BUCKS COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING

Wednesday, July 5, 2017
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 7, 2017
4. Planning Services Director’s Report
5. Presentation: Preliminary Plan of Land Development for Medical Marijuana Grower/Processor in Falls Township – Chris Dochney, 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 7, 2017

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

STAFF PRESENT: Richard G. Brahler, Jr.; Lynn T. Bush, Debra Canale; Paul W. Gordon; John S. Ives; David P. Johnson; Charles T. McIlhinny; Margaret A. McKevitt; Michael A. Roedig; David A. Sebastian; Maureen Wheatley; Lisa M. Wolff.

GUESTS: James Boyle, County Reporter, Bucks County Courier Times
Brian Hessenthaler, COO Bucks County
Wayne Martorelli, Upper Makefield Township Resident
Larry Menkes, Warminster Resident
Wally Rosenthal, Hilltown Township Resident and Business Owner

Prior to the start of the meeting, Mr. Stone congratulated Ms. Bush on her retirement and thanked her for her years of devoted service to Bucks County and the Planning Commission. He presented her with a beautiful rose bush and a card from the Board Members of the Planning Commission. Ms. Bush thanked everyone.

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

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

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FOR THE MEETING OF MAY 3, 2017
Upon motion of Mr. Nyman, seconded by Mr. Dowling, with the vote being 7-0 the motion carried to approve the minutes of the May 3, 2017 meeting as presented.

4. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR’S REPORT
The Executive Director’s report was previously submitted with the packet mailed to the board.

Ms. Bush noted that the BCPC has begun asset inventories of Tullytown and Penndel boroughs to assist in the economic development of their communities. Penndel is planning a town hall meeting on June 26.

Ms. Bush spoke about money that is to become available from the settlement of the Volkswagen case of falsifying emissions levels. Pennsylvania is allocated $110 million which is to be used to support clean energy systems, such as replacement of old diesel vehicles and installation of electric vehicle infrastructure, but we are unsure of all the mechanisms involved in this and how it will affect Bucks County.
Ms. Bush told us that she and Mr. Nyman, met with the Dublin revitalization board to discuss the next planning steps. We reviewed the idea of an “official map” but decided that this tool, which was to announce the intention to acquire certain properties, was not necessary for their future planning. The focus will instead be on intersection, bridge and road improvements.

Ms. Bush said she met with the Warminster manager and Board of Supervisors chair about their desire to purchase Shenandoah Woods (former Navy housing) and restore it for open space. She said that although they are aware that there currently is no funding for open space, they wished for us to know their intentions should a funding opportunity arise.

Ms. Bush spoke about the controversial one lane bridge in Tinicum Township. She said that PennDOT has requested about $600,000 to study and repair the bridge and that the funding for this was approved at the regional planning commission board last week.

Ms. Bush informed us that the BCPC is sponsoring a brainstorming meeting with the Bristol Township Stakeholders to be held on June 8, to get input on the future impacts of the I95/PA Turnpike connection. The Economy League of Philadelphia will be running the meeting. We were able to hire the League, through acquired program grant money, to do outreach and report to us their findings on what kind of land uses might be attracted to the transportation improvements.

Ms. Bush updated us on the presentation of the letter from the BCPC Board and the commemorative Bucks County tile to Bill Pezza of Bristol Borough, at the County Commissioners’ meeting last week. She said that Bristol Borough’s revitalization efforts are evident throughout the borough.

In conclusion, Ms. Bush announced that Bucks County will be preserving its 200th farm in the Agricultural Preservation Program next month.

5. PRESENTATION: 2016 ANNUAL REPORT – MICHAEL ROEDIG, SENIOR PLANNER
Mr. Roedig gave a presentation and overview of the 2016 Annual Report of Review Activity. The report is based on reviews completed by BCPC staff in 2016. Mr. Roedig highlighted development trends and proposals and discussed comparative results with previous years’ development in Bucks County.

Mr. Roedig informed us that in 2016, the BCPC reviewed a total of 274 proposals submitted for subdivision, land development, and municipal actions. This was a 7 percent decline from last year’s total of 296 reviews. A breakdown of reviews into four categories reveals that in 2016, sketch proposals increased 20 percent. The number of major proposals decreased by 27 percent, minor proposals increased by 65 percent, and municipal proposals reviewed decreased by 7 percent.

Mr. Roedig stated that the land potentially impacted by development was 656 acres, 432 less acres than the amount recorded in 2015. He further stated that if all the proposals were developed, over 172 acres (26 percent) would be preserved as open space, park and recreation land, and/or conservation easements.
Mr. Roedig said that in 2016, the number of proposed residential units (557) declined 67 percent from 2015’s 1,669 units. The total number of multifamily, attached, and semi-detached units accounted for over 60 percent of residential units proposed in 2016. This is the twelfth year in a row that the combined number of these unit types outpaced the number of single-family units.

Mr. Roedig told us that the number of nonresidential land developments reviewed in 2016 totaled 37 lots, 21 more lots than the total of 16 lots in 2015 (an increase of 131 percent). He said that the amount of proposed nonresidential area (over 2.2 million square feet) is a significant increase of 73 percent from the amount reviewed in 2015.

Mr. Roedig stated that the largest amount of industrial development (490,000 square feet) proposed in 2016 was located in East Rockhill Township, followed by Perkasie Borough (200,000 square feet).

Mr. Stone and the board thanked Mr. Roedig for his report.

6. **ACT 247 REVIEWS**

The reviews of June 7, 2017, were mailed to the board for their review prior to the meeting. Upon motion of Mr. Nyman, seconded by Ms. Peirce, the motion carried to approve the June 7, 2017 Act 247 reviews.

Mr. Dowling and the board discussed in-depth a previously approved review that may allow for 5G cell towers, the health concerns associated with cell towers, the location of towers in proximity to homes and businesses, and the BCPC role in whether or not the towers will be built.

7. **OLD BUSINESS**

Ms. Bush addressed an update request from Ms. Pierce on the Park 10 area in Sellersville. She said that over two years ago the Redevelopment Authority brought it before the BCPC and was certified as a redevelopment area. Ms. McKevitt continued by telling us that the area is up for sale once again and if they are to continue, they will need to come before us again with a new plan for redevelopment. Ms. McKevitt further stated that the Redevelopment Authority has received funding and are in the process of a cleanup of the area. Ms. Pierce stated that this would be a very difficult area to develop. Mr. Stone stated that the environmental remediation would help determine what would be able to be built there, if anything.

Ms. Bush then commented on the role of the Bucks County Planning Commission in the time that she has been here. She stated that through forces and factors, the BCPC has evolved into much more than data collection and report writing. She further stated that the BCPC has really effected the environment, open space and agricultural preservation, community revitalization and the development of the trails initiative. We have achieved real permanent and positive changes in Bucks County.

8. **NEW BUSINESS**

Mr. Martorelli, Upper Makefield Township resident, representing his neighbors in Washington Crossing took the floor to speak about the possibility of acquiring assistance to provide a safe trail from their neighborhood to the canal towpath. He was directed to speak to Mr. Gordon of the BCPC.
9. **PUBLIC COMMENT**
Mr. Menkes, Warminster Resident, questioned what the BCPC could do to take advantage of energy savings in their county buildings. Ms. Bush and the board told him that other than recommendations in comprehensive plans and reviews, the BCPC does not have a role in those decisions. Mr. Nyman suggested Mr. Menkes attend a commissioners meeting to suggest the BEGIN committee be reinstated with new goals.

Mr. Rosenthal, resident of Hilltown Township, took the floor to request a positive endorsement from the BCPC of the expansion of commercial zoning to include the 18 acres behind his furniture store on Route 309. After much discussion from the board, Ms. Bush clarified to Mr. Rosenthal that included in the boards packet is a municipal review for Hilltown Township (#15-17-3(P)) to amend the zoning from RR Rural Residential to PC-1 Planned Commercial; the review was done without a sketch plan included in the proposed amendment. She further stated that the BCPC cannot endorse or inhibit a plan for the proposed track; that process is for the municipality to undertake.

10. **ADJOURNMENT**
Mr. Stone adjourned the meeting at 3:05 PM.

Submitted by:
Debra Canale, Staff Secretary
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 Buckingham and Milford townships and Sellersville and New Britain boroughs Planning Commission meetings.

Plans & Activities – Production continued on the New Britain Borough comprehensive plan update. At the borough Planning Commission’s June meeting, the natural features chapter was discussed.

Work continues on updating the text and mapping for the Warrington Township comprehensive plan update. The chapters targeted in June include transportation and land use.

The staff is beginning the process of working with West Rockhill Township to update their comprehensive plan. Staff has started conducting background research and developing a community survey. The township has recently put together a steering committee of residents to help guide the plan, and BCPC staff will soon be meeting with the committee to establish a framework for the process of completing the plan.

Staff presented highlights of the draft Cross Keys Study to the Buckingham Township Planning Commission and solicited public comments. The draft plan will be finalized to reflect certain input obtained during our four presentations. A digital version of the final plan has been distributed to each municipality.

An open house meeting was held at Penndel Borough. Staff members assisted borough officials in gathering information from residents and business owners to help establish a working committee, an overall vision, and set priorities to move forward with a plan. The meeting consisted of a brief introduction and was followed by an open house with display boards and interaction with staff and officials.

Staff continued gathering background information for the Tullytown Borough MEDI project. A preliminary outline of tasks for the project was developed and will be discussed with the Borough at a meeting in July. Borough officials have requested assistance in developing strategies to replace lost tax revenue due to the impending closure of the Tullytown Resource Recovery Facility.

Staff met with Quakertown Borough’s economic development consultant and the borough’s zoning officer to review information for the Quakertown Borough – Summary of Parking Inventory. The parking inventory is being prepared for Quakertown Borough under the MEDI program.

Staff assisted with the Bristol Township and Lower Bucks County Economic Stakeholder Roundtable Meeting held at the Bristol Township building. Attendees of the meeting were broken into four groups and a SWOT (strength, weaknesses, opportunities, threats) analysis was
performed. Economy League of Greater Philadelphia, who moderated the meeting, will be preparing a meeting summary by the end of July.

Staff met with Bensalem Township staff to discuss an overlay zoning district for a portion of the Street Road corridor, including a possible town center area between Knights and Hulmeville roads. A proposed ordinance could be expected by late summer.

In addition to the plans and activities discussed above, we continue to prepare, under contract, comprehensive plans for Northampton and Hilltown townships.

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 attended the Economic Impact of Tourism seminar at DVRPC, which including information on annual visitation; hospitality and tourism-related employment; and the industry’s overall economic impact, including the economic impact that tourism has had on Bucks County and its many communities.

Act 247 and 537 Review Activity
- 8 Subdivision and Land Development Proposal
- 2 Sketch Plans
- 2 Municipal Plans and Ordinances
- 3 Sewage Facility Planning Modules
- 2 Traffic Impact Study

Transportation and Trails

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 participated in DVRPC’s Long Range Plan Subcommittee Meeting. We also coordinated with SEPTA regarding potential bus route modifications within the county. We participated in the TMA Policy Committee and attended the TMA Summit, as well as reviewing the TMA Bucks’ proposed work program. We also provided project coordination for the Upper Bucks Rail Trail, the Newtown Rail Trail and the Neshaminy Greenway Trail.

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 always provided to our Consortium members when requested.

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 currently utilizing a cloud hosted infrastructure that supports a centralized and shared regional GIS database. Earlier this year the group contracted with Pictometry to acquire both aerial and oblique
imagery. The 2017 spring flight is completed and we expect the online viewing application to be available by the end of this month. Other products derived from the flight will become available later this year.

The May meeting was cancelled due to the Memorial Day holiday. The June meeting was held at the Chester County Government Center in West Chester.

**Bucks County GIS** has been actively working with departments and agencies throughout the county in the development of web-based GIS applications. We also assist departments that need updating of their maps and databases. GIS recently completed the mapping and inventory of county maintained local bridges for the General Services division of the county. GIS created an online viewing application with links to the PADOT Multimodal Project Management System Interactive Query (MPMS IQ) database and application. The web viewing application was designed to assist General Service’s staff in both the maintenance and monitoring of local bridges.
<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>15-17-CR1</td>
<td>Hilltown Township</td>
<td>(15-17-64, 15-19-57,</td>
<td>County Review: Lot Line Change &amp; Subdivision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15-19-70, &amp; 15-30-12)</td>
<td>Former Blooming Glen High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plumstead Township</td>
<td>34-17-3</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors</td>
<td></td>
<td>Amend the SALDO Ordinance: Master Trail Plan Reference</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEMORANDUM

TO: Hilltown Township Board of Supervisors
    Hilltown Township Planning Commission

FROM: Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Proposal for Lot Line Change and Subdivision—Former Blooming Glen High School
        TMPs #15-17-64, 15-19-57, 15-19-70, and 15-30-12
        Applicant: Hilltown Township
        Plan Dated: May 18, 2017
        Received: June 23, 2017

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 July 5, 2017.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposed Action: Consolidate TMPs #15-17-64, 15-19-57, 15-19-70, and 15-30-12 and subdivide the resultant 6.87-acre parcel into two lots. Proposed Lot 1 consists of 34,041 gross square feet (29,149 net square feet) and contains an existing vacant municipal building. Proposed Lot 2 consists of 265,511 gross square feet (257,536 net square feet) and contains the existing Blooming Glen playground. Lot 1 is served by an on-site well and public sewer facilities. Sewage disposal on Lot 2 is provided seasonally by the use of portable toilets. Water service is not provided to Lot 2.

Location: Proposed Lot 1 is located at the intersection of Blooming Glen Road and Miriam Drive. Proposed Lot 2 is located on the east side of North Main Street, approximately 750 feet north of Blooming Glen Road.

Zoning: The VC Village Commercial District permits Use F4 Municipal on a minimum lot area of 20,000 square feet. There are existing nonconformities on proposed Lot 1 with respect to minimum lot width, minimum front yard setback, and minimum side yard setback.

Present Use: Municipal (vacant building) and recreation area.
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.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the July 5, 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 regarding this proposal.

MMW:jmk

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

TO: Plumstead Township Board of Supervisors
    Plumstead Township Planning Commission

FROM: Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Proposal to Amend the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance—Master Trail Plan Reference

Applicant: Board of Supervisors
Received: June 19, 2017
Hearing Date: Unknown

In accordance with the provisions of Sections 304 and 505 of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, this proposal was sent to the Bucks County Planning Commission for review. The following review was prepared by the staff and endorsed by the Bucks County Planning Commission at a meeting held on July 5, 2017.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposed Action: Amend the township’s subdivision and land development ordinance to reference the Plumstead Township Master Trail Plan (February 2017) and include requirements that future development on sites referenced in the plan are developed with the appropriate trail elements (e.g., sidewalks, bicycle paths, crosswalks, and pedestrian access) and at appropriate locations as specified in the plan. Also, the definition of ‘Pedestrian Way’ is to be revised as the definition for ‘Sidewalk.’

COMMENTS

We commend the township for developing a township-wide trail network that provides a wide range of outdoor recreational options. We recommend township officials adopt the proposal since this will aid in the successful implementation of the Master Trail Plan.

We recommend the appropriate narrative and figures from the Master Trail Plan be incorporated into the township’s comprehensive plan, when the time comes to update this plan.
We would appreciate being notified of the Board of Supervisors’ decision regarding this matter. If the amendment is adopted, please send a copy within 30 days as required by Section 505(b) of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code.

DAS:dc

cc: Jonathan J. Reiss, Esq., Grim, Biehn & Thatcher, Township Solicitor
    Carolyn McCreary, Township Manager (via email)
<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>12247</td>
<td>(2-33-7)</td>
<td>2670 Galloway Road</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>30 Single-family Lots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bristol Township</td>
<td>12248</td>
<td>(5-35-2 &amp; -3)</td>
<td>New Falls Dental</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Commercial Land Development: 7,436.5 Square feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falls Township</td>
<td>6253-QQ</td>
<td>(13-51-1)</td>
<td>Harsco Storage Tent</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Industrial Land Development: 10,280 Square feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falls Township</td>
<td>6253-LL2</td>
<td>(13-51-1-24)</td>
<td>Medical Marijuana Grower/Processor</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Industrial Land Development: 123,685 Square feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falls Township</td>
<td>12243</td>
<td>(13-15-1)</td>
<td>Lake Caroline - Lower Bucks YMCA</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Commercial Land Development: 55,000 Square feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haycock Township</td>
<td>7367-B</td>
<td>(14-6-17 &amp; -20)</td>
<td>Tohi, LLC</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Lot Line Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield Township</td>
<td>12250</td>
<td>(42-15-14, -14-1, -14-2)</td>
<td>Montag</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Lot Line Changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield Township</td>
<td>12244</td>
<td>(42-1-15, -4-4)</td>
<td>Traditions of America at Locust Valley</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>11 Single-family Lots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Makefield Township</td>
<td>12246</td>
<td>(47-7-11-1 &amp; -2)</td>
<td>Worthington Land Holding, LLC</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Lot Line Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warrington Township</td>
<td>9831-C</td>
<td>(50-10-14-1)</td>
<td>Gloria Dei Community</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Institutional Land Development: 76,813 Square feet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEMORANDUM

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

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Preliminary Plan of Subdivision for 2670 Galloway Road
   TMP #2:33-7
   Applicant: ELU Galloway, LLC
   Owner: Same
   Plan Dated: May 22, 2017
   Date Received: May 30, 2017

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 11.83 acres into 30 single-family detached dwelling lots. Lot sizes range from 7,725 to 18,945 square feet. An existing 2-story frame dwelling, aluminum storage building, and stone and frame barn are to be removed. Public water and sewage disposal are proposed.

Location: West side of Galloway Road, 200 feet north of its intersection with Grace Avenue.

Zoning: The R-2 Residential District permits single-family attached dwellings on lots which have a minimum lot area of 7,500 square feet and a minimum lot width of 75 feet.

Present Use: Rural residential.

COMMENTS

1. **Wetlands**—Sheet C0.1 (Existing Conditions Plan) notes the existence of wetlands on the site. The plan should include a wetlands certification, signed by the site investigator, as required by Section 201-41(d)(15) of the subdivision and land development ordinance.
The plan should demonstrate compliance with Section 232-57(2)(b) of the zoning ordinance, which requires a buffer of 50 feet to be measured from the wetlands vegetation or the limit of wet soils, whichever is shorter, and be preserved in an 80 percent natural cover. A minimum undisturbed natural cover buffer of 20 feet measured from the wetlands vegetation or limit of wet soil, whichever is shorter, is to be maintained at all times.

However, the pond is not identified as a wetland. Section 232-56(2) of the zoning ordinance defines wetlands as any land consisting of undrained, saturated soils supporting wetland vegetation, where the water table is at or near the surface or where shallow water covers the site due to permanent or seasonal inundation of surface or ground water; wetlands shall also be defined to include lakes and ponds and their peripheral vegetation, and as identified within the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service National Wetlands inventory system.

2. **Soils**—Sheet C6.0 identifies the site as having Chalfont silt loam and Doylestown silt loam soils, both of which have shallow depth to the water table. It appears the houses will be built with basements (including several with walk-outs). The township should be assured that the proper construction techniques will be used to guard against basement wetness and flooding.

3. **Traffic impact study**—We recommend that the applicant and the township investigate the feasibility of constructing a left-turn lane for the site driveway for westbound Galloway Road. Although the turning volumes listed within the traffic impact study are below levels warranted for a turn lane, it is our opinion that, due to the roadway geometry and the high levels of through-traffic, a left-turn lane would provide for safer ingress and egress from the site. Galloway Road has limited shoulders and currently there is a vertical curve just to the west of the proposed site entrance, which could present safety concerns for vehicles attempting to enter the site drive. The lack of sufficient shoulders also prevents through traffic from having unimpeded flow if turning traffic cannot find sufficient gaps in the eastbound traffic. It is our opinion that an exclusive left-turn lane for the site would greatly enhance safety and the operational capacity of the site drive access with Galloway Road.

4. **Sidewalks and curbs**—The plan does not show sidewalks along Galloway Road. Section 201-111(a) of the subdivision and land development ordinance requires sidewalks along all streets. Section 201-110(a) requires curbing along streets. While no sidewalks along Galloway Road are immediately adjacent to the proposed development, we recommend that sidewalks be provided in anticipation that there will be future need.

5. **Buffer**—As we noted in our review of the private request to change the zoning of the site (BCPC #2-16-6), the site is located adjacent to the PARX Casino and Racetrack. Nuisances, such as noise, light, and smells may cause negative impacts to residents of the subdivision. The plan shows disturbance of the existing treeline along the north and west borders of the site. We recommend the applicant limit disturbance of these wooded areas and additional plantings be provided (as deemed necessary) to supplement the existing vegetation in order to buffer possible impacts.

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 July 5, 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.

