

HILLTOWN TOWNSHIP BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
PUBLIC HEARING
PROPOSED ZONING ORDINANCE (CONTINUATION)
Monday, November 14, 1994
6:00 PM

The continuation of the Public Hearing for the proposed Zoning Ordinance was called to order by Chairman William H. Bennett, Jr. at 6:00PM and opened with the Pledge of Allegiance.

Also present were: Jack C. Fox, Supervisor
Bruce G. Horrocks, Township Manager
John Rice, Township Solicitor's Office

Chairman Bennett announced the Supervisors will hear 1 1/2 hours of public comment concerning the proposed Zoning Ordinance. At 7:35PM, the advertised Public Hearing will be adjourned and the Supervisors will enter into the regularly scheduled Worksession Meeting. Chairman Bennett advised Supervisor Bennington was out of the country on business and would not be in attendance this evening. Chairman Bennett introduced those members of the Planning Commission who were in attendance - Mr. Joe Phillips, Vice-Chairman; Mr. Jack C. Fox, Mr. Jim Coyne, Ms. Alice Kachline, and Mr. Franklin Rice.

Chairman Bennett explained this is not a debate, the Supervisors will first hear comments from those residents who did not speak at the first of the Public Hearings which was held on Monday, October 24, 1994. After all those residents have been heard, those who spoke at the previous Public Hearing will be permitted to comment again. Residents may speak for five minutes each and the comments will be recorded.

Mr. Horrocks announced that copies of the proposed Zoning Ordinance are available for public review this evening.

A. PUBLIC COMMENT:

1. **Mr. William Godek** noted several corrections to the proposed Zoning Ordinance:

- page 3, section 104, number 2, third line should read "or other structure, **or** tract of land, to be invalid or ineffective..."

- page 6, section 201, number 6, which reads "Airport: Any area of land or water which is used or intended to be used, for the landing and take-off of aircraft." Mr. Godek feels the words "or intended to be used," are redundant, and suggested that those words be eliminated.

- page 12, section 201, number 71, Mr. Godek believes the words "or intended for occupancy" are redundant, and suggested those words be eliminated.
- page 13, section 201, number 76, which gives a definition of the term "Employee." Mr. Godek asked Solicitor Rice if there is a distinction between part-time/full-time employees and seasonal employees; or if seasonal employees are covered under the terms "full or part-time employees."
- page 15, section 201, number 101, Mr. Godek feels the word "streets" should contain an apostrophe as being possessive in this particular instance.
- page 15, section 201, number 102, Mr. Godek believes the words "or intended for occupancy" are redundant, and suggested those words be eliminated.
- page 18, section 201, number 131, Mr. Godek believes the words "or intended to be utilized." are redundant, and suggested those words be eliminated.
- page 22, section 201, numbers 174 and 175 requires a space to separate the two paragraphs.
- page 22, section 201, number 179, Mr. Godek believes the word "predominate" is incorrect. It should be "predominant."
- page 22, section 201, number 182, Mr. Godek believes the word "act" should be capitalized because it is referring to a specific Act.
- page 28, section 201, number 226, Mr. Godek believes the word "carrier" should be changed to "carried."

2. **Mr. Charles Baker** of Rt. 113 is not familiar with all the details of the proposed Zoning Ordinance, however he would like to address the issue of home inspections. Mr. Baker understands an inspection of any property for re-sale will be required and he is opposed to this inspection. Mr. Baker is aware of a resident in a neighboring community whose home, upon inspection, was found in non-compliance with Township requirements. Mr. Baker does not believe the Township should have any authority on how and when he sells his home. Mr. Baker would resent paying the Township for a certification in order to sell his home.

3. **Mrs. Ralph Powers** of Keystone Drive has been a resident of the Township for over 40 years. Mrs. Powers wondered why the Supervisors feel changing the zoning in this area from PC-I to Light Industrial will help the residents. Mrs. Powers explained

Page 3
Public Hearing for Proposed Zoning Ordinance
November 14, 1994

that Keystone Drive and Schoolhouse Road experiences a great deal of truck traffic and it is very dangerous for school children. Further, Mrs. Powers noted that Rt. 113 has seen a definite increase in traffic, and there is a significant amount of pollution coming from Waste Management.

