structure from any street: 100 feet.

This district is clearly aimed at office and industrial uses and is not appropriate for residential living arrangements. We further note that the district is located far from the commercial and institutional centers of the township, making it difficult for future residents to access needed services.

We also note that parking requirements for the proposed Transient Dwelling have not been provided.

3. **Bucks County Recovery House Association**—We recognize that “recovery houses” in Bucks County are mostly unregulated. One organization that has attempted to rectify this is the Bucks County Recovery House Association, which is an organization of owners who agree
to abide by a set of standards set in place by the association’s Board, including house inspections, proper permitting, policies and procedures, and grievance procedures for residents. Members include:

- Owners of Approved Recovery Houses
- Bucks County Drug & Alcohol Commission
- Bucks County Probation & Parole Department
- Bucks County Department of Corrections
- The Council of Southeastern Pennsylvania / Pro-Act

One additional requirement the township could include in the proposed amendment would be membership in this organization. We would also encourage the township to work with representatives of the Bucks County Recovery House Association to help draft more reasonable zoning requirements for this type of use.

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: Robert Pellegrino, Township Manager (via email)
    Michael Solomon, Township Director of Planning and Zoning
    Joseph Pizzo, Township Solicitor
MEMORANDUM

TO: Perkasie Borough Council
Perkasie Borough Planning Commission

FROM: Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Proposal to Amend the Zoning Ordinance—Signs
Applicant: Borough Council
Received: October 20, 2016
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 November 2, 2016.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposed Action: Amend various sections of Article IX Signs of the zoning ordinance to add provisions stating that directional, parking, and warning signs shall not be considered in calculating sign area; add regulations for temporary signage for new developments, and provide additional regulations for projecting signs and parallel signs.

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. **Content-based distinctions**—Prior to the borough taking action on the proposed amendment, we recommend that the borough solicitor evaluate whether changes should be made to the proposed sign requirements based on the Supreme Court’s recent ruling on Reed v. Town of Gilbert, which stated that sign regulations cannot have content-based distinctions.

2. **Parallel and projecting signs**—Proposed Sections 186-80.A(4) (which should be (6); see Comment 4) and 186-80.E(7) state that a use occupying a single structure shall not have a parallel sign and a projecting sign. We note that those sign types perform different functions. A parallel sign is best viewed from across the street or while driving down the street past a
business. Projecting signs are small and are seen by people walking on the sidewalk. Well-designed and properly-sized signs can add charm to the streetscape as well as identify businesses. We believe both sign types would be appropriate on a building, and visual clutter would be avoided, if the projecting sign size is limited and the total area of the two signs does not exceed the permitted maximum sign area for the structure.

3. **Awning or canopy signs**—Existing zoning ordinance Section 186-81.1 Awning or canopy sign, states that when a canopy, awning, or similar structure is affixed with any lettering, design, or symbol intended to advertise a business, the total area of such lettering, design, or symbol shall conform to the size requirements for a projecting sign in that district. As related to Comment 2, it should be clarified whether Section 186-80.A(4) (which should be (6)) means that if a parallel sign is utilized for a use in a single structure, then the use shall not also have an awning or canopy sign and if Section 186-80.E(7) means that if an awning or canopy sign is utilized for a use occupying a single structure, the use shall not have a parallel sign.

4. **Editorial comment**—Under 4.A on Page 2, the last three subpoints, (2), (3), and (4), should be renumbered as (4), (5), and (6) to avoid duplication of numbering.

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.

MW:dc

cc: Nate Fox, Esq., Begley, Carlin & Mandio, Borough Solicitor
Andrea Coaxum, Borough Manager (via email)
Brandy McKeever, Perkasie Code Enforcement Administrator (via email)
CONFIDENTIAL — NOT FOR RELEASE

November 2, 2016
BCPC #36-16-1

MEMORANDUM

TO: Richland Township Board of Supervisors
    Richland Township Planning Commission

FROM: Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Proposal to Amend the Zoning Ordinance—B1 Single-Family Detached Dwelling and B1A Single-Family Detached Dwelling Exemption

Applicant: Board of Supervisors
Received: October 3, 2016
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 November 2, 2016.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposed Action: Amend the township’s zoning ordinance by reducing the yard and setback requirements for Single-Family Detached Dwellings which would be located on the same property as a Riding Academy (A5), Commercial Kennel (A6), or Farm Unit (A8), from the setbacks applied to Use B1A (Single-Family Detached Exemption) to Use B1 (Single-Family Detached Dwelling). Also proposed is to allow Use A4 (Forestry) as an accessory use to Use B1 (Single-Family Detached Dwelling), to allow a Kennel-Hobby (Use H12) as an accessory use to Use B1 (Single-Family Detached Dwelling), to allow a Bed and Breakfast (H14) as an accessory use to Use B1 (Single-Family Detached Dwelling), and to revise the requirements for mobile/manufactured homes within Use B5 (Performance Standard Subdivision).

Proposed Zoning Provisions: Chapter 27, Section 405 (Use Regulations), subsection A5, A6, and A8, will be amended to change the yard and setback requirements for dwellings from those which apply to B1A, to B1. Chapter 27, Section 405.B.B1 will be amended to include language to permit Forestry as an accessory use, under all the conditions associated with Use A4. Chapter 27, Section 405.B.B5 will be amended to change the requirements for a mobile/manufactured home from the standards of B1A, to B1 Single-Family Detached Dwellings. Chapter 27, Section 405.H.H12 will be amended to allow a Kennel-Hobby as an accessory use to Use B1. Chapter 27, Section 405.H.H14 will be amended to allow a Bed and Breakfast as an accessory use to Use B1. Chapter 27, Section 1205.G will be amended to include Use B1 in the list of mobile/manufactured home uses in the table which lists the number of school children per type of dwelling unit.
COMMENTS

We recognize that the proposal appears to be generally consistent with the ordinance requirements as presented by the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, but we offer the following comments for consideration by the township prior to adoption:

1. **Yard and setback requirements**—The proposed amendment is to change the yard and setback requirements for single-family dwellings on certain properties from the B1A use standards to the B1 use standards.

   If a single-family detached dwelling on a Riding Academy, Commercial Kennel, or Farm Unit were to be developed under the B1 use standards, rather than the standards for a B1A use, the required setbacks would be significantly less. It appears that the general intent of this ordinance amendment is to reduce the restrictions on single-family dwellings in these circumstances, making them more consistent with the standards for most other single-family dwellings in the township.

   Although the proposed setbacks under the B1 use standards in some instances are 1/3 of what the standards are under the B1A use, the impacts of the change should be minimal. The proposed changes will only apply to homes which would be accessory uses to a Riding Academy, Farm, or Commercial Kennel, all of which require large properties and are limited in number throughout the township. The change will not impact any general residential development or subdivisions.

   Currently, a single-family detached dwelling under the standards of the B1A use has a specific set of yard and setback requirements, where there are no yard or setback requirements specific to the B1 use. All single-family detached dwellings under B1 use would use the yard and setback requirements for the zoning district in which they are located. As the ordinance amendment is drafted, it appears to be referencing standards which do not exist. An alternative is to reference the yard and setback requirements of the chart in Section 27-513 rather than reference B1 which has no unique yard and setback standards.

2. **Accessory Uses**—The proposed ordinance amendments will permit Use A4 (Forestry) and Use H14 (Bed and Breakfast) as accessory uses to Use B1.

   Currently, a single-family dwelling is not permitted as an accessory use to A4 (Forestry). The township should consider permitting Use B1 (Single-Family Detached Dwelling) as an accessory to Use A4 (Forestry), instead of or in addition to permitting Forestry as an accessory to a single-family dwelling. Many of the other agricultural uses in the township do permit a single-family home or a farm house on the property as an accessory use. The same language which is used in the ordinance for Use A5, A6, and A8 permitting Use B1 as an accessory use, could be used for this. It seems unlikely that any property which could meet the standards for Forestry Use (A4) would have the forestry use as an accessory use to a single-family detached dwelling. It seems more likely that the dwelling would be accessory to the forestry use.

   The proposed change to permit forestry (A4) on single-family residential properties may have some impact on residential neighborhoods, but there are strict conditions which are placed on any forestry use which are already in place that should mitigate any issues.
When reading the proposed language to permit a Bed and Breakfast (H14) as an accessory to a single-family detached dwelling, it is unclear if this would permit a second structure, one as the single-family dwelling and one as the B&B. If it is the intent that the B&B be an accessory use within the primary structure of the single-family dwelling, this may need to be stated directly in the ordinance. If the intent is to permit two structures, that also may need to be expressly stated, and any area or dimensional requirements for a second structure may need to be included as well.

3. **Editorial Comment**—There is a typographical error in the proposed text for the amendment to Section 27-405.H.H14(a). The text reads “B1A Single-Family Detached Exception.” This should read “Exemption.”

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.

CND:dc

cc: Lincoln Treadwell, Esq., Township Solicitor
    Paul Stepanoff, Township Manager (via e-mail)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Warminster Township Board of Supervisors
   Warminster Township Planning Commission

FROM: Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Proposal to Amend the Zoning Map Change from R-1 Residential District to C-2 Commercial District

Applicant: Board of Supervisors
Received: October 14, 2016
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 April 6, 2016.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposed Action: Change the zoning of TMP #49-24-26 from R-1 Residential District to C-2 Commercial District.

Location & Size of Tract: The 3.94-acre parcel is located on the northeastern side of Street Road approximately 900 feet west of its intersection with Davisville Road.

Proposed Zoning Provisions: C-2 Commercial-2 District permits Medical or dental office/clinic, Business or professional office, Retail shop, Service business, Bank, Savings and Loan Association, Restaurant, Repair shop, Veterinary office, Motor vehicle fueling station, Motor vehicle repair garage, and others on lots of 1 acre or more. Conditional uses permitted include Day care center, Car wash, Motor vehicle sales, Large retail store, and Shopping center.

Existing Zoning Provisions: The R-1 Residential 1 District permits single-family detached dwellings on lots of 20,000 square feet or more. The maximum density permitted is 1.6 units per acre.

COMMENTS

1. **Comprehensive Plan**—The future land use plan of the Warminster Township Comprehensive Plan 2006 classifies the site as commercial and policy for retail and office commercial uses is
provided. At the time the plan was written, the township had a number of vacant stores, and growth of big box stores was taking away from smaller locally-owned stores. The plan recommended against rezoning to permit additional commercial uses and stated the most effective way to minimize the predatory behavior of large retailers and preserve existing stores is to restrict commercial uses and zoning to what exists now. Rezoning additional area allows for more commercial uses and growth in tax revenue, but it increases competition for existing stores and may increase the problem of closures.

The proposed zoning is not consistent with the comprehensive plan. If the township adopts the zoning change we recommend that the comprehensive plan be amended.

2. Adjacent land use—The Jefferson on the Creek multifamily residential complex abuts the site to the north. The Davisville Shopping Center commercial use abuts the site to the southeast. Single-family detached dwelling residential uses on lots of 10,000 square feet or more abut the site to the east and lots of 10,000 square feet to 1-acre to the west and south across Street Road. The proposed zoning change would permit uses which are consistent with that to the southeast.

3. Adjacent zoning—The north side of the site abuts the R-4 Residential 4 District which permits multifamily dwellings on sites of 5 acres or more. The southeastern side of the site abuts the C-2 Commercial district which permits retail stores and other commercial uses on lots of 1 acre or more. The R-1 Residential 1 District abuts the northeastern and southeastern side of the site and permits single-family detached dwellings on lots of 20,000 square feet or more and a density of 1.6 units per acre or less. To the west, the site abuts the R-2 Residential 2 District which permits single-family detached dwellings on lots of 12,500 square feet or more and a density of 2.2 units per acre. Section 1201.G of the zoning ordinance requires a 25-foot-wide buffer yard along any zoning district boundary. The proposed zoning would be consistent with adjacent C-2 zoning to the southeast. Required buffering would mitigate impacts of any new development on residential parcels to the northeast and northwest.

4. Site development—Environmental restrictions significantly diminish the amount of the site that may be developed. The 3.94-acre parcel is almost completely forested and contains a portion of the Southampton Creek and associated wetlands. The stream lies in a shallow valley. A stub street, Glen Road, abuts the northern side of the site.

Zoning ordinance Section 2103, Environmental Standards, permits removal of no more than 30 percent of forested land. Wetlands shall be protected at a rate of 100 percent. No land shall be disturbed within the 100-foot-wide riparian buffer. A 25-foot-wide required buffer is required along all zoning district boundaries and would mitigate impacts upon adjacent residential uses.

The eastern area of the site abuts a single-family detached neighborhood and a stub street. This area may be developed by right for a single-family dwelling under existing zoning. The stream bisecting the site and riparian buffer would limit development in the center of the site and along the Street Road frontage. Development of the site for commercial uses under C-2 zoning would be difficult. The subject site may be joined with adjacent TMP #49-24-24, providing land area for additional commercial development related to the adjacent shopping center.
Summary

The township comprehensive plan recommends that no additional land be rezoned to minimize impacts upon existing retail; however, the site has limited commercial development potential due to natural resource restrictions. The proposed C-2 zoning would be consistent with zoning and land use to the southeast. Required buffering would mitigate impacts to adjacent residential districts and uses. Using the subject site as land area for the adjacent shopping center would be reasonable.

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:dc

cc: Michael Savona, Esq., Eastburn and Gray, PC, Municipal Solicitor
    Gregg Schuster, Municipal Manager (via email)
PERTINENT INFORMATION

Site Characteristics, Natural Features: The site is wooded and contains a small creek and associated wetlands.

Existing Land Use: Vacant

Surrounding Land Use:

- Northwest: Multifamily residential
- Southeast: Commercial
- South: Single-family detached
- Southwest: Single-family detached

Surrounding Zoning:

- Northwest: R-4 Residential
- Southeast: C-2 Commercial
- South: R-1 Residential
- Southwest: R-2 Residential

Zoning History: The proposed zoning amendment states the property was zoned for commercial use from at least 1973 until the adoption of the current township zoning map in September 2009.

County Comprehensive Plan: The Bucks County Comprehensive Plan (2011) classifies the subject site as Mature Suburban Area which are medium density areas with mostly single-family residential development. 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. Despite the stagnation in population growth Mature Suburban Areas remain very important to the county because of the large number of residents and the extent of infrastructure and public services within these areas.

Because these areas are close to build-out and have a limited amount of vacant land, redevelopment and revitalization of underutilized land will be the primary driver of growth. 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 Comprehensive Plan: The future land use plan of the Warminster Township Comprehensive Plan 2006 classifies the site as commercial and policy for retail and office commercial uses is provided. At the time the plan was written, the township had a number of vacant stores. Growth of big box stores was taking away from smaller locally owned stores. The plan recommend against rezoning to permit additional commercial uses.