MAR:jmk

cc: ELU Galloway, LLC
    Robert Cunningham, P.E., Holmes Cunningham, LLC
    Thomas Hecker, Esq., Begley, Carlin & Mandio, LLP
    Ron Gans, P.E., Municipal Engineer, O’Donnell & Naccarato (via email)
    Loretta Alston, Bensalem Dept. of Building and Planning (via email)
    William Cmorey, Bensalem 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 for New Falls Dental
        TMP #5-35-2, -3
        Applicant: Vamsi K. Venisetty
        Owner: Vamsi K. Venisetty & Nishita N. Irukulla
        Plan Dated: October 15, 2016
        Date Received: May 31, 2017

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

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposal: Consolidate two tax parcels, one containing 10,800 square feet and one containing 8,100 square feet, into one parcel that will contain 18,900 square feet (0.433 acre). Also, the plan shows the proposed construction of a two-and-a-half story, 7,436.5-square-foot dental clinic on a 0.433-acre site. The site has two existing structures and two accessory garages that will be demolished. The plan indicates that a total of 38 parking spaces is proposed. Public water and sewer facilities are intended to serve the site. Public sewer service will be provided via a proposed sanitary sewer lateral extension from the existing line located to the southwest of the site.

Location: Along the northern side of New Falls Road, approximately 60 feet southwest of the intersection of New Falls Road and Red Cedar Drive. The site includes approximately 2,700 square feet of land that was formerly part of 2nd Avenue, which was legally vacated by the township in 1991.

Zoning: C Commercial District permits Use C2 Medical Office 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.

Present Use: Commercial and medical offices.
COMMENTS

1. **Waivers**—Notations on Plan Sheet 4 of 9 indicate that the applicant is requesting waivers from the subdivision and land development ordinance requirements (the ordinance sections are not indicated on the plan) regarding the following issues:
   - To permit a side yard of 9.43 feet
   - To permit a rear yard of 26.90 feet
   - To provide 38 off-street parking spaces

   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. **Special front yard setback**—Section 205-130.A of the zoning ordinance requires a special setback of 100 feet from Newportville-Fallsington Road (New Falls Road). Zoning information listed on Plan Sheet 2 indicates the special front yard requirement. This required setback is to be measured from the center line of the existing right-of-way. The plan does not meet this required setback.

   Also, it is recommended that the special setback requirement be noted along with the other setback information within the zoning chart on Plan Sheets 4 and 6.

3. **Parking**—The parking lot layout should be revised to comply with all parking requirements and to eliminate areas of potential conflicts between vehicles utilizing the lot. We note the following issues that should be addressed.
   a. **Parking lot circulation**—The plan shows four proposed parking spaces behind the building. Three of the spaces dead-end at the western lot line, sandwiched between the building and rear lot line. The area between the building and rear lot line measures only 26.90 feet. The fourth parking space is parallel to the rear lot line and is located next to the trash enclosure and just 35 feet from the end of another parking space. Aisle width between the trash area enclosure and the one parallel space next to the trash enclosure measures approximately 15 feet. Section 177-40.F of the subdivision and land development ordinance (SALDO) requires a minimum width of 24 feet for driveways accommodating two-way traffic. This access drive will need to accommodate two-way traffic to serve the proposed parking spaces.

   In addition, Section 177-41.J of the SALDO requires that all dead-end parking areas shall be designed to provide sufficient area for backing and turning movements from the end stalls of the parking area. It is not clear how vehicles parked behind the building will be able to maneuver into and out of these parking spaces.

   Also, the last space in the 15-space parking row has minimal space to back up and turn due to the location of the trash area behind the space. The plan should be revised to provide adequate area for vehicles to back out of this parking space.
   b. **Number of parking spaces**—The plan states that 9 parking spaces are located in the parking row in front of the building. Only 8 parking spaces are clearly identified and
proposed landscaping is shown within what may be considered the western-most parking space in the row. The plan should be revised to clarify this discrepancy.

c. **Undesignated area between parking rows**—The plan shows an undesignated space between the row of parking in front of the building and the parking row along the eastern side of the building. The plan should indicate what the purpose of this area would serve, such as if it is intended to be a pedestrian connection to the proposed sidewalk next to the building. Also, the plan should be revised to provide a bumper stop for the eastern-most parking space in the row directly in front of the building.

d. **Perpendicular parking**—Section 177-41.C of the SALDO states that at no time shall angle or perpendicular parking be provided along public or private streets. All parking lots and bays permitting parking other than parallel shall be physically separated from the street and confined by curbing or other suitable separating device. The plan shows parking spaces located perpendicular to New Falls Road, without curbing to separate the roadway and parking area. This presents a safety issue due to the potential conflict with cars backing out into moving traffic on New Falls Road.

e. **Parking distance from building**—Section 177-41.F of the SALDO requires a minimum distance of 15 feet of open space between the curbline of any uncovered parking area and the outside wall of the nearest building. The plan shows parking as close as 5 feet from the proposed medical office for the rows along the front and side of the building, and a parking space in the rear is shown abutting the building.

f. **Parking space dimensions and parallel parking space**— The plan should be revised to indicate the dimensions of the proposed parking spaces in accordance with the requirements listed in Section 177-41.G of the SALDO.

In addition, Section 177-41.G of the SALDO states that parallel parking in off-street parking facilities shall be permitted only where Council determines angled parking is not practical. The plan shows one parallel parking space, next to the outdoor trash area, in the rear of the site.

g. **Curbing around parking areas**—Section 177-41.K of the SALDO states all internal parking lots, separator islands, and aisles shall be confined within curbing. Curbing is shown only bordering the parking spaces along the front and side of the building.

h. **Curblines**—Section 177-41.M of the SALDO states that no less than a five-foot radius of curvature shall be permitted for all curblines in all parking areas.

i. **Parking setback**—Section 177-41.N of the SALDO states that except at entrance and exit drives, all parking areas shall be set back from the future right-of-way line as provided in the zoning ordinance or at least 5 feet, whichever is greater. The distance between the required setback and the future right-of-way shall be permanently maintained as a planting strip. Portions of 10 parking spaces are shown within the future right-of-way along New Falls Road.

j. **Landscaping around parking areas**—Section 177-41.Q of the SALDO requires street trees to 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. The plan shows two proposed landscaped areas along the side lot lines, but does not indicate any proposed trees.
4. **Sidewalks**—Sections 177-35.A and 177-43.A of the SALDO require sidewalks on one side of abutting streets unless determined unnecessary by Council. The plan should be revised to comply with this requirement unless it is determined that sidewalks are unnecessary.

5. **Maximum impervious surface**—Information in the zoning regulations chart listed on Plan Sheets 4, 6, and 9, indicate that the proposed impervious surface for the site will be 70 percent. Given the amount of development proposed for the site, the plan should be revised to clearly indicate compliance with the allowable maximum impervious surface ratio of 70 percent.

6. **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 does not include the required site capacity calculations.

7. **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. Future plan submissions should show street trees along New Falls Road, in compliance with this ordinance requirement.

8. **Trash receptacle**—The plan shows a concrete pad for a trash area within an enclosed fence in the rear of the site. In accordance with Section 177-55.K.(2) of the SALDO, the trash enclosure should be screened and landscaped. The plan should be revised to provide the required landscaping.

9. **Fire lanes**—Section 177-55.M of the SALDO requires that for nonresidential development, fire lanes be established, as required by the Bureau of Fire Prevention, pursuant to the provisions of the Fire Prevention Code. The plan does not identify any proposed fire lanes. The governing body, along with the township fire marshal, should ensure this issue is adequately addressed.

10. **Stormwater management**
   
   a. **Stormwater management plan**—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 plan.

   b. **Proposed underground basin**—The plan shows a proposed underground stormwater basin within the central 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 management on the site, in this case, the property owner.

11. **Preliminary plan requirement**—Section 177-91.D of the subdivision and land development ordinance requires a landscape plan showing proposed contours and required street trees, parking lot plantings, buffers, and plant schedule. Although there are landscaped areas noted on the plan, the plan does not specify any plant material and does not indicate the proposed
street trees and parking lot landscaping (see Comments #3.j and 7). The plan should be revised to comply with this ordinance requirement.

12. **Plan submission**—It should be noted that Sheet No. 1 of the plan set was not included in the submission received by our office.

13. **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 July 5, 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: Vamsi K. Venisetty  
Ambric Technology Corporation  
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, Bristol Township Zoning Officer (via email)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Falls Township Board of Supervisors
    Falls Township Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Final Plan of Land Development—Harsco Storage Tent
        TMP: # 13-51-1
        Applicant: Harsco
        Owner: Same
        Plan Dated: April 18, 2017
        Date Received: May 31, 2017

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 three additions to an existing industrial facility: a 10,080-square-foot storage tent; expand an existing concrete pad by 3,850 square feet; and construct a 200-square-foot addition to an existing metal storage building. The 10-acre site is serviced by water and sewer from US Steel.

Location: On the east side of South Port Road, in the US Steel industrial complex.

Zoning: The MPM (Materials Processing and Manufacturing) District permits storage, processing, distribution, and manufacturing facilities on lots of at least 5 acres in area. A minimum front yard setback of 100 feet is required, and a maximum impervious coverage of 80 percent is permitted.

Present Use: Industrial.

COMMENTS

1. **Parking**—Section 209-30.E of the zoning ordinance requires one off-street parking space for every employee on any one shift. No clearly designated parking areas exist, or are proposed on the site. However, we note that the plan indicates that the proposed land development will not include any additional employees beyond the current levels.
2. **Street trees**—Section 191-48.A of the subdivision and land development ordinance (SALDO) requires that street trees be planted along the sides of all streets. No street trees are proposed for the frontage of Port Road.

3. **Sidewalks**—Section 191-39 of the SALDO requires sidewalks along all streets. The township should determine whether sidewalks are appropriate in this industrial area.

4. **Lighting**—Section 191-38 of the SALDO provides standards for lighting. No lighting plan has been provided.

5. **Editorial comment**—The zoning chart on Sheet 1 of 4 lists a permitted impervious surface coverage of 75 percent. Attachment 8, Table 5 of the zoning ordinance indicates a maximum impervious coverage permitted in the MPM District of 80 percent for parcels greater than 8 acres in area. This discrepancy should be corrected.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the July 5, 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.

CND:dc

cc: Russ Dickert, Harsco  
Erik Garton, P.E., Gilmore & Associates (via email)  
Jim Sullivan, P.E., T&M Associates, Township Engineer  
Peter Gray, Township Manager (via email)  
Diane Beri, Township Clerk (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 Medical Marijuana Grower/Processor
          TMP: #13-51-1-24
          Applicant: MHL 150 Roebling, LLC
          Owner: 150 Roebling Rd. Mortgagee, LLC
          Plan Dated: June 2, 2017
          Date Received: June 6, 2017

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 123,685 square feet of industrial space in two separate structures, to be used as medical marijuana grower/processor facilities, on a 32.05-acre lot. The lot will be split into two areas, a 17.94-acre area to be retained by the owner (MLH 150 Roebling) and be developed with a building which will house a 43,400-square-foot greenhouse, and a 20,500-square-foot processing area, for a total of 63,900 square feet of building area. The remaining 14.08 acres of the lot will be leased to Pharmacann and will be developed with a 35,425-square-foot greenhouse, and a 24,360-square-foot processing area, for a total of 59,785 square feet of building area. Both facilities will be accessed by an existing driveway along Roebling Road. A new fire lane for emergency vehicle access is proposed to encircle the buildings. The project will be served by water and sewer from US Steel.

Location: On Roebling Road, near Sorrels Boulevard in the US Steel industrial complex.

Zoning: The Materials, Processing, and Manufacturing (MPM) District permits a medical marijuana grower/processor facility as a special exception use. A minimum lot area of 5 acres per principal use is required, with a maximum permitted building coverage of 60 percent, and a maximum permitted impervious coverage of 80 percent.

The plan indicates that a special exception was granted on April 11, 2017 for a medical marijuana grower/processor facility.

Present Use: Industrial.
COMMENTS

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

   - Section 191-30.I to not provide a traffic impact study;
   - Section 191-37.B to permit no curbing in the parking area;
   - Section 191-37.G(3) to permit no curbed raised islands in the parking area;
   - Section 191-37.G(4) to permit no shade trees, street trees, and plantings in the parking area;
   - Section 191-48 to permit no shade trees or plantings;
   - Section 191-62.B to permit no curbing on streets;
   - Section 191-78.B(6) to permit a location map at a different scale;
   - Section 191-78.C(2) to permit less than the minimum required information regarding existing conditions surrounding the property;
   - Section 191-80.A(2) to permit plans on size 30”x42” paper;
   - Section 187-13.B(1) to permit pipes of a diameter smaller than the minimum required;
   - Section 187-16 to permit no infiltration facility;
   - Section 187-9 to permit exceptions to the stormwater management 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 and the minimum modification necessary. The final plan should list all granted waivers.

   We note that three of the requested waivers listed are from the requirements of Chapter 187 of the Township Code, which is the stormwater management ordinance. These requested waivers are not a part of the subdivision and land development ordinance.

2. **Medical marijuana laws**—Both the state law, and the township’s medical marijuana ordinance are new laws, which place a number of conditions on a grower/processor facility. The applicant should demonstrate compliance with both of these laws.

3. **Parking**—The zoning ordinance contains conflicting standards regarding the required amount of off-street parking. Section 209-42.H(22) of the zoning ordinance (amended as part of the recently adopted medical marijuana ordinance) requires off-street parking at a ratio of 1 space per 500 square feet of gross floor area for a medical marijuana grower/processor. The Parking Summary table provided on Sheet 2 of 18 indicates that required off-street parking is based on the number of employees on the largest shift, which would be consistent with the general off-street parking requirements of the MPM District as stated in Section 209-30.E of the zoning ordinance. The township should resolve this conflict, and determine which parking standard should be applied to this development. If it is determined that it is more appropriate to base the parking standard on the number of employees, the township may wish to consider amending the medical marijuana grower/processor facility use to eliminate the parking requirement based on gross floor area.

   Based on the ordinance requirements of the recently adopted medical marijuana ordinance, the MHL 150 Roebling building would require 128 off-street parking spaces. The Parking Summary (based on number of employees) indicates that 62 spaces are provided. The Pharmacann building would require 120 parking spaces and the Parking Summary states that 50 spaces are provided. We note that the plan shows 10 additional spaces indicated as future parking. The Parking Summary should include the future parking spaces.
4. **Office building**—The Parking Summary on Sheet 2 for the MHL 150 Roebling, LLC facility indicates that 18 spaces are provided for office/visitor parking. The plan shows 18 existing spaces around the existing 2-story office building on the northwestern corner of the property. It is not clear if the existing building on the property, which will be outside of the fence which will surround the two grower/processor facilities, will be used in connection with the proposed medical marijuana facilities as an accessory building. Some clarification may be needed regarding the use of this building, and how it might impact the required parking for the site. Additionally, point A.5 of the Parking Summary should clarify that the 18 spaces of office/visitor parking are in addition to the 62 proposed parking spaces for the MHL 150 Roebling facility.

5. **Curbing**—Section 191-36.D of the subdivision and land development ordinance (SALDO) requires that all driveways be curbed. It does not appear that curbing is proposed for the driveways or fire lane.

6. **Landscaping**—No landscaping plan has been provided, and no proposed landscaping appears to be illustrated on any of the drawings submitted. While the applicant is requesting several waivers regarding landscaping, the plan is required to provide landscaping in compliance with zoning ordinance Section 209-42.B(1) which requires that plantings of at least 4 feet in height be maintained between the parking area and any lot line or street.

7. **Fence**—Section 209-37.B of the zoning ordinance permits a fence in a nonresidential district to have a maximum height of 8 feet. The fence proposed to surround the property will be 8 feet in height, but will also be topped with barbed wire, which will be above 8 feet in height. The ordinance as written does not appear to provide direction as to whether the barbed wire on the top is to be included or excluded from the calculation of the height of the fence.

8. **Sidewalks**—No sidewalks are proposed along Roebling Road. Section 191-39 of the SALDO requires sidewalks along all streets. The township should determine whether sidewalks are appropriate in this industrial area.

9. **Editorial comment**—A note in the Zoning Data Table on Sheet 2 of 18 indicates that the property is in the I-2 Industrial District. This should be corrected to show that the property is in the MPM District.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the July 5, 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.

CND:dc

cc: MHL 150 Roebling, LLC
Jennifer Wunder, Esq., Fox Rothschild LLP
Jim Sullivan, P.E., T&M Associates, Township Engineer
Peter Gray, Township Manager (via e-mail)
Diane Beri, Township Clerk (via e-mail)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Falls Township Board of Supervisors
   Falls Township Planning Commission

FROM: Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Sketch Plan of Land Development for Lake Caroline – Lower Bucks YMCA
        TMP #13-15-1
        Applicant: Lower Bucks Family YMCA
        Owner: Bucks County
        Plan Dated: April 27, 2017
        Date Received: May 9, 2017

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 55,000-square-foot recreation center building with a playground, rain gardens, and 319 parking spaces, on a 12.93-acre lease area portion of a 78.86-acre site. The recreation center will be connected to the Oxford Valley community pool, and share a driveway on Hood Boulevard with the Fairless Hills Fire Company. The project will be served by public water and public sewer.

Location: The northwest corner of the intersection of Olds Boulevard and Hood Boulevard, on the Lake Caroline county-owned open space property.

Zoning: The OSP—Open Space Preservation District permits growing of crops, public playgrounds and parks, single-family residences, and utilities. Recreation centers are not permitted. The application indicates that a rezoning request is concurrent with this land development.

Present Use: Community pool/wooded open space.

COMMENTS

1. **Zoning**—The proposed recreation center use is not permitted in the OSP Open Space Preservation District. A recreation center would be permitted in the CR Community Recreation District. The submission indicates that a rezoning request is concurrent with this land development, to rezone the site from the OSP Open Space Preservation District to the CR Community Recreation District.
A rezoning request has not been submitted to the Bucks County Planning Commission for review, so we do not have comments regarding the merits of a rezoning. The proposed sketch plan does not comply with the existing OSP District zoning provisions. The following review was prepared as if the plan were in compliance with the requested Community Recreation District rezoning, but it is not a recommendation to rezone.

Section 209-39 of the zoning ordinance states that wherever an application requires a change in zoning, various impact studies are required (e.g., environmental, transportation, and services). Therefore, the required impact statements should be provided with any request for a zoning change. We recommend that no action be taken on this application until zoning issues have been resolved.

2. **Natural resources**—Future plan submissions should include the entire parcel area so that compliance with natural resource protection ordinance requirements, including woodlands and floodplain, can be illustrated on the plan. The natural resource protection standards noted in Section 191-52.1 of the subdivision and land development ordinance (SALDO) indicate that the protection requirements apply to the entire lot, and not just an individual lease area. In addition, a note on the plan indicates that the property is subject to flood prone areas per FEMA map. It is not clear what is intended by this note.

3. **Stormwater management**—The plan proposes a stormwater infiltration basin within the wetland margin area. Future plans should verify that the soils in the wetland margin are suitable for an infiltration basin.

4. **Transportation issues**
   a. We recommend that the township require that the applicant perform a traffic impact study to determine if a traffic signal is warranted at the site entrance.
   b. The plan indicates that the proposed entrance and exit driveways will be separated by approximately 50 feet. We recommend that the driveways be consolidated into one driveway that provides full access to the site. The proposed separation of the driveways could cause safety issues with vehicles attempting to enter or exit the site.
   c. We recommend that the southern driveway access (near Hood Boulevard) for the fire company parking area be removed since it could negatively impact the queue of vehicles exiting the site.
   d. It appears that the existing trees along Hood Boulevard on the fire company property could pose a sight distance risk to the vehicles exiting the site. This issue should be investigated.

5. **Parking amount**—Section 209-42.H(6) of the zoning ordinance requires only that commercial recreation uses provide sufficient parking so that vehicles not spill onto public right-of-ways, private driveways, or fire lanes. No specific minimum is required. The township has some discretion in determining the appropriate amount of parking for this proposal. The applicant has provided calculations for parking based on the ITE (Institute of Transportation Engineers) standards for a recreation center which would require 3.2 spaces/1,000 square feet, or 176 spaces. The plan provides 319 total spaces, which includes 71 existing spaces for the adjacent Fairless Hills Fire Company, and 64 spaces for the Oxford Valley community pool. The township should determine if the proposed amount of parking is adequate.
6. **Off-street parking area standards**—Future plans should address the following off-street parking area requirements:

   a. Section 209-42.B(1) of the zoning ordinance requires that a landscaped buffer of 4 feet in height be maintained between any parking area and any lot line or street line.

   b. Section 209-42.B(3) of the zoning ordinance requires that a minimum of the equivalent area of one parking space for every 30 spaces be landscaped with ground cover, trees, or shrubs. This landscaping should be distributed throughout the parking area in order to break the view of long rows of parked cars, and reduce impervious surface coverage.

   c. Section 191-37.G(1) of the SALDO does not permit more than 20 continuous parking spaces without being broken up by a raised planter bed or landscaping. There are rows of 27 and 36 spaces on the west side of the property.

   d. Section 191-37.G(2) requires that there be one shade tree for every curbed planting bed.

   e. Section 191-37.G(3) permits that where necessary, the township may require a double loaded row of parking spaces to include a curbed raised planting strip of 10 feet in width. The planting strips between parking rows shown on the plans are narrow, at approximately 3 feet wide. Any landscaping that may be planted within this narrow strip would be minimal, and would likely present a maintenance issue. The township should consider whether the proposed curbed strip is adequate to provide sufficient landscaping to meet the intent of the ordinance.

   f. Section 191-37.G(4) requires that at least one tree be planted for every 6 parking spaces in a single row, or 12 spaces in a double loaded row, planted in a manner to afford maximum protection from the sun.

   g. The township may wish to consider whether designated parking or loading areas for buses and vans may be appropriate on the site.

