



**MINUTES**  
**WARRINGTON TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION**  
**April 20, 2023 – 7:00 P.M.**

**MEMBERS**

Richard Rycharski	Chairman	Present
William Connolly	Vice-Chairman	Present
Vince Evans	Secretary	Present
Ted Cicci	Member	Present
Fred Gaines	Member	Present
Bob Watts	Member	Present
Herb Rubenstein	Member	Present
Darshan Patel	Alternate	Present
Mary Stover, P.E.	Township Engineer, CKS	
Doreen Curtin	Zoning Officer	
Christian Jones	Township Assistant Manager	
Kim Albright	Assistant Zoning Officer	

**CALL TO ORDER**

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

None

**AGENDA**

**1. Approval of Minutes**

a. April 6, 2023

Mr. Connolly made the motion to approve the minutes to include the corrections noted.

Motion was seconded by Mr. Cicci and carried unanimously.

**2. Old Business**

Discuss alternate plan for 771 Easton Road, 807 Easton Road, and Oakfield at Easton Road parcels in the BZ zoning district.

Mr. Peter Miller – Applicant

Mr. Miller discussed the residential plan on the east side of 611 first and presented a graphic showing revisions made based upon comments by the Planning Commission (PC) in anticipation of making a formal presentation at the next meeting. Mr. Miller presented a revised graphic of the townhouse community concept. He noted that 4 of the units would be designed as live-work (LW) units, added additional parking on south side, and on Hilltop added parking stalls along the roadway. The plan

showed widened driveways of 28' for the LW units. The new plan modified access to Valley Square Blvd by having one way access from Roland out to Valley Square Blvd where access is right and left out only. A left-out egress point would require a cut-through in median. Mr. Miller believed that the new plan would result in less traffic and advised the PC that they are waiting on a traffic study from their engineer that would be forwarded upon completion.

The new concept showed a revised circulation and access pattern. He noted that Hilltop would be resurfaced, and Ivanhoe and Roland would be rebuilt to better service existing residents. An architect was engaged to design the concept by modeling it after the Belvidere project, a similar project in Doylestown.

Mr. Rycharski commented on the two parking stalls on Hilltop noting concerns about them becoming a hindrance to traffic and recommended they be removed from the concept plan. Mr. Connolly was supportive of the Live-Work unit concept. He noted that a 20' travel lane was narrow and added that a normal travel lane could accommodate normal parking, acting as a parking lane. Mr. Miller inquired about the width of Ivanhoe and Mr. Connolly noted that the cartway was 26', suitable for two-way traffic and could work well with another lane for parking. Discussion ensued regarding the width of cartways for the concept plan. Additional discussion ensued regarding options for access into and egress from the proposed site. Mr. Dixon commented that the sight line for turning left would help determine if a median cut-through would be feasible, adding that from a safety perspective, sight distance and traffic volume should be considered. Mr. Gaines added that consideration could be given to road markings such as cross-hatching to alert drivers to not block intersections.

The PC suggested that a revised concept plan show widening Hilltop to 26' and consider indicating parking further down on the plan to avoid traffic hinderances. Mr. Gaines noted there is a slope before Georges lane which causes people to accelerate inadvertently and should be considered in the design of a safe traffic layout. Discussion ensued regarding a left turn from Roland with Mr. Miller noting they would be willing to modify the concept plan to accommodate comments from the Traffic Engineer.

On resident spoke during public comment expressing a concern about losing the existing ability to make a left turn on Georges Ln. It was noted by the PC that the project was still in the design phase and all concerns would be evaluated and addressed. Mr. Connolly added that the architectural design of the project would be very important in keeping with the overall plan for the design of the community. Mr. Miller was very agreeable to incorporating the recommendations and concerns of the Planning Commission throughout the development of the project.

Mr. Miller then proceeded to discuss the Oakfield/611 parcel. He noted that the revised concept plan reflected comments from the June 13, 2022, review letter. He listed the variances he believed would be required. In describing the two concept plans noted as CP14 and CP14SK, Mr. Miller noted that the difference between them was based on feedback about the bypass lane, noting the lane being discussed was not the drive-thru lane but the "escape" lane. He described some of the features of the bypass lane noting that it followed the building, it allowed cars to be able to make a right onto Oakfield or left access onto 611 and further discussion ensued. He noted that there were also changes to the configuration of parking and location of trash.

Mr. Rycharski noted that trash enclosures cannot be in front yards and discussion ensued with suggests for locations and considerations that enclosures to do not impede traffic flow or interfere with sight triangles.

Mr. Rycharski commented that the new revision was better and they would support the relief in terms of variances needed from the Zoning Hearing Board (ZHB).

Concluding, Mr. Miller noted they would submit formal plans based upon the discussions. Mr. Gaines made a final comment suggesting the exit from the property be formatted in such a way so that cars leaving the site would have to exit left onto Oakfield.

### **3. New Business**

Discussion concerning installation of EV charging stations in Township Parks and, if appropriate, make recommendations to the Board of Supervisors to waive Land Development requirements.

Mr. Oles led a discussion on the possibility of adding electric vehicle (EV) charging stations in the Township parks, noting that addition of EV stations met with the climate action plan presented by the Environmental Action Committee (EAC) of the Township. He introduced Angel, the CEO of Plug and Go charging stations. She discussed the proposal to install level 2 charging stations in several of the parks. Mr. Connolly asked about some of the technical data of the stations and their output and discussion ensued. It was noted that the EV stations coordinate with a phone app and she proceed to discuss that feature. She noted that the stations contain no advertising and the charging cords were about 25 feet long. She noted that their company's chargers are universal and can work on all makes of cars. She also offered assistance with providing signs and parking lot markings.