The township contains individual office buildings which are generally single use, and they are usually vacant in the evenings and on weekends. Additional office development in the township should be mixed with other uses and be designed to support use of transit by commuters and have a streetscape that is friendly to walkers and motorrists.

Municipal Sewage Facilities Plan: The Final Environmental Impact Statement Horsham-Warminster-Warrington, Pennsylvania Wastewater treatment Facilities 1980 is the official Act 537 Plan for the majority of Warminster Township. This area is served by the Warminster Municipal Authority Log College Treatment Plant.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>BCPC Number</th>
<th>Tax Parcel Numbers</th>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Submission Level</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bristol Township</td>
<td>12190</td>
<td>(5-46-388)</td>
<td>Republic Bank</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Commercial Land Development: 3,016 Square-feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bristol Township</td>
<td>12187</td>
<td>(5-13-95 &amp; -96)</td>
<td>Seeberger</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>2 Residential Lots Lot Line Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckingham Township</td>
<td>12146</td>
<td>(6-6-39)</td>
<td>Trycieki Tract</td>
<td>RP</td>
<td>2 Single-family Lots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Southampton Township</td>
<td>12189</td>
<td>(21-7-1)</td>
<td>Feasterville</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Commercial Land Development: 125,753 Square-feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middletown Township</td>
<td>11077-A</td>
<td>(22-48-12)</td>
<td>McCafferty Kia</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Commercial Land Development: 9,300 Square-feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middletown Township</td>
<td>9708-A</td>
<td>(22-5-7)</td>
<td>Stone Farm</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>122 Single-family Lots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milford Township</td>
<td>10074-B</td>
<td>(23-10-90 &amp; -100-1)</td>
<td>Willauer Annexation</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Lot Line Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milford Township</td>
<td>11660-H</td>
<td>(23-10-175-1 &amp; -15-99)</td>
<td>Milford Village - Phase 2</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>172 Multifamily Units Commercial Land Development: 93,000 Square-feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Britain Borough</td>
<td>12195</td>
<td>(25-5-50)</td>
<td>Kirk Tract</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Industrial Land Development: 44,600 Square-feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newtown Township</td>
<td>9262-A</td>
<td>(29-3-24)</td>
<td>Newtown Shopping Center</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Commercial Land Development: 11,218 Square-feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richland Township</td>
<td>8754-E</td>
<td>(36-17-32-1)</td>
<td>US Cold Storage</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>Industrial Land Development: 277,818 Square feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solebury Township</td>
<td>5985-B</td>
<td>(41-28-67-3)</td>
<td>Riverview</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Commercial Land Development: 39,659 Square-feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Southampton Township</td>
<td>12002-A</td>
<td>(48-22-20-46, -63, -64 &amp; -65)</td>
<td>Mill Creek Estates</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Lot Line Changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipality</td>
<td>BCPC Number</td>
<td>Tax Parcel Numbers</td>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>Submission Level</td>
<td>Proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Southampton Township</td>
<td>12188</td>
<td>(48-17-34)</td>
<td>Kole Tract</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Commercial Land Development: 19,500 Square-feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warminster Township</td>
<td>12191</td>
<td>(49-18-148-2 &amp; -148-3)</td>
<td>Sansalone</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>1 Multifamily Lot 1 Single-family Lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warminster Township</td>
<td>12194</td>
<td>(49-9-87)</td>
<td>Guerra HLA, Inc.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Commercial Land Development: 1,930 Square-feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warrington Township</td>
<td>9268-A</td>
<td>(50-23-141-1)</td>
<td>Shihadeh</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>2 Single-family Lots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warwick Township</td>
<td>12156</td>
<td>(51-3-31-3, -31-4 &amp; -31-5)</td>
<td>Central Park at Warwick</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>13 Single-family Lots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrightstown Township</td>
<td>12192</td>
<td>(53-12-28)</td>
<td>Worthington Mill Estates</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>3 Single-family Lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrightstown Township</td>
<td>10813</td>
<td>(53-15-5)</td>
<td>Black Oak Place (Anchor Nursery)</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>10 Single-family Lots 1 Commercial Lot</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEMORANDUM

TO: Bristol Township Council
Bristol Township Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Preliminary Plan of Land Development for Republic Bank
TMP #5-46-388
Applicant: Republic Bank
Owner: YMCA of Lower Bucks County
Plan Dated: September 1, 2016
Date Received: September 20, 2016

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 3,016-square-foot bank with three drive-thru lanes on a 1.05-acre parcel. A total of 22 parking spaces is proposed. Public water and sewer facilities are intended to serve the development.

Location: Along the northern side of S. Oxford Valley Road, between Saxony Drive and S. Queen Anne Drive.

Zoning: C Commercial District permits financial establishments on a minimum lot area of 5,000 square feet with a minimum lot width of 50 feet at the building setback line. Maximum building coverage and maximum impervious surface ratio for sites in this district are 35 and 70 percent, respectively.

Information on Plan Sheet 1 of 17 indicates that the following variances from the zoning ordinance were obtained from the Zoning Hearing Board on July 11, 2016: to permit 22 parking spaces where 26 spaces would be required (Section 205-120.A); to permit a freestanding sign to be 64 feet instead of the maximum permitted 60 feet (Section 205-165.A(1)(a)); to permit a freestanding sign height to be 17 feet where a maximum of 12 feet is permitted (Section 205-165.A(1)(b)); to permit signs on the rear of the building façade and to exceed the total square footage of all building signs (Section 205-165.A(2)(a)); and to permit 7 directional signs and 1 freestanding sign (Section 205-165.A(1)).
Present Use: Recreation (playground/open space for adjacent YMCA.)

COMMENTS

1. **Site capacity calculations**—Section 205-107 of the zoning ordinance requires the submission of site capacity calculations with all applications for subdivision and land development. The plan submission does not include the required site capacity calculations.

2. **Access on S. Oxford Valley Road**—The plan shows two full-movement driveways: one accessing S. Oxford Valley Road and one accessing S. Queen Anne Drive. Given the volume of traffic along Oxford Valley Road and insufficient storage space for vehicles in the existing left turn lane, it is recommended that the feasibility of restricting the Oxford Valley Road access to a right-in/right-out only access be investigated. We feel the full movement intersection along Oxford Valley Road, as proposed, could lead to increased safety issues due to a higher number of turning conflicts.

3. **Special setback**—Section 205-130.A of the zoning ordinance requires a special setback of 100 feet from Oxford Valley Road. This required setback is to be measured from the center line of the existing right-of-way. It appears that the plan does meet this setback requirement. However, it is recommended that the centerline of Oxford Valley Road be indicated on the plan to verify compliance with this requirement. Also, it is recommended that the special setback requirement be noted along with the other setback information within the Zoning Data indicated on Plan Sheet 1 of 17.

4. **Landscaping requirements**
   a. **Street trees**—Section 177-51.A.(1)(c) of the subdivision and land development ordinance requires street trees to be planted from 25 to 50 feet apart depending upon the size of the tree chosen. Based upon a street frontage distance of approximately 574 feet, between 12 and 23 street trees should be provided, at minimum. While landscaping is provided along the adjacent roadways, only four street trees are provided. The plan should be revised to comply with this requirement.
   
   b. **Parking lot landscaping**—Section 509.q of the subdivision and land development ordinance requires that street trees be provided at the rate of not less than two trees for every 10 parking spaces, which shall be in addition to any other requirements for buffering or landscaping. Based on 22 parking spaces, four trees would be required to meet the parking lot landscaping requirement, in addition to required street trees. The plan should be revised to indicate compliance with this requirement.

5. **Buffer yard**—Section 177-51 requires a 30-foot-wide planted buffer between a proposed retail and consumer use and adjacent residential areas. A 30-foot-wide buffer yard is shown along the site’s northern boundary, between the proposed bank and adjacent residential uses. However, proposed buffer plantings are shown within only the interior 20 feet of the buffer since the exterior 10 feet is identified to be a utility easement. Township officials should determine if this arrangement will adequately buffer the adjacent residences to the north of the site.
6. **Tree protection**—The Landscape Plan (Plan Sheet 13 of 17), as well as Sheets 4, 5, 7, and 16, show the proposed location of the tree protection fence for existing trees to be preserved. However, the proposed location of the fencing is shown within the dripline, close to the trunk of one of the two large trees to remain. A substantial area within the dripline is proposed to be developed with pavement and the stormwater management underground storage. Disturbance of the tree’s root system within the dripline will likely lead to the death of the tree.

Sections 205-11 of the zoning ordinance and 177-10 of the subdivision and land development ordinance require that the tree protection zone be 15 feet from the trunk of the tree to be retained, or the distance from the trunk to the dripline, whichever is greater. Section 177-52.A(4) of the subdivision and land development ordinance states that the area within the tree protection zone shall not be built upon, nor shall materials be stored there either temporarily or permanently. It is recommended the plan be revised to eliminate any disturbance within the dripline of trees that are intended to remain on the site in compliance with these ordinance requirements.

Also, a tree protection detail, consistent with the requirements in Section 177-52 of the subdivision and land development ordinance, should be provided on the plan.

7. **Trash receptacles**—If an outdoor refuse collection station is intended, the plan should be revised to show the location of the collection station and the required screening and landscaping in compliance with Section 177-55.K.(2) of the subdivision and land development ordinance.

8. **Stormwater management**

   a. **Required study**—A stormwater management plan should be submitted for the proposal in accordance with Sections 177-50 and 177-91.D.(18) of the subdivision and land development ordinance.

   b. **Maintenance**—The plan shows two underground storage chambers for stormwater. Maintenance is extremely important to the proper functioning of underground basins and tanks. Therefore, we recommend that the township require the developer to submit a detailed plan outlining specific tasks for proper long- and short-term maintenance, as well as the manufacturer’s recommendations regarding maintenance. Also, information on the projected life span of the facilities, as well as projected wear-down time of basin components should be provided to the township. It is also recommended that frequent observation of the facilities occur to avoid problems with standing water in the event an obstruction occurs within the tank or outlet.

9. **Fire lanes**—Section 177.M of the subdivision and land development ordinance requires that for nonresidential development, fire lanes shall be established as required by the Fire Prevention Board, pursuant to the provision of the Fire Prevention Code. The plan does not identify any proposed fire lanes. The governing body, along with the fire marshal, should ensure this issue is adequately addressed.
This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the November 2, 2016, 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:dc

cc: Republic Bank
Stantec Consulting Services, Inc.
Kurt Schroeder, P.E., Gilmore & Associates, Township Engineer
Randy Flager, Esq., Flager & Associates, Township Solicitor
William McCauley, Bristol Township Managing Director (via email)
Colleen Costello, Bristol Township Department of Licenses and Inspections (via email)
Thomas Scott, Township Zoning Officer (via email)
October 12, 2016
BCPC #12187

MEMORANDUM

TO: Bristol Township Council
   Bristol Township Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Preliminary Plan of Subdivision for Seeberger
   TMP #5-13-95, -96
   Applicant: Charles W. Seeberger
   Owner: Same
   Plan Dated: August 12, 2016
   Date Received: September 13, 2016

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 TMP #5-13-96 into two lots and relocate an existing lot line and convey 2,500 square feet from TMP #5-13-95 to adjacent TMP #5-13-96. The proposal would create one additional residential lot (3 lots total). Single-family detached dwellings are intended to be constructed on proposed Lot 1 (7,500 square feet) and proposed Lot 2 (10,000 square feet). Proposed Lot 3 (17,500 square feet) contains an existing automobile detail garage. The plan indicates that no new construction is proposed on Lot 3 at this time. Public water and sewer facilities currently serve the existing business on Lot 3 and are intended to serve the proposed dwellings on Lots 1 and 2.

Location: At the western corner of the intersection of U.S. Route 13 and Franklin Avenue. The site has frontage on U.S. Route 13, Franklin Avenue, and Buchanan Street.

Zoning: C Commercial District permits various retail and service uses on a minimum lot size of 5,000 square feet with a minimum lot width of 50 feet at the building setback line. Maximum building coverage and maximum impervious surface ratio for sites in this district are 35 and 70 percent, respectively.

Present Use: Automobile detail garage.
COMMENTS

1. **Zoning**—Both existing parcels, TMPs #5-13-95 and 5-13-96, are currently zoned C Commercial. Single-family dwellings are not permitted in the C District; therefore, the dwellings intended to be constructed on proposed Lots 1 and 2 are not currently allowed and the subdivision plan, as proposed, should not be approved.

The plan does list regulations that pertain to the R-2 Residence District under the title “Proposed Zoning Requirements.” If the applicant’s intent is to request a zoning map change from C Commercial to R-2 Residence, an official request for a rezoning, consistent with the procedures outlined in Section 205-196 of the zoning ordinance, should be submitted to the township. Action on the proposed subdivision plan should not be considered until resolution of the zoning for the site.

2. **Request for variance**—Notes on Plan Sheet 1 of 3 indicate that the applicant is requesting a variance to allow a maximum impervious surface ratio of 89.49 percent instead of the maximum 70 percent permitted in the C Commercial District. This issue should be resolved before action is taken on the proposed subdivision.

3. **Requested waivers**—Notes on Plan Sheet 1 of 3 indicate that the applicant is requesting waivers from the following requirements of the Bristol Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance:

   177-35.B where a subdivision or land development 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
   177-43.A sidewalks shall 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.
   177-54.A curbs shall be provided on one side of all abutting streets *(reference should be to Section 177-45.A)*
   177-91.A(1) & 177-92.A.(1) plan shall be drawn at a scale of 1 inch equals 50 feet or 1 inch equals 100 feet
   177-91.C(3) & 177-92.C(3) the location, names, and widths of streets; the location and names of railroads; the location of sanitary sewers, storm drains, water mains, culverts, petroleum or petroleum product lines, gas lines, electric and telephone lines, fire hydrants, and all other utilities or significant manmade features on or within 200 feet of any part of the tract shall be shown on the plan.

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.
4. **Site capacity calculations**—Section 205-107 of the zoning ordinance requires the submission of site capacity calculations with all applications for subdivision and land developments. The plan submission does not include the required site capacity calculations.

5. **Buffer yard**—Section 205-109.C.(3) of the zoning ordinance 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. A portion of the parking area with 7 concrete bumpers, as well as part of a 6-foot chain link fenced-in area are located within the designated 30-foot buffer yard. These should be removed from the required buffer yard and the plan should be revised to indicate compliance with this ordinance requirement.

   In addition, Plan Sheet 2 of 3 indicates that the buffer yard will be landscaped per the township code. Section 205-109 of the zoning ordinance and Section 177-51.B of the subdivision and land development ordinance contain requirements for buffer yard plantings. The plan should be revised to provide specific information regarding the planting scheme and plant material intended so that compliance with the ordinance requirements can be verified.