7. **Sidewalks**—We recommend that future plans provide a sidewalk or trail connection through the site to provide pedestrian access from the residential neighborhoods to the east of the site along South Olds Boulevard to the proposed YMCA building and the existing trail around Lake Caroline.

8. **Street trees**—Section 191-48 of the SALDO requires that street trees be planted along the sides of all streets where suitable trees do not exist. Portions of the frontage of both streets are currently wooded. The township should determine if any additional street trees are warranted.

9. **Lawn area**—Section 209-23.H(2) of the zoning ordinance, as referenced by 209-25.G (General requirements for a commercial recreation use), requires that the first 30 feet adjacent to any street be maintained as a lawn, or landscaped with evergreen shrubbery.

10. **Buffers**—209.38.1.F of the zoning ordinance indicates that a buffer of 20 feet in width is required between commercial uses and all other uses. There are residences across Olds Boulevard from the property. The existing wooded areas along the edge of the property are greater than 20 feet in width. The township should determine if the existing vegetation along the eastern property line is a sufficient buffer.

11. **Lighting**—On future plans, the lighting of the parking areas should conform to the standards of Section 191-38 of the SALDO.
12. **Editorial comment**—The sketch plan provided indicates that it is drawn at a scale of 1 inch equals 100 feet. This appears to be inaccurate. Based on manually scaling dimensions provided, the drawing appears to be closer to a scale of 1 inch equals 40 feet.

13. **Sewage facilities**—The applicant must submit a Sewage Facilities Planning Module Application to the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (PaDEP) to determine if an Act 537 Planning Module 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 July 5, 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.

CND:dc

cc: Lower Bucks YMCA  
Boucher & James, Consulting Engineers  
Jim Sullivan, P.E., T&M Associates, Township Engineer  
Thomas Beach, P.E., Remington, Vernick & Beach, Township Transportation Engineer  
Peter Gray, Township Manager (via e-mail)  
Michael Klimpl, Esq., Solicitor, County of Bucks  
William Mitchell, Executive Director, Bucks County Parks Department  
Brian Hessenthaler, COO, County of Bucks
MEMORANDUM

TO: Haycock Township Board of Supervisors
   Haycock Township Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Preliminary Plan of Lot Line Change for Tohi, LLC
   TMP: #14-6-17 and 14-6-20
   Applicant: Tohi, LLC
   Owners: Tohi, LLC
   Plan Dated: May 30, 2017
   Date Received: June 14, 2017

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

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposal: Convey 71.8294 acres (gross) from TMP #14-6-17 to TMP #14-6-20. As a result of the lot line change, Lot 1 (TMP #14-6-17) will be 14.3870 acres (gross) and Lot 2 (TMP #14-6-20) will be 123.5063 acres (gross). Both lots contain an existing dwelling unit and additional outbuildings. Individual on-lot water and sewage facilities service both lots.

Location: The site is located north of the Tohickon Creek, approximately 825 feet south of Richlandtown Road, near the boundaries of East Rockhill and Richland Townships.

Zoning: The RP Resource Protection permits single-family detached dwellings on lots of 2 acres (gross) or more.

Present Use: Residential/recreational.

COMMENTS

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

   - Section 402.2(A) Plan Scale
   - Section 409 Wetland Delineation
   - Section 403.3.(G) Location Map Scale
Section 402.3.F.(3) Site Capacity Calculations
Section 504.2(D) Lot Line Orientation
Section 505.16, 512, 513, 515.1.A Street Improvements
Section 506.2.A Future Rights-of-Way

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

2. **Plan Information**—Section 402.3.N of the subdivision and land development ordinance requires the plan show the existing on-site sewage disposal system and all its component parts for TMP #14-6-20. Section 402.3.F.(3) of the subdivision and land development ordinance requires that the natural resource protection standards contained in the zoning ordinance be shown on the proposed plan.

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 July 5, 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.

AAF:dc

cc: Shawn Touhill, Tohi, LLC
Scott P. McMackin, P.E., Cowan Associates, Inc.
Nancy Yodis, Township Secretary/Treasurer
MEMORANDUM

TO: Springfield Township Board of Supervisors
    Springfield Township Planning Commission

FROM: Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Preliminary Plan of Lot Line Adjustment for Montag
    TMP #42-15-14, 14-1, 14-2
    Applicant: Susan A. and Richard O. Montag
    Owner: Susan A. and Richard O. Montag; Sherry L. Stangil
    Plan Dated: May 23, 2017
    Date Received: June 6, 2017

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 consolidate three lots into two parcels. An area of 0.169 acres will be conveyed from tax map parcel (TMP) #42-15-14 to TMP #42-15-14-1 and an area of 0.086 acres will be conveyed from tax map parcel (TMP) #42-15-14 to TMP #42-15-14-2. As a result of the conveyance, TMP #42-15-14-1 will be 0.083 net acres and TMP #42-15-14-2 will be 0.088 net acres. TMP #42-15-14 will be dissolved. TMP #42-15-14-1 and TMP #42-15-14-2 contain an existing single-family twin dwelling. The existing condominium agreement will be dissolved. No development is proposed. The site is served by public water and a community sewerage facility.

Location: The southwestern corner of the intersection of Walnut and Center streets.

Zoning: The VR—Village Residential District permits twin dwellings on a minimum lot area of 7,000 square feet. A 60-foot minimum lot width, 25-foot front yards, 10-foot side yards (each) and 35-foot rear yards are also required.

Present Use: Residential
COMMENTS

1. **Lot definition**—According to Section 202 of the subdivision and land development ordinance, a lot shall not include any land within the ultimate right-of-way of a public or private street upon which the said lot abuts. The proposed lot lines do not appear to meet this requirement and, therefore, should be revised.

2. **Off-street parking**—The plans depict a “Paved Parking Area” along Center Street within the area of the proposed TMP #42-15-14-1. However, this area appears to be within the legal right-of-way for Center Street. In addition, there are no parking facilities shown for TMP #42-15-14-2. The proposed parking arrangements should be shown on the plans so that compliance with the off-street parking requirements of the zoning ordinance and the subdivision and land development ordinance can be determined.

3. **Zoning data**—The plans depict the required zoning data for the site. The plans should be revised to indicate the proposed lot dimensions so that compliance with the zoning ordinance can be determined, in accordance with Section 402.3.F of the subdivision and land development ordinance.

4. **Community sewer system easement**—According to the plans, the required 20-foot wide sewer easement is shown on the plans. The terms of the easement, including how this easement area can be used, should be provided to the lot owners and the township.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the July 5, 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.

RGB:jmk

cc: Susan A. and Richard O. Montag
Sherry L Stangil
Mease Engineering, P.C.
C. Robert Wynn, P.E.
Michael Brown, Township Manager (via email)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Springfield Township Board of Supervisors
Springfield Township Planning Commission

FROM: Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Preliminary Plan of Subdivision for Traditions of America at Locust Valley
TMPs #42-1-15, -4-4
Applicant: Traditions of America
Owner: Camrra, LLC – Robert Ashford
Plan Dated: May 10, 2017
Date Received: May 11, 2017

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

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposal: Consolidate the lot lines on two parcels to combine TMP #42-1-15 with TMP #42-4-4. Once combined, the site will be developed with 11 age-restricted single-family detached dwelling lots. The plans do not indicate the individual lot sizes, but do indicate that the minimum lot size will be 43,625 square feet. The site is to be served by on-lot wells and on-lot sewerage facilities. On the adjacent tract in Upper Saucon Township, Lehigh County, 125 age-restricted single-family detached dwellings are proposed, to be served by public water and sewerage.

Location: At the current site of the Locust Valley Golf Course, between Allentown Road and Old Bethlehem Road.

Zoning: DD—Development District requires a minimum lot area of 1 acre for Single Family Detached Dwellings without central water and central sewer services. A 110-foot minimum lot width, 35-foot front yards, 20-foot side yards (each) and 40-foot rear yards are also required.

Present Use: Golf Course
COMMENTS

1. **Preliminary plan requirements**—The plans should be revised to include the following preliminary plan requirements of the subdivision and land development ordinance:
   
   a. **Section 403.3.K**—The plan should include an inventory of all natural resources, natural resource protection rates, allowable disturbance to each resource and proposed disturbance to each resource. Furthermore, according to Section 509.A of the zoning ordinance, all applicants for subdivision and land development shall include maps delineating the natural resources and demonstrating compliance with the environmental protection standards of the zoning ordinance. This information should be provided so that compliance with the environmental standards in Section 509.B.2.a of the zoning ordinance can be determined.

   b. **Section 403.7**—The plan should provide a stormwater management plan which shall include post development drainage boundaries and required stage/storage chart for stormwater management basins and infiltration facilities. In addition, the township should ensure that this plan meets the requirements of the Springfield Township Stormwater Management Ordinance.

   c. **Section 403.8**—An Erosion and Sedimentation (E&S) Control Plan was not submitted with the plans, as required by the subdivision and land development ordinance. Section 519 of the subdivision and land development ordinance requires an E&S plan for all applications wherein excavation, placement of fill, and/or grading activities are proposed.

2. **Excavation and grading**—There are several locations on the plans where it appears that slopes in excess of a 3 to 1 slope are proposed. According to Section 518.1 of the subdivision and land development ordinance, no excavation or fill shall be made with a face steeper than 3 to 1 unless the material is sufficiently stable to sustain a steeper slope or an approved retaining wall is proposed. The plans do not indicate that a retaining wall is proposed. There is also no indication that a material is being proposed that would allow for a steep slope. Furthermore, Section 518.2 indicates that if the vertical drop is greater than five feet, then the maximum slope shall not exceed 4 to 1 slope. The township should determine if the proposed slopes are acceptable or should be revised.

   Even if it is determined that the material is sufficiently stable to allow for the greater than 3 to 1 slopes, these slopes will impact the usability of the lots by the residents. Lots 6-9 and 11 have steep slopes proposed that will limit the use of the yard areas by the residents and be difficult to mow and maintain.

3. **Sidewalks**—The plans indicate that a sidewalk is proposed along one side of the access road in both Upper Saucon Township and Springfield Township. However, at the township border, these sidewalks are on opposite sides of the road which will force pedestrians to cross the road to continue using the sidewalk. Furthermore, according to Section 515 of Springfield Township’s subdivision and land development ordinance, sidewalks are required along both sides of all existing and proposed streets. The plans should be revised to include sidewalks along both sides of the proposed street within the subdivision, as well as along Old Bethlehem Pike.
4. **Road improvements**—According to the plans, access to the site will be from Old Bethlehem Pike. There are no proposed improvements shown along Old Bethlehem Pike. According to Section 505.14 of the subdivision and land development ordinance, when a subdivision abuts an existing street, drainage improvements shall be made to the existing street. Additionally, existing cartways shall be reconstructed where necessary. The plans should be revised to include these improvements.

5. **Sight distance**—According to Section 403.5.J of the subdivision and land development ordinance, existing and proposed sight distances at proposed intersections shall be shown on the plans. We recommend that proposed sight distances be added to the plans.

6. **On-lot septic systems**—According to Section 507.F.5 of the subdivision and land development ordinance, to ensure that a suitable location is available for a new sewage disposal area if the original sewage disposal area should malfunction, each lot shall include both a primary and reserve sewage disposal area location. The plans should be revised to show a primary and reserve area for the proposed septic systems.

7. **Lot sizes**—The plans do not indicate the individual lot sizes. It is recommended that individual lot sizes be provided so that compliance with the lot area requirements of the zoning ordinance can be verified.

8. **Tree protection**—The plans should be revised to indicate compliance with the Section 508.B.8 of the subdivision and land development ordinance with regard to tree protection requirements.

9. **First floor elevations**—According to Section 403.6.B of the subdivision and land development ordinance, the first floor elevations and garage floor elevations shall be shown for all proposed buildings. We recommend that the plans be revised to include this information.

10. **Water resources study**—According to Section 408 of the subdivision and land development ordinance, a Water Resources Study is required for all subdivisions five lots of more. A Water Resources Study was not submitted for review.

11. **Narrative summary of proposed development**—According to Section 411 of the subdivision and land development ordinance, a Narrative Summary of Proposed Development is required for all major subdivisions. A Narrative Summary of Proposed Development was not submitted for review.

12. **Unusable lot area**—The rear portion of Lot #11 will be unusable to the homeowner as it is currently shown due to the angle at which the lot lines meet and the proposed steep slopes in the rear of the lot. We recommend that the lot be redesigned into a more usable lot.

13. **Open space maintenance**—The plans should be revised to indicate who will own and maintain the proposed open space. In addition, the township should determine if the plans meet the requirements of Section 511 of the zoning ordinance.
14. **Stormwater facility ownership**—The plans should be revised to indicate who will own and maintain the proposed stormwater facilities. In addition, according to Section 528.1 of the subdivision and land development ordinance, easements for storm sewers, utilities and drainage shall be a minimum of 20 feet wide. If easements are proposed for the development, they should be shown on the plans.

15. **Editorial comments**

   a. **Number of dwelling units**—According to Note #3 under General Notes (Sheet 2 of 53), the number of lots will be 13. This should be corrected to 11 single-family lots and two stormwater facility lots.

   b. **Proposed water and sewage facilities**—Under General Notes at the top of Sheet 2 of 53, Note #9 states that the proposed site will be served by public water and on-lot sewer within Springfield Township. However, under the second listing of General Notes (below the Zoning Compliance Summary for Upper Saucon Township), Note #9 states that the proposed site will be serviced by private water supply (on-lot wells) and private on-lot sewer within Springfield Township. The BCPC application also indicates individual on-lot water and sewerage in Springfield Township. The discrepancy in the General Notes should be rectified.

16. **Sewage facilities**—The applicant must submit a Sewage Facilities Planning Module Application Mailer to the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (PaDEP) to determine if an Act 537 Planning Module 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 5, 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.

RGB:dc

cc: David O. Biddison, Traditions of America  
    Robert Ashford, Camrra, LLC  
    Scott M Harney, P.E., Pennoni Associates Inc.  
    C. Robert Wynn, P.E., C. Robert Wynn Associates, Springfield Township Engineer  
    Michael Brown, Springfield Township Manager (via email)  
    Upper Saucon Township Manager  
    Lehigh Valley Planning Commission
MEMORANDUM

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

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Preliminary Plan of Lot Line Change for Worthington Land Holding, LLC
   TMPs #47-7-11-1 and -2
   Applicant: Chance Worthington
   Owner: Same
   Plan Dated: May 17, 2017
   Date Received: May 26, 2017

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 convey 4.87 acres from TMP #47-7-11-1 (Lot 1) to TMP #47-7-11-2 (Lot 2). As a result of the lot line change, TMP #47-7-11-1 (Lot 1) will be 16.31 acres (gross) and TMP #47-7-11-2 (Lot 2) will be 15.83 acres (gross). A single-family residential dwelling, driveway, pool, and other outbuildings are proposed for TMP #47-7-11-1 (Lot 1). A single-family dwelling, driveway, walkways, and outbuildings on the 4.87-acre portion of TMP #47-7-11-1 (Lot 1) to be conveyed to TMP #47-7-11-2 (Lot 2) are to be removed. An existing gravel driveway and easement extending from the area of conveyance through TMP #47-7-11-2 (Lot 2) to Deerpath Lane are also to be removed. An existing single-family dwelling on TMP #47-7-11-2 (Lot 2) is to remain and no construction is proposed on this lot.

Both lots are served by individual on-lot wells and sewage disposal systems.

Location: The site is located on the northeastern side of Eagle Road, approximately 1,000 feet southeast of the intersection of Eagle Road and Thompson Mill Road.

Zoning: The CM Conservation Management District permits single-family detached dwellings on a minimum gross site area of 3 acres, with a minimum lot area of 1 acre and a maximum gross density of 0.33 dwelling units per acre.

Present Use: Residential/agricultural.
COMMENTS

1. **Street trees**—Section 324.1 of the subdivision and land development ordinance specifies that within any land development or subdivision, street trees shall be planted along the side of all streets where suitable street trees do not exist. There is currently a lack of street trees along most of the Eagle Road frontage of Lot 1.

2. **Sidewalks**—Section 409 of the subdivision and land development ordinance specifies that sidewalks shall be constructed on one side of all frontage streets.

3. **Curbs**—Section 410 of the subdivision and land development ordinance specifies that curbs shall be provided along both sides of all streets.

4. **Open space link**—The *Newtown Area Linked Open Space Plan* (1998) identifies a roadway open space link along Eagle Road. In addition to determining if sidewalks and curbs should be required along Eagle Road, township officials should determine if specific measures need to be taken as it applies to the recommended roadway open space link.

5. **Tree replacement**—Section 324.5 of the subdivision and land development ordinance specifies that trees of six inches or more, which are to be removed or destroyed during any stage of development, grading and/or construction, shall be replaced in accordance with size requirements established by section 324.5 and of the type provided as specified in Sections 324.8 and 324.9 of the subdivision and land development ordinance. The applicant should indicate on the plan whether any of the trees shown on sheet 5 of 18, Existing Features and Demolition Plan, have girths of 6 inches or more and provide for their replacement in accordance with the requirements of the subdivision and land development ordinance.

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 July 5, 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.

PWG:dc

cc:  Chance Worthington  
Bernard and Judith E. Newman  
Eric Janetka, P.E., Kelly & Close Engineers  
Larry Young, P.E., Tri-State Engineers & Land Surveyors, Inc.  
David R. Nyman, Interim Township Manager (via email)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Warrington Township Board of Supervisors
    Warrington Township Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Sketch Plan of Land Development for Gloria Dei Community
    TMP #50-10-14-1
    Applicant: G.D.L. Farms Corp.
    Owner: Same
    Plan Dated: May 19, 2017
    Date Received: May 19, 2017

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 76,813-square-foot personal care facility building on a 3-acre lot served by public water and sewer.

Location: Southern side of Street Road, approximately 1,200 feet east of its intersection with Folly Road.

Zoning: IU-A-1 Institutional Age Qualified District permits age-qualified townhouse/courtyard with a garage in combination with assisted living facilities or personal care facilities. The minimum tract area for age-qualified townhouse/courtyard with a garage is 25 acres, and three acres for assisted living facilities or personal care facilities. The maximum density is six units per acre of gross site area for age-qualified townhouse/courtyard with a garage, and not to exceed 30 beds per acre for assisted living facilities or personal care facilities. No less than 50 square feet per bed shall be provided for open space for an assisted living facility or personal care home.

Present Use: Vacant
COMMENTS

1. **Permitted use**—Section 902-B of the zoning ordinance permits age-qualified townhouse/courtyard with a garage in combination with assisted living facilities. The proposed use is a personal care facility, which abuts, but is not on the same parcel with, Lamplighter Village, an age-qualified townhouse/courtyard. The subject site was subdivided from TMP #50-10-14 in the early 2000s, but never developed. A personal care facility was proposed in 2004 and 2007, but never constructed. The township should clarify this requirement and determine if the proposed use is permitted on a separate parcel from the age-qualified use.

2. **Open space**—Section 903-B1.D of the zoning ordinance requires 50 square feet per bed of a personal care facility to be provided for open space. The plan indicates that 82 beds are proposed, so 4,100 square feet of open space would be required. The plan does not indicate that any open space is provided. Future plans should show the required open space.

3. **Traffic Impact Study**—Section 2501 of the subdivision and land development ordinance requires that a traffic impact study be submitted for residential subdivisions with more than 10 units. A traffic impact study was submitted in 2001 for Lamplighter Village which contained the subject tract. The township should determine if a revised traffic impact study should be submitted for the proposed development. We recommend that a traffic impact study be required due to the increase in development and traffic in the vicinity of the site in the 16 years since the previous study was prepared.

4. **Drop-off/pick-up area**—We recommend that a drop-off and pick-up area be provided for the safety and convenience of users. The plan proposes a two-way moving aisle that is 24 feet wide along the building’s main entrance. If a vehicle stops in front of the building to drop off or pick up a resident or visitor the moving aisle would be reduced to one-way.

5. **Sidewalks**—Section 408 of the subdivision and land development ordinance requires that sidewalks be provided along all existing abutting streets for all land developments. The plan does not show a sidewalk along Street Road. The preliminary plan should show a sidewalk along Street Road.