3. **Mr. Jeff Warner** of Fairhill Road questioned section 804 Issuance of Permits and Occupancy Certificates on page 158, and asked if he would be required to have his home and property inspected by the Township if he wishes to sell it. Chairman Bennett agreed that home inspections for re-sale has been proposed. Mr. Warner is opposed to this requirement, stating that when he purchased his home, he paid to have the home inspected to his personal satisfaction. Mr. Warner does not see any reason or benefit for the Township to be involved with inspection of a re-sale home, which would eventually add more cost to the taxpayers of Hilltown Township.

Chairman Bennett stated that he is not a member of the Planning Commission. The Planning Commission has revised and presented the proposed Zoning Ordinance to the Board of Supervisors for their approval or disapproval.

4. **Mr. Matt Wall** of Keystone Drive opposes the Light Industrial Zoning proposal. Mr. Wall noted the area currently zoned Light Industrial is hardly being used. There is a tract of land on Rt. 309 directly across from Silk Warehouse that is not being used, there is a parcel for sale and a parcel for rent on Spur Road, and there are several sites for rent and sale within the Hilltown Industrial Park. Mr. Wall referred to the proposed zoning map showing the area of Keystone Drive and Orchard Road. If the proposal is approved, Mr. Wall's neighborhood would be surrounded on all three sides by industrial zoning. Keystone Drive is presently a "short-cut" to and from these industrial areas to Rt. 113, and Mr. Wall is concerned about the increase in traffic. Mr. Wall does not feel it would be unreasonable to ask for a buffer between the currently existing industrial zoning area and the residential area he lives in.

5. **Mr. Jackson Teed** of Mill Road is new to the area and is not familiar with all the proposed zoning changes, however being in construction himself, he has found that many times when areas are re-zoned to Light or Heavy Industrial it is basically because of the tax base. Hilltown Township is a large Township, however Mr. Teed does not believe there are many public services to offer in the way of light industry or manufacturing. Mr. Teed is concerned that if the proposed areas are re-zoned, new industry and manufacturing facilities may not have the ability to obtain the water necessary. Mr. Teed also noted that maintenance of the roadways would increase greatly if the area is re-zoned for Light

Industrial. Further, Mr. Teed believes that home inspections should be the responsibility of the buyer. At present, the State mandates that water and sewer be tested, but anything beyond that should be between the buyer and the seller.

6. **Mrs. Carol Weibley** of 205 Keystone Drive lives across the street from Rotundo and behind the diner. Mrs. Weibley feels that the area is presently very dangerous due to the existing traffic. Mrs. Weibley is concerned for the safety of her children. With regard to the proposed home inspections, Mrs. Weibley wondered exactly what the Township would be inspecting for and what gives the municipality the right to conduct these inspections.

7. **Mr. Ron Theis** of Florence Circle stated that at the last Public Hearing, he asked questions concerning the proposed changes to zoning. Mr. Theis inquired as to whether or not any studies have been performed to determine the impact on the schools or roads, and if it would require higher taxes or expansion of schools. Knowing how things are planned to be re-zoned, Mr. Theis believes there must be some studies with regard to the impact on the general community. To Chairman Bennett's knowledge, no studies have been conducted. Without those studies, Mr. Theis asked how the Planning Commission can recommend putting this re-zoning in place, and asked what the cost to the residents would be. Until those studies have been done, Mr. Theis does not believe any change in zoning should take place for long range planning.

Mr. Theis asked the intent of recommending the home inspections. Solicitor Rice commented his office has reviewed the proposed Zoning Ordinance. It is Solicitor Rice's understanding that those provisions have been incorporated into the proposed Zoning Ordinance solely to check the property for use; not whether the well or septic system is working, or whether the dwelling meets building codes. For example, it is a way for the Township to determine if a single family dwelling is being used for apartments or as a business, primarily in the Rural Residential Zoning District. Mr. Horrocks advised the inspections are required for a use certificate, not for an occupancy certificate. Until proper studies are done on the impact on the community and schools, Mr. Theis recommended that this section of the proposed Zoning Ordinance be tabled.