6. **Off-street parking**

   a. **Proposed dwellings**—Section 205-120.A.(1) of the zoning ordinance requires two off-street parking spaces per dwelling unit. Compliance with this requirement should be verified.

   b. **Commercial use on Lot 3**—Proposed Lot 3 contains an existing automobile detail garage. In addition to the existing building, Lot 3 is shown to contain several concrete pads with much of the lot consisting of broken macadam. Prior to consideration to reducing the size of this lot, compliance with the off-street parking requirements in Section 205-120 of the zoning ordinance should be verified.

7. **Recreation land**—The plan should be revised to indicate how the subdivision would meet the recreation land requirements of Section 177-53 of the subdivision and land development ordinance and/or fee-in-lieu provisions in Section 177-53.C.

8. **Landscaping**—Proposed landscaping is shown on Plan Sheet 2 of 3. The plan should be revised to identify the types and sizes of trees proposed on the site. Compliance with the landscaping requirements in Section 177-51 of the subdivision and land development ordinance should be verified.

9. **Stormwater management**—The plan shows a proposed 15-foot wide by 15-foot long by 3-foot deep infiltration basin in each back yard for proposed Lots 1 and 2. However, there is nothing shown to indicate how stormwater will be addressed for Lot 3. The plan should be revised to address this issue.

   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 basins. 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.
In addition, any restrictions for the area containing the infiltration basins (e.g., placement of play structures, trees and shrubs, etc.) should be made clear to future homeowners in order to maintain proper function of the facilities and to avoid enforcement issues for the township.

10. **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:

   - **177-91.C.(5)** location, size and ownership of all underground utilities, and any rights-of-way or easements within the property.
   - **177-91.D.(6)** the proposed density
   - **177-91.D.(13)** a landscape plan showing proposed contours and required street trees, buffer, and plant schedule in accordance with Section 177-51 of the SALDO.

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 must be submitted for this proposed subdivision.

   This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the November 2, 2016, 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:dc

cc:  Charles W. Seeberger  
     J.F. Hamill Land Surveying  
     Kurt Schroeder, P.E., Gilmore & Associates, Township Engineer  
     Randy Flager, Esq., Flager & Associates, Township Solicitor  
     William McCauley, Bristol Township Managing Director (via email)  
     Colleen Costello, Bristol Township Department of Licenses and Inspections (via email)  
     Thomas Scott, Township Zoning Officer (via email)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Buckingham Township Board of Supervisors
Buckingham Township Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Revised Preliminary Subdivision Plan for Trycieki Tract
TMP #6-6-39
Applicant: Thomas and Susan Trycieki
Owner: Same
Plan Dated: January 25, 2016
Last Revised: September 10, 2016
Date Received: September 14, 2016

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 74.77-gross acre tract into two lots. TMP #6-6-39 will remain the parent tract with a gross lot size of 73.76-acres and Lot 1 will have a total of 3.69-gross acres. The parent tract (TMP #6-6-39) is subject to an agricultural conservation easement recorded with the County of Bucks on March 22, 2013. A dwelling unit is proposed on Lot 1 and a dwelling unit and various accessory structures exist on the parent tract. Both lots are to be served by individual on-lot water and sewerage facilities.

Location: East side of Long Lane, approximately 525 feet south of its intersection with Indian Spring Road. Bittersweet lane terminates at the tract along its northern property boundary.

Zoning: AG-2 Agriculture 2 District permits the uses B1 Detached Dwelling and B13 Preservation Development with Single Family Detached Dwellings.

Present Use: Agriculture and Residential.

COMMENTS

1. **Surrounding Features Plan**—The proposed Lot #1 total and net acres labeled on the Surrounding Features Plan, Sheet 4 of 14, are inconsistent with the total and net acres noted on the Record Plan, Sheet 2 of 14. The Surrounding Features Plan does not display the revised Bittersweet Lane right-of-way area. The numbers should be corrected prior to approval as required in SALDO Section 6.3.6.b.
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 must be submitted for the 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.

3. **Subdivision and land development ordinance requirements**—The plan may not meet 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 the November 2, 2016 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.

JSI:dc

cc: Thomas and Susan Trycieki
    Sharon K. Dotts, P.E., Gilmore and Associates, Inc.
    William Kozub, Esq.
    Dan Gray, P.E., Knight Engineering, Inc.
    Dana S. Cozza, Esquire, Township Manager (via email)
    Richard B. Harvey, Bucks County Agricultural Preservation Program
MEMORANDUM

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

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Preliminary Plan of Land Development for Feasterville Development
        TMP #21-7-1
        Applicant: Gator Feasterville Partners, Ltd.
        Owner: Same
        Plan Dated: September 13, 2016
        Date Received: September 14, 2016

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: Shopping center redevelopment on an 11.68-acre site to construct a 110,753-square-foot large retail box strip and two retail pads totaling 15,000 square feet. The plan proposes 546 parking spaces. Public water and sewer service the site.

Location: 176 West Street Road at the intersection with Pennsylvania Boulevard.

Zoning: C-2 Heavy Commercial District permits a variety of retail and commercial activities on lots of 1 acre or more. Large retail center (Use 41) is permitted by conditional use.

According to the plan, the following zoning ordinance variances were granted by the Lower Southampton Township Zoning Hearing Board on July 21, 2016:

Section 27-902.G  To permit parking within the required buffer area adjacent to the residential district to the east.

Section 27-1403.E.(19)(c)  To allow 26 percent of the rear building setback to be landscaped and to permit a building setback of 42.8 feet from the west property line and 37 feet from the east property line.

Section 27-1403.E.(19)(e)  To permit parking areas within the required rear yard buffer setback.

Section 27-1718.1  To permit a building height of 40 feet in lieu of the required 35 feet.
Section 27-1720.B(1)  To permit buildings within the 100-foot building setback along Street Road.

Section 27-1903.3  To permit fewer electrical charging parking spaces than the required 1 per 15 parking spaces.

Present Use: Retail commercial (Kmart).

COMMENTS

1. **Waivers requested**—The site plan indicates that the applicant is requesting waivers from the following subdivision and land development ordinance requirements:

   - **Section 22-404.3.B & Section 22-406.C.(2)**
     To require the location, names and widths of streets, the location and name of railroads, the location of property lines and names of owners, the location of watercourses, sanitary sewers, storm drains, and similar features within 400 feet of any part of the land to be subdivided or developed to the satisfaction of the township engineer.

   - **Section 22-505.3**
     To require a 100-foot right-of-way on Street Road.

   - **Section 22-512.5**
     To allow parking rows to exceed 12 single stacked spaces and 24 double stacked spaces.

   - **Section 22-512.11.A**
     To require 5 percent of parking spaces to be designated with electrical charging ports.

   - **Section 22-520.2.D**
     To permit stormwater piping less than 18” diameter and with a slope less than 1 percent.

   - **Section 22-522.4.C**
     To permit 11 street trees in lieu of the required 13 street trees.

   - **Section 22-522.4.E**
     To permit the street trees to be planted outside of the ultimate right-of-way.

   - **Section 22-522.4.G**
     To permit street trees with a diameter of 2” in lieu of 2.5”.

   - **Section 22-522.6.B**
     To provide 75 deciduous trees less than 2.5” diameter in lieu of 110 deciduous trees with a 2.5” minimum diameter.

   - **Section 22-522.7.C.(3)**
     To provide 8 deciduous trees in lieu of 51 trees required in the stormwater management facilities.

   - **Section 22-522.C.(1).(A)**
     Requiring a Class 1 buffer to be installed adjacent to the R-2 residential zoning district on the east property line.

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. **Conditional use**—Zoning ordinance Section 27-2207 outlines specific conditional use standards to be evaluated relative to the proposed land development submittal. The proposed redevelopment of the subject site appears to be consistent with several goals noted in the traffic and land use planning recommendations and Chapter 11, Implementation Strategy of the Lower Southampton Township Comprehensive Plan (2010).

The redevelopment would be a significant improvement to the property. However, there are several goals and objectives which the township should evaluate and determine if the plan should be revised. Possible additional supplemental improvements and studies noted within both the general traffic and land use categories of the comprehensive plan include the following:

- Traffic study per Goal 5-19 within Chapter 5, Transportation to understand the impact of the proposed uses on traffic volume, signal timing, and circulation. Through conversation with the township, we understand that the township traffic engineer and the applicant are working to address traffic and transportation issues.

- Additional streetscape improvements, Goals 8-6, 8-7, and 8-11 that require decorative street lights, uniform signage, and enhancing the Street Road frontage streetscape. Other streetscape elements that the township should consider requiring is a grass strip between the sidewalk and curb that would provide a slight safety buffer for pedestrians from vehicles traveling on Street Road. In addition, benches and additional bike racks can be added to the streetscape environment.

Simple improvements, such as shrubs between the sidewalk and parking lot area help soften hard edges and provide contrasting colors and textures and help in the overall aesthetic of a streetscape. Improvements are evident at 213 Street Road, across from the Sunoco gas station where a variety of shrubs are planted that screen parked cars and provide year round color and interest (also, see Comment 15).

3. **Use 41, Large Retail Center**—Zoning ordinance Section 27-1403 outlines specific requirements for permitted uses in addition to area and dimensional requirements. The large retail center (Use 41(b)) requires buildings to be designed to reflect and enhance the visual, historic, and cultural character of the township and be constructed of brick, wood, stone, tile, or other traditional materials. No exterior elevations, sections, or notes on materials were submitted. The township should ensure compliance with the building design requirements.

In addition, the use regulations note that there should be no uninterrupted lengths of blank wall longer than 100 feet and that walls should be differentiated with recesses, windows, and façade details. The plan displays no variation along the facades of the grocery and retail stores as well as the two pad sites, which are 100 linear feet or more. The township should ensure compliance with the façade requirements.

Other zoning use requirements not submitted or shown on the plan that should be included in all future submissions:
• Market analysis indicating the market for the proposed facility and the area from which patrons will be attracted.

• Public amenities such as an outdoor plaza, patio seating, water feature, clock tower, etc. that will enhance the character of the area. These amenities should be noted on the plan.

4. **Vehicular circulation**—Left turns are limited onto Street Road from the site and can only be taken from the access drive in the northeast corner of the site. The other alternative to travel west on Street Road is to exit the site on Pennsylvania Boulevard and take a left at the signalized intersection with Street Road. Without the benefit of a traffic study, it is hard to estimate the volume of the traffic that will exit the site onto Pennsylvania Boulevard. In addition, we recommend the proposed right turn only onto Street Road from the center access drive be more pronounced and the median redesigned to prevent or curtail potential left turns.

The township should determine if there will be potential vehicular circulation conflicts with the 22 spaces that are located on-axis with the access drive entrance off Pennsylvania Boulevard where cars will be backing into the main drive aisle. Also, the Delivery Truck Access Plan, Sheet C-110 shows delivery trucks using the same access route through the two parking areas where vehicles may be backing into the aisle. The parking requirement chart on the Site Plan, Sheet C-100 shows an excess of 42 spaces which creates a potential to create two landscape islands without compromising the parking requirement. Landscape islands extending into the site from Pennsylvania Boulevard, would help direct traffic, minimize potential conflicts, provide space for landscaping and sidewalks, and eliminate cars backing into the aisle.

5. **Pedestrian circulation**—The plan has a clear, defined pedestrian path system from Street Road into the shopping center which connects all proposed buildings and uses. We commend the applicant for providing pedestrian links, however, the township should evaluate the need for a pedestrian connection to Pennsylvania Boulevard, as well as adding sidewalk as required by the subdivision and land development ordinance (SALDO) Section 22-809.1 on Pennsylvania Boulevard. Even though there are no existing sidewalks on Pennsylvania Boulevard, the future need may arise considering the proposed uses on the subject site and number of businesses located nearby.

6. **Structures within front yard setback**—Zoning ordinance Section 27-1715.1 notes that no building or structure shall be built within the minimum depth from the front of the lot line. A retaining wall that ranges from 2 to 6 feet in height is considered a structure by definition (zoning ordinance Section 27-202) and is within the front yard setback area. The plans should be revised accordingly.

7. **Front yard setback and Street Road right-of-way**—Pennsylvania Department of Transportation (PennDOT) classifies Street Road through Lower Southampton Township as a principal arterial highway on their map entitled Federal Functional Class Bucks County. SALDO Section 22-505.3 classifies a PennDOT regional arterial as having a 100-foot right-of-way. An 80-foot right-of-way is displayed on the plan. Although a variance was granted to allow buildings in the front yard setback, the delineation of the 100-foot ultimate right-of-way should be consistent with the ordinance and reflected on the plan.
8. **Accessory drive-through facilities**—SALDO Section 22-511 outlines several requirements associated with a drive-through for retail and financial uses. It appears both drive-throughs have a bypass/escape lane to allow traffic to pass. These lanes should be demarcated and labeled on future submissions.

In addition, part of the application requirements for allowing a drive-through is providing a traffic impact study to determine the necessary stacking area and impact the proposal will have upon local traffic circulation (Section 22-511.10). The township should ensure the traffic impact study addresses the pertinent issues noted in the SALDO.

9. **Curb ramps**—It appears curb ramps are being upgraded at the main access point into the site from Street Road. For ease of pedestrian circulation within the streetscape corridors, the township should ensure that the other two access drives (Pennsylvania Boulevard and Street Road) have compliant curb ramps and crossing details per PennDOT and American with Disabilities Act (ADA) design standards. SALDO Section 22-513.5 notes that at corners and pedestrian street-crossing points, sidewalks shall be extended to the curb with handicap ramps designed in accordance with PennDOT and ADA standards.

10. **Grading**—SALDO Section 22-518.6 notes that the top or bottom edge of slopes should be a minimum of 5 feet from the property line to permit normal rounding of the slope edge. It appears the bottom edge of the slope along the eastern property boundary with the White Chapel Memorial Park parallel to the proposed retail building is within 5 feet of the property line. The plan should be revised accordingly.

11. **Easements**—SALDO Section 22-519.3 notes that the area of an easement shall be kept as lawn. There is a parking aisle and curb located within a portion of the Transcontinental Gas pipeline easement along the eastern border of the property adjacent to the White Chapel Memorial Park that maintains the same edge as the existing condition. The township should determine if the entire easement area should be kept as lawn and the plan revised.

12. **Landscape architect**—SALDO Section 22-522.2.D requires the Landscape Plan to be signed and sealed by a landscape architect, registered in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. The landscape plan should be revised to include the seal of a licensed landscape architect.