6. **Connector trail**—The adjacent Lamplighter Village has a perimeter trail that may be connected with the subject site. The Lamplighter development may contain residents who have friends or relatives served by the proposed facility. A trail connection would facilitate movement between the sites and encourage visitation. We recommend that the preliminary plan show a trail connection with the adjacent parcel.

7. **Screening**—Section 2103 of the subdivision and land development ordinance requires that all loading/unloading areas be adequately screened by the use of dense evergreen planting, earthen berms, or solid walls or fences. No landscaping is shown on the southwestern side of the site to screen the loading area. The preliminary plan should show the required screening.

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
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 July 5, 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.

DCZ:dc

cc: G.D.L. Farms Corp.
    Ken Bissinger, P.E., Renew Design Group
    Kimberly Freimuth, Esq., Fox Rothschild, LLP
    Tom F. Zarko, P.E., CKS Engineers, Inc., Municipal Engineer
    Barry Luber, Municipal Manager (via email)
    Barbara Liverone, Assistant to 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>Newtown Township</td>
<td>Village at Newtown Redevelopment</td>
<td>5616-D</td>
<td>29-3-24-3, -24-4, -24-5, -24-6, &amp; 29-10-172</td>
<td>1-09935-216-3J</td>
<td>0201-60062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Southampton Township</td>
<td>Lorenzetti Subdivision</td>
<td>11907</td>
<td>21-18-2</td>
<td>1-09006-163-3J</td>
<td>0201-60063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Southampton Township</td>
<td>Curry Subdivision</td>
<td>12218</td>
<td>21-10-185</td>
<td>1-09006-164-3J</td>
<td>0201-60064</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
June 19, 2017

Ms. Tara Bernard
Ebert Engineering, Inc.
P.O. Box 540
4092 Skippack Pike, Suite 202
Skippack, PA 19474

RE: Village at Newtown Redevelopment Planning Module
PaDEP Code #1-09935-216-3J
BCPC #5616-D
TMPs #29-3-24-3,-24-4,-24-5,-24-6, and 29-10-172
Newtown Township, Bucks County, PA

Dear Ms. Bernard:

We have received a copy of the planning module regarding the redevelopment of the Brixmor Village at the Village at Newtown shopping center, which entails the addition of 50,558 square feet of retail shops and restaurant space, and connection to public sewerage and public water. The site is approximately 20 acres located on South Eagle Road, and generally bounded by Durham Road on the north, Ice Cream Alley to the east, and Silo Drive to the south.

The proposed redevelopment equates to an addition of 127 EDUs for connection to the Newtown Township Public Sanitary Sewer System. Using the flow of 242 gallons per day/EDU, as defined by the Newtown Bucks County Joint Municipal Authority, the projected sewage flow is 30,734 gallons per day.

The project will tie into an existing sanitary sewage connection located within the project area where it will flow 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.

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 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.
Ms. Tara Bernard  
June 19, 2017  
Page 2

The Newtown Township Act 537 Official Plan Revision (1993) is the official Act 537 Plan for this portion of Newtown Township. 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 where only public sewer service is permitted. In addition, the plan 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 project is included in the BCWSA Neshaminy Interceptor Connection Management Plan (CMP) for Newtown Township. The capacity allocation is a combination of the 2015 CMP Village at Newtown allocation, 2015 CMP Newtown Township miscellaneous nonresidential allocation, and the purchase of unused EDUs from the 1986 sewage facilities planning approval for the Village at Newtown.

Component 3. Sewage Collection and Treatment Facilities does not include signatures authorizing collection, 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.

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

Sincerely,

Michael Roedig  
Senior Planner

MW:dc

Attachment

cc: Genevie Kostick, BCDH  
    Elizabeth Mahoney, PaDEP  
    Kurt Ferguson, Newtown Township Manager  
    Kristie Kaznicki, Township Municipal Services Secretary  
    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
Village at Newtown Redevelopment-Newtown Township

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

1. Date plan received by county planning agency. **May 19, 2017**

2. Date plan received by planning agency with areawide jurisdiction
   - Agency name

3. Date review completed by agency **June 19, 2017**

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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
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 19, 2017

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 19, 2017

Mr. Lawrence Byrne, P.E.
Eastern/Chadrow Associates, Inc.
333 East Street Road
Warminster, PA 18974

RE: Lorenzetti Subdivision Planning Module
PaDEP Code #1-09006-163-3J
BCPC #11907
TMP #21-18-2
Lower Southampton Township, Bucks County, PA

Dear Mr. Byrne:

We have received a copy of the planning module\(^1\) regarding the subdivision of 10.6 acres into two single-family detached lots. A new single-family dwelling is proposed to be constructed and an existing dwelling is to remain. Both lots are proposed to be connected to the public sewer system. The site is located approximately 2,400 feet northwest from the intersection of Buck Road and Bristol Road West. The total proposed flow from the two dwellings will be 536 gallons per day (2 EDUs).

The 1970 Bucks County Sewerage Facilities Plan is the official Act 537 Plan for this portion of Lower Southampton Township. The tract is within an area served by sanitary sewerage facilities. The sewerage from the lots will tie into the existing sanitary sewer main adjacent to Mill Creek, which is owned by the Upper Southampton Municipal Authority. Wastewater will flow into the Poquessing Interceptor to be ultimately treated at the Philadelphia Water Department’s Northeast Water Pollution Control Plant. The proposal is consistent with the official Act 537 Plan.

Component 3 Sewage Collection and Treatment Facilities does not include signatures authorizing collection and treatment capacity in Section G. Proposed Wastewater Disposal Facilities and Section J. Chapter 94 Consistency Determination. Component 3.G.7 indicates that support documentation regarding a Pennsylvania Natural Diversity Inventory (PNDI) search has been included in the module. No PNDI receipt or support documentation has been included in the submitted module. Documentation to confirm that this project is consistent with DEP Technical Guidance 012-0700-001 Implementation of the PA State History Code (Component 3.G.6) are not included in the submitted module.

\(^1\) 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 Lower Southampton 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
Mr. Lawrence Byrne, P.E.
June 19, 2017
Page 2

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,

John S. Ives
Senior Planner

JSI:dc

Attachment

cc: Genevie Kostick, BCDH
Elizabeth Mahoney, PaDEP
John McMenamin, 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
Lorenzetti Subdivision

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

1. Date plan received by county planning agency. June 2, 2017
2. Date plan received by planning agency with areawide jurisdiction
   Agency name: Bucks County Planning Commission
3. Date review completed by agency June 19, 2017

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<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 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 20, 2017

Mr. Lawrence Byrne, P.E.
Eastern/Chadrow Associates, Inc.
333 East Street Road
Warminster, PA 18974

RE: Curry Subdivision Planning Module
    PaDEP Code #1-09006-164-3J
    BCPC #12218
    TMP #21-10-185
    Lower Southampton Township, Bucks County, PA

Dear Mr. Byrne:

We have received a copy of the planning module\(^1\) regarding the 2-lot subdivision that will retain one single-family dwelling and construct another. The new dwelling will be connected to the public sewer system. The site is located along the southeast side of Skyline Drive, approximately 200 feet southwest of the intersection of Harding Avenue and Skyline Drive. The total proposed flow from the new dwelling will be 400 gallons per day (1 EDU).

The 1970 Bucks County Sewerage Facilities Plan is the official Act 537 Plan for this portion of Lower Southampton Township. The tract is within an area served by sanitary sewerage facilities. The house lateral will tie into the existing main that runs along Skyline Drive. Wastewater will flow into the Poquessing Interceptor to be ultimately treated at the Philadelphia Water Department’s Northeast Water Pollution Control Plant. The proposal is consistent with the official Act 537 Plan.

Component 3. Sewage Collection and Treatment Facilities does not include signatures authorizing collection and treatment capacity in Section C. Proposed Wastewater Disposal Facilities and Section J. Chapter 94 Consistency Determination. Component 3.G.7 indicates that support documentation regarding a Pennsylvania Natural Diversity Inventory (PNDI) search has been included in the module. No PNDI receipt or support documentation has been included in the submitted module. Documentation to confirm that this project is consistent with DEP Technical Guidance 012-0700-001 Implementation of the PA State History Code (Component 3.G.6) are not included in the submitted module.

---

\(^1\) 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 Lower Southampton 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.
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,

[Signature]

John S. Ives
Senior Planner

cc: Genevie Kostick, BCDH
    Elizabeth Mahoney, PaDEP
    John McMenamin, 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
David Curry Subdivision

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

1. Date plan received by county planning agency. June 8, 2017
2. Date plan received by planning agency with areawide jurisdiction
   Agency name Bucks County Planning Commission
3. Date review completed by agency June 20, 2017

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

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

| Name:      | John Ives |
| Title:     | Senior Planner |
| Signature: | John Ives |
| Date:      | June 20, 2017 |

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

Address: 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 5, 2017
4. Planning Services’ Report
5. Galloway Road Certified Redevelopment Area, Bensalem Township
   Jeff Darwak, Deputy Director for The Redevelopment Authority of the County of Bucks
   Allen Toadvine, RDA Solicitor
6. Presentation: Penndel Borough Open House
   John Ives, Senior Planner and Chris Dochney, Planner
7. Act 247 Reviews
8. Old Business
9. New Business
10. Public Comment
11. Adjournment

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

AGENDA SUBJECT TO CHANGE PRIOR TO MEETING
BUCKS COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
Minutes of Meeting
July 5, 2017

MEMBERS PRESENT: Raymond (Skip) W. Goodnoe; Edward Kisselback, Jr.; Robert M. Pellegrino; Carol A. Pierce; Evan J. Stone, R. Tyler Tomlinson; Walter S. Wydro

STAFF PRESENT: Debra Canale; Christopher S. Dochney; David P. Johnson; Heather Mahaley; Charles T. McIlhinny; Michael A. Roedig; David A. Sebastian; Maureen Wheatley

GUESTS: James Boyle, County Reporter, Bucks County Courier Times; Larry Menkes, Warminster Resident; Brian Welcker, Doylestown Township Resident

1. CALL TO ORDER
   Mr. Stone called the meeting to order at 2:00 PM.

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

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FOR THE MEETING OF JUNE 7, 2017
   Upon motion of Mr. Goodnoe, seconded by Ms. Pierce, with the vote being 6-0-1, the motion carried to approve the minutes of the June 7, 2017 meeting as presented. Mr. Kisselback abstained.

4. PLANNING SERVICES DIRECTOR’S REPORT
   Mr. Sebastian began by introducing the newest member of the planning team, Heather Mahaley, formerly of Bucks County Housing and Community Development. Ms. Mahaley said she was looking forward to working with everyone and was happy to be a planner once again.

   Mr. Sebastian spoke to the board about informally authorizing a Heritage Tourism project for Bucks County that Mr. Stone suggested. This could be an additional component of the Bucks County Comprehensive Plan and possibly as a stand-alone document. Mr. Stone said he found a model of a similar document for Passaic County and was intrigued by the contribution and effect this reporting could have on the comprehensive plan and tourism in Bucks County. Mr. Sebastian said that if authorized to move forward, Mr. Roedig, as Project Manager will work on this project along with the assistance of Visit Bucks County, board members, and BCPC staff. Discussion followed regarding the scope and outline of the project, and its effect on tourism and the economic development of Bucks County and its municipalities. The board agreed this could be a valuable product to promote Bucks County and informally authorized the project.

   Mr. Sebastian provided some highlights from the BCPC Activity Report, stating that he, Mr. Braehler, Ms. Bush, and Mr. Walters attended a Bristol Township roundtable meeting. They assisted the Economy League of Greater Philadelphia in managing the discussion between state and local officials and business owners on maximizing growth and economic development due to the impact
of the I-95/PA Turnpike connection to the Lower Bucks area in the next decade. The Economy League’s summary of the meeting is currently being reviewed by our staff and subsequently, there will be a meeting of a Project Advisory Committee that will hopefully provide focus and direction for preparing the study, which has a June 2018 deadline.

Staff attended a Penndel Borough Open House meeting to assist them with a strategy for addressing the future economic needs of the borough. Following up on the success of the Morrisville Town Hall meeting, this meeting was similar in scope and content; it was well-attended and well-received. There were over 60+ attendees including local officials, residents, and business owners, who provided their feedback and opinions (good, bad, and indifferent) on a variety of topics. There will be a summary presentation at the next BCPC meeting on their findings.

Mr. Sebastian and Mr. Roedig, along with Matthew Takita, Bensalem Director of Planning and Zoning, and several members of their solicitor’s office, met to discuss zoning for the Bensalem Riverfront and Street Road areas. Mr. Sebastian said the Township sent us a draft ordinance for a potential town center along the Street Road corridor between Knights and Hulmeville roads utilizing the vacant Neil Armstrong Middle School.

Mr. Sebastian announced that the Bucks County Bicycle Task Force will be holding their first annual meeting on Thursday, September 7, 2017. They will be addressing multi-use trails and bicycle lanes. There is also the possibility of a guest speaker, PennDOT Secretary, Leslie Richards.

Mr. Sebastian informed us that we were asked by PEMA and Bucks County Emergency Management Agency Director, Scott Forster, to assist in the identification of floodplain sites and structures. This project is to begin in August as part of the state’s floodplain program for the possibility of acquisition and demolition versus elevation of structures.

Lastly, Mr. Sebastian told us that the BCPC was issued a subpoena to provide plan file information regarding a development in East Rockhill Township.

The board thanked Mr. Sebastian for his report.

5. **PRESENTATION: PRELIMINARY PLAN OF LAND DEVELOPMENT FOR MEDICAL MARIJUANA GROWER/PROCESSOR IN FALLS TOWNSHIP – CHRISTOPHER DOCHNEY, PLANNER**

Mr. Dochney began his presentation by stating that although at least a dozen or so municipalities within Bucks County have adopted ordinances regulating medical marijuana dispensaries and grower/processor facilities, Falls Township is the only municipality that has submitted a land development plan specifically for medical marijuana grower/processor.

Mr. Dochney stated that Falls Township adopted their local Medical Marijuana Ordinance in November 2016 and it largely follows state regulations with a few of their own variations. He said the state requires a minimum distance of 1,000 feet from schools and day care centers, but Falls Township added a minimum distance of 1,000 feet from all residences, places of worship, public parks, and community centers.

Mr. Dochney stated that for dispensaries, their local ordinance allows (with a special exception) for them to be located only in the Highway Commercial Zone along Route 1 on the eastern and/or western ends of the township. One possible site is south of Morrisville which may or may not
work because it is somewhat close to a residential area and the other site is a shopping center on the west side of the township across from Middletown which also may or may not work because it is close to Sesame Place.

Mr. Dochney stated that for a grower/processor, the local ordinance allows (with special exception) for it to be located in the Farming and Mining District, and the Materials, Processing, and Manufacturing District. The U.S. Steel Industrial Complex on the south side of the township is where the sketch plan and preliminary/final land development is located. The nearest residence is over a mile away across the river in New Jersey. He said that their plan is to demolish the majority of existing structures on the property and build two new structures; one for MHL Roebling LLC, and one for PharmaCann. Each building is to be over 60,000 square feet in area.

Mr. Dochney explained the reason for some of the variances that were approved for the site, such as eliminating the sidewalk and street trees requirements and adjusting the parking regulations. He said that the township realized that the grower/processor establishment would only require parking for their employees. Visitors or customers would not be welcome nor would they want to encourage people walking around the building.

Mr. Dochney said the state was been broken down into 6 regions for grower/processor permitting; Bucks County is included in the Southeast Region 1. For this round each region was granted 2 permits. The state announced the benefactors of the permits last week. In the Southeast Region 1, Berks County received both permits, one in Sinking Spring and one in Reading. He said that the current application before us is essentially gambling on receiving a permit in the next round.

Mr. Dochney stated that there were 177 applicants statewide, 46 of those applicants were from the Southeast region. The process is expensive; the application fee is $10,000, the permit fee is $200,000 and applicants must have a minimum of $2 million in capital funds. There are also legal and development fees. Each application is then ranked by the Pennsylvania Department of Health based on 21 criteria and the top two from each region are granted permits, however, no applicant is granted more than one permit. Mr. Dochney added that there is research showing growers/processors can earn up to $1 million a month in revenue.

Mr. Dochney said that for the state dispensary permits there were 280 applications but there will only be a total of 50 permits granted statewide. He said that 27 permits were issued in this first round and each permit can have up to three locations. The fees for dispensaries are also expensive, the application fee is $5,000, and the permit fee $30,000. There were 3 permits issued in Bucks County, one each to Bensalem Township, Bristol Township, and Sellersville Borough.

Mr. Dochney polled the board for questions. Discussion followed on state regulations.

The board thanked Mr. Dochney for his presentation.

6. **ACT 247 REVIEWS**

Ms. Pierce asked if staff knew the building plans for BCPC Municipal Review #15-17-CR1 - Hilltown Township - Former Blooming Glen High School. Mr. Sebastian stated that the plan was submitted only as a subdivision of the lot without future development data.
The reviews of July 5, 2017, were mailed to the board for their review prior to the meeting. Upon motion of Mr. Pellegrino, seconded by Ms. Pierce, the motion carried to approve the July 5, 2017 Act 247 reviews.

7. **OLD BUSINESS**
   Ms. Pierce asked if staff were aware of the status of the triangle parking area in the center of Quakertown Borough. Mr. Sebastian referred her to Lisa Wolff who is currently conducting and compiling a parking inventory report of Quakertown Borough.

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

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

10. **ADJOURNMENT**
    Mr. Stone adjourned the meeting at 2:45 PM.

Submitted by:
Debra Canale, Staff Secretary
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 New Britain Borough Planning Commission meeting and the Quakertown Area Planning Committee (QAPC) meeting.

Plans & Activities – Production continued on the New Britain Borough comprehensive plan update. A first draft of the plan will be presented to the Borough Planning Commission at its August meeting.

A final draft of the Hilltown Township comprehensive plan has been completed and distributed to the Board of Supervisors. We are awaiting their comments.

Staff submitted a draft of the Warrington Comprehensive Plan with the exception of the land use chapter and various appendices to the township for review and comment. Work continues on updating the mapping and land use chapter, which are projected to be completed by early August.

The staff is beginning the process of working with West Rockhill Township to update their comprehensive plan. Staff has started conducting background research and developing a community survey. BCPC staff had a kick-off meeting with the township’s Comprehensive Plan Steering Committee at the end of June, and will meet on the last Thursday of each month to continue the process. At the July meeting, the steering committee and BCPC staff are expected to discuss the history of the township and demographic and economic changes since the last comprehensive plan.

Work progresses on the Penndel Borough MEDI project. Staff is currently tabulating and compiling the results of the resident survey boards and written survey sheets from the June Open House meeting. Over 50 people attended this meeting.

Staff worked to update the draft Quakertown Borough – Summary of Parking Inventory based on current information obtained from the Borough’s economic development consultant and zoning officer. The parking inventory is being prepared for Quakertown Borough under the MEDI program.

Staff met with officials from Tullytown Borough to discuss tasks for the Tullytown Borough MEDI project and to tour various sites with redevelopment potential within the Borough. Borough officials had requested assistance in developing strategies to replace lost tax revenue due to the closure of the Tullytown Resource Recovery Facility. With the consideration of current train station renovations and possible future developments, borough officials discussed the need to develop a transit-oriented development overlay ordinance as a first order of business.

Staff met with Northampton Township’s Economic Development Corporation to discuss final changes to the Richboro Village Master
Plan. The final plan will be presented to the township planning commission at their August meeting.

Following the Bristol Township and Lower Bucks County Economic Stakeholder Roundtable Meeting conducted last month, the Economy League of Greater Philadelphia prepared a summary report following this meeting. Staff of the BCPC has reviewed and provided revisions to this report. A separate meeting with Bristol Township officials will be conducted in early August to solicit further input and 'buy in' from the host municipality.

Staff met for the second time with Bensalem Township staff to discuss an overlay zoning district that the township is proposing for a portion of the Street Road corridor, including a possible Town Center area between Knights and Hulmeville roads. A proposed ordinance could be expected by late summer.

In addition to the plans and activities discussed above, a proposal and work program has been submitted to Chalfont Borough for the preparation of a comprehensive plan update.

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 attended a Land Use Law review webinar at DVRPC. Several Supreme Court cases were reviewed along with a short discussion about regulation of unattended clothing donation bins, which is an issue that may have relevance in Bucks County municipalities. These bins have become a nuisance across the country and some ordinances regulating them have been challenged for violation of free speech protections.

Act 247 and 537 Review Activity
5 Subdivision and Land Development Proposal
2 Sketch Plans
11 Municipal Plans and Ordinances
1 Sewage Facility Planning Modules
2 Traffic Impact Study

Transportation and Trails

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 reviewed several applications for the Multimodal Transportation Funding Program and provided support letters for same. 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 goes into Bucks County. This month we participated in a visioning workshop for the project.