There has been some discussion about a tower being erected on the Bolton Turkey Farm property, and Mr. Theis asked the status of this matter. Chairman Bennett replied a special meeting has been advertised and will be held on November 29, 1994, dealing primarily with the zoning. This matter will be before the Planning Commission on November 21, 1994 and then before the Board of Supervisors on November 28, 1994. Mr. Theis asked if the former zoning or the new proposed zoning would allow such a use in that

area. Solicitor Rice explained a tower is classified as a "utility use" in both the new proposed Ordinance and the old Ordinance. Under the new Zoning Ordinance, a tower is permitted as a conditional use. A conditional use is a type of permitted use that would be heard by the Board of Supervisors for their approval at a judicial-type of hearing, where a written decision and opinion must be rendered. Anyone wishing to oppose this matter is welcome to appear at the hearing to take a position against it. Under the former Ordinance, Solicitor Rice explained "utility uses" were permitted by right without any hearing in every zoning district. This is a change in the proposed Zoning Ordinance.

Chairman Bennett knows very little about this issue at present, however he asked if the tower is legitimately considered a utility. Solicitor Rice commented that will be the subject of the hearing to be held on November 29, 1994. Approximately 25 years ago, Chairman Bennett noted, Philadelphia Electric erected towers adjoining his own property in the Township, which he fought at the time, until he learned that Pennsylvania is one of only six states where public utilities have the right of eminent domain.

8. **Mr. Paul Lapinski** of Middle Road is quite troubled by the proposal to increase the minimum lot size in the Rural Residential Zoning District, more than doubling the lot sizes required for subdivision where there is no public water available. Mr. Lapinski feels the Township is being very harsh on a number of residents in this community by the proposal. Mr. Lapinski is also opposed to the home inspection, even though Solicitor Rice assured the residents that this is to ferret out illegal uses. Mr. Lapinski still feels it is an invasion of privacy.

Mr. Lapinski was told by the Zoning Officer that it would cost approximately \$500.00 to appear before the Zoning Hearing Board, a cost that he feels is prohibitive. Mr. Lapinski believes the Supervisors should make that fee more reasonable for residents of this community. Chairman Bennett commented all fees are reviewed during preparation of a new budget, and the Supervisors do intend to review that fee again. Chairman Bennett explained the fee of \$500.00 for a Zoning Hearing covers the Township's cost for a court stenographer, the \$25.00 per meeting provided to all three Zoning Hearing Board members, the Solicitor's fee, and the fee of the court reporter.

9. **Mr. Ralph Powers** of 619 Keystone Drive asked the Township this morning for a copy of the old Ordinance dated 1989, and was told that the old Ordinance was no longer in effect. The Zoning Officer attempted to explain why that was so, but his response was unsatisfactory to Mr. Powers. Mr. Powers wondered how the proposed Ordinance can be enforced when it has not yet been approved and adopted by the Township Supervisors. Mr. Horrocks explained that

from the moment a new Zoning Ordinance is legally advertised in a newspaper, its rules immediately take effect until the Board of Supervisors either adopts it as-is; revises and adopts it; or denies it; in which case the regulations of the old Zoning Ordinance would apply. Over the years, Mr. Horrocks noted, the State adopted this new pending Ordinance law in order to avoid an onslaught of developers attempting to construct something that the new Ordinance may not allow. It puts everything in limbo, however it also brings all property owners in under the same new rules, assuming that the governing body adopts it.

Mr. Powers noted that the first page of the proposed Ordinance states "This Ordinance was prepared for, and duly adopted by, the Hilltown Township Board of Supervisors in accordance with Article VI of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, Act 170, and amends the Hilltown Township Zoning Ordinance of 1983, as amended." Chairman Bennett explained the document has not yet been adopted, this is merely a draft of what is proposed to be adopted. Mr. Horrocks noted the very last page of the proposed Ordinance is not signed or dated, and it is stamped "DRAFT". This document is strictly a draft copy and all pages have been written on the assumption that it will be adopted.