Mr. Rycharski asked the selection process for the proposed locations of the EV stations and Mr. Oles discussed what the considerations were with review given to the ability to provide adequate power.

Mr. Oles stated that they were requesting a waiver of land development (LD) for the EV charging stations. Mr. Connolly noted that the Township Engineer (CKS) would need to look at the plans for compliance with LD and the Ordinances. Mr. Connolly and Mr. Gaines both noted that the lease was not acceptable as submitted and would require revision and legal review.

Angel discussed the components of the project, some technical information about the stations, their appearance, details about how the company used technology to provide for a user-friendly experience. Mr. Connolly made comments regarding issues that needed to be considered regarding the capacity of that panel supplying power. A discussion ensued in detail regarding the conditions of the lease with comments that the lease did not appear to have favorable terms for the Township. Mr. Gaines noted that the project needs to be competitively bid being a municipal project. Mr. Luber, Township Manager, commented that he was not sure it required competitive bid and would check. Mr. Connolly read portions of the lease to illustrate his concerns with some of the terms, summarized his assessment of the lease as written and concluded that the stringent nature of the lease would require a Request For Proposal (RFP). Angel stated that the lease was open to negotiation. Mr. Rycharski added that a lease arrangement would need to be compliant with the planning requirements.

Mr. Rubenstein voiced objection to allowing the operation of for-profit company on Township property. It was his opinion that such an arrangement went beyond the appropriateness of a government function for a Second-Class Township. Mr. Luber made the comparison to the snack vendor's stands as they operate as independent businesses within the park. He added the EV stations provided a service to residents at the park and noted addition of EV stations fit with the Energy Action Plan. Mr. Rubenstein noted the EV stations would be subject to vandalism and possibly present a danger of personal attack to anyone using the stations in the dark. He further added that he believed the township should not be competing with businesses providing the same service. Mr. Evans expressed concerns over the newness of the technology and the wisdom of utilizing technology that has not provided a long-term track record of service.

The discussion turned back to the concerns over the lease. Mr. Connolly was concerned that the lease essentially eliminated any options for competition noting the lease appeared one-sided as written by containing what was presented as a 20-year franchise. Mr. Gaines suggested that the project was further investigated by showing sites that were compliant with the ordinance, where power was readily available and the project was put out for competitive bids. Mr. Rycharski confirmed the PCs position that more research needed to be done to confirm use of power and there was a thorough review of the lease as presented.

Ms. Ross noted that other townships have EV charging stations on Township property. She discussed the option of getting funding for purchasing instead of leasing EV chargers. Mr. Rycharski commented that it may not be possible to waive LD. Mr. Patel asked whether Plug and Go had any other public park installations to which Angel replied they had not done any to date. Ms. Ross added that most Townships have Climate Action Plans and EV stations are included in those plans. Mr. Rycharski wanted to understand how the company expected to yield a return on their investment. Discussion ensued regarding the technological aspects of the charging stations, the service that it would provide and how that worked with their business model.

Mr. Watts spoke adamantly about his objection the EV stations in parks that are part of the Township Open Space plan, reiterating that he would not want to see commercial businesses in open space.

Further discussion ensued regarding the exclusive nature of the lease, how the EV stations were to obtain adequate power without presenting a hardship to the existing power capacity of the Township and if the project was in compliance with the ordinances and land development provisions. Mr. Connolly read some of the terms of the lease and all the members of the PC noted that the lease required scrutiny by the Township Solicitor and would require renegotiation.

Mr. Rycharski commented on the limited number of residents who would be able to take advantage of the service. Mr. Rubenstein offered up an alternative, suggesting that the Township consider giving incentives to private business to install EV stations on commercial properties and not on Township property. It was suggested that an incentive for installing an EV charging station at a business might be the reduction of an Ordinance-required parking space in order to install an EV charging station at a parking space.

Ms. Ross offered to investigate how many other Townships offer EV charging stations as an amenity. Mr. Rycharski commented that he did not believe it was the Township's responsibility to provide residents with charging stations for personal vehicles and noted that the only location he believed a charging station would be appropriate would be by the police station. Discussion ensued regarding pricing and how cost to use the station would be structured with Angel noting that the Commonwealth regulates pricing.

Discussion ended with the conclusion that more information would need to be provided for consideration before the PC would be able to reach a decision about the project with regard to either a recommendation or not to the Board of Supervisors.

Short term priorities –

Discussion ensued regarding the potential uses for large open spaces in the PI zoning districts. Mr. Connolly brought up the need to clarify and strengthen conditional use standards. He also suggested engaging one of the major property owners in those districts in discussions about potential uses as the properties change hands. Mr. Connolly recommended that the large PI districts be rezoned to preclude truck terminals and distribution centers. The current PI district is surrounded by Residential Districts. The PC should start drafting changes soon before properties sell. He also noted that it would be worth requesting the assistance from the Bucks County Planning Commission.

May 4 – Elite Plaza submitted revised plans including a report by their Traffic Engineer and will be requesting a recommendation for Final LD Approval.

An incomplete application for a canopy for Chick-fil-A was submitted. The PC told them no canopy on the building was shown on plans when they first applied. Mr. Connolly inquired as to the size of their kitchen and whether they had building permits for the project.

Mr. Jones commented that the project on Folly and Street Rds still had a punch list to do and the McNanny project started demolition. Barclay development.

Meeting adjourned 8:50