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 continued to work with the municipalities and project consultant regarding wetland issues and traffic signalization permits for road crossings. The County has hired a consultant to design the Newtown Rail Trail. The current project will construct the portion of the Newtown Rail Trail in Upper Southampton Township and will connect with the Pennypack Trail in Montgomery County. Staff coordinated with
Upper Southampton Township, the consultant and PennDOT to design the trail crossing at County Line Road and Second Street Pike. We also conducted a kickoff meeting/site visit for the **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. We also were awarded grant funding through DVRPC for another segment of the Neshaminy Greenway Trail, which will traverse Dark Hollow Park. 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. Updates of GIS data are always provided to our Consortium members when requested. This month we provided updates to New Hope Borough.

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 currently utilizing a cloud hosted infrastructure that supports a centralized and shared regional GIS database. Earlier this year the group contracted with Pictometry to acquire both aerial and oblique imagery. The 2017 spring flight is completed and we have begun setting up access accounts and reviewing the imagery. Pictometry will hold training sessions for interested county staff sometime in the fall. Imagery mosaics of the county derived from the flight will become available later this year.

The July meeting was held at the Delaware County Emergency Services Center in Media.

**Bucks County GIS** has been actively working with departments and agencies throughout the county in the development of web-based GIS applications. We also assist departments that need updating of their maps and databases. This past month we started updating the countywide zoning database. In addition we began mapping of the redistricted county court areas for District Courts and flood plain delineation maps of county properties for Finance.
At their July 12, 2017 meeting, the Commissioners celebrated the 200th farm preserved by the Bucks County Agricultural Land Preservation Program. The celebration was held at the Edward Litzenberger farm, located on Berger Road in Nockamixon Township. About 50 farmers attended that have preserved their farms. We have preserved 16,162 acres since 1990.
<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>Bristol Township</td>
<td>5-17-SD2</td>
<td>Bristol Township School District</td>
<td>(5-39-584-1)</td>
<td>Sale of George Washington Elementary School site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bristol Township</td>
<td>5-17-SD3</td>
<td>Bristol Township School District</td>
<td>(5-72-113)</td>
<td>Sale of John Fitch Elementary School site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bristol Township</td>
<td>5-17-SD4</td>
<td>Bristol Township School District</td>
<td>(5-59-144)</td>
<td>Sale of Lafayette Elementary School site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bristol Township</td>
<td>5-17-SD5</td>
<td>Bristol Township School District</td>
<td>(5-21-162-1)</td>
<td>Sale of Abraham Lincoln Elementary School site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bristol Township</td>
<td>5-17-SD6</td>
<td>Bristol Township School District</td>
<td>(5-22-10: 5-26-1; -26-8)</td>
<td>Sale of Maple Shade Elementary School site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckingham Township</td>
<td>6-17-1R</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors</td>
<td></td>
<td>Amend the Zoning Ordinance: Various</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milford Township</td>
<td>23-17-2</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors</td>
<td></td>
<td>Amend the Zoning Ordinance: Building Height &amp; Avigation Easement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morrisville Borough</td>
<td>24-17-SD1</td>
<td>Morrisville School District</td>
<td>(24-9-107-1 &amp; -107-3)</td>
<td>Sale of M.R. Reiter Elementary School site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solebury Township</td>
<td>41-17-2</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors</td>
<td></td>
<td>Amend the Zoning Ordinance: Various</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tincum Township</td>
<td>44-17-ASA1</td>
<td>Mark Schmidt</td>
<td>(44-11-7, -7-1; 1-15-9)</td>
<td>ASA Extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamburgersville Borough</td>
<td>45-17-1</td>
<td>Borough Council</td>
<td></td>
<td>Amend the Zoning Ordinance: Medical Marijuana</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONFIDENTIAL — NOT FOR RELEASE

MEMORANDUM

TO: Bristol Township Council
    Bristol Township Planning Commission

FROM: Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Proposal for Sale of George Washington Elementary School site
        TMP #5-39-584-1
        Applicant: Bristol Township School District
        Received: July 6, 2017
        Hearing Date: Not Set

In accordance with the provisions of Section 305 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 2, 2017.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposed Action: The Bristol Township School District proposes to sell the George Washington Elementary School site as part of a school district-wide facility consolidation and reconfiguration program.

Location: George Washington Elementary School is located on a 17.61-acre parcel along the northwestern side of Oaktree Drive and the southwestern side of Crabtree Drive. The Black Ditch Creek parallels the site to the west.

Zoning: R-3 Residence District permits higher density residential uses and institutional and recreational uses that are compatible with residential neighborhoods.

Present Use: Former elementary school.

COMMENTS

According to information submitted, the Bristol Township School District facility consolidation and reconfiguration program included the construction of three new regional elementary school buildings (the “New Schools”) which replaced the District’s nine existing elementary school buildings (the
“Legacy Schools”). Each of the three New Schools have been constructed on District property which previously served as the venue for one of the Legacy Schools which has since been demolished. The District intends to repurpose a fourth site that previously housed a Legacy School into an administrative and transportation facility. The five remaining Legacy Schools, which includes the former George Washington Elementary School, have been deemed by the District to be unused and unnecessary and currently sit vacant.

The Bucks County Comprehensive Plan (2011) addresses school facilities in the Community Facilities and Services component of the plan. Principle 6 of the Plan is to “Provide Adequate Community Facilities and Services” by continuing to promote proactive, cost-effective and efficient community facilities and services that will keep pace with and fulfill the changing needs of our citizenry. The Plan notes that to accommodate changing student populations, some districts have closed schools and redrawn attendance maps to best utilize school facilities.

Since elementary school students have been accommodated at one of the three New Schools within the District, the proposed sale of the George Washington Elementary School site appears to be reasonable and consistent with the District’s consolidation and reconfiguration program.

We would appreciate being notified of the School District’s decision regarding this matter.

LMW:dc

cc:    Dr. Melanie Gehrens, Bristol Township School District Superintendent
       David J. Truelove, Esq., Hill Wallack, LLP
       William McCauley, Bristol Township Managing Director (via email)
       Colleen Costello, Bristol Township Building, Planning & Development (via email)
       Kurt Schroeder, P.E., Gilmore & Associates, Township Engineer
       Randy Flager, Esq., Flager & Associates, Township Solicitor
CONFIDENTIAL — NOT FOR RELEASE
August 2, 2017
BCPC #5-17-SD3

MEMORANDUM

TO: Bristol Township Council
Bristol Township Planning Commission

FROM: Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Proposal for Sale of School Property—John Fitch Elementary School site
TMP #5-72-113
Applicant: Bristol Township School District
Received: July 6, 2017
Hearing Date: Not Set

In accordance with the provisions of Section 305 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 2, 2017.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposed Action: To provide notice regarding the possible sale of the John Fitch Elementary School site as part of a school district-wide facility consolidation and reconfiguration program.

Location: John Fitch Elementary School is located on a 17.52-acre parcel located between Stonybrook, Greenbrook, and Farmbrook drives.

Zoning: R-2 Residence District permits medium- to high-density single-family detached residential uses and institutional and recreational uses that are compatible with residential neighborhoods.

Present Use: Former elementary school.

COMMENTS

According to information submitted, the Bristol Township School District facility consolidation and reconfiguration program included the construction of three new regional elementary school buildings (the “New Schools”) which replaced the District’s nine existing elementary school buildings (the “Legacy Schools”). Each of the three New Schools have been constructed on District property which previously served as the venue for one of the Legacy Schools which has since been demolished. The
District intends to repurpose a fourth site that previously housed a Legacy School into an administrative and transportation facility. The five remaining Legacy Schools, which includes the former John Fitch Elementary School, have been deemed by the District to be unused and unnecessary by the District and currently sit vacant.

The Bucks County Comprehensive Plan (2011) addresses school facilities in the Community Facilities and Services component of the plan. Principle 6 of the Plan is to “Provide Adequate Community Facilities and Services” by continuing to promote proactive, cost-effective and efficient community facilities and services that will keep pace with and fulfill the changing needs of our citizenry. The Plan notes that to accommodate changing student populations, some districts have closed schools and redrawn attendance maps to best utilize school facilities.

Since elementary school students have been accommodated at one of the three New Schools within the District, the proposed sale of the John Fitch Elementary School site appears to be reasonable and consistent with the District’s consolidation and reconfiguration program.

We would appreciate being notified of the School District’s decision regarding this matter.

LMW:dc

cc:  Dr. Melanie Gehrens, Bristol Township School District Superintendent  
      David J. Truelove, Esq., Hill Wallack, LLP  
      William McCauley, Bristol Township Managing Director (via email)  
      Colleen Costello, Bristol Township Building, Planning & Development (via email)  
      Kurt Schroeder, P.E., Gilmore & Associates, Township Engineer  
      Randy Flager, Esq., Flager & Associates, Township Solicitor
MEMORANDUM

TO:       Bristol Township Council
          Bristol Township Planning Commission

FROM:     Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT:  Proposal for Sale of Lafayette Elementary School site
          TMP #5-59-144
          Applicant: Bristol Township School District
          Received: July 6, 2017
          Hearing Date: Not Set

In accordance with the provisions of Section 305 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 2, 2017.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposed Action: The Bristol Township School District proposes to sell the Lafayette Elementary School site as part of a school district-wide facility consolidation and reconfiguration program.

Location: Lafayette Elementary School is located on a 20.95-acre parcel along the northwestern side of Fayette Drive.

Zoning: R-2 Residence District permits medium- to high-density single-family detached residential uses and institutional and recreational uses that are compatible with residential neighborhoods.

Present Use: Former elementary school.

COMMENTS

According to information submitted, the Bristol Township School District facility consolidation and reconfiguration program included the construction of three new regional elementary school buildings (the “New Schools”) which replaced the District’s nine existing elementary school buildings (the “Legacy Schools”). Each of the three New Schools have been constructed on District property which previously served as the venue for one of the Legacy Schools which has since been demolished. The
District intends to repurpose a fourth site that previously housed a Legacy School into an administrative and transportation facility. The five remaining Legacy Schools, which includes the former Lafayette Elementary School, have been deemed by the District to be unused and unnecessary and currently sit vacant.

The Bucks County Comprehensive Plan (2011) addresses school facilities in the Community Facilities and Services component of the plan. Principle 6 of the Plan is to “Provide Adequate Community Facilities and Services” by continuing to promote proactive, cost-effective and efficient community facilities and services that will keep pace with and fulfill the changing needs of our citizenry. The Plan notes that to accommodate changing student populations, some districts have closed schools and redrawn attendance maps to best utilize school facilities.

Since elementary school students have been accommodated at one of the three New Schools within the District, the proposed sale of the Lafayette Elementary School site appears to be reasonable and consistent with the District’s consolidation and reconfiguration program.

We would appreciate being notified of the School District’s decision regarding this matter.

LMW:dc

cc: Dr. Melanie Gehrens, Bristol Township School District Superintendent
    David J. Truelove, Esq., Hill Wallack, LLP
    William McCauley, Bristol Township Managing Director (via email)
    Colleen Costello, Bristol Township Building, Planning & Development (via email)
    Kurt Schroeder, P.E., Gilmore & Associates, Township Engineer
    Randy Flager, Esq., Flager & Associates, Township Solicitor
MEMORANDUM

TO: Bristol Township Council
   Bristol Township Planning Commission

FROM: Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Proposal for Sale of Abraham Lincoln Elementary School site
         TMP #5-21-162-1
         Applicant: Bristol Township School District
         Received: July 6, 2017
         Hearing Date: Not Set

In accordance with the provisions of Section 305 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 2, 2017.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposed Action: The Bristol Township School District proposes to sell the Abraham Lincoln Elementary School site as part of a school district-wide facility consolidation and reconfiguration program.

Location: Abraham Lincoln Elementary School is located on a 9.96-acre parcel off of Plumtree Place within the Plumbridge section of Levittown.

Zoning: R-3 Residence District permits higher density residential uses and institutional and recreational uses that are compatible with residential neighborhoods.

Present Use: Former elementary school.

COMMENTS

According to information submitted, the Bristol Township School District facility consolidation and reconfiguration program included the construction of three new regional elementary school buildings (the “New Schools”) which replaced the District’s nine existing elementary school buildings (the “Legacy Schools”). Each of the three New Schools have been constructed on District property which
previously served as the venue for one of the Legacy Schools which has since been demolished. The District intends to repurpose a fourth site that previously housed a Legacy School into an administrative and transportation facility. The five remaining Legacy Schools, which includes the former Abraham Lincoln Elementary School, have been deemed by the District to be unused and unnecessary and currently sit vacant.

The Bucks County Comprehensive Plan (2011) addresses school facilities in the Community Facilities and Services component of the plan. Principle 6 of the Plan is to “Provide Adequate Community Facilities and Services” by continuing to promote proactive, cost-effective and efficient community facilities and services that will keep pace with and fulfill the changing needs of our citizenry. The Plan notes that to accommodate changing student populations, some districts have closed schools and redrawn attendance maps to best utilize school facilities.

Since elementary school students have been accommodated at one of the three New Schools within the District, the proposed sale of the Abraham Lincoln Elementary School site appears to be reasonable and consistent with the District’s consolidation and reconfiguration program.

We would appreciate being notified of the School District’s decision regarding this matter.

LMW:dc

cc:   Dr. Melanie Gehrens, Bristol Township School District Superintendent  
      David J. Truelove, Esq., Hill Wallack, LLP  
      William McCauley, Bristol Township Managing Director (via email)  
      Colleen Costello, Bristol Township Building, Planning & Development (via email)  
      Kurt Schroeder, P.E., Gilmore & Associates, Township Engineer  
      Randy Flager, Esq., Flager & Associates, Township Solicitor
MEMORANDUM

TO: Bristol Township Council
Bristol Township Planning Commission

FROM: Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Proposal for Sale of Maple Shade Elementary School site
TMPs #5-22-10; 5-26-1; -26-8
Applicant: Bristol Township School District
Received: July 6, 2017
Hearing Date: Not Set

In accordance with the provisions of Section 305 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 2, 2017.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposed Action: The Bristol Township School District proposes to sell the Maple Shade Elementary School site as part of a school district-wide facility consolidation and reconfiguration program.

Location: The Maple Shade Elementary School site consists of three parcels totaling approximately 5.8 acres that are located between Prospect Avenue and Newport Road.

Zoning: R-1 Residence District permits medium-intensity suburban residential uses and institutional and recreational uses that are compatible with residential neighborhoods.

Present Use: Former elementary school.

COMMENTS

According to information submitted, the Bristol Township School District facility consolidation and reconfiguration program included the construction of three new regional elementary school buildings (the “New Schools”) which replaced the District’s nine existing elementary school buildings (the “Legacy Schools”). Each of the three New Schools have been constructed on District property which previously served as the venue for one of the Legacy Schools which has since been demolished. The
District intends to repurpose a fourth site that previously housed a Legacy School into an administrative and transportation facility. The five remaining Legacy Schools, which includes the former Maple Shade Elementary School, have been deemed by the District to be unused and unnecessary and currently sit vacant.

The Bucks County Comprehensive Plan (2011) addresses school facilities in the Community Facilities and Services component of the plan. Principle 6 of the Plan is to “Provide Adequate Community Facilities and Services” by continuing to promote proactive, cost-effective and efficient community facilities and services that will keep pace with and fulfill the changing needs of our citizenry. The Plan notes that to accommodate changing student populations, some districts have closed schools and redrawn attendance maps to best utilize school facilities.

Since elementary school students have been accommodated at one of the three New Schools within the District, the proposed sale of the Maple Shade Elementary School site appears to be reasonable and consistent with the District’s consolidation and reconfiguration program.

We would appreciate being notified of the School District’s decision regarding this matter.

LMW:dc

cc: Dr. Melanie Gehrens, Bristol Township School District Superintendent  
    David J. Truelove, Esq., Hill Wallack, LLP  
    William McCauley, Bristol Township Managing Director (via email)  
    Colleen Costello, Bristol Township Building, Planning & Development (via email)  
    Kurt Schroeder, P.E., Gilmore & Associates, Township Engineer  
    Randy Flager, Esq., Flager & Associates, Township Solicitor
MEMORANDUM

TO: Buckingham Township Board of Supervisors
Buckingham Township Planning Commission

FROM: Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Revised Proposal for Amendments to the Zoning Ordinance—Create Overlay Districts, New Uses and Definitions, and New Lighting and Sign Restrictions.
Applicant: Board of Supervisors
Received: July 24, 2017
Hearing Date: TBD

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 (BCPC) at a meeting held on August 2, 2017.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposed Action: Amend the zoning ordinance to create three overlay districts and establish new use classifications relating to medical marijuana dispensary, medical marijuana grower/processor, hotel, and parking garage. In addition, amend and revise the forestry and wireless communication uses, and noise, lighting, blasting, and sign restrictions.

Proposed Zoning Provisions: The proposed ordinance has revised the previously submitted amendment (Ordinance 2017-02), dated April 13, 2017 and still retains the new overlay districts (with additions) and has minor changes to various sections of the zoning ordinance. Staff of the BCPC reviewed the previous revision (See BCPC #6-17-1, dated May 3, 2017). Newly proposed revisions and modifications are noted below:

Cross Keys Enterprise Zone Overlay District:

- A Parking Garage (E20) use has been added to the permitted uses.
- Establish minimum yard setbacks for all uses other than Use 23 Motor Vehicle Gasoline Station. Front, side, and rear yard setback to be 25 feet and measured from the property line, without regard to the limit of resource restricted lands that are 80 percent or more protected from disturbance.
- For Use 23 Motor Vehicle Gasoline Station access to roads shall be at least 150 feet from the intersection of any streets.
• Multiple Use Structures are allowed that can incorporate a mix of the following uses: C4 Library or Museum, C10 Day Care Center, D1 Medical Office, D2 Veterinary Office, D3 Office, D6 Outpatient Surgical Facility, E1 Retail Stores, E5 Service Business, E6 Financial Establishment, E10 Tavern, E11 Convenience Store, E29 Shopping Center, and G2 Research. A Multiple Use Structure has specific dimensional requirements that include a minimum lot area of 2 acres, front, side, and rear yard setbacks of 25 feet, and a maximum impervious surface ratio of 65 percent.

• On lots 10,000 square feet or greater, public amenities such as plazas, seating areas, outdoor eating areas, landscaping, site amenities, pedestrian-scaled lighting, gateways, and streetscape recommendations from the Land Use & Transportation Study of the Cross Keys Area, dated June 7, 2017, as prepared by the Bucks County Planning Commission are to be incorporated into each land development or subdivision within the overlay zone.

• Sidewalks shall be a minimum width of 4 feet.

Communications Overlay District 4: The Overlay District is intended to regulate the construction, expansion, and erection of personal wireless facilities comprised of distributed antenna systems (DAS). The revisions include:

• The Overlay District is proposed to be located in areas of the public Rights-of-Way along or near major thoroughfares, their intersections and interchanges and transportation arteries where, by the placement of such facilities, significant gaps in Personal Wireless services will be reduced and/or eliminated.

• Equipment shall be installed 78 inches above the ground level to discourage tampering.

Uses: The following uses are revised or amended from the previous submittal:

• Use B7 Rooming or Boarding Home—The definition has been expanded to include rentals offered through web enterprises such as Airbnb, VRBO, HomeAway, FlipKey, and Tripping.com that offer short-term rentals.

• Use E20 Parking Garage—A new use with 2 or more vertical levels used for short-term storage of automobiles and other light vehicles with the following conditions and restrictions:
  o A maximum height to the upper parking level driving surface shall be 33 feet.
  o Minimum lot area of 3 acres with set dimensional requirements.
  o Can be both an accessory and primary use.
  o Strict location and access requirements.
  o Shall be similar in scale, form, massing, building materials, and appearance to adjacent structures.
  o Strict lighting requirements.

• Use E4 Medical Marijuana Dispensary and Use G4 Medical Marijuana Grower/Processor— Both uses shall dispose of waste and by-products according to standards set by the Commonwealth Department of Health.

Section 201 Definitions—The definition of Boarder, Roomer or Lodger has been modified.
General Regulations Applicable to All Districts: The following minor revision is proposed:

- Section 3029, Blasting and Detonation Requirements—Revisions to the section that outlines the requirements and restrictions associated with blasting and detonation activities has been expanded.

Existing Zoning Provisions:

Section 201, Rooming or Boarding House: A dwelling used for housing of roomers, boarders, or lodgers with or without common eating facilities, including dormitories, fraternity or sorority houses, or other buildings of charitable, educational, or philanthropic use.

PC-1 Planned Commercial District: The district permits various commercial, office, institutional, and recreational uses on a minimum lot area of 20,000 square feet. The maximum building coverage is 20 percent and the maximum impervious surface coverage is 50 percent. Required minimum yard areas are: front—50 feet; side (both)—25 feet; and rear—50 feet.

PI Planned Industrial District: The district permits various commercial, office, business, and laboratory uses on a minimum lot area of 2 acres. The maximum building coverage is 15 percent and the maximum impervious surface coverage is 35 percent. Required minimum yard areas are: front—50 feet; side (both)—30 feet; and rear—50 feet.

COMMENTS

The proposed amendments appear to be consistent with the ordinance requirements as presented by the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code. However, we recommend township officials consider the following comments prior to adoption.