Mr. Powers commented Keystone Drive is currently built up to the maximum, particularly from Rt. 113 to Bethlehem Pike, and he can not understand why the Planning Commission has proposed to change the zoning in that area from Rural Residential to Country Residential I. Supervisor Fox advised that particular area was never zoned Rural Residential. Mr. Powers is also against the proposed home inspection after seeing it fail in other communities.

10. **Mr. William Godek** stated this document is meant for the safety and benefit of the residents of this Township. Mr. Godek noted that if a resident or group of individuals wished to change the zoning of a parcel of land, be it a quarry or any other group of people, they had to meet three requirements including the Hilltown Comprehensive Plan, an environmental impact study, and a transportation impact study, under the current 1983 Zoning Ordinance. In the proposed Zoning Ordinance, page 174, section 1002 - Private petition for Amendment, item 6, states "Information about the market area to be served by the proposed development, if a commercial use, including population, effective demand for proposed business facilities, and any other information describing the relationship of the proposed development to the needs of the market area as the zoning officer, planning commission, or Board of Supervisors may prescribe." Mr. Godek commented this is public government and asked what this has to do with "marketing", which is strictly a private entity. Mr. Godek strenuously objects to this. Mr. Godek noted the requirement for an environmental impact

study has also been removed from the proposed document. Mr. Godek would like to see those three requirements placed back in the proposed Zoning Ordinance. Mr. Godek would like to know why these requirements were deleted in the first place.

11. **Robert Grunmeier** of 1811 Bethlehem Pike stated that at the last meeting, he presented a list of questions for the Supervisors to review and comment on. One of those questions pertained to the Light Industrial Zoning District, which Mr. Grunmeier feels has been thoroughly addressed this evening. Another question pertained to the proposal to increase the non-conforming lot size, which has been reduced from 50% to 25%. Mr. Grunmeier also left a copy of a case of Gem Star versus Springfield Township Zoning Hearing Board, which he hopes the Supervisors have reviewed.

Mr. Grunmeier referred to page 78, Section E10 - Gasoline Service Station, item 9, which states "Vehicles shall not be stored outdoors while awaiting repairs for more than five (5) days." Having been associated with vehicle repair businesses, Mr. Grunmeier stated it sometimes takes two to three weeks to obtain parts for a car. If the vehicle has a current license plate or inspection sticker, he feels the Township should take the time element into consideration because he believes five days is unreasonable.

Mr. Grunmeier referred to page 110, Section 502 - Performance Standards: Bulk and Area. The PC-1 District in the previous Ordinance was 20,000 sq. ft., and the PC-2 District (including Rt. 313) was also 20,000 sq. ft.. It has now been increased in the proposed Zoning Ordinance in the PC-2 District to 50,000 sq. ft., and must be served by public water and sewer. Mr. Grunmeier asked the Township's plans for public water and sewer in the PC-1 and PC-2 District.

With regard to page 80, Section E15 - Specialty/Cultural Shopping Center, item 6, which states "All such uses should be located along the front building set back line of the street with all parking placed to the rear of the buildings so as not to be visible from the street," Mr. Grunmeier asked for a point of clarification. Mr. Grunmeier asked if this means that customers must park behind the building. If that is indeed the case, Mr. Grunmeier asked where the tractor trailers will then deliver merchandise, since most deliveries are made in the rear of the building.

It is Mr. Grunmeier's greatest concern that the Rural Residential Zoning District minimum lot size will be increased to 3 acres from 50,000 sq. ft.. Mr. Grunmeier noted 50,000 sq. ft. is 1.15 acres and is a reasonable amount of land to maintain. Mr. Grunmeier commented three acres, in our society today, is a very large parcel to maintain. Mr. Grunmeier respectfully asks the Board of

Supervisors, with the comments given this evening, to indeed remit the proposed Zoning Ordinance back to the Planning Commission for further review, taking into consideration all the points that have been raised.