13. **Street tree requirements**—SALDO Section 22-522.4.C requires street trees every 40 linear feet of frontage. The lot frontage along Street Road is 618.09 linear feet as noted on the Demolition and Site plans, therefore requiring 16 street trees. In addition, the frontage along Pennsylvania Boulevard is noted at 225 linear feet, therefore requiring 6 street trees. The street tree calculation on the Landscape Notes, Sheet C610 should be corrected as well as the landscape plan to depict the correct number of street trees required. We note that the requested street tree waiver (see Comment 1) to allow 11 street trees instead of 13 is based on the incorrect calculation. In addition we do not support a waiver of street tree requirements along the Street Road corridor in compliance with the comprehensive plan's streetscape goals. If the trees cannot be accommodated along the frontage due to access drives or other constraints, the township may wish to require an informal arrangement of the trees or place the trees elsewhere on the site.
14. **Buffer plantings**—A 25-foot-wide, Class 1 buffer is required when the C-2 Heavy Commercial District borders a residential zoning district (zoning ordinance Section 27-902.G and SALDO Section 22-522.5.C(1)). There is approximately 550 linear feet where the 25-foot buffer requirement would apply, however the applicant was granted a variance to allow a buffer width of 11.20 feet. As noted previously, a portion of the buffer contains the Transcontinental Gas pipeline easement and will be kept as lawn. However, the pipeline easement shifts east off-site onto the White Chapel Memorial Park property and leaves a portion of the required buffer area that can be planted. The township should decide if plantings are warranted within the buffer area along the property line and if the plan should be revised accordingly.

15. **Parking area landscaping**—SALDO Section 22-522.6.A requires one shrub per 5 feet of curb surrounding the parking spaces along the exterior of the parking lot. According to the landscape requirements chart on the Landscape Notes plan, Sheet C-610, the majority of the shrubs were placed on the interior of the site within the bio-retention landscape islands. We commend the applicant for the extent of proposed landscaping that will contribute to the aesthetic and environmental appeal of the site.

However, as noted in Comment 2, the addition of shrubs along the exterior of the parking lots along the Street Road frontage will increase compliance with the intent of the ordinance and the streetscape goals noted in the comprehensive plan. Shrubs around the parking lot perimeter will help screen the parked vehicles (but won’t block the view of the buildings) as well as provide visual and aesthetic appeal of the site.

16. **Stormwater detention/retention planting**—The landscape requirements chart on the Landscape Notes plan, Sheet C-610, notes that not all the required tree quantities required per SALDO Section 22-522.C(3) were used. The township should determine if the trees can be placed elsewhere on the site and the plan should be revised accordingly.

17. **Replacement trees**—It appears that several existing trees will be removed that are over three inches in caliper. SALDO Section 22-522.8.C requires replacement trees to be provided at an inch-per-inch replacement ratio. The replacement tree calculation should be added to the plan and either be replaced on-site, placed elsewhere in the township, or provide a fee-in-lieu-of.

18. **Ash tree**—Due to the discovery of the emerald ash borer (EAB) in Bucks County, the proposed *Fraxinus pennsylvanica* ‘Autumn Purple’ ash trees should be replaced with another type of shade 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 strategy for treating or removing existing ash trees located in municipal parks and other public property.

19. **Refuse collection**—The plan displays a refuse collection area associated with the proposed grocery and retail stores. There are no refuse areas shown on the plan to service the two pad buildings along the Street Road frontage. The township may wish to see a vehicular circulation plan to understand how the outdoor waste collection function will work for the pad sites and ensure compliance with zoning ordinance Section 27-1723 and SALDO Section 22-526.11.
20. **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 November 2, 2016 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.

JSI:dc

cc: William Goldsmith, V.P., Gator Feasterville Partners, Ltd.
    John Genovesi, P.E., Tri-State Engineers and Land Surveyors, Inc., Township Engineer
    John McMenamin, Township Manager (via e-mail)
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 McCafferty Kia Proposed Showroom
   TMPs # 22-48-12
   Applicant: The Bean Family Partnership
   Owner of Record: Same
   Plan Dated: July 19, 2016
   Date Received: September 15, 2016

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 9,300-square-foot building for a new automobile showroom on a 5.3-acre parcel. Modifications to the existing layout are also proposed including the removal of a building and reconfiguration to the parking layout and interior circulation system. The site is served by public water supply and public sewerage.

Location: Southwestern corner of the intersection of East Lincoln Highway and Woodbourne Road.

Zoning: C Commercial District allows motor vehicles sales establishments on lots with a minimum size of 60,000 square feet with a maximum impervious surface ratio of 60 percent.

Present Use: Commercial; automotive dealership and service center.

COMMENTS

1. Plan information—The record plan includes features that are proposed to be removed or reconfigured on the site plan. For plan clarity purposes we recommend that the record plan be revised to omit the features that are to be removed on the site. For example, although the existing parking spaces located by the drop-off/pick-up service area of the building are shown on the demolition plan to be removed, they appear on the record plan and would interfere with the proposed moving aisle configuration. Also, a portion of an existing parking row is...
shown on the record plan as extending across the drive-in service area into the proposed showroom. The plan should be revised to clearly illustrate how this parking row will be treated or restriped to adequately serve the new development. In addition, it is not clear which areas in proximity to the building are intended to be converted to green space. It appears that yard space may be provided between the side and rear of the building given the plan note reference of EOP, which we assume is intended as a reference to “edge of pavement.” Future submissions should clearly indicate the areas proposed for lawn or plants. We encourage the integration of defined planted areas in the overall plan as an effective measure to not only better define motor vehicle patterns, but to provide some relief from the wide expanse of asphalt paving on the lot.

2. **Street trees and buffer yards**—Section 417(2) of the subdivision and land development ordinance requires the provision of street trees at intervals of not more than 40 feet for large trees and 25 feet for small trees. The plan delineates the required 20-foot buffer yard pursuant to Section 1502(P)(3) of the zoning ordinance around the perimeter of the site, but does not show any buffer plantings or vegetation in the area. Instead, the existing pavement is to remain along the parcel frontage. If determined necessary, the plan should be revised to comply with the buffer yard requirements.

We note that the intent of the buffer yard regulations are to help beautify the commercial corridor. Therefore, the incorporation of an attractive streetscape, such as a mixture of plant materials (e.g., annuals/perennials/low growing shrubs/trees) and possibly other hardscaping features would be beneficial in not only improving the curb appeal of the car dealership, but also enhancing the environment. Even a relatively small strip of landscaped green space offers benefits to the environment in that one tree can absorb as much as 48 pounds of carbon dioxide per year and has the capacity to lift up to 100 gallons of water out of the ground and discharge it into the air. Trees and plant materials also improve water quality by absorbing and filtering rainwater. Therefore, as stated in Comment 1, we encourage additional green space with appropriate plantings to be integrated into the overall land development plan.

3. **Site access**—The existing driveway on Lincoln Highway is intended to provide access to the new showroom and parking lot. We note that access into the parking area for the new showroom will be reduced to about 20 to 30 feet from Lincoln Highway. This accessway to the parking lot is intended to serve as both entrance and exit for the showroom. This area is currently fenced off and the short taper to the parking lot’s intersection does not provide much stacking area for motorists entering the site. We recommend that the applicant consult with PennDOT officials to determine if the proposed use and new internal circulation system will require a revised highway occupancy permit submission.

In addition, we recommend that the township request an internal circulation plan that shows the proposed traffic patterns. It is unclear if the interior driveways will continue to be one-way. It also appears that it may be difficult to traverse the site conveniently given the proposed layout for parking and service area.

4. **Parking issues**—Section 421.5.D of the subdivision and land development ordinance requires that the edge of parking areas not be any closer than 15 feet to the outside wall of the nearest building. The parking row located in front of the proposed showroom is closer than 15 feet.
In addition, subdivision and land development ordinance Section 421.5.A requires a raised planting bed between parking spaces exceeding 12 spaces in one row. The customer parking row is proposed to have 23 spaces and, therefore, at least one planting bed is required to comply with the ordinance provision. The plan should be revised accordingly.

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 must be submitted for this proposal.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for its November 2, 2016, 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:dc

cc: The Bean Family Partnership  
   Mark Havers, Pickering, Corts & Summerson, Inc.  
   Larry Young, P.E., TriState Engineers, Township Engineer  
   Stephanie Teoli Kuhls, Township Manager (via email)  
   Patrick Duffy, Township Zoning Officer (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 for Stone Farm
    TMP #22-5-7
    Applicant: Metropolitan Development Group
    Owner: Estate of Ezra C. Stone, Estate of Josef S. Stone and Francine Lida Stone
    Plan Dated: September 12, 2016
    Date Received: September 14, 2016

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 168.028-acre tract into a 122-lot single-family development. Lots range in size
from approximately one-half acre (22,500 square feet) to 30,000 square feet or more. The existing
residence and farm buildings will be retained on 9.452 acres. Open space consists of buffer yards
and a 39.259-acre tract that includes a pedestrian path and six of the eight proposed stormwater
management basins. Public water and sewer facilities are intended to serve the development.

Location: Northeast side of Newtown-Langhorne (PA Route 413) and Tollgate roads, extending to
Fulling Mill Road.

Zoning: The parcel is split-zoned with about 131 acres in the RA-2 Residence Agricultural District
and about 30.5 acres located along Langhorne-Newtown Road in the RA-3 Residence Agricultural
District. The RA-2 District allows a single-family detached dwelling on a minimum lot size of
30,000 square feet with a maximum density of 1.2 du/ac. RA-3 District allows a single-family
detached dwelling on a minimum lot size of 22,500 square feet. Both zoning districts require a
minimum front yard of 50 feet and minimum lot width of 125 feet, and a maximum impervious
surface coverage of 30 percent.

Present Use: Agricultural; historic farmstead with cultivated fields.
COMMENTS

1. **Traffic impact study**—Section 3105.3.B of the zoning ordinance requires that any use which will generate 500 or more trips per day is required to submit a transportation impact statement (TIS). To fully ascertain potential roadway improvements needed, a TIS should be provided for the development.

2. **Natural resource protection**
   a. **Wetland encroachment**—Plan Sheet 16 of 85 indicates the natural resource protection calculations and illustrates that wetlands are to be disturbed. Section 2501.G of the zoning ordinance states that wetland areas shall not be altered, regraded, filled, piped, diverted or built upon except where state and federal permits have been obtained. Sheet 63 of the plan provides a wetland protection/notification detail, but no information regarding permitting or remediation was submitted with the proposal.
   
   b. **Riparian corridor**—The County of Bucks holds an easement of the subject site. The eased area contains floodplain, wetlands, and a partially vegetated headwater and feeder stream that flows to Lake Luxemburg within Core Creek Park. The headwater and associated riparian corridor area have significant value as a water quality protection area. Given the subject proposal to convert the land from farmland to residential development, we recommend that the applicant and county officials take advantage of the opportunity to develop a riparian restoration plan for the feeder stream.

3. **Historic preservation**—We support the preservation of this historic farmstead and suggest that historic recognition/designation be discussed during the subdivision approval process to encourage the long-term preservation of the important historic resource. In addition to conservation easement options, a façade easement and compatible treatment of the surrounding landscape should be considered.

4. **Plan information**—Plan Sheet 2 of 85 indicates zoning data for the proposal including site density and base site area. Lot information for open space, buffers, and stormwater basin areas is shown on various plan sheets including sheets 24, 25, 27, and 28. However, the location and area for Buffer/Open Space 1 and the proposed size of SWM Basin 8 (in the vicinity of Langhorne-Newtown Road) is not denoted. For clarity and recording purposes, we recommend that the lot delineations and area for the open space and stormwater facilities be presented in an organized manner on the overall site plan.

   Additionally, the proposed ownership and maintenance responsibilities for these facilities should be clearly noted on the plan.

5. **Compliance with ordinance provisions**—Section 2602.A of the zoning ordinance requires that driveways be setback at least 12 feet from the side property line. This required setback should be specified on the plan. In addition, although sidewalks appear to be proposed along all interior roadways they are not labeled on the site plans. The proposed widths of the sidewalks, cartway, and right-of-way also are not specified on the site plans. It appears they scale to 50 feet for the right-of-way, 28 feet for the cartway, and 4 or 5 feet for the sidewalks. The plan detail sheets also do not provide clarification on these facilities (see Comment 6).
6. **Plan details conflicts**—Information on site construction details Sheets 65 and 66 conflict with one another regarding the road and sidewalk standards proposed. For example, the detail on Sheet 66 indicates a 4-foot-wide sidewalk whereas the detail on Sheet 65 indicates a 5-foot sidewalk width and a reference to Note 19. We were unable to locate a Note 19 on the plan that related to the sidewalk detail. Similarly, the road specification details for both the Typical Roadway and the PADOT Highway differ on these plan sheets, making it difficult to determine what improvements are proposed for various streets. We recommend that the plan be revised to coordinate the proposed improvements on the overall site plan with the plan detail sheets. Specific plan notes or a numbering system may be beneficial to use on the site plan to correspond to the appropriate plan detail.

7. **Public improvements**—None of the overall site plans or land development plan sheets is clear regarding the proposed locations for public improvements or features, such as crosswalks and handicapped access at street corners, light fixtures, fire hydrants, and traffic signage (including designated on-street parking areas or prohibitions). The plan should be revised to clearly show or note where such features are intended to be located. In addition, if determined to be needed by township officials, protective barriers for basins or along the pathway, should be provided.

8. **Community connections**—The *Bucks County Bicycle Master Plan* (2012) recommends pedestrian and bicycle linkage to nearby community facilities, including neighboring Core Creek Park, the nearby shopping center, and school facilities abutting the site across Route 413. Although an on-road bike lane is indicated for Route 413, there appears to be sufficient area along the site’s frontage to include an off-road pedestrian way. Township officials should, therefore, determine if sidewalks or a pathway should be provided on Langhorne-Newtown Road or along Tollgate Road.

   We also recommend that crosswalks be designated at appropriate locations along Tollgate Road to safely connect residents of the development to adjacent Core Creek Park.

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 must be submitted for this proposed subdivision.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the November 2, 2016, 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:dc

cc: Metropolitan Development Group
   Eric S. Clase, P.E., Gilmore & Associates
   Larry Young, P.E., TriState Engineers, Township Engineer
   Stephanie Teoli Kuhls, Township Manager (via email)
   Patrick Duffy, Township Zoning Officer (via email)
   William M. Mitchell, Executive Director, Bucks County Department of Parks and Recreation
MEMORANDUM

TO: Milford Township Board of Supervisors
Milford Township Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Preliminary Plan of Lot Line Change for Milford Convenience and Verna Willauer Annexation
TMP #23-10-90 and -100-1
Applicant: Milford Convenience LP
Owner: Milford Convenience LP
Plan Dated: August 18, 2016
Date Received: October 14, 2016

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 12.22-acre parcel (Annex Parcel A) from Lot #1 (TMP #23-10-100-1) to Lot #2 (TMP #23-10-90). As a result, Lots 1 and 2 will be 16.98 and 77.00 gross acres, respectively. On-lot water and sewage facilities serve Lot 2. No construction is proposed at this time.

Location: Northeast corner of John Fries Highway (Route 663) and Weiss Road.