Cross Keys Enterprise Zone Overlay District—We commend the township for adding a new use and additional requirements to the overlay district. The new revisions include Use E20 Parking Garage, mixed use structures, and requiring public spaces and amenities as recommended in the Land Use and Transportation Plan for the Cross Keys Area (June 2017). We suggest the township officials consider the following:

1. Use E23 Motor Vehicle Gasoline Station
   a. Overlay District Purpose—Section 4303.F notes that Use E23 may contain only two of the following types of activities: fuel pumps; convenience commercial; service bays; and car wash. As described in Section 4301 of the proposed amendment, the purpose of the Cross Keys Enterprise Overlay District is to accommodate compatible development that enhances economic vitality in the area that creates a synergistic mix of uses. The township may wish to eliminate service bays as one of the four activity options for Use E23 within the overlay district. Motor vehicle service is commonly associated with industrial and heavy commercial areas and in conflict with the intent of a walkable and attractive development center.
   b. Editorial—Use E23 Motor Vehicle Gasoline Station is referenced as a ‘Service Station’ in Section 4303.F, H, I, and J. The use name should match for consistency.
2. **Section 4304 Multiple Use Structure**
   
a. **Use E20 Parking Garage**—The township may wish to add Use E20 Parking Garage to the mix of permitted uses within a Multiple Use Structure (Section 4304.A). The potential to add parking below or above other permitted uses can help reduce impervious coverage, optimize site development, reduce walking distances, and create more area for public space and amenities.

  b. **Maximum height**—The maximum building height for a Multiple Use Structure is proposed to be 60 feet or 5 stories. Based on the proposed building setbacks, a Multiple Use Structure is permitted to locate a minimum distance of 25 feet from the street right-of-way of the front, side, or rear yards. Taller buildings located adjacent to a road, can create a canyon effect if the upper floors are not stepped back. The township may wish to add language to step back the upper portion of a building or increase the building setback according to the building’s proximity to the adjacent roadway. Section 4303.B which discusses architectural design as approved by the Board of Supervisors, could also be revised to address this issue.

3. **Parking ratio reduction**—Since required parking/parking ratio is one factor that influences development intensity on a particular tract, the township may wish to consider reducing the retail and office parking ratio that ranges from 1 space per 180 to 200 square feet to 1 space per 250 square feet. Convenience-type uses are the exception since they are generally associated with greater number of trips and higher turnover by patrons. The reduction may be considered within the overlay district and can be applied as a standard within Section 4304 Multiple Use Structures. The reduced parking ratio can help reduce impervious coverage, optimize site development, and create more area for public space and amenities.

4. **Section 4305 Public Amenities**—For clarity of distinguishing public space and site amenities, we recommend the following restructuring and modifications to Section 4305 Public Amenities:

   a. Revise the title of proposed Section 4305, to read, ‘Public Spaces and Amenities.’

   b. Section 4305.B Purpose and Requirements for Public Space. Revise the listing and description as follows:

   Examples of public spaces are:

   1) Plazas
   2) Courtyards
   3) Pocket parks
   4) Seating areas
   5) Outdoor eating areas

   Public spaces must be visible from and accessible from Easton Road, except for any public spaces not located along Easton Road, in which case they must be accessible from a public road but not necessarily visible from the road.
c. Insert 4305.C as follows:

As part of the Cross Keys Enterprise Zone Overlay District, public amenities should be provided as identified in the *Land Use & Transportation Study for the Cross Keys Area*, dated June 7, 2017, where feasible. Examples of public amenities include:

1) Streetscape improvements, such as landscaping, street trees, planting strips, and perimeter parking lot hedge rows.
2) Bike racks, street furniture, benches, wayfinding signs, and other site amenities.
3) Pedestrian-scaled lighting with banners.
4) Gateway features at strategic locations as identified in the *Cross Keys Study*.

d. Change 4305.C to 4305.D Sidewalks shall be....

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

JSI:dc

cc: Craig A. Smith Esq., Smith & Porter, P.C., Township Solicitor
Dana S. Cozza, Esq., Township Manager (via email)
Daniel E. Gray, P.E., Township Engineer
MEMORANDUM

TO: Milford Township Board of Supervisors
   Milford Township Planning Commission

FROM: Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Proposal to Amend the Zoning Ordinance—Building Height and Avigation Easement
Applicant: Board of Supervisors
Received: July 10, 2017
Hearing Date: Unknown

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 2, 2017.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposed Action: Amend the zoning ordinance to permit a building of 50 feet in height as a special exception in the Planned Industrial (PI) District, and to require avigation easements on all land development within an Approach, Transitional, Horizontal, or Conical Zone of the airport, as a condition of approval.

Proposed Zoning Ordinance Provisions:

Section 529 (Exceptions to Building Height) of the zoning ordinance will be removed and replaced. The replacement text includes a reorganization of the existing language in the ordinance, and will now include a new subsection within Section 529 which permits an increase in height in the PI District under certain conditions.

The existing language of Section 529 will become a new subsection, 529(a), which establishes the permitted exceptions to building height as follows:

- Church spires, belfries, silos, water towers, solar energy systems, antennas, television towers, masts, aerials, flagpoles, or other structures necessary for providing water, electricity, heat, cooling, radio or similar facilities provided they are not used for human occupancy.
• Above mentioned exceptions must be setback 1.5 times their height (from ground level to top of structure) from any property lines.

New subsection 529(b) will be inserted into Section 529:

• In the PI (Planned Industrial) district, the maximum building height may be increased to 50 feet provided that a special exception is granted by the Zoning Hearing Board, and the following conditions must be met:
  o The fire department must be capable of accessing the building from all sides.
  o The building must be equipped with a sprinkler system.
  o Fire department connections and standpipes must be installed in locations acceptable to the Board of Supervisors.
  o Applicant must grant to the Bucks County Airport Authority an avigation easement that grants the Authority the right to remove any obstructions on the property that may interfere with air navigation.

Section 647(a) of the zoning ordinance (Permits-Future Uses) will be amended to include a provision that requires all land developments on any property in the Approach, Horizontal or Conical Zone of the Airport Zone, as a condition of approval, to grant avigation easements to the Bucks County Airport Authority. The easement grants the Authority the right to remove any obstructions on the property that may interfere with air navigation.

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 offer the following additional comment for the township’s consideration:

• It is common that ordinance language that addresses fire safety and construction requires approval from the Fire Chief or Fire Marshal. The township may wish to consider including such language in Section 1, 529(b)2 and 3, that sprinkler systems and standpipe locations be approved by the Fire Marshal and not just the Board of Supervisors, as fire suppression systems and equipment require specialized technical knowledge.

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: Terry W. Clemons, Esq., Clemons, Richter, & Reiss, Township Solicitor
    Kevin Wolf, P.E., Andersen Engineering, Inc., Township Engineer
    Marilyn Stecker, Township Secretary/Office Manager (via email)
    Jeffrey Vey, Township Manager (via e-mail)
CONFIDENTIAL — NOT FOR RELEASE

MEMORANDUM

TO: Morrisville Borough Council
    Morrisville Borough Planning Commission

FROM: Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Proposal for Sale of M.R. Reiter Elementary School site
    TMP #24-9-107-1, 107-3
    Applicant: Morrisville Borough School District
    Received: July 10, 2017
    Hearing Date: Not Set

In accordance with the provisions of Section 305 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 2, 2017.

GENERAL INFORMATION


Location: M.R. Reiter Elementary is located on a 3.096-acre parcel at Clymer and Harper avenues.

Zoning: The CS-1 Community Service Districts’ purpose is to provide for the orderly growth of community services within the Borough, to provide reasonable standards for development, and to otherwise create conditions conducive to carrying out the broad purposes of the zoning ordinance.

Present Use: Vacant, former elementary school.

COMMENTS

Morrisville Borough is acquiring the vacant M.R. Reiter Elementary School property from the Morrisville School District in order to demolish the dilapidated school building which has been vacant for nearly a decade, and restore the grounds as open space for the benefit of all Borough residents. According to information submitted, the Morrisville Borough School District determined that the
M.R. Reiter Elementary School was unused and unnecessary to the School District’s continued operations. The property is proposed to be used as a public park, primarily for passive recreation use. Future plans may incorporate amenities such as a garden area, picnic tables, an educational kiosk, and a pavilion. The existing open field and parking lot will remain, and potential improvement may also include the restoration of the small playground area along Clymer Avenue.

The *Bucks County Comprehensive Plan* (2011) addresses Park and Recreation facilities in Principle 2 of the Plan is to “Preserve and Expand Parks, Open Space, and Agricultural Resources.” The proposed purchase of this site for the use as open space is consistent with the *Bucks County Comprehensive Plan*, since it will provide for active and passive recreational areas to promote the health and well-being of residents of all ages and physical abilities.

We would appreciate being notified of the School District’s decision regarding this matter.

RGB:dc

c: Jason Harris, Morrisville School District Business Manager
   Mike Kopakowski, Morrisville School District Superintendent
   David J. Truelove, Esq., Hill Wallack, LLP, Morrisville School District Solicitor
   Robert C. Sooby, Morrisville Borough Manager (via email)
   Sean Kilkenny, Esq., Morrisville Borough Solicitor
MEMORANDUM

TO: Solebury Township Board of Supervisors
   Solebury Township Planning Commission

FROM: Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Proposal to Amend the Zoning Ordinance—Various
Applicant: Board of Supervisors
Received: June 27, 2017
Hearing Date: August 15, 2017

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 2, 2017.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposed Action: Amend the zoning ordinance (Chapter 27) to update definitions; amend the administration of permits; update references to the floodplain ordinance; update the regulations for the keeping of livestock; amend the list of conditional uses in the Light Industrial (LI) district; amend the permitted sound and vibration levels in certain districts; and amend the area and bulk standards in the Village Residential (VR) district.

Proposed Zoning Ordinance Provisions:

Section 27-202 (Definitions) will be amended to update or replace the following definitions:

- Flood, 100-year – replaced with “base flood”
- Flood – updated definition
- Floodplain – updated definition
- Floodway – updated definition
- Base Flood Elevation – new definition added
- Automobile Service Station – new definition added

Section 27-2902.1 (Requirement for Zoning Permit) will be amended to require that the permit is deemed complete and in conformity with the provisions of the zoning ordinance by the zoning officer.
Section 27-2902.1.A(7) (Requirements for Zoning Permit) will be amended to remove reference to Section 27-2905 (Driveway Permits), and replaced with a reference to Section 27-2902.1.D (Private Water Supply Requirements).

Section 27-2603.1.H (Accessory Livestock, Horse, and Pony Regulations) will be amended to insert a comma after the word ponies, and to remove the provision that the regulations only apply to properties less than 10 acres in size.

Section 27-2607.1.A, and 27-2607.2.B (Scenic Road Setback Requirements) will each be amended to remove reference to Section 27-2610 (Environmental Impact Assessment), and replace it with a reference to Section 27-2510 (Non-conformities).

Section 27, Part 21 (Floodplain Conservation District) will be amended to remove and replace references to terms which are proposed to be redefined, in order to be consistent with proposed updated definitions in Section 27-202 (Definitions).

Section 27, Part 22 (Natural Resource Protection Standards) will be amended to remove and replace references to terms which are proposed to be redefined, in order to be consistent with proposed updated definitions in Section 27-202 (Definitions).

Section 27-1702.4.C (Conditional Uses in the Light Industrial district) will be amended to add a new subpart; that any use not specifically listed, but of the same general character of other listed uses, will be a permitted conditional use in the LI district.

Section 27-1504.4 (Rural Commercial district, Area and Bulk Regulations, hotels or inns) will be amended to replace a reference to Section 27-1604.1.B (No matching ordinance), with a reference to Section 27-1604.1.A (Area and Bulk Regulations in the Traditional Commercial district).

Section 27, Attachment 3:1 (VR Village Residential district, Summary Table – Area and Bulk Regulations) will be amended to remove a duplicitous line of regulations for a single-family detached dwelling.

COMMENTS

In general, it appears that the proposed ordinance amendment does not consist of substantive changes to the existing zoning ordinance, but updates outdated references and makes corrections to other errors and inconsistencies in the ordinance.

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 offer the following editorial comments for the township’s consideration:

1. For the sake of consistency with the previously adopted floodplain ordinance (Ordinance 2015-02, Chapter 8 of Township Code), the township may wish to consider amending the term “floodplain” to be “floodplain area (floodplain),” as that is the term and definition in the floodplain ordinance.

2. In Section 27-202 (Definitions), the proposed definition of Base Flood Elevation should read “exceeded” and not “exceeding.”
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: Joanna A. Waldron, Esq., Curtin & Heefner LLP
    Dennis H. Carney, Township Manager (via email)
MEMORANDUM

TO:    Tinicum Township Board of Supervisors
       Tinicum Township Planning Commission
       Bedminster Township Board of Supervisors
       Bedminster Township Planning Commission

FROM:    Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT:    Request for an Addition to the Agricultural Security Area
            TMP #44-11-7, -7-1; 1-15-9
            Owner/Applicant: Mark K. Schmidt
            Received: June 30, 2017
            Hearing Date: August 1, 2017

In accordance with the provisions of Act 43 of 1981, the Agricultural Security Act as amended, this proposal was 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 August 2, 2017.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Requested Action: Add three parcels totaling 60.79 acres to the Agricultural Security Area of Tinicum Township.

Landowner: Schmidt Properties, LLC
Tax Map Parcel: 44-11-7
Location: East of the intersection of Tohickon Creek and Bedminster Road.
Size of tract: 42.73 acres
Zoning: PI Planned Industrial District
Comprehensive Plan: Agricultural
Soil Classes: 3w, 4e

Landowner: Schmidt Properties, LLC
Tax Map Parcel: 44-11-7-1
Location: East of the intersection of Tohickon Creek and Bedminster Road.
Size of tract: 3.36 acres
Zoning: PI Planned Industrial District
Comprehensive Plan: Agricultural
Soil Classes: 3w, 4e
Landowner: Schmidt Properties, LLC
Tax Map Parcel: 1-15-9
Location: Between Bedminster Road and Spruce Hill Road, on the south side of Tohickon Creek.
Size of tract: 14.7 acres
Zoning: AP Agricultural Preservation District
Comprehensive Plan: Agricultural Preservation
Soil Classes: 2e, 3w

COMMENTS

The Bucks County Planning Commission recommends that the two contiguous parcels in Tinicum Township and the parcel in Bedminster Township be added to the Agricultural Security Area (ASA) of Tinicum Township since they comply with the requirements of Act 43 and are consistent with the applicable township comprehensive plans and zoning ordinances.

The two parcels in Tinicum Township total 46.09 acres. One hundred (100) percent of the soils on these parcels are designated Class I through IV in the Natural Resources Conservation Service’s (NRCS) land capability classification. Based upon a recent aerial photograph, it appears that these parcels are being actively farmed. A principle of the Tinicum Township Comprehensive Plan (2015) is to protect open space and agriculture. The site is shown as “Agricultural” in the Ottsville Planning Area of the Future Land Use Map. This planning area describes agricultural uses as appropriate and lists agricultural preservation as an opportunity to protect and enhance the area’s heritage and improve residents’ quality of life. The underlying zoning of these two parcels is Planned Industrial (PI) District; its purpose is to encourage development compatible with the rural character of the township. While these parcels are zoned PI District, the underlying Future Land Use Policy is consistent with the township’s comprehensive plan.

The 14.7-acre parcel in Bedminster is generally forested with soils designated by the Natural Resources Conservation Service’s (NRCS) land capability classification as Class I through IV. A goal of the Bedminster Township Comprehensive Plan (2008) is to retain its farming heritage and support the agricultural industry by conserving land for farming activities. According to the Land Use Plan (Map 16) in the comprehensive plan, the parcel is classified as “Agricultural Preservation.” In addition, the parcel is located within the AP Agriculture Preservation zoning district. Therefore, the property’s inclusion within the ASA is consistent with local land use policies and zoning regulations.

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

MAR:dc
cce: Stephen B. Harris, Esq., Harris and Harris
      Mark K. Schmidt
      Teri Lewis, Township Manager (via email)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Trumbauersville Borough Council
   Trumbauersville Borough Planning Commission

FROM: Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Proposal to Amend the Zoning Ordinance—Medical Marijuana

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 2, 2017.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposed Action: Amend the zoning ordinance to establish new use classifications relating to Medical Marijuana Dispensary and Medical Marijuana Grower/Processor uses. The ordinance will provide definitions and standards for the new uses.

Proposed Zoning Provisions:

Definitions for the following terms will be added to Article II. Definitions:

- Department of Health
- Medical Marijuana Act
- Medical Marijuana Dispensary
- Medical Marijuana Grower/Processor
- Medical Marijuana Permit

Two new uses will be added to the ordinance: E31 Medical Marijuana Dispensary and G17 Medical Marijuana Grower/Processor. Both uses would be permitted by right in the CC Central Commercial District.
The following use regulations will be added to Section 404 and will apply to both Medical Marijuana Dispensary and Medical Marijuana Grower/Processor uses:

- Each use shall provide a copy of the Medical Marijuana Permit issued by the Department of Health or proof that a Medical Marijuana Permit has been sought and is pending approval, and shall at all times maintain a valid, accurate, and up-to-date permit. Each use shall, at all times, operate in compliance with all Department of Health regulations pertaining to such facilities.

- Medical Marijuana Dispensary and Medical Marijuana Grower/Processor shall not be located closer than 2,500 feet from another Medical Marijuana Dispensary or Medical Marijuana Grower/Processor. Medical Marijuana Dispensary and Medical Marijuana Grower/Processor may not operate on the same site.

- Such uses must operate within an indoor, enclosed and secured facility. For Medical Marijuana Dispensary use, exterior sales, sidewalk displays, drive-through, drop-off and pick-up services shall be prohibited.

- The hours of operation shall be limited to not earlier than 9:00 a.m. and not later than 9:00 p.m.

- A disposal plan must be submitted to, and receive approval from the Borough Zoning Officer. Medical Marijuana remnants and byproducts shall be disposed of according to an approved plan and shall not be placed within an exterior refuse container.

- There shall be no omission of dust, fumes, vapors, or odors which can be seen, smelled, or otherwise perceived from beyond the lot line for the property where a dispenser or grower/processor facility is located.

- No one under the age of 18 shall be permitted on the premises of a Medical Marijuana Dispensary and no one under the age of 21 shall be permitted in a Medical Marijuana Grower/Processor facility.

- No use of medical marijuana shall be permitted on the premises of a Medical Marijuana Dispensary and a Medical Marijuana Grower/Processor site.

- A security plan, in compliance with the Medical Marijuana Act and as supplemented by regulations promulgated by the Department of Health, shall be submitted to and receive approval from Borough Council.

- Each use shall provide proof of a contract with a private security company and shall be staffed and monitored by security personnel, 24 hours a day, 7 days a week.

- A site plan shall be submitted for approval by the Borough Engineer and a Floor Plan shall be submitted for approval by the Borough Code Enforcement Officer. The floor plan shall identify internal security measures. All medical marijuana products, byproducts and waste shall be stored in an interior secure vault or receptacle.

For Use E31 Medical Marijuana Dispensary, in addition to the above bulleted regulations:

- Such use shall not be operated or maintained on a parcel within 100 feet, measured by a straight line in all directions, from the nearest point on the property line of a parcel containing a residence, public, private or parochial school, or a day-care center.

- The minimum size of a Medical Marijuana Dispensary facility shall be 2,000 square feet in total floor area.

- Except for an emergency exit, there shall be only one door for ingress/egress.
For Use G17 Medical Marijuana Grower/Processor, in addition to the above bulleted regulations:

- The use must be located on a lot containing not less than one acre.
- Such use shall not be operated or maintained on a parcel within 1,000 feet, measured by a straight line in all directions, from the nearest point on the property line of a parcel containing a residence, public, private or parochial school, or day-care center.
- No retail sales of medical marijuana shall be permitted on the premises of a Medical Marijuana Grower/Processor.

Existing Zoning Provisions: There are currently no definitions or standards within the borough’s zoning ordinance addressing medical marijuana dispensaries or growers/processors. Recent state legislation has legalized marijuana for medical purposes under certain conditions, and these are new uses not previously contemplated by the comprehensive plan or the borough when drafting the zoning ordinance.

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 borough’s solicitor 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. **Required setback for Medical Marijuana Dispensary**—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 a day-care center. (Note: There are no similar setback requirements for a grower/processor within the Medical Marijuana Act.) As proposed, zoning ordinance Section 404 E31(c) would require that a dispensary not be operated or maintained on a parcel within 100 feet, measured by a straight line in all directions, from the nearest point on the property line of a parcel containing a residence, public, private or parochial school, or a day-care center. As proposed, the setback for a dispensary does not meet the minimum required distance as specified in the state’s Medical Marijuana Act.