12. **Mr. Fred Zoeller** lives on Rt. 113 and purchased his property approximately 25 years ago. At the time, Mr. Zoeller had a choice to purchase a lot with a building, or a building and a lot with two extra lots. With the new proposed Zoning Ordinance, Mr. Zoeller explained those lots can no be longer building lots. Mr. Zoeller purchased the property under the assumption that in later years, he would have a nest egg for retirement. Mr. Zoeller is upset and disappointed that the Supervisors would consider making this change. Further, Mr. Zoeller feels the Township has no business conducting home inspections on properties for re-sale.

If the problem is water shortages, Mr. Zoeller asked why the Township has granted approval of housing developments in our community. Mr. Zoeller appealed to the Supervisors to reconsider approving the proposed Zoning Ordinance.

13. **Mrs. Beverly Slifer** of 1019 Orchard Road stated in the past, she trusted the governing body to do their job and protect her rights, however after listening to comments this evening, she is concerned that her rights are not being protected. Mrs. Slifer is speaking specifically about the proposed re-zoning of Keystone Drive and Orchard Road, to which she and many of her neighbors object. Mrs. Slifer feels that her buffering zone for noise and traffic is being taken away. Mrs. Slifer asked the Supervisors to look at the meaning of the term "buffer yards" in the proposed Ordinance.

14. **Mr. John Snyder** of 2018 Mill Road is expressing his personal opinion this evening, and his opinion does not represent those of the Zoning Hearing Board, of which he is a member. Upon review of the proposed Ordinance, Mr. Snyder feels it is becoming very restrictive in not allowing residents freedom of the use of their property. Some examples include the home occupation and nursery, which no longer will allows retail sales at a home. If Mr. Snyder were to have an office at his home, he would not be permitted to have retail sales. Nurseries are no longer allowed to have a secondary usage, such as landscaping. Mr. Snyder feels those two businesses go hand-in-hand.

After hearing earlier testimony concerning the commercial area, Mr. Snyder noted the Township will not only be telling residents where they have to build on their lot, but will also tell them they must build on their front setback line, with parking in the rear. This will create a rather unusual design of a building and will present

safety concerns for customers leaving a business. Another concern is the removal of greenhouses from the Agricultural District. Greenhouses do not appear anywhere in the Ordinance. Mr. Snyder is also opposed to the three acre requirement within the Rural Residential area.

There appears to be a concern that Hilltown Township does not have enough Light Industrial area. Mr. Snyder can give an example of at least one seventeen acre tract that has been on the market for approximately 5 years, and is a lot that would be suitable for subdivision for numerous light industrial businesses.

Mr. Snyder is also apprehensive about the inclusion of many non-zoning items in the proposed Ordinance, including the constant referral to specific NFA, DER, and EPA standards, which will change at any time. If that were to happen, a public hearing would be advertised and held, and the Zoning Ordinance would constantly be revised. Even referring to Act 170 is not current since that Act had previously been revised twice. Mr. Snyder suggested it be referred to as the Municipal Planning Code or the MPC.

In summary, Mr. Snyder feels the Ordinance is too restrictive and goes well beyond what is needed and required for a Zoning Ordinance. It appears to Mr. Snyder to be an attempt to create a pure Zoning Ordinance, which is very difficult to do in a Township of this size that has been incorporated since 1721. If the Zoning Ordinance is adopted and enforced in its present form, these provisions will be challenged, costing the Township substantial sums of money in defending these individual challenges and curative amendments in this Ordinance.

15. **Mr. Patrick Matthews** of 535 Rt. 113 would like the residents of Hilltown Township to know that he is not a liar as Supervisor Fox stated at the last meeting. Mr. Matthews thanked Supervisor Bennington, who is not present this evening, for supporting Mr. Matthews' integrity by asking Supervisor Fox to prove his statement. Further, Mr. Matthews felt that zoning laws mean nothing if you are a friend of Supervisor Fox. Mr. Matthews explained that Mr. Ward's dogs are still barking every morning and he can not get any sleep in his own home.