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

The PC Planned Commercial District permits a variety of office, retail and consumer, institutional and recreational, and limited industrial uses with a minimum site and lot area of 1 acre and maximum impervious surface ratio of 0.85.

Present Use: Vacant and single-family residential dwelling
COMMENTS

1. **Waivers requested**—The site plan indicates that the applicant is requesting waivers from the following subdivision and land development ordinance requirements:

   - Section 703.a  Scale of 1” = 200’
   - Section 703.c  Site context map
   - Section 701.e and 703.e  Existing resource and site analysis
   - Section 701.e.5  Use of contours from reference documents instead of actual field survey

   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. **Lot boundary**—According to the plan, the southern boundary of Lot #2 (TMP #23-10-90) includes a portion of Route 663 and TMP #23-10-90-1 located on the south side of Route 663. According to the Bucks County Board of Assessment, TMP #23-10-90-1 is owned by Edgar and Patricia Brubaker. Therefore, this TMP #23-10-90-1 and the right-of-way of Route 663 should not be included as part of Lot #2. The plan should be revised to adjust the southern boundary of Lot 2 to align with the ultimate right-of-way on the northern side of Route 663.

3. **Future road**—According to a note on the plan, “Future Road R/W from Reference Plan, See Note #6.” Township officials should review this right-of-way configuration to determine if it satisfies their future development objectives.

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 proposal.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the November 2, 2016 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.

DAS:jk

cc: Milford Convenience LP.
    Ludgate Engineering Corporation
    Kevin Wolf, Andersen Engineering, Inc., Township Engineer
    Marilyn Stecker, Township Secretary/Office Manager (via email)
    Jeffrey Vey, 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 for Milford Village—Phase 2, Sections 1 and 4
         TMP #23-15-99-5; 23-10-175-1
         Applicant: LifeQuest
         Owner: Same
         Plan Dated: September 15, 2016
         Date Received: September 27, 2016

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 two sections of the Milford Village development which will contain a total of 172 apartment units and 93,400 square feet of retail space. Proposed Section 1 consists of 172 apartment units to be located in six buildings, two retail buildings totaling 43,200 square feet, two stormwater management basins, and an infiltration basin. Proposed Section 4 consists of two retail buildings totaling 50,200 square feet. Public water and sewer facilities will serve the development.

The submission also includes plans for the relocation of Mill Hill Road, which includes the closure of the existing Mill Hill/State Route 663 intersection, the creation of a cul-de-sac (Mill Hill Court), and the relocated portion of Mill Hill Road through the Milford Village site, where it will intersect with LifeQuest Drive.

Also, the plans include a “Second Revised Unified Master Record Plan” for the entire Milford Village development.

Location: Northeastern corner of John Fries Highway (SR 663) and Mill Hill Road. Section 1 will be located between Route 663 and the relocated Mill Hill Road. Section 4 will be located along the northern side of the relocated Mill Hill Road, west of LifeQuest Drive.

Zoning: RD—Rural Development District permits primarily low-density residential and institutional uses.
The site resides within the Arterial Mixed Use (AMU) Overlay District, which includes the following requirements:

- Minimum site area—200 acres
- Site must have a minimum of 500 feet of frontage along a corridor designated under Section 620 of the zoning ordinance.
- Public water and sewerage must be available to the site.
- The site must be developed according to the Unified Master Plan submitted with the Conditional Use Application and subject to the approval as part of the conditional use. The Unified Master Plan shall address to the satisfaction of the Board of Supervisors, the specific requirements contained in Section 665 of the zoning ordinance.

Present Use: Institutional and undeveloped lands.

**COMMENTS**

1. **Conditional use**—Correspondence submitted with the plans indicate that the applicant is requesting conditional use approval for the land development plans that have been submitted for review. Conditional use approval from the township would also be needed for the revised master record plan. These issues should be resolved before action is taken on the proposed land developments.

2. **Second Revised Unified Master Record Plan**—We acknowledge that the “Second Revised Unified Master Record Plan” is conceptual in nature and changes to each Section (phase) may occur at the time of land development, ultimately affecting the proposed uses and the overall site design/layout. It is recommended that township officials be assured that each Section of the development is in compliance with the revised master plan.

We note that, for this submission, our office received Sheet 1 of 13 of the Second Revised Unified Master Record Plan. We did not receive Sheets 2 through 13 of the plan which according to the overall sheet index, includes environmental resources plan, road network improvement plan, grading, etc. For instance, assurances should be provided to township officials that development of the site, and its individual sections, complies with the resource protection standards and the site capacity calculations noted on the master plan. In addition, assurances should be provided that any required traffic and roadway improvements that may have been part of previous approvals for this overall development are addressed.

3. **Requested waivers**—According to correspondence submitted with the plan and plan notes, the applicant is requesting waivers from the following subdivision and land development ordinance (SALDO) sections:

- **505.a** from the requirement to maintain a cartway width of 36 feet along relocated Mill Hill Road (*indicated on Mill Hill Road relocation plan*)
- **512.1.1.1.b** from the requirement that all storm piping be Class III reinforced concrete pipe (*should be Section 512.1.1(b), indicated on plans for Sections 1 and 4*)
- **512.1.1.1.c** from the requirement that minimum storm pipe size be 18 inches (*should be Section 512.1.1(c), indicated on plans for Sections 1 and 4*)
516.c from the township specification for an 8-inch curb reveal (*indicated on correspondence for Section 1 and 4*)

616.a from the requirement to provide all electric, telephone and communications facilities by underground cables (*indicated on plans for Sections 1 and 4 and Mill Hill road relocation plan*)

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. 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.

4. **Utility improvements**—It is unclear what utility improvements (water, sewer, and stormwater) are associated with this proposal. Information should be provided to clearly indicate the proposed improvements related to utilities so assurances are provided that all proposed dwellings and nonresidential uses that are part of Sections 1 and 4 will be adequately served.

5. **Pedestrian connectivity**—Safe pedestrian connections between different land uses proposed for the development should be provided. It is recommended that crosswalks, similar to that shown across relocated Mill Hill Road at its intersection with Abby Road, be provided throughout the development to enhance pedestrian safety.

A crosswalk should be provided across Abby Lane, near residential apartment building #5, which would connect the proposed residential units in Section 1 to the retail space. A safe pedestrian crossing on this road is particularly important since Abby Lane will be a main road through the site and will provide direct access to Rt. 663 with a right-in/right-out driveway. In addition, a crosswalk crossing the access drive to the retail uses on the eastern side of Abby Lane should be provided to facilitate a safe pedestrian connection.

6. **Traffic calming**—Given the relocation of Mill Hill Road through the site and the amount of future residential and nonresidential development that is intended to occur on the site, consideration of traffic calming methods along key roadways should be considered.

7. **Landscaped parking islands**—Section 517.B.1 of the subdivision and land development ordinance requires a 10-foot wide raised landscaped parking island along every other doubled row of parking spaces. Raised landscaped parking islands are shown along two of the parking rows for the proposed retail space in Section 4; however, the plan should be revised to show the required islands along every other doubled row of parking spaces in compliance with the this ordinance requirement.

8. **Parking space size**—Section 517.b.4 of the subdivision and land development ordinance requires parking stall dimensions to be a minimum of 10 feet wide by 20 feet long with 24-foot aisles when 90-degree parking is proposed. The parking lots in both Sections 1 and 4 are shown to contain some spaces that measure only 18 feet long. The plans should be revised to comply with this ordinance requirement.
9. **Section 1, Maximum height**—Plan Sheet 2 of 19 of the plan for Milford Village Section 1 indicates that the proposed height of the buildings varies. Note #2 on the same plan sheet, (which is consistent with Section 665.A.4 of the zoning ordinance) indicates that the height of multi-story apartments and some other permitted uses may be increased to four stories with a height not to exceed 60 feet, provided such buildings are equipped with elevators and fire suppression systems and are located at least 200 feet from any perimeter property boundary of the site other than the arterial highway. The plan should be revised to indicate the proposed height of the buildings so that compliance with this zoning ordinance requirement can be verified.

10. **Existing features**—According to aerial photographs, wooded areas exist in several different areas of the site. It is recommended that the Existing Features plans for both proposed Sections 1 and 4 be revised to indicate the location of existing woodlands. The Existing Features Plan for both development sections indicate only the existing elevations and soils information.

11. **Tree protection standards**—The plan indicates an existing wooded area bordering adjacent residences along Mill Hill Road is intended to remain as part of the proposed landscaped buffer. Section 521 of the subdivision and land development ordinance requires that a tree protection zone (TPZ) be delineated on the site prior to construction that conforms to the approved development plans. Grade changes and excavations shall not encroach within the designated TPZ. The plan should be revised to provide a TPZ around trees or group of trees/woodlands to remain and a tree protection detail that satisfies Section 521.b of the subdivision and land development ordinance.

12. **Stormwater management issues**

   a. **Stormwater management plan**—The plan submission does not include a stormwater management plan as required by Section 512.e of the subdivision and land development ordinance.

   b. **Underground infiltration basins**—The plans indicate that five underground infiltration beds are proposed throughout the parking areas for the residential units in Section 1. The maintenance of underground basins is a concern because they are not easily accessible. Therefore, the applicant should provide assurances to the township that ongoing maintenance to the basins will be adequately addressed.

13. **Plan information**—Information under Proposed Improvements on Plan Sheet 2 of 19 of the plan for Milford Village Section 1 provides information on the number of dwelling units in the proposed buildings. However, information shown on Plan Sheet 6 of 19 for Section 1 provides conflicting information. The plans should be revised for consistency.

The reference to the “First Revised Unified Master Plan” contained in the Phasing Sequence on the Second Revised Unified Master Plan should be revised to the “Second Revised Unified Master Plan.” Also in the Phasing Sequence on the revised master plan, reference to two non-residential buildings with a total of 46,000 square in Phase II, Section 1, should be revised to indicate a total of 43,200 square feet.
Also, the overall proposed number of units from the Second Revised Unified Master Plan, as indicated on that plan and plans for Sections 1 and 4, is 1,070 units. However, the individual numbers provided for each dwelling unit type total 1,071 units.

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.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the November 2, 2017, 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:dc

cc: LifeQuest, c/o Roger Hiser
Pany & Lentz Engineering Company
Kevin Wolf, Andersen Engineering Associates, Inc.
Terry Clemons, Esq., Clemons, Richter & Reiss PC, Township Solicitor (via email)
Jeff A. Vey, Township Manager (via email)
Lisa Wolff, QAPC
MEMORANDUM

TO: New Britain Borough Council
New Britain Borough Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Preliminary Plan of Land Development for 211 Mathews Avenue (Kirk Tract)
TMP #25-5-50
Applicant: David & Lynn Kirk
Owner: Same
Plan Dated: September 28, 2016
Date Received: October 4, 2016

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 three nonresidential buildings totaling 41,000 square feet and a 3,600-square-foot addition to an existing 2-story industrial building on a 7.09-acre site. The site is served by public water and sewerage.

Location: West Mathews Avenue, approximately 400 feet east of South Sand Road.

Zoning: LI Light Industrial District permits a variety of light industrial, trade, and office uses. The minimum lot size for all permitted uses is one acre.

Present Use: Industrial

COMMENTS

1. **Variance requested**—The site plan indicates that the applicant will be seeking a variance from zoning ordinance Section 450-24.D.(3) to permit 64.7 percent impervious surface ratio, where 50 percent is permitted. We recommend that the plan not be acted upon by borough officials until resolution of the request for the variance from the Zoning Hearing Board is received.
2. **Waivers requested**—The site plan indicates that the applicant is requesting waivers from the following subdivision and land development ordinance requirements:

- Section 385-17.(F)  Grading within five feet of a property line
- Section 385-21  Curb along all streets
- Section 385-23.A  Sidewalks along existing streets
- Section 385-34.3.(C)  Storm drainage pipe size
- Section 385-34.5(b)  Inlet and outlet pipe inverts
- Section 385-39.F  Traffic impact study

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. **Waiver Request for Sidewalks**—To provide pedestrians with safe and convenient access to shopping centers, transportation, and other community facilities within the borough, we recommend that the proposed development provide sidewalks as required by Section 385-23.A of the subdivision and land development ordinance. For a roadway network to serve the transportation needs of a community, it must serve all users. In planning for new subdivisions and land developments, it may be possible to incorporate pedestrian sidewalks along the existing street system that will link all destinations together.

3. **Traffic impact study**—The applicant has requested a waiver of Section 385-39.F of the subdivision and land development ordinance for the required traffic impact study. We recommend that the applicant provide a traffic impact study given that this project is located adjacent to single-family residential uses and open space (Wilma Quinlan Nature Preserve) and that previous concerns about truck traffic have been raised for Mathews Avenue.

4. **Street improvements**—Section 385-30.D of the subdivision and land development ordinance requires that along the existing street on which a land development abuts improvements shall be made to the street. The existing street is deficient in cartway width and curbs. Section 385-16.C(1) of the subdivision and land development ordinance requires a 26-foot-wide cartway where on-street parking is prohibited. The site plan depicts an existing cartway width of 18 feet. The applicant has requested a waiver of the required curb along West Mathews Avenue. Borough officials should determine if the increased truck traffic and stormwater would necessitate these improvements.

5. **Proposed on-road bike lane**—The Tri-Municipal Master Trail and Greenway Plan (2010) proposes an on-road bike lane along Mathews Avenue which would connect to a proposed off-road trail along the SEPTA rail line.

6. **Curb radii**—In accordance with Section 385 of the subdivision and land development ordinance the curb radii for the northern parking area driveway between buildings 3 and 4 should be shown on the plan.
7. **Street trees**—Borough Council should determine if the existing street trees along Mathews Avenue meet the requirements of Section 385-24 of the subdivision and land development ordinance.

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 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 November 2, 2016 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:  David & Lynn Kirk  
Mark G. Hintenlang, P.E., Borough Engineer  
Sam Bryant, Borough Manager (via email)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Newtown Township Board of Supervisors
    Newtown Township Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Sketch Plan of Land Development for Newtown Shopping Center Retail Building
        TMP #29-3-24
        Applicant: Newtown Bucks Associates, L.P.
        Owner: Same
        Plan Dated: September 1, 2016
        Date Received: September 27, 2016

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 an 11,218-square-foot retail building in the Newtown Shopping Center. A 3,720-square-foot future building addition behind existing Unit F, as shown on the approved shopping center plan, will not be constructed and that area is to be reallocated to the proposed retail building. Public water and sewerage facilities serve the site.

Location: Southern side of Route 413 (Durham Road) in the Newtown Shopping Center. The site is between the Acme Market building and Bed, Bath & Beyond.

Zoning: The PC Planned Commercial District permits retail uses by conditional use approval on a minimum lot area of 20,000 square feet.

Present Use: Commercial.