2. **Proposed setback from residential uses**—For both the Medical Marijuana Dispensary and Medical Marijuana Grower/Processor uses, the proposed amendment requires a minimum distance to residential uses. The proposal prohibits dispensaries from locating within 100 feet from a parcel containing a residence and growers/processors would be prohibited from locating within 1,000 feet from a parcel containing a residence. Based on a brief mapping analysis of the CC district and the location of existing residences, it appears that the proposed setback requirements from all residences will likely preclude the dispensary and grower/processor uses from locating in the borough. To ensure both uses are not zoned out of the borough, the proposed amendment should be revised. For instance, consideration should be given to removing the distance requirement from residences.

3. **Prohibitions/restrictions**—Section 2017(1) of the Medical Marijuana Act states that a 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, proposed Section 404 E31(d) (Medical Marijuana Dispensary) prohibits drive-through, drop-off and pick-up services. Section 404 E31(k) requires a minimum size of a dispensary facility to be 2,000 square feet in total floor area. In addition, the amendment limits the hours of operation to 9:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m. for both dispensaries and growers/processors. These standards are not required for other commercial, manufacturing, processing, and production facilities that are permitted by the zoning ordinance.

4. **Disposal plan**—The proposed ordinance includes a provision that requires a dispensary and grower/processor to provide a disposal plan for review and approval by the Borough Zoning Officer for all medical marijuana remnants and byproducts. While the Medical Marijuana Act does require that a dispensary and grower/processor 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 part of the permitting and licensing requirements to operate a medical marijuana facility.

5. **Parking standards**—We recommend that the proposed amendment be revised to provide appropriate parking requirements for both the Grower/Processor and Dispensary uses that are similar to other like industrial and commercial uses.

6. **Editing comment**—Section 3 of the proposed amendment refers to a new use, identified as G18 – Medical Marijuana Grower/Processor. However, subsection (p) under Section 3 references the use as G17 – Medical Marijuana Grower/Processor. Based on the current list of industrial uses in Section 404.G of the zoning ordinance, it appears that the use should be referenced as G17.

   In addition, it is recommended that proposed Section 404 E31(n) of the zoning ordinance be revised to insert the word “improper” between “against” and “dissemination.” Additionally, the word “Marijuana” should be inserted between the words “Medical” and “Grower/Processor” in proposed Section 404 G17(k) of 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.

LMW:dc

cc: Gregory S. Ghen, Esq.
Larry Smock, Borough Administrator (via email)
<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>Falls Township</td>
<td>8129-A</td>
<td>(13-28-77)</td>
<td>Britton Industries</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>12 Leaseholds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hope Borough</td>
<td>4323-C</td>
<td>(27-10-51 &amp; -51-1)</td>
<td>Logan Inn</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Commercial Land Development: 7,210 Square feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perkasie Borough</td>
<td>12249</td>
<td>(33-14-25 &amp; -26)</td>
<td>Nacarella</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Commercial Land Development: 2,250 Square feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richland Township</td>
<td>7833-C</td>
<td>(36-5-84-1, 36-5-84)</td>
<td>Trainer's Corner Retail</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>Commercial Land Development: 7,500 Square feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Southampton Township</td>
<td>5833-C</td>
<td>(48-11-4-3)</td>
<td>75 - 95 James Way</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>2 Commercial Lots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warwick Township</td>
<td>10339-A</td>
<td>(51-3-89-3 &amp; -90)</td>
<td>Warwick Village Commons Phase II</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Commercial Land Development: 37,943 Square feet</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 Wawa Food Market & Fueling Station

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 5,585-square-foot convenience store and fueling stations with a 5,296-square-foot canopy on a 2.70-acre parcel. A total of 50 parking spaces is proposed. Public water and sewer facilities will serve the development.

Location: At the northwest corner of the intersection of Route 413 and State Road. The site is bordered to the north by the Pennsylvania Railroad Company railroad lines.

Zoning: M-2 Heavy Manufacturing District permits a variety of industrial uses on a minimum lot area of 10,000 square feet. Use D15 Service Station is not a permitted use in the M-2 District.

Information submitted with the plan indicates that on October 10, 2016, the Bristol Township Zoning Hearing Board granted a variance to permit the redevelopment of the site to construct a Wawa convenience store with fueling stations.

Present Use: Vacant, outdoor storage.
COMMENTS

1. **Waivers requested**—Plan Sheet 2 indicates that the applicant is requesting waivers from the following subdivision and land development ordinance requirements:

   - **Section 177-14E** submission of preliminary and final application considered separate applications (applicant is proposing preliminary and final applications together)
   - **Section 177-41(F)** no less than 15 feet of open space shall be provided between the curbline and the outside wall of the building (applicant is proposing a distance of 6.1 feet between the curbline and the doorway outcover and 10 feet between the curbline and the primary building)

   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. **Approved variance**—Per the “Findings of Fact and Conclusions in Support of the Decision of the Bristol Township Zoning Hearing Board”, item #30, under Section II. Findings of Fact, indicates that the applicant will conduct and prepare a full environmental study of the property. Township officials should ensure that the referenced environmental study is submitted and adequately reviewed to ensure the site is free from contaminants prior to action on the proposed land development.

3. **Size of retail area**—For Use D15 Service Station, Section 304.D15.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. The proposed Wawa convenience store is proposed in a 5,585-square-foot (gross) building. The plan should be revised to indicate the square footage of the building intended to be sales floor area.

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 development. The plan does not include the required site capacity calculations.

5. **Special setback**—Section 205-130.A of the zoning ordinance requires a special setback of 120 feet, measured from the center line of the existing right-of-way, along Route 413. While the proposed building appears to meet this requirement, zoning information listed on Plan Sheet 2 of 20 indicates that the minimum front yard setback along Route 413 is 30 feet. Information within the zoning chart on Plan Sheet 2 of 20 should be revised to indicate the required special setback.

6. **Parking**—Information on Plan Sheet 2 of 20 indicates that a total of 62 parking spaces is required based on parking requirements for a service station and the convenience store (retail use). This information also indicates that 62 spaces are provided. However, the plan identifies 50 parking spaces on the site. The plan should be revised to comply with the requirement and resolve the discrepancy in the number of spaces.
7. **Sidewalks**—Sections 177-35.A and 177-43.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 unless it is determined that sidewalks are unnecessary.

8. **Clear sight triangles**—The plan should be revised to indicate the required clear sight triangles in accordance with Section 177-38.D.(2) of the subdivision and land development ordinance.

9. **Landscaping**

   a. **Required number of 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 of approximately 600 feet, between 12 and 24 street trees should be provided, at minimum. While landscaping is provided along the adjacent roadways, only five canopy trees are proposed and four existing trees are proposed to remain. The plan should be revised to comply with this requirement.

   b. **Proposed plants**—The plant list on Sheet 11 proposes the use of *Euonymus alatus ‘Compactus’* (dwarf winged euonymus). This nonnative species 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). Therefore, we recommend that the plan be revised to provide an appropriate shrub substitution from the township’s plant list found in Table 3 of the zoning ordinance (and Section 177-51.B(11) of the subdivision and land development ordinance), and that *Euonymus alatus* be removed from the township’s plant lists.

   In addition, the plan proposes eight red oak trees (*Quercus rubra*) on the site. We have been alerted that bacterial leaf scorch, which is an infectious chronic disease, has affected a significant percentage of red oaks in southeastern Pennsylvania. Given the potential disease risk to the red oak, we recommend that the applicant consider other suitable types of trees in place of the proposed red oaks. Municipal officials should monitor planting plans to ensure that the red oak is not overplanted, to avoid the risk of infection and eventual loss of these trees.

10. **Tree protection**—Plan Sheets 3, 5, and 12 show the proposed location of the tree protection fence for existing trees to be preserved. However, the proposed location of the fencing and the limit of disturbance is shown within the dripline, close to the trunks of some of the trees to remain. A substantial area within the dripline of the largest tree to remain is proposed to be developed with pavement. 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.
11. **Freestanding sign**—Section 205-167.A.(1)(a) of the subdivision and land development ordinance permits a maximum of one freestanding sign on each lot within the M-2 zoning district. The plan proposes two freestanding signs for the site. Information provided on the Signage Table on Plan Sheet 2 of 20 indicates that one freestanding sign per frontage or 2 freestanding signs are permitted. The plan should be revised to comply with Section 205-167.A(1)(a) of the ordinance that permits a maximum of one freestanding sign on each lot.

12. **Canopy design**—Plan Sheet 17 of 20 includes a Wawa canopy elevation detail which shows the proposed canopy to have a low pitched, shed style roof design. We recommend that the applicant consider providing a side gabled roof canopy which complements the proposed roof of the convenience store.

13. **Stormwater management**—The plan shows a proposed detention/infiltration basin in the northwest 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 stormwater management facility. The maintenance manual should include any type of potential maintenance that may be necessary to continue sound performance of the facility.

14. **Fire lanes**—Section 177-55.M of the subdivision and land development ordinance requires that for nonresidential development, fire lanes be established, as required by the Bureau of Fire Prevention, pursuant to the provisions of the Fire Prevention Code. The plan does not identify any proposed fire lanes. The governing body, along with the township fire marshal, should ensure this issue is adequately addressed.

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 must be submitted for this proposed land development.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the August 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: Croydon State, LLC
    Dynamic Engineering Consultants, PC
    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 & Inspections (via email)
    Thomas Scott, Bristol Township Zoning Officer (via email)
July 20, 2017
BCPC #8129-A

MEMORANDUM

TO: Falls Township Board of Supervisors
    Falls Township Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Revised Final Plan of Land Development—Britton Industries
          TMP: # 13-28-77
          Applicant: Britton Realty of Morrisville, LLC
          Owner: Same
          Plan Dated: June 6, 2017
          Date Received: June 29, 2017

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: Establish 12 separate lease areas within an existing 22.68-acre industrial property. The leasehold areas will range in size from 0.51 acre (Tenant 1 Lease Area) to 4.82 acres (Tenant 12 Lease Area). There are 6 existing buildings on the property which are proposed to remain. No new buildings are proposed at this time. The plan states that the site is served by private water and sewer.

Location: On M-Y Lane, in between Route 1 and the Delaware Canal, along the border with the Morrisville Borough.

Zoning: The Heavy Industrial (HI) District permits large-scale industrial operations such as manufacturing or use of heavy machinery for processing, on properties of at least 0.5 acre in size. A maximum building coverage of 40 percent, and a maximum impervious surface coverage of 80 percent is permitted. Lots are permitted to have more than one principal structure.

Present Use: Industrial.
COMMENTS

1. **Prior approval**—A previous preliminary and final plan of land development for this site was granted approval by the Board of Supervisors and memorialized in Resolution 2015-20, dated September 1, 2015. We have been informed by the township that the approved plan was not recorded and the current submission is being reviewed as a revised final plan. Final plan submissions should comply with all previous conditions of plan approval. We offer the following comments in regards to the revised plan.

2. **Requested waivers**—The plan indicates that the applicant is requesting waivers from the following requirements of the subdivision and land development ordinance (SALDO):

   - Section 191-31.A to allow less than the required cartway width on M-Y Lane;
   - Section 191-31.A to permit no curbing along street frontages;
   - Section 191-36.D to permit no curbing along the driveways;
   - Section 191-37.B to permit no curbing in the parking area;
   - Section 191-37.G(1) to permit no curbed raised planting beds in the parking area;
   - Section 191-37.G(2) to permit no shade trees in the planting beds;
   - Section 191-37.G(4) to permit no shade trees in the parking area;
   - Section 191-62.B to permit no curbing on streets
   - Section 191-48.A to permit no street trees along M-Y Lane;
   - Section 191-48.E to permit no 10-foot wide planting easement along M-Y Lane;
   - Section 191-78.C(2) to permit less than the required information 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 and the minimum modification necessary. The final plan should list all granted waivers, as well as the waivers that were previously granted.

3. **Impervious coverage**—Proposed Tenant 7 Lease Area and Tenant 8 Lease Area are currently mostly wooded. If these lease areas were to be developed with a permitted industrial use, it appears that this would require the clearing of the existing vegetation to make way for buildings and parking or storage areas. Doing so would impact the impervious surface coverage calculations for the site as a whole. The maximum permitted impervious surface amount is 80 percent, per Section 209-29.F (Table 5) of the zoning ordinance. The site is currently covered with 79.34 percent impervious coverage according to the zoning chart on Sheet 2 of 18. This leaves little room for removal of vegetation and remaining within the maximum permitted impervious surface coverage. This issue should be addressed to ensure that development of the lease areas will not exceed the maximum permitted impervious surface coverage.

4. **Woodlands and steep slopes**—It appears that future development of Tenant 7 Lease Area and Tenant 8 Lease Area and the accessway area would involve disturbance of steep slopes and woodland. Issues regarding compliance with the natural resource protection requirements of Sections 191-52.1.B(3) and (4) of the SALDO should be addressed.

5. **Planting beds**—Section 191-37.G(1) of the SALDO requires that raised planting beds be provided if rows of parking spaces exceed 20 spaces. A waiver is being requested from this...
requirement, although the plans do not indicate any parking areas where there would be 20 or more consecutive spaces.

6. **Driveways**—The plans show several pavement areas which will provide access to several of the lease areas, however the lease areas on the northwest end of the site will be accessed by what is simply noted as an accessway area in between the lease lines. It is unclear whether this accessway area will be paved.

7. **Accessway**—The plan should include a statement indicating the party responsible for maintenance of the accessways, the property owner or the lessee.

8. **Lighting**—Section 191-38.B of the SALDO requires that all parking areas be illuminated to a minimum of 0.3 footcandles. The lighting plan indicates that all lights are existing, and shows a 1.0 footcandle radius around each fixture. It is not clear if the parking area in front of the building on Tenant 11 Lease Area will meet this requirement.

9. **Landscaping**—Section 209-29.G(4) of the zoning ordinance requires that all portions of the property that are not taken up by building or paved surfaces be landscaped. The majority of the property is currently a gravel surface.

10. **Sidewalks**—Section 191-39.A of the SALDO requires sidewalks with a 3-foot planting strip along all streets. No sidewalk or planting strip is shown along M-Y Lane.

11. **Trees**—The landscaping plan indicates that *Picea pungens* ‘Baby Blue Colorado Spruce’ trees are proposed for the majority of the property’s frontage along Route 1. This type of tree is not listed in Section 191-48.I of the SALDO as an approved tree for a buffer strip or along a highway.

12. **Delaware Canal**—Section 209-38.1.H of the zoning ordinance requires that a buffer of 25 feet in width be provided along all properties which abut the Delaware Canal, measured from the edge of the canal. It does not require screen plantings along the canal, but states that the buffer yard shall be open and unobstructed. There is a row of trees existing along the property line between the site and the canal. The buffer line should be shown on the plans.

13. **Editorial comment**—The plans show areas of heavy duty pavement and standard pavement. It is not entirely clear if these are existing or will be new construction. Based on viewing aerial photos of the site, it does not appear that these driveways exist, other than as gravel drives. Future submissions should be clear as to what is proposed as new construction, and what existing features are to remain.

14. **Morrisville Borough**—The plans include site information for the property immediately to the northeast of the site, TMP #27-6-307. This property lies outside of Falls Township in Morrisville Borough. Although no improvements are shown for the property at this time, the plans do note a 100-foot by 100-foot square area as a lease area. The township should coordinate their review of this application with Morrisville for any necessary approvals from Morrisville that may be required.
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 must be submitted for this proposed land development.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the August 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.

CND:dc

cc:  James A. Britton, Britton Realty of Morrisville, LLC  
Heath Alan Dumack, P.E., P.L.S., Dumack Engineering  
Jim Sullivan P.E., T&M Associates, Township Engineer  
Peter Gray, Township Manager (via e-mail)  
Diane Beri, Township Clerk (via e-mail)
MEMORANDUM

TO:       New Hope Borough Council
          New Hope Borough Planning Commission

FROM:     Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT:  Preliminary Plan of Land Development for Logan Inn
          TMP #27-10-51 & 51-1
          Applicant: Landmark Developers
          Owner: 10 West Ferry Street Property, LLC
          Plan Dated: October 1, 2016
          Date Received: June 13, 2017

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: Tax map parcels (TMP) #27-10-51 (47,451 gross square feet) and 27-10-51-1 (12,727 gross square feet) will be combined into one parcel (60,178 gross square feet or base site area of 44,938 square feet). Once consolidated, 7,210 square feet will be added to an existing commercial building. The site is served by public water and sewer facilities.

Location: The northwest corner of West Ferry Street and South Main Street.

Zoning: CC Central Commercial District allows restaurants by special exception. The requirements for a commercial use are as follows: a minimum lot area of 4,000 square feet, a minimum lot width of 40 feet, minimum front yard of 10 feet, minimum rear yard of 15 feet, and minimum side yards of 6 feet each.

The plan indicates that the applicant received four variances from the New Hope Borough Zoning Hearing Board on October 30, 2002. These variances from the zoning ordinance include:

Section 404(E10)(f) in order to provide 38 guest rooms;
Section 404(F1) & Section 800(E) in order to provide less off-street parking and stall dimensions;
Section 500 to permit variance from the front yard setback, rear yard setback, maximum impervious surface coverage, and minimum landscape area requirements; and Section 1003(A)(2) to permit expansion of a non-conforming use.

The plan also indicates that the applicant received seven variances from the New Hope Borough Zoning Hearing Board on April 22, 2016. These variances from the zoning ordinance include:

Section 275-17.D.2.a to permit covered outdoor dining areas. (On March 3, 2017, a modification was granted to permit a total of 116 outdoor uncovered seats);

Section 275-17.D.2.d.2 to permit outdoor use areas to be located within 25 feet of a side property line (existing non-conformity);

Section 275-31.B.2.d & e to permit expansion of the Inn to include 38 rooms and additional restaurant and event space;

Section 275-38.A & B to permit the building to be within required yard areas (existing non-conformity);

Section 275-41 to permit the installation of lighting on the subject property that will illuminate the steeple on the adjacent property;

Section 275-46.C.8.e to permit an individual use to exceed 5,000 square feet (existing non-conformity); and

Section 275-47.A to permit uses and activities to be located outside the required building setback lines.

Present Use: Restaurant.

COMMENTS

1. **Floodplain requirements**—The plans indicate that a portion of the site is within the 100-year floodplain for the Delaware River. The borough should ensure that the applicant meets all the requirements of Section 275-43 of the zoning ordinance with respect to development in the floodplain. The borough should also ensure that the applicant meets any requirements of federal or state agencies and receives all necessary state or federal permits for development in the floodplain.

2. **Requested waivers**—According to the plans, the applicant is requesting six waivers from the subdivision and land development ordinance. In accordance with the requirement of Section 512(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. **Stormwater management systems**—According to the plans, the proposed stormwater management facilities will tie into existing storm sewers along North Main Street. Since the site currently has an impervious surface ratio of 90.4 percent and will be reduced to 89.1 percent through the redevelopment of the site, the borough should determine if additional stormwater management facilities or changes to the existing stormwater management facilities are necessary.
4. **Historic District**—The site lies within the Historic District according to Ordinance No. 183-A-1. According to Section 5 of this ordinance, the zoning officer shall not issue any permits for the erection, reconstruction, alteration, restoration, demolition or razing of any building, in whole or in part, within a Historic District until the Borough Council has issued a Certificate of Appropriateness as provided within the ordinance. Section 4 of this ordinance indicates that the New Hope Borough Historical Architectural Review Board (HARB) shall give counsel to the Borough Council regarding any proposed development activity in the Historic District. Therefore, the borough should not act upon this plan until it has received comments from the HARB.

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 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.

RGB:dc

cc:  Frank Cretella, Landmark Developers
     10 West Ferry Street Property, LLC
     Mark Havers, P.E., Pickering, Corts & Summerson
     Steve Harris, Esq., Harris and Harris, P.C.
     Craig D. Kennard, P.E. Gilmore & Associates, New Hope Borough Engineer
     Cathryn Thomas, New Hope Borough Manager (via email)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Perkasie Borough Council
    Perkasie Borough Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Preliminary Plan of Land Development for Nacarella

    TMP #33-14-25 and -26
    Applicant: Lawrence Nacarella
    Owner: Same
    Plan Dated: May 29, 2017
    Date Received: June 2, 2017

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

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposal: Consolidate TMP #33-14-25 (7,696 square feet) and TMP #33-14-26 (7,502 square feet) into a 15,197.4-square-foot parcel. Construct a 2,250-square-foot addition to an existing restaurant/bar, an outdoor seating area of approximately 527 square feet, and associated additional parking. An existing two-story block building is to be removed from existing TMP #33-14-25. The site is served by public water and sewerage facilities.

Location: Southeastern corner of the intersection of South Main Street and Walnut Street.

Zoning: The C-2 General Commercial District permits a range of residential, institutional, retail and consumer service uses, including eating place (without drive-through service), tavern, office, bank, retail shop, service business, and planned commercial development. For principal nonresidential uses such as restaurant or tavern, the C-2 District requires a minimum lot area of 6,000 square feet and maximum building coverage of 30 percent.