16. **Mr. Frank Beck** of 514 Keystone Drive was present as a citizen, not as a member of the Water and Sewer Authority. Some time ago, when the Comprehensive Plan was revised, many residents were against upgrading Rt. 313 and Rt. 113. Mr. Beck noticed Keystone Drive was recently blacktopped, and has basically turned into a "race track" every single morning.

Also, Mr. Beck stated there are several industrial sites located on Rt. 309 that the Township can not control at present. Even DER does not want to take care of these problem. If the existing problems can not be solved, Mr. Beck wondered why the Township should create another one at the corner of Orchard Road and Keystone Drive.

With regard to the proposed three acre minimum, Mr. Beck begs to differ, stating there is plenty of water in this Township.

17. **Mrs. Pat Ehly** of Pheasant Hill Road is a bit confused by the statement made earlier concerning the new pending Ordinance law adopted by the State. If this proposed Zoning Ordinance is not passed, Mrs. Ehly asked what happens to all the residents who got zoning under the new, proposed Ordinance. In Pennsylvania, Solicitor Rice explained, there is something called the Pending Ordinance Rule. Certain types of zoning approvals will come in under a new Zoning Ordinance once that Ordinance is advertised. Solicitor Rice does not know whether any residents have received any zoning approvals under the proposed Ordinance. For example, the Township must treat the proposed tower by Metrophone under the new Zoning Ordinance as a Conditional Use. This is actually better than what it is under the old Ordinance which did not require any hearing or review at all. There are certain things that can not come in under the new Zoning Ordinance until it is actually adopted. One of those things is subdivisions. Until the new Ordinance is adopted, subdivisions continue under regulations of the old Zoning Ordinance. Mrs. Ehly asked about the Light Industrial area that is proposed. Solicitor Rice explained that is not changed until the Zoning map is adopted, which is a part of the proposed Zoning Ordinance. If someone were to propose an industrial building in the newly proposed Light Industrial Zoning District, Solicitor Rice explained they would not be permitted to do that because it would require a land development under the old Zoning Ordinance regulations. There is not a statute, however it has been established by case law.

Mrs. Ehly can not understand why the Planning Commission feels the Township needs more available industrial land. As has been stated this evening, there is quite a bit of industrial land lying dormant at present that no one is using. Mrs. Ehly stated there are many children and elderly residents in this Township, and it will make for hazardous conditions. DER has not been contacted, and there are noise and pollution control studies demanded by the government, yet none of these required studies have been performed. Mrs. Ehly feels the rights of the residents of this Township are being violated by the proposed re-zoning.

18. **Mr. Ron Theis** asked if the Supervisors must approve the entire proposed Zoning Ordinance document as is, or if just certain sections can be approved. Chairman Bennett replied it is a proposal for the Board's adoption, and portions may be approved or disapproved. Mr. Theis asked what recourse the Township residents have if the Supervisors approve this Ordinance, and wondered if residents can file a class action suit to overturn that. Solicitor Rice explained he represents the Board of Supervisors, as the elected officials of this Township, and therefore, can not give Mr. Theis legal advice. Solicitor Rice stated a Zoning Ordinance or a Zoning Amendment is a legislative function of the Board of Supervisors, it is not a judicial hearing. When a law is passed, whether it is the Board of Supervisors, Borough Council, or the State Legislature, there are certain constitutional arguments that can be made. The Supervisors or Council have been given wide discretion in Pennsylvania to adopt Zoning Ordinances and Amendments. Unless the Supervisors approve something that is blatantly a problem, Solicitor Rice noted there is not much recourse for a legislative decision by a local governing body. Solicitor Rice believes all three of the Supervisors have some doubt about various provisions of the proposed Zoning Ordinance.

Mr. Theis feels there is a potential conflict of interest on the part of Supervisor Fox by being a member of the Board of Supervisors, as well as a member of the Planning Commission. Since this document was written by the Planning Commission, Mr. Theis has real concerns about