COMMENTS

1. **Conditional use**—Section 602.A.2.e of the zoning ordinance permits a retail use by conditional approval. Conditional use approval must be obtained from the Board of Supervisors prior to plan approval.
2. **Impervious surface**—The plan indicates that a variance shall be required from Section 602.B.1 of the zoning ordinance, which requires a maximum impervious surface ratio of 50 percent. The plan proposes that the maximum site impervious coverage increase 2.18 percent (31,773 square feet) for a total site impervious coverage of 53.50 percent, where 51.32 percent currently exists and/or has been approved. Action should not be taken on the plan until this zoning issue is resolved.

3. **Parking**—The plan proposes to construct 62 previously reserved parking spaces, proposes 58 additional reserved spaces, and indicates that 103 previously reserved parking spaces will remain unconstructed. Zoning ordinance Section 1001.G states that the Board of Supervisors may permit a reduction in the required amount of parking, provided certain conditions are satisfied and the plan illustrates the layout for the required number of parking spaces to be held in reserve. The township should determine whether the proposed reserved parking is acceptable.

4. **Parking stall size**—According to zoning ordinance Section 1101.B.3, the conventional parking stall shall conform to minimum dimensions of 10 feet wide by 20 feet deep. The plan proposes parking spaces of 10 feet wide by 18 feet deep.

5. **Parking setback**—Section 514.9 of the subdivision and land development ordinance states that the edge of any parking area shall not be closer than 20 feet to the outside wall of the nearest building. Proposed parking rows of 10 and 19 spaces are shown only 10 feet from the adjacent building walls.

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 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 November 2, 2016, 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:dc

cc: Newtown Bucks Associates, L.P.
    Aria Engineering, L.L.C.
    Jeffrey Garson, Esq., Begley, Carlin & Mandio, Township Solicitor
    Michele Fountain, P.E., CKS Engineers, Inc., Township Engineer
    Michael Shinton, P.E., Gilmore & Associates, Township Traffic Engineer
    Michael Bucke, Boucher & James, Inc., Township Planner
    Kurt M. Ferguson, Township Manager (via email)
    Micah Lewis, Assistant Township Manager (via email)
    Martin Vogt, Township Zoning Officer (via email)
    Kristie Kaznicki, Municipal Services Secretary (via email)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Richland Township Board of Supervisors
Richland Township Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Revised Final Plan of Land Development for U.S. Cold Storage
TMP: #36-17-32-1
Applicant: United States Cold Storage, LLC
Owner: Same
Plan Dated: August 5, 2016
Date Received: September 13, 2016

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: Amend a previously approved plan for phased construction of a cold storage warehouse. Previously approved was a three-phase construction sequence of over 500,000 square feet of storage space. Phase 1 (228,084 square feet) has already been constructed. Now proposed is a full build-out in a single phase rather than two more phases of construction, and minor modifications to the site layout. The build-out will increase the size of the existing storage building by 277,818 square feet, bringing the total building area to 505,902 square feet. Portions of the building will be two stories. The total amount of building floor area proposed will be 528,929 square feet (505,902 first floor + 23,027 second floor). Additional truck parking on the north side of the property is also proposed. The site will be served by public sewer and water.

Location: The southwest side of the intersection of East Pumping Station and Heller roads.

Zoning: PI Planned Industrial District permits a range of industrial, office and commercial uses on a lot of at least 1 acre, with a maximum impervious surface ratio of 60 percent. Use G3, wholesale business, storage, or warehousing, is permitted by right in the district. Variances were previously approved for impervious coverage, building height, floodplain disturbance, steep slope disturbance, front yard, encroachments in the buffer area, buffer width, light pole height, off street loading, and signs. A special exception was granted to allow stormwater facilities within the floodplain.
Present Use: Industrial (Storage).

COMMENTS

1. Impervious cover—Although a variance has been previously granted to permit 65 percent impervious surface coverage, the impervious surface coverage will increase by 0.7 percent, which is greater than the amount of coverage which was permitted by the variance.

2. Parking—A letter from Michael Jeitner, P.E., of Bohler Engineering, dated September 8, 2016, indicates that additional auto parking is proposed as a part of this build-out. However, the previous drawings on file with this office, dated December 2013, show the same amount of auto parking as the current proposed drawings. Further, it appears that all of the auto parking has already been constructed. While it is clear that additional truck parking is now proposed on the north side of the building, it does not appear that any additional 9 feet by 18 feet vehicular parking is proposed at this time. Clarification is necessary.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the November 2, 2016. It is not necessary for you to attend this meeting, but you are welcome to do so and to offer comments on the proposals 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.

CND:dc

cc: United States Cold Storage, LLC
    Michael Jeitner, P.E., Bohler Engineering
    Judith Stern Goldstein, Boucher & James, Township Planner
    Mike Schwartz, P.E., Gilmore & Associates, Township Engineer (via e-mail)
    Paul Stepanoff, Township Manager (via e-mail)
    Quakertown Area Planning Committee
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 Riverview Banquet Facility & Fine Dining Restaurant
TMP #41-28-67-3
Applicant: Pantera Realty, LLC
Owner: Same
Plan Dated: September 2, 2016
Date Received: September 20, 2016

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: Construct a 2-story, 33,545-square-foot, banquet hall on a 10.01-acre site. The existing barn is proposed to be converted into a two story restaurant (6,114 square feet) and the existing historic dwelling unit will become a reception suite. A total of 250 spaces are provided. The development will be served by community on-site sewerage and on-site public water supply.

Location: Northwest side of the Route 202 Spur, south of its intersection with River Road (PA Route 32).

Zoning: LI Light Industrial District allows various manufacturing and warehouse uses on a minimum lot size of 3 acres and a maximum impervious surface coverage of 60 percent. An office park is permitted on a lot comprised of 10 acres or more, with a maximum impervious surface coverage of 50 percent.

The plan notes that Conditional Use was granted by the Board of Supervisors to allow the entrance drive and utilities to cross Rabbit Run and also allow the applicant to remove the existing dam. In addition, the entrance drive is permitted to cross steep slopes with parking areas allowed on steep slopes.
Variances were granted by the Zoning Hearing Board to permit the banquet facility and restaurant uses, as well as, a reduced buffer for parking and a greater disturbance of woodlands, class II slopes, and agricultural soils than that permitted by the natural resource protection provisions.

Present Use: Vacant; former homestead.

COMMENTS

1. **Historic preservation**—We support the preservation and reuse of the historic dwelling and barn. The historic recognition/designation should be discussed during the land development approval process to encourage the long-term preservation of these important historic resources. In addition to conservation easement or façade easement options, appropriate treatment of the surrounding landscape should be considered in context with the structures to enhance their historic attributes.

2. **Traffic flow and parking**—According to the site parking calculations (Sheet 3), five parking spaces are intended for the Bridal House, leaving seven spaces for the rear portion of the restaurant in the vicinity of the loading zone and trash enclosure. If the intent is to use these parking for employees, we suggest they be designated as such. Furthermore, the proposed traffic flow into and out of this parking area should be provided. We suggest that a traffic circulation template be submitted to illustrate the intended on-site traffic movements for both service trucks and motorists accessing each building. Section 5.18.B.9.a of the subdivision and land development ordinance requires a minimum of 15 feet for one-way access. As proposed, the existing drive from the Route 202 Spur is rather narrow (11 to 12 feet wide) and the other drive into this portion of the site consists of a 15-foot-wide driveway with an awkward intersection arrangement for right-in turning movements. The plan should be revised accordingly.

We note that Sheet 16 indicates traffic sign details, but their location is not indicated on the site plan. Therefore, all proposed signage should be indicated on future submissions.

3. **Pedestrian connections**—Sidewalks are proposed in front of the restaurant, around portions of the banquet hall, and in the vicinity of the pavilion. We recommend that the township determine whether any additional crosswalks or sidewalk areas should be required to enhance pedestrian traffic among buildings including the bridal house. For example, sidewalks could be extended and designated crosswalks could be provided to connect the ends of the pavilion’s walkway to nearby sidewalks. Accommodations for pedestrian traffic between the parking lots and buildings should also be considered.

4. **Building encroachment**—Sheet 2 shows a small portion of the barn (approximately 8 to 10 feet) encroaching upon the adjacent Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission property (TMP #41-1-90-6). We recommend that this encroachment issue be addressed, given the proposal to convert the barn to restaurant use. We suggest that area in the form of an easement or agreement for exterior maintenance of the barn may also be needed.

5. **Utility plan**—Sheet 8 does not show the proposed water lines or locations for fire hydrants. The Environmental Impact Assessment Report indicates that a water resources impact study
will be performed after two test wells are constructed. These wells will also be constructed for possible future use as water supply wells. This information should be provided in future plan submissions.

6. **Waiver requests**—Waivers from provisions of the subdivision and land development ordinance have been requested including: deviations from required plan scale, pipe diameter, size of parking spaces, parking setback, and landscaping provisions. In accordance with the requirement of Section 512(b) of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Code, township officials should determine if the waivers should be approved in whole or in part.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for its November 2, 2016, 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:dc

cc: Pantera Realty, LLC
Gilmore & Associates
Dennis H. Carney, Township Manager (via email)
MEMORANDUM

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

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Final Plan of Mill Creek Estates Lot Line Changes

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: Lot line changes are proposed that increase the lot area of TMP #48-22-20-63 (Lot 17) from 11,826 square feet to 12,462 square feet and reduce the lot areas of TMP #48-22-20-65 (Lot 19) from 12,701 square feet to 12,125 square feet and TMP #48-22-20-46 (Open Space 3) from 56,765 square feet to 56,705 square feet. TMP #48-22-20-64 (Lot 18) retains the same lot area (12,375 square feet). All lots are to be served by public water and sewer service.

Location: Strathmann and Woodland drives at the former Stackpole Elementary School.

Zoning: 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. Cluster development is permitted by special exception with minimum lot area of 12,000 square feet.

Present Use: Residential cluster development totaling 28 single-family residential lots.

COMMENT

- Variance (Zoning ordinance, Sections 185-16(7)(C) and 185-17(C))—The adjusted lot line between TMP #48-22-20-63 (Lot 17) and TMP #48-22-20-64 (Lot 18) slightly impacts the designated open space area of TMP #48-22-20-46 (Open Space 3). The variance granted by the Upper Southampton Township Zoning Hearing Board on January 16, 2014 permitted 7.902 percent open space as opposed to the 30 percent required open space. There is a minimal decrease in the open space area and the township should verify the decrease relative to the variance granted.
This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the November 2, 2016, 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.

JSI:dc

cc: Stackpole Investment, LP
    John VanLuvanee, Esq., Eastburn & Gray
    Robert Cunningham, P.E., Holmes Cunningham LLC
    Joe Golden, Township Manager (via email)
    Larry Young, P.E., TriState Engineers & Land Surveyors, Inc.
MEMORANDUM

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

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Preliminary Plan of Land Development for the Kole Tract
        TMP #48-17-34
        Applicant: Dr. Edward Kole
        Owner: Same
        Plan Dated: September 9, 2016
        Date Received: September 14, 2016

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 two-story 19,500-square-foot (gross) floor area multi-tenant building for professional, business, and doctor offices (Uses 24, 26 and 28) on a 1.23-acre tract. Seventy-four parking spaces are proposed and the building will be serviced by public water and sewer facilities.

Location: South side of Street Road, approximately ½ mile east of Second Street Pike.

Zoning: CC, Controlled Commercial District is to provide for nonretail commercial uses, professional offices, institutional uses, and other related low-traffic-generating uses on a minimum lot area of 1 acre.

The Upper Southampton Township Zoning Hearing Board granted the following variances on May 27, 2016:

Section 185-47 To permit 74 parking spaces, where 77 are required.
Section 185-22 To allow impervious surface coverage of 84.4 percent where 80 percent is allowed.
Sections 185-30 & 185-31.D(1) To allow a front yard setback of 39.37 feet as measured from the ultimate right-of-way, where 125 feet is required.
Section 185-63.A(2)(h)  
To allow a freestanding sign to be located 33.61 feet from the curb line and 1 foot from the ultimate right-of-way line.

Present Use: Vacant and vegetated (former single-family residential and commercial block building).

COMMENTS

1. **Waivers requested**—The applicant is requesting waivers from the following subdivision and land development ordinance (SALDO) requirements:

   - **Section 160-41.E**  
     To allow parking spaces of 9 feet wide by 18 feet long where spaces of 9 feet wide by 19.5 feet long are required.

   - **Section 160-41.C**  
     Requiring an 8-foot-wide grass strip in a parking area totaling more than 36 cars.

   - **Section 160-67.D(2)(c)[7]**  
     Requires basin side slopes to be four feet horizontal to one foot vertical.

   - **Sections 160-67.D(2)(c)[iii], & [vii]**  
     Requiring a minimum of 18-inch diameter pipe and a minimum cover of 2 feet for storm sewer pipe outside of the cartway.

   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. **Traffic Impact Study**—Street Road is classified as a principal arterial in the *Upper Southampton Township Comprehensive Plan Update (2010)* that carries high volumes of traffic. We recommend the township request a traffic impact study to identify potential problem areas and recommend adequate and safe measures to maintain circulation and protect major streets from undue congestion and hazard. The traffic impact study can evaluate current and potential access management issues, the existing center turning lane, and the potential for new signage or other traffic control strategies that may increase efficiency and safety along Street Road.

3. **Access management**—SALDO Section 160-33.E notes that a development that is proposed on an existing arterial should consider reducing the number of access points on major streets. In addition, the *Upper Southampton Township Comprehensive Plan Update (2010)*, Chapter 7, Transportation discusses Street Road, east of Second Street Pike as an area where there are frequent curb cuts and recommends consolidating access points to decrease conflict areas and increase safety. Both properties to the east and west of the subject site have existing drives close to the shared, common property lines creating an opportunity for shared access and reduction of curb cuts on Street Road. The township should consider requiring shared access when reviewing this land development.

   A similar comment was made in the correspondence for the Preliminary Plan of Land Development for the Southampton Senior Living Facility, BCPC #12170, dated June 28, 2016.
The stretch of commercial properties along the Street Road frontage east of Kutcher Road to the two tracts proposed for the senior living facility (TMP #48-17-37 and #48-20-43) appear to have more than one curb cut within close proximity to each other. The township may wish to initiate agreement between property owners, during the land development phase, to consolidate curb cuts along Street Road in hopes of reducing potential conflicts of left turn in and left turn out. Also, it will help create planting strips and increase the space for the addition of streetscape improvement elements such as street trees, benches, gateway features, and screening shrubs.

The two drives on the subject site may require coordination and review by the Pennsylvania Department of Transportation and potentially require a Highway Occupancy Permit. The drives appear to tie in with existing grades and the existing edge of sidewalk. The drives should comply with SALDO Section 160-61.A and be constructed with curbs with adequate radii to tie into the existing street curbing.

4. **Internal vehicular circulation, access, and loading**—The submitted plan should clearly demonstrate safe and compliant truck and emergency vehicle access throughout the site.