Present Use: Restaurant/bar (The Perk)
COMMENT

1. **Parking amount**—Note 9 on Sheet 1 of the plan indicates that the purpose of the plan is to demolish an existing building, consolidate two parcels, expand the existing restaurant, and add parking. The plan shows six proposed parking spaces on the site, but it does not provide a calculation of the required off-street parking for the existing or proposed building area, or possibly any off-site parking area, so that compliance with the parking requirements of the zoning ordinance can be determined. The parking calculation also should take into account the proposed outdoor seating area of approximately 527 square feet that is shown on the plan.

   Zoning ordinance Section 186-61.C.(5)(c) requires an eating place (with or without drive-through service) to provide one off-street parking space per 300 square feet of gross floor area or one space for five seats, whichever is greater. Zoning ordinance Section 186-61.C.(5)(r) requires a tavern to provide one off-street parking space for every two seats intended for use by patrons, plus one additional space for each employee.

   It is unclear which requirement would apply. As stated above, Note 9 on Sheet 1 of the plan indicates the use is a restaurant, but on the BCPC review application the applicant lists the existing use as restaurant/bar. No information is provided regarding the number of seats (existing or proposed) or number of employees. Using the requirement for a restaurant, based on square footage, 8 additional parking spaces would be required (not counting the square footage of the proposed outdoor seating area).

   The plan should be revised to provide information necessary to ensure compliance with the parking requirements.

2. **Off-street parking standards**—Section 186-70 of the zoning ordinance and Section 164-25 of the subdivision and land development ordinance (SALDO) specify design standards that shall be required for all off-street parking facilities with a capacity of three or more vehicles. The plan should comply with the requirements, including the following:

   a. **Parking setback from lot line**—Section 186-70.I of the zoning ordinance states that all parking spaces and access drives shall be at least 5 feet from any lot line. The proposed driveway repaving and existing landscape timber edge extend along the property line with TMP #33-14-24. The plan also should clarify the ownership and maintenance responsibilities for the landscape timber edge.

   b. **Accessible parking**—Section 186-70.F of the zoning ordinance indicates that accessible parking for disabled persons shall be located in accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act standards, in locations convenient for disabled patrons and employees. The plan does not provide accessible parking.

   c. **Perimeter plantings**—Section 164-25.A.(1)(d) of the SALDO states that perimeter plantings shall be provided around all parking areas and shall have a minimum width of 5 feet. No perimeter plantings are proposed on the plan.

   d. **Parking setback from building**—Section 164-25.A.(1)(f) of the SALDO states that the edge of any parking area or parking driveway shall not be closer than 15 feet to the outside wall of the nearest building. The proposed row of six parking spaces is 5 feet from the proposed building addition.
c. **Landscaping**—Section 164-25.A(2)(a) of the SALDO states that all parking areas shall have at least one tree of one-and-one-half-inch caliper, minimum, for every six parking spaces in single rows. No trees are proposed on the plan, but there are opportunities to provide trees in the proposed landscaped areas near the proposed parking row.

3. **Parking layout**—The proposed six parking spaces, to be composed of pervious pavers, abut a proposed sidewalk that is flush with the parking surface, with no curb separation. We recommend that concrete bumper stops be provided to prevent vehicle overhang on the sidewalk and provide for safe pedestrian access for the building.

4. **Buffer**—The plan should address the buffer requirements of the borough’s ordinances. According to Section 186-54 of the zoning ordinance and Section 164-35 of the SALDO, a Class C buffer is required when a retail and consumer service use is proposed adjacent to a residential use, and a Class A buffer is required along all streets. Trees for the Class A buffer could be added along the proposed outdoor seating area along South Main Street and along the proposed landscaped area along Walnut Street.

5. **Tree protection**—Tree protection should be addressed for the two existing large trees shown on the site near the boundary line with TMP #33-14-27. It appears that the trees are intended to remain, however, proposed construction (building addition, concrete, and driveway paving) is proposed near the trees. Section 186-5 of the zoning ordinance defines the tree protection zone (TPZ) as the area radial to the trunk of a tree in which no construction activity shall occur. The TPZ shall be 15 feet from the trunk of the tree to be retained or the distance from the trunk to the dripline, whichever is greater. In the SALDO, Section 164-68.D(18) states that the TPZ shall be indicated on the preliminary plan, and Section 164-41.1 specifies that grade changes and excavations shall not encroach on the TPZ, the area within the TPZ shall not be built on, nor shall any materials be stored there, either temporarily or permanently, and vehicles or equipment shall not be parked in the TPZ.

6. **Refuse collection**—The plan should address trash disposal. For Use E(3) Eating Place, Section 186-18.E(3) of the zoning ordinance requires that all trash disposal areas shall be enclosed so as not to be visible from nearby residences and shall be closed to control odors. For Use E(18) Tavern, Section 186-18.E(18) of the zoning ordinance states that outdoor collection stations shall be provided for garbage and trash removal. These stations shall be located to the rear of the building and shall be screened and landscaped.

7. **Plan information**—The plan should be revised to comply with Section 164-68.D(9) of the SALDO, which requires the preliminary plan to show building setback lines, established by zoning or other ordinances or deed restrictions, with distances from the right-of-way line, so that compliance with the requirements can be verified.

8. **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 August 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.

MW:dc

cc: Erik Garton, P.E., Gilmore & Associates, Borough Engineer
Andrea Coaxum, Borough Manager (via email)
Brandy McKeever, Code Enforcement Administrator (via email)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Richland Township Board of Supervisors
    Richland Township Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Revised Final Plan of Land Development—Trainers Corner Retail
    TMP: # 36-5-84-1, 36-5-84
    Applicant: Highglen Pineville Quakertown Open Associates, LP
    Owner: Same
    Plan Dated: April 13, 2017
    Date Received: June 27, 2017

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 7,500 square-foot commercial building within an existing shopping center on a 43.45-acre property. The building will consist of three tenant spaces: a 3,000-square-foot credit union with a drive-through; a 1,900-square-foot general retail space, and a 2,600-square-foot restaurant. Changes to the parking and circulation of the shopping center will result in a net increase of 2 parking spaces, with 136 parking spaces proposed as deferred parking spaces. The site is served by public water and public sewer.

Location: The Trainers Corner shopping center, on West End Boulevard (Route 309), at the intersection with Route 313, on the border with Quakertown Borough.

Zoning: The Planned Commercial (PC) district permits multiple commercial use (Use E22) on a single site as a conditional use. Maximum permitted building coverage is 25 percent, and maximum permitted impervious surface coverage is 85 percent. The site also falls within the Arterial Corridor (AC) Overlay district. All land development within the AC Overlay district requires conditional use approval.

Present Use: Retail/shopping center.
COMMENTS

1. **Conditional use**—All land development within the Arterial Corridor Overlay District is permitted only by conditional use. Section 27-1109 of the zoning ordinance sets the requirements for a conditional use permit to be granted. We recommend that no final action be taken on this application until all required approvals regarding the conditional use have been satisfied.

2. **Access improvements**—The plan provided indicates that there are proposed improvements to the entrance to the site from Route 309, just north of the building site, but that those details for the proposed entrance improvements can be found on other plans. The township should be sure to coordinate the review of this application with any other plans for street or intersection improvements on Route 309.

3. **Wetlands**—Section 27-514.J.2 of the zoning ordinance requires that no development take place on any wetlands, except for minor road crossings in the case that there are no alternatives available. It appears that some wetland disturbance is proposed in the area of the entrance drive.

4. **Buffer plantings**—Section 27-516, Tables 1 and 2 of the zoning ordinance, requires a class A buffer at the northern end of the property. It appears there are some existing plantings along this buffer within the wetland area. The township should determine if the existing vegetation is sufficient.

5. **Building architecture**—Section 27-405.E.22 (Multiple Commercial Use) of the zoning ordinance requires that each building be designed so that it appears as a single architectural unit. No architectural drawings have been provided. The township should ensure that the proposed new retail building will be architecturally compatible with the buildings in the existing shopping center.

6. **Sidewalks**—Section 22-518.1 of the subdivision and land development ordinance (SALDO) states that sidewalks shall be provided where required by the municipality. It does not appear that any sidewalks are existing or proposed along Route 309.

7. **Street trees**—Section 22-519.1 of the SALDO requires street trees along all streets where suitable trees do not exist. There are some trees along Route 309, but it does not appear that they meet the requirement of Section 22-519.2, that the street trees be planted at an interval of no greater than 45 feet apart.

8. **Traffic impact study**—Section 22-524 of the zoning ordinance requires that a traffic impact study be submitted where a proposed land development may result in greater than 100 trips per day. No traffic impact study has been submitted.

9. **Editorial comments**
   a. Section 22-703.B(6) of the SALDO requires that zoning requirements be shown on final plan submissions. The zoning chart on Sheet 2 of 15 indicates that the zoning information is taken from the 1975 zoning ordinance. The township has updated their
zoning ordinance. The most recent comprehensive zoning ordinance was adopted in November of 2011, and has been amended several times. The zoning chart should be updated accordingly.

b. The zoning chart lists the existing and proposed use as Use E21 Shopping Center. This use is no longer contained within the zoning ordinance. The proposed use appears to be most consistent with Use E22 Multiple Commercial Use.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the August 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.

CND:dc

cc: Highglen Pineville Quakertown Open Associates, LP
    Richard A. Stoneback, P.E., Charles E. Shoemaker, Inc
    Judith Stern Goldstein, Boucher & James
    Quakertown Area Planning Committee
    Mike Schwartz, P.E., Gilmore & Associates, Township Engineer (via e-mail)
    Paul Stepanoff, Township Manager (via e-mail)
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 Subdivision for 75-95 James Way
         TMP #48-11-4-3
         Applicant: David & Solomon Mermelstein, Trustees
         Owner: Same
         Plan Dated: June 30, 2017
         Date Received: July 20, 2017

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 an existing 7.86-acre lot into two parcels. Lot 1 would be 3.02 acres with an existing two-story, 32,000-gross-square-foot commercial/office building. Lot 2 would be 4.84 acres with an existing one-story, 55,000-gross-square-foot commercial/office building. Existing parking is adjacent to both buildings. Public water and sewer serve the site.

Location: Southeastern corner of the intersection of County Line Road and James Way. The site is also bounded by the Pennsylvania Turnpike.

Zoning: LI Limited Industrial District permits wholesale, warehouse or manufacturing operations, research laboratories, and general office uses on a minimum lot size of two acres. A maximum building coverage of 35 percent and a maximum impervious surface ratio of 75 percent is permitted.

Present Use: Commercial/Office.
COMMENS

The proposed subdivision will create two separate lots each containing an existing building. The proposed lot line is located within an existing parking area between the existing buildings. We offer the following comments regarding the proposed subdivision.

1. **Upper Southampton Township Comprehensive Plan** (2010)—Chapter 12, Growth Areas & Future Land Use Plan identifies the LI Zoning District that includes Industrial Boulevard, South Second Street Pike, Jaymore and James Way as a special study area with the purpose of keeping the industrial core of the township revitalized and economically viable. The proposed subdivision appears to be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.

2. **Nonconformities**—The following notes potential nonconforming issues created by the proposed subdivision. These issues should be addressed prior to approval of the plan.
   a. The Coverages for Proposed Subdivision chart on the submitted plan notes that Lot 2 exceeds the maximum impervious coverage ratio of 75 percent.
   b. The current combined lot does not meet the parking standards outlined in zoning ordinance Section 185-47 for an office use and is an existing nonconformity. The proposed subdivision creates two lots that do not meet the minimum parking requirements for an office use. If there is a change of use in either one of the existing buildings, it may impact the number of required parking spaces.

3. **Sewage facilities**—If an expansion or new construction occurs at a future date, 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 August 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.

JSI:dc

cc: David and Solomon Mermelstein Trustees
Nicholas T. Rose, P.E., ProTract Engineering, Inc.
Larry Young, P.E., TriState Engineers and Land Surveyors, Inc., 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: Sketch Plan of Land Development for Warwick Commons Phase II
        TMP # 51-3-89-3, 51-3-90
        Applicant: Warwick TVC-ARC, LP, c/o Tom Verrichia
        Owner: Same
        Plan Dated: June 2, 2017
        Date Received: June 14, 2017

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 the second phase of a multiple-use development on a 16.9-acre site. The site will consist of an 18,850-square-foot food market (Use G3), a 19,093-square-foot Tractor Supply retail building (Use G3), and a 5,585-square-foot Wawa convenience store (Use G21) which includes an accessory 6-pump gasoline service station. The Wawa convenience store and gas pumps have already been constructed on the site. The second phase of development will consist of the remaining structures and their associated parking areas and landscaping. The site is serviced by public water and sewer.

Location: On the eastern side of York Road, just north of Meyer Way and west of Meetinghouse Road.

Zoning: The Village Center II (VC2) District is intended to promote a mix of commercial, municipal, and recreational uses as an interconnected retail center in the Jamison Village area along York Road. The VC2 District permits Use G3 (Retail) and Use G21 (Convenience Store) on lots of a minimum size of 30,000 square feet, with a maximum building coverage of 20 percent, and a maximum impervious coverage of 45 percent. Multiple uses on a single site are permitted as a conditional use. Buildings with a floor area greater than 3,500 square feet are permitted as conditional uses in the VC2 District.
The site is subject to the supplemental regulations set forth by the Corridor Overlay District (Ordinance #99-04). A conditional use approval to allow multiple uses on the site was previously granted.

Present Use: Wawa convenience store and gas pumps; vacant.

COMMENTS

1. **Variances**—The sketch plan provided indicates that the applicant is requesting the following variances from the requirements of the zoning ordinance:

   - Section 195-58.14.B(2)(h) to permit less than the required buffer width along arterial streets
   - Section 195-58.14.B(2)(i) to permit a landscape buffer of less than 50 feet between the parking lot and the street
   - Section 195-58.15 to exceed the maximum allowable impervious surface
   - Section 195-58.16.F(1) to permit a building in length greater than 150 feet

   We recommend that no final action be taken on this application until the zoning issues have been resolved.

2. **Village center**

   a. Sections 195-42.4.B(2) and (3) of the zoning ordinance set specific conditional requirements for mixed uses on a single parcel in the VC2 District, and for buildings greater in size than 3,500 square feet. Conditional use approval has been previously granted to permit multiple uses on the site, however the current proposal differs from the plans which were previously approved. The previous proposal included a day care center, and smaller retail buildings than are currently proposed. The township should determine to what extent the previously granted conditional use approval for mixed uses on a single site may still apply to the current application.

   b. The township should consider how the new proposal meets the intentions of the VC2 zoning district as stated in Section 195-42.1 of the zoning ordinance. While the overall layout is similar to the previously approved plans, the buildings are fewer, and larger, and now include an expansive outdoor display area alongside a big box chain retail store. The stated intent of the VC2 District is to promote small-scale buildings in a compact arrangement in order to emulate the character of a village. In addition, the township’s comprehensive plan identifies this site as part of the Jamison Village Center area, which recommends smaller scale buildings, and discourages strip commercial developments.

3. **Corridor overlay district**—Section 163-51.3 of the subdivision and land development ordinance (SALDO) provides a set of standards regulating all development within the York Road Corridor Overlay District. Future submissions should demonstrate compliance with these requirements.

4. **Architectural design**—The standards provided by Section 163-51.3 of the SALDO (Corridor Overlay District) and Section 195-42 of the zoning ordinance (VC2 District), largely concern the architectural design quality of proposed development. Compliance with these standards cannot be determined without detailed architectural drawings and/or renderings of
the proposed buildings. Future submissions should include drawings which demonstrate compliance with these design requirements. Particular attention should be paid to Section 163-51.3.D(1)(a) which requires that all sides of a building which will be visible from the street be given equal architectural treatment as the front, as the proposed food market will have its rear façade oriented towards York Road.

5. **Outdoor storage and display**—Section 195-16.I(2)(a)[2] of the zoning ordinance permits an accessory outdoor storage or display area to be no greater than one half the size of the building coverage. The outdoor display area for the proposed Tractor Supply building is over 15,000 square feet, which is approximately 75 percent of the area of the building.

6. **Concrete pad in buffer area**—A 50-foot-wide landscaped buffer is required along Meetinghouse Road, per Section 195-42.4.B(3)(h) of the zoning ordinance. The plan shows a concrete pad encroaching into this buffer space, and notes that a variance will be required, but no purpose for the pad is indicated. Is this intended to be additional outdoor display area for the proposed Tractor Supply retail store? The concrete pad is located at the end of parking stalls, and it does not appear that any curbing or wheel stops are proposed between the two. Is it intended that vehicles could pull into the concrete pad? Future plans should indicate the purpose for the concrete area.

7. **Prior approvals**—This application has previously been granted approvals for conditional uses, variances, and design waivers from the Warwick Township Board of Supervisors, and the Zoning Hearing Board. We recommend that future land development submissions include a listing of all prior approvals, along with the stated conditions of those approvals.

8. **Parking**
   a. Section 195-16.G(3)(b) of the zoning ordinance requires 1 parking space for each 200 square feet of total floor area, plus 1 space for every 2 employees, for retail buildings. Under these conditions, the Tractor Supply building would require 95 spaces, plus spaces for employees, and the food market would require 94 spaces, plus spaces for employees. There are 110 spaces provided at the tractor supply and 88 spaces provided at the food market location. The parking provided at the food market would be less than required, however the overall parking, including a small surplus of parking at Wawa, would exceed the requirements. The zoning ordinance does not specify whether parking in the VC2 District can be considered a shared parking arrangement, or provide guidance as to the particular distribution of parking within a given site. It should be determined whether the distribution of parking spaces is adequate to serve the proposed uses.
   
   b. The parking requirement notes on the sketch plan indicate 4 employees for the food market, and 8 employees for the Tractor Supply retail building. These numbers seem low, in particular for the food market. A typical grocery store, even a small one such as proposed, is likely to have more than 4 employees working during a peak shift.
   
   c. Section 163-39.D of the SALDO permits no more than 12 parking spaces in a single row. Rows of greater than 12 spaces shall be broken up by a planting strip equal to the width of one stall. The proposed plan includes several rows of parking spaces of 20 stalls.
9. Editorial comments

   a. The zoning chart on the sketch plan provided appears to reference outdated sections of the township's zoning ordinance. Section 195-58 is a ‘reserved’ section of the ordinance. The references should be updated to note that the VC2 zoning regulations are found in Section 195-42 of the zoning ordinance. The zoning chart and the list of requested variances should be updated accordingly.

   b. The zoning chart indicates that the minimum required yards along York Road, Meetinghouse Road, and Meyer Way are 50 feet, 50 feet, and 40 feet, respectively. While these are functionally accurate, technically the required front yard setback per Section 195-42.5 of the zoning ordinance is 15 feet. It is the buffer that is required by Section 195-42.4.B(3)(h) that calls for the additional setbacks.

   c. The sketch plan notes the Wawa as being proposed. Future plan submissions should note that the Wawa has been constructed.

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. 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 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.

CND:dc

cc: Thomas Verrichia, Warwick TVC-ARC, LP
    Eric A. Britz, P.E., Bohler Engineering PA, 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)
<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>Northampton Township</td>
<td>Northampton Township Police Building</td>
<td>31-15-142-3 &amp; -142-7</td>
<td>1-09937-418-3J</td>
<td>0201-60065</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
July 18, 2017

Kurt M. Schroeder, P.E.
Gilmore & Associates, Inc.
508 Corporate Drive West
Langhorne, PA 19047

RE: Northampton Township Police Building – 111 Township Road
PaDEP Code # 1-09937-418-3J
TMPs #31-15-142-3, -142-7
Township #17-1
Northampton Township, Bucks County

Dear Mr. Schroeder:

We have received a copy of the planning module\(^1\) concerning the proposal to renovate and expand the existing Northampton, Bucks County, Municipal Authority building (including a 15,485-square-foot addition, additional driveway, parking lot, and carport) to be used by the Northampton Township Police Department. New wastewater flows (612 gallons per day or 2 EDUs) will flow by public sewer 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 *Bucks County, Pennsylvania, Sewerage Facilities Plan, 1970* is the official Act 537 Plan for this portion of Northampton 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 public sewers.

The Northampton, Bucks County, Municipal Authority certifies that it has collection capacity to receive the daily flows from 2 new EDUs, which will not create a hydraulic overload or a five-year projected overload. However, Component 3. Sewage Collection does not include BCWSA and PWD signatures authorizing conveyance and treatment capacity in Section G. Proposed Wastewater Disposal Facilities and Section J. Chapter 94 Consistency Determination.

---

\(^1\) 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 *Bucks County, Pennsylvania, Sewerage Facilities Plan, 1970*. 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 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
    Elizabeth Mahoney, PaDEP
    Mike Solomon, Northampton Township, Director of Planning and Zoning
    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  
Northampton Township Police Building – 111 Township Road

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

1. Date plan received by county planning agency: June 16, 2017
2. Date plan received by planning agency with areawide jurisdiction:  
   Agency name:  
3. Date review completed by agency: July 18, 2017

## 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:  
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:
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: July 18, 2017

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.