   It appears that proposed directional access is one way in and one way out which should be notated on the plan. In addition, it appears the drop-off area located in front of the building can only be accessed on the way out after driving through the one way circulation loop through the entire parking lot. The second option to access the drop-off area would be by making an awkward, hard left turn over the striped area immediately after entering the site. We recommend the drop-off circulation in the front of the building be designed and delineated to promote clear, safe, and direct vehicular movement to the drop-off area and exit lane without traveling through the parking lot aisles in the rear. It will help prevent potential car and pedestrian conflicts.

5. **Nonconforming structure**—Zoning ordinance Section 185-68.A notes that a nonconforming structure may be altered, reconstructed, or enlarged, provided that such alteration, reconstruction, or enlargement does not increase the extent of the existing nonconformity. The submitted plan shows an increase in the extent of nonconformity for the side yard setback requirement. The minimum required side yard setback is 20 feet and the existing nonconformity along the eastern property line is a 13.2-foot side yard setback. The proposed building setback is 12.32 feet, increasing the nonconformity by almost a foot. The plan should be adjusted to not increase the extent of the nonconformity.

6. **Tree removal**—There appears to be several mature trees on the site that are being removed and zoning ordinance Section 185-20.E(3) requires a zoning permit for trees to be removed that are greater than 10 inches in caliper 4 feet above the grade. The township should ensure compliance with this requirement.

   In addition, the planting section of the SALDO Section 160-51.O notes that each tree that is removed over the minimum size for which a permit is required shall be replaced and the replacement tree location and species shall be indicated on the preliminary plan. The plan does not indicate replacement tree locations. Since a variance was granted to allow an increase in overall impervious surface and minimal landscaping is required other than a buffer strip and street trees, the township should consider requiring the replacement trees be placed on the
site. The plans should be updated with accurate information regarding tree removal and replacement.

7. **Off-street parking**—SALDO Section 160-41.C states that parking areas that exceed 36 cars shall be physically separated by an 8-foot planting strip. The proposed parking area shows 74 spaces with no planting strip. The plan should be revised accordingly.

   The required parking stall depth for 60 degree parking is 19.5 feet and the plan shows 18 feet. The plan should be revised accordingly.

8. **Street trees**—The Landscaping Plan, Sheet 4 of 10, displays two street trees within the proposed exit drive. The trees should be properly located prior to the next submission.

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 must be submitted for this proposed 19,500-gross-square-foot office building. We recommend that the planning module be submitted at the preliminary plan stage to coordinate land development review with the planning module review.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the November 2, 2016, 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.

JSI:dc

cc: Dr. Edward Kole  
Joe Golden, Township Manager (via email)  
Larry Young, P.E., TriState Engineers & Land Surveyors, Inc., Township Engineer
MEMORANDUM

TO: Warminster Township Board of Supervisors
    Warminster Township Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Preliminary Plan of Subdivision for Sansalone
    TMP #49-18-148-2; 148-3
    Applicant: Carmelo and Lauren Sansalone
    Owner: Same
    Plan Dated: August 31, 2016
    Date Received: September 23, 2016

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 TMP #49-18-148-2 (32,016 square feet) into two residential lots. Lot 1 (25,477 square feet) contains two dwellings of 1,152 and 1,057 square feet. TMP #49-18-148-3 (3,484.8 square feet) will be consolidated with Lot 1, allowing an existing 901-square-foot garage to be completely contained within the bounds of the lot. Lot 2 (9,109 square feet) will not be developed at this time. The lots are served by public water and sewerage.

Location: Eastern side of Evergreen Avenue between Cedar and Date streets.

Zoning: R-3 Residence District permits single-family detached dwellings on lot of 9,000 feet or more.

Present Use: Multifamily residential.

COMMENTS

1. **Sidewalks**—Section 809 of the subdivision and land development ordinance requires that sidewalks be constructed on one side of all frontage streets and both sides of all other streets within the subdivision. The plan shows an existing sidewalk along Evergreen Avenue but no sidewalk along Cedar or Date streets. The plan should be revised to show sidewalks.
2. **Street trees**—Section 523.4, Street Trees, of the subdivision land development ordinance requires that street trees shall be planted along all streets except where the township agrees that suitable street trees are already in place. One street tree shall be planted for every 40 lineal feet of street frontage and may be planted in groupings. Aerial photos show existing trees along all road frontages, but the township should ensure that adequate street trees are provided.

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 must be submitted for this proposed subdivision.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the November 2, 2016, 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:dc

cc: Carmelo and Lauren Sansalone  
Eastern Chadrow Associates, Inc.  
Craig D. Kennard, P.E., Gilmore & Associates, Township Engineer  
Greg Schuster, Municipal 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 Guerra
                   TMP #49-9-87
                   Applicant: Guerra HLA, Inc.
                   Owner: Same
                   Plan Dated: July 13, 2016
                   Date Received: October 5, 2016

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 1,930-square-foot addition to an existing 726-square-foot commercial building on a 0.3-acre (13,356-square-foot) parcel. An existing 1,459-square-foot building will be removed. The site is served by public water and sewer.

Location: Southeastern side of York Road approximately 1,200 feet south of its intersection with Bristol Road.

Zoning: C-1 Commercial District permits retail shop, restaurants, and business or professional office on lots of a minimum 15,000 square feet.

Present Use: Commercial.

COMMENTS
1. **Nonconforming structure**—Zoning ordinance Section 2401.a states nonconforming structures may be altered, reconstructed, or enlarged provided that such alteration, reconstruction or enlargement does not increase the extent of the existing nonconformity. The plan shows an addition to an existing nonconforming garage structure which extends approximately five feet beyond the front of the garage building which is an increase in the nonconformity. The applicant is requesting a variance to this requirement. Action should not be taken prior to the zoning issue being resolved.
2. **York Road setbacks**—Zoning ordinance Section 2019.B.b, Special setbacks, requires that parking areas be set back a minimum of 50 feet along York Road, with appropriate landscaping and screening provided. The applicant is requesting a variance from Section 2019.B.b. Action should not be taken prior to the zoning issue being resolved.

3. **Parking setback**—Subdivision and land development ordinance Section 512.10 requires that all parking areas shall be set back from the future right-of-way line at least 15 feet except at entrance and exit drives. The distance between this required setback and the future cartway shall be maintained as a planting strip. The existing parking area along York Road is set back only 2 feet from the ultimate right-of-way. The plan should be revised to show the required setback.

4. **Parking calculation/building area**—The table showing building area indicates that the total proposed building area is 3,808 square feet. The table also shows the existing garage area is 1,452 square feet. The parking calculations are based on the proposed building area but do not include the existing garage. The total building area including the garage would be 5,260 square feet. The plan should be revised to clarify the building area that will generate parking and revise the parking calculations, if necessary.

5. **Setback lines**—Section 404.4.I, Preliminary plans, of the subdivision and land development ordinance requires that building setback lines established by the zoning ordinance be shown on the plan. The plan does not show the front, side, or rear yard setback lines required by zoning ordinance Section 1101 for the C-1 District. This information is important to depict nonconformities and compliance with zoning setback requirements. The plan should be revised to show this information.

6. **Trash enclosure**—The plan shows a trash enclosure located 7 feet from the southern property line. This enclosure lies within the required 10-foot side yard. Also, no detail drawing of the enclosure is provided such as fencing or dumpster location. The enclosure should be moved to comply with the side yard setback and a detail drawing should be provided.

7. **Landscaping plan**—The Lighting and Landscaping Plan (Sheet 5) should be revised to provide calculations for required street tree, buffer, and parking area landscaping so compliance with Section 523, Landscape Improvements, of the subdivision and land development ordinance can be verified.

8. **Street trees**—Section 523.4, Street Trees, of the subdivision and land development ordinance requires that street trees shall be planted along all streets. One street tree shall be planted for every 40 linear feet of street frontage and may be planted in groupings. There are no existing street trees along York Road and only one is proposed (*Acer saccharum*—sugar maple). The plan should be revised to show the required plantings.

We note that two sugar maple trees are proposed at the rear of the site. If they are required street trees intended to be relocated on the site due to sight distance issues along York Road, this should be noted on the plan, provided the township approves of this arrangement.

9. **Invasive plant**—The plant materials list on Sheet 5 proposes the use of 47 *Euonymus alatus* (burning bush) shrubs. This nonnative species is included on the township’s Disapproved
Plant List (Section 523.10 of the subdivision and land development ordinance) and has been classified as an invasive plant in Pennsylvania by the Department of Conservation and Natural Resources (DCNR) [www.dcnr.state.pa.us/forestry/plants/invasiveplants/index.htm](http://www.dcnr.state.pa.us/forestry/plants/invasiveplants/index.htm). Section 523.10 states that all plantings proposed shall not be classified as an invasive species according to the most recent listings of the USDA, DCNR, or Pennsylvania Department of Agriculture. Therefore, the plan should be revised to provide an appropriate shrub substitution. We also recommend that more than one type of shrub be proposed, to reduce the possibility of all shrubs on the site being wiped out due to disease or a pest infestation.

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 must be submitted for this proposed land development.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the November 2, 2016, 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:dc

cc: Guerra HLA, Inc.
    Eastern/Chadrow Associates, Inc.
    Craig D. Kennard, P.E, Gilmore & Associates, Municipal Engineer
    Gregg Schuster, Township Manager (via email)
    Amanda Zimmerman, Assistant Township Manager (via email)
    Judith Stern Goldstein, Boucher & James Engineers, Township Planner (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 Subdivision for Shihadeh
         TMP #50-23-141-1
         Applicant: John Shihadeh
         Owner: Same
         Plan Dated: August 19, 2016
         Date Received: September 22, 2016

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 1.3915-acre parcel into two single-family detached lots. Lot 1 (40,567 square feet) contains an existing single-family dwelling. Lot 2 (20,046 square feet) will not be developed at this time. Public sewerage and on-lot water serve the site.

Location: Northern side of the intersection of Tohickon Lane and Grady Avenue.

Zoning: R-2I Residential Infill District permits single-family detached dwellings on lots of 20,000 square feet or more.

Present Use: Residential and vacant

COMMENTS

1. **Frontage on a public street**—Proposed Lot 2 has frontage on Grady Avenue, which consists of a gravel driveway that has not been improved to township standards. Section 2317 of the zoning ordinance requires that all lots have access to a public street of at least a fifty-foot width.
2. **Street improvements**—The plan does not show the required street improvements for Grady Avenue. Section 304.2 of the subdivision and land development ordinance requires that residential streets have a paved cartway width of 26 feet with curbs and 24 feet without.

3. **Sidewalks**—Section 311.1 of the subdivision and land development ordinance requires that sidewalks be provided along all streets classified as secondary or greater. Sidewalks may also be required at the discretion of the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors along residential streets where foot traffic volumes warrant. The township should determine if sidewalks should be provided Grady Avenue.

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 subdivision.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the November 2, 2016, 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:dc

cc: John Shihadeh  
ProTract Engineering  
Tom Zarko, CKS Engineers, Township Engineer  
Barry Luber, Municipal Manager (via email)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Warwick Township Board of Supervisors
Warwick Township Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Preliminary Plan of Subdivision – Central Park at Warwick
TMP # 51-3-31-3, 51-3-31-4, 51-3-31-5
Applicant: Prestige Property Partners, LLC
Owner: Kenneth D. and Nancy S. Reiff, Donald D. Reiff, Barbara Ann Fry
Plan Dated: September 14, 2016
Date Received: September 28, 2016

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 20.4-acre parcel into 13 clustered single-family residential lots. Eleven of the lots (Lots 2-12) will be 15,000 square feet (0.34 acres), while Lots 1 and 13 will be 1.89 acres and 3.6 acres, respectively, and contain existing dwellings. Three common open space areas are proposed totaling 8.94 acres. Open Space A will be 4.06 acres, Open Space B will be 1.34 acres, and Open Space C will be 3.54 acres and contain 0.65 acres of active open space. Additional open space is provided, as 1.67 acres of Lot 13 will be deed restricted as agriculture, for a total amount of 10.61 acres of open space. The subdivision will include a cul-de-sac street to provide access to each lot. All lots are to be served by public water and sewer service.

Location: East side of Guinea Lane, north of the intersection with Turkey Trot Road, across from Ashton Drive and Wynne Way.

Zoning: The R-1 Residential District permits use B2 Cluster Subdivision as a conditional use, with a minimum site area of 15 acres, a minimum lot area of 15,000 square feet, and a gross density of no greater than 120 percent of the permitted density of use B1 single-family. A minimum of 50 percent of the site area is required to be set aside as open space.

Present Use: Residential/agricultural
COMMENTS

1. **Conditional use**—Section 195-20 of the zoning ordinance requires that all conditional use applications request a formal hearing before the Board of Supervisors for conditional use approval. The materials provided do not indicate whether such an approval has been requested. Plan approval should not be granted until conditional use approval is obtained from the Board of Supervisors.

2. **Waivers requested**—The site plan indicates that the applicant is requesting waivers from the following subdivision and land development ordinance requirements:

   - **Section 163-33.1** A curbed width of 36 feet of pavement is required for collector streets where paving tapers of 75 feet in width are proposed on Guinea Lane.
   - **Section 163-35.F** A vertical curve of 125 feet is provided where a minimum of 100 feet is required.
   - **Section 163-36.B** A cul-de-sac street with a length of 1,020 feet is proposed where the maximum length permitted is 500 feet.
   - **Section 163-36.E** Drainage of a cul-de-sac is required to be located near the open end, where drainage is not proposed near the open end.
   - **Section 163-65.A** Sidewalks are required on both sides of the street, where no sidewalk is proposed for the frontage along Lot 13.

   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. **Pavement width**—Although requested, a waiver may not be required. The subdivision and land development ordinance (SALDO) indicates a width of 36 feet or greater is required. A greater width is provided.

4. **Vertical curve**—A waiver may not be required. The SALDO indicates that a distance of 100 feet for a vertical curve is the minimum distance. A vertical curve with a distance of 125 feet is proposed.

5. **Active open space**—The zoning ordinance Section 195-62.B(5) requires that all active open space provide recreational facilities. The plan indicates that there will be 0.65 acres of active open space within Open Space area C, but does not indicate any particular recreational facilities on this space. The plan should be revised to show compliance with the requirement for recreational facilities.

6. **Tree protection**—Section 163-51.1 does not permit any grading activity within a tree protection zone. It appears that some grading is proposed around the detention basin which is approximately 20 feet from the drip line, and in Open Space area A where a wooded area currently exists. The plan should be revised to comply with the tree protection ordinance.

7. **Buffer**—The notes on the record plan (Sheet 3 of 18) do not match the notes on the landscape plan (Sheet 9 of 18). The record plan correctly identifies that a Class B buffer is required along the northern portions of the property, whereas the schedule of plantings on the landscape plan indicates that a Type 1 buffer is required.
8. **Impact statements**—Section 163-13 of the SALDO requires that for subdivisions of 10 or more lots, an education impact statement and an environment impact statement must be provided.

9. **Lighting plan**—It does not appear that the lighting plan (Sheet 9 of 18) shows all of the proposed light fixtures. The lighting legends and luminaire schedule indicate 20 fixtures and 18 fixtures, respectively, while the plan only indicates a location for three fixtures.

10. **Street trees**—The landscaping plan and tree planting schedule are not coordinated in regards to the street trees proposed along Road A. The plan indicates three different types of trees, while the schedule lists four.

11. **Signage**—No details for any subdivision identification sign have been provided. If any such sign is proposed, it must conform to Article XXII of the zoning ordinance.

12. **Easement**—The access easement for TMP #51-3-48 should be revised. General Note #23 on Sheet 3 of 18 states that Road A is intended to be privately owned and maintained by the homeowners association. Sheet 2 of 18 shows a 25-foot wide “right-of-way” access easement in favor of adjacent TMP #53-3-48. The easement is located slightly off the center line of proposed Road A and several feet onto Lots 1-7 along the Road A frontage. The easement should be revised to include the entire width of Road A, including sidewalks, and to exclude areas located on Lots 1-7.

13. **Trail**—General Note 24 on Sheet 3 of 18 states that the homeowners association grants a blanket easement to Warwick Township for all pedestrian trails. Does this mean that the trails will be open to the public? The plan shows the trails connecting to the sidewalk on Road A at the cul-de-sac bulb. Since Road A is proposed to be private, the public will not have the right to use the sidewalk, or the road that connects to the trails, unless an easement is established to permit public access.

14. **Natural resource protection**—Sheet 3 of 18 of the plan indicates that the amount of proposed resource protected land is less than the amount required to be protected for floodplain soils and riparian buffer area per zoning ordinance Section 195-61.B. A note indicates the amount of disturbance is for construction of the walking trail. This discrepancy with the zoning ordinance requirement should be resolved prior to plan approval.

CND:jk

cc:  Prestige Property Partners, L.L.C  
Karl B. Janetka, P.E., Van Cleef Engineering Associates  
John VanLuvanee, Esq., Eastburn and Gray, P.C.  
Michele Fountain, P.E., CKS Engineers, Inc., Township Engineer (via email)  
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)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Wrightstown Township Board of Supervisors
Wrightstown Township Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Preliminary Plan of Subdivision for Worthington Mill Estates
TMP #53-12-28
Applicant: Barley Homes, LLC
Owner: Richard M. Plusch
Plan Dated: September 15, 2016
Date Received: September 26, 2016

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 32.8-acre tract into three lots of the following sizes: Lot 1, 4.64 acres; Lot 2, 4.662 acres; and Lot 3, 23.025 acres. Proposed Lots 1 and 2 would be used for construction of single-family detached dwellings (Use B-1). Proposed Lot 3 would include an existing single-family detached dwelling and continue the present agricultural and horticultural use (Use A-1). The proposed lots would share a driveway with access from Worthington Mill Road and stormwater management facilities. The lots would be served by individual on-lot wells and on-low sewage disposal systems.

Location: North side of Worthington Mill Road, between its intersections with Swamp Road and Mud Road.

Zoning: CM-Conservation Management District permits Use B-1 Single-family detached dwellings on lots of at least 1 acre and Use A-1 Agriculture and horticulture on lots of at least 5 acres.

Present Use: Residential and agricultural

COMMENTS

1. Trees to be removed—It appears that trees will be removed at the driveway entrance along Worthington Mill Road. We recommend that the trees to be removed at this location and any other location are labeled as such in accordance with Section 22-525.A(2)(f) of the subdivision and land development ordinance.
2. **Tree planting on stormwater basin berm**—As shown on the landscape plan (Sheet 4) trees are to be planted on the berm of the proposed detention basin. Planting trees on the basin berm is not recommended because tree roots have been found to weaken the structural integrity of basin berms.

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 must be submitted for this proposed subdivision.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the November 2, 2016 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: Keith C. Boyd, Barley Homes, LLC  
Evan D. Sowers, P.E., H & K Group, Inc.  
Mario Canales, P.E., Pickering, Corts, & Summerson, Inc., Township Engineer  
Joseph F. Pantano, Township Manager (via email)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Wrightstown Township Board of Supervisors
   Wrightstown Township Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Revised Final Plan of Subdivision for Black Oak Place (Anchor Nursery Tract)
   TMP #53-15-5
   Applicant: Realty Landscaping Corporation
   Owner: Same
   Plan Dated: August 22, 2016
   Date Received: September 19, 2016

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 33.17-acre parcel into 10 lots for single-family detached dwellings and one commercial lot for an existing nursery. The nursery lot (Lot 11) would encompass 7.38 acres. An open space lot of 9.87 acres would also be created. According to a note on the plan, the residential portion of the proposal will not be recorded at this time. Individual on-lot water and sewage facilities will serve the commercial portion of the site.

Location: Between Durham Road (Route 413) and Second Street Pike, about 1,200 feet south of Penn Park Road.

Zoning: CR-2 Country Residential/Medium Density District which permits single-family detached dwellings on a lot of at least 30,000 square feet and agricultural/horticultural uses on a lot of at least 2 acres. The zoning hearing board has granted variances from the following sections of the zoning ordinance:

- Section 903.B.2 regarding wetland crossings
- Section 1000.E.3 regarding proximity of sand mound to property line
- Section 1000.E.3d allowing septic systems for three lots to lie within the required setbacks
- Section 1000.E.3d allowing septic systems for Lot 3 to be located within Parcel B

A special exception has been granted for relief from Section 905.IV.B(1), regarding utility and road crossing of a floodplain.
Present Use: Vacant/agricultural

COMMENTS

It is our understanding that only the nursery lot would be subdivided at this time. Given that the subdivision of the single-family detached dwelling lots is also depicted we recommend that a note is added to the plan explicitly stating that this submittal is for subdivision of only the nursery lot (Lot 11). 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 November 2, 2016 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: Robert J. Dwyer, Realty Landscaping Corporation
Van Cleef Engineering Associates
Mario Canales, P.E., Pickering, Corts & Summerson, Inc., Township Engineer
Joe Pantano, Township Manager (via email)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Development</th>
<th>BCPC Number</th>
<th>Tax Parcel Number</th>
<th>PaDEP Code Number</th>
<th>Plan Review Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wrightstown Township</td>
<td>Dacey Tract</td>
<td>5076-F</td>
<td>53-2-103</td>
<td>1-09953-197-2</td>
<td>0201-60036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warwick Township</td>
<td>Central Park at Warwick</td>
<td>12156</td>
<td>51-3-31-3, -31-4 &amp; -31-5</td>
<td>1-09951-197-3J</td>
<td>0201-60037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middletown Township</td>
<td>Stonehaven</td>
<td>12173</td>
<td>22-31-59</td>
<td>1-09003-384-3J</td>
<td>0201-60039</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
October 19, 2016

Adam Crews
Crews Surveying, LLC
1806 Deep Run Road, Suite B
P.O. Box 289
Pipersville, PA 18944

RE: Dacey Subdivision Planning Module
PaDEP Code #1-09053-197-2
BCPC #5076-F
TMP #53-2-103
Wrightstown Township, Bucks County, PA

Dear Mr. Crews:

We have received a copy of the planning module\(^1\) regarding the subdivision of TMP #53-2-103 into three single-family residential lots and the proposal to construct two single-family dwellings. The dwellings will be served by individual elevated sand mound disposal systems.

The 201 Facilities Plan, Township of Wrightstown, 1984 is the official Act 537 Plan for this portion of Wrightstown Township. The installation of individual sand mound disposal is consistent with the official Act 537 Plan, since this plan indicates that the site is within an area to be served by systems with on-site sewage disposal systems.

A note under Section G.6 of Component 2 indicates that the project is exempt per PaDEP technical guidance because the disturbance is less than 10 acres. However, there appears to be a structure on the property that is older than 40 years, which would require notification to confirm compliance.

The County Planning Agency Review, Component 4B, is attached for inclusion with the planning module application to the PaDEP. If the municipality approves the planning module and 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 BCDH and BCPC 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 Wrightstown Township Sewage Facilities Plan. Therefore, the Bucks County Department of Health (BCDH) and Bucks County Planning Commission (BCPC) 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

MMWjk

Attachment

cc: Genevie Kostick, BCDH
    Elizabeth Mahoney, PaDEP
    Joe Pantano, Township Manager
    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
Dacey Subdivision

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

1. Date plan received by county planning agency. September 23, 2016
2. Date plan received by planning agency with areawide jurisdiction
   Agency name
3. Date review completed by agency October 19, 2016

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.)?

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</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

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

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

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

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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? 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. N/A</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><img src="signature.png" alt="Signature" /></td>
<td></td>
<td>18. Name, Title and signature of person completing this section:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="signature.png" alt="Signature" /></td>
<td></td>
<td>Name: Matthew M. Walters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="signature.png" alt="Signature" /></td>
<td></td>
<td>Title: Community Planner Signature:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="signature.png" alt="Signature" /></td>
<td></td>
<td>Date: October 19, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="signature.png" alt="Signature" /></td>
<td></td>
<td>Name of County or Areawide Planning Agency: Bucks County Planning Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="signature.png" alt="Signature" /></td>
<td></td>
<td>Address: The Almshouse, 1260 Almshouse Road, Doylestown, PA 18901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="signature.png" alt="Signature" /></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.
October 19, 2016

Karin A. Holsinger P.E.
Van Cleef Engineering Associates
501 N. Main Street
Doylestown PA, 18901

RE: Central Park at Warwick
PaDEP Code # 1-09951-197-3J
BCPC #12156
TMP # 51-3-31-3, 51-3-31-4, 51-3-31-5
Warwick Township, Bucks County, PA

Dear Ms. Holsinger,

We have received a copy of the planning module\(^1\) regarding the proposed construction of a 13-lot single-family subdivision on a 20.4-acre site that will be connected to the public sewer system. The projected sewage from the 13 home subdivision will be 3,510 gallons per day. The sewage will be collected by a force main and grinder pump and flow eventually to the Fish Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant.

The *Act 537 Sewage Facilities Plan for Warwick Township, 1995* is the official Act 537 Plan for this portion of Warwick Township. The plan indicates that this property is outside the area intended to be served by public sewer. The Act 537 Plan designates this property for on-lot sewage disposal. The planning module’s alternatives analysis indicates that the property is not suitable for on-lot disposal due to the small size of the proposed cluster development lots, and also unsuitable for spray irrigation due to the presence of environmentally sensitive areas surrounding the cluster development.

The proposal to install grinder pumps and a low pressure force main to connect to public sewer is not consistent with the official Act 537 Plan, since this plan indicates that the subject site is outside an area to be served by public sewer. The plan recommends that properties located outside of a sewer service area utilize on-lot systems, and where on-lot disposal is not suitable, that each site be evaluated individually for alternatives such as a small-flow or package treatment facilities.

The Act 537 Plan does indicate other properties in the area which are designated to be served by public sewer, including other properties along Guinea Lane to the north and south of the property.

---

\(^1\) Under the revised Chapter 71 of the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection’s Title 25, Rules and Regulations, the planning module is a revision to the Warwick Township Sewage Facilities Plan. Therefore, the Bucks County Department of Health (BCDH) and Bucks County Planning Commission (BCPC) are required to review and comment on the proposed plan revision.
Section G.6 of Component 3 notes that the applicant is awaiting a response from the Pennsylvania Historic and Museum Commission (PHMC) to confirm the project is consistent with the state history code. Section G.2 and J.3 and J.4 have not been signed by a representative of the Warwick Township Water and Sewer Authority to indicate that the collection and conveyance facilities have adequate capacity and are able to provide services to the proposed development.

The County Planning Agency Review, Component 4B, is attached for inclusion with the planning module application to DEP. If the municipality approves the planning module and 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 Bucks County 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,

Christopher N. Dochney
Planner

CND:jk

Attachment

cc: Genevie Kostick, BCDH
     Elizabeth Mahoney, PaDEP
     Gail Weniger, Manager, Warwick Township
     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  
Central Park at Warwick

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

1. Date plan received by county planning agency. **September 28, 2016**
2. Date plan received by planning agency with areawide jurisdiction  
   Agency name
3. Date review completed by agency **October 19, 2016**

## 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>
</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?

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
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 attached 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?

☐ ☐ 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: Christopher N. Dochney

Title: Planner Signature: [Signature]

Date: October 19, 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.
October 25, 2016

Mr. David DiCecco
DL Howell & Associates, Inc.
1250 Wright's Lane
West Chester, PA 19380

RE: Stonehaven Langhorne Subdivision Planning Module
PaDEP Code #1-09003-384-3J
BCPC #12173
TMP #22-31-59
Middletown Township, Bucks County, PA

Dear Mr. DiCecco:

We have received a copy of the subject planning module\(^1\) regarding the proposed connection of 10 single-family residences (one existing) to the existing Middletown/Bucks County Water and Sewer Authority sanitary sewer system.

According to our records the *Bucks County, Pennsylvania Sewerage Facilities Plan* (1970) is the official Act 537 Plan for Middletown Township. We note that the township has submitted a proposed update to the Act 537 Plan for review by our office, but as of this date, we have not received official notification as to the plan’s status. However, the proposal to connect to the lots to public sewers appears to be consistent with the township Act 537 plans and county planning policies regarding sewage facilities. The site is within an area to be served by public sewers that will flow to the Neshaminy Interceptor and ultimately be conveyed and treated at the Northeast Philadelphia Treatment Plant.

Component 3 Sewage Collection does not include signatures authorizing collection and conveyance and treatment capacity in Section G. Proposed Wastewater Disposal Facilities and Section J. Chapter 94 Consistency Determination.

The County Planning Agency Review, Component 4B, is attached for inclusion with the planning module application to the PaDEP. If the municipality approves the planning module and 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 BCDH and BCPC 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 Middletown Township Sewage Facilities Plan. Therefore, the Bucks County Department of Health (BCDH) and Bucks County Planning Commission (BCPC) 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,

Catherine Irving Gauthier
Planner

CIG:dc

Attachment

cc: Genevie Kostick, BCDH
    Elizabeth Mahoney, PaDEP
    Stephanie Teoli Kuhls, Township Manager
    Patrick Duffy, Township Zoning Officer
    BCPC 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
Stonehaven Langhorne Subdivision

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

1. Date plan received by county planning agency. October 19, 2016
2. Date plan received by planning agency with areawide jurisdiction
   Agency name
3. Date review completed by agency

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>
</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 archæological 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? 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. N/A</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></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: Catherine Irving Gauthier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Title: Planner Signature: Catherine Irving Gauthier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Date:</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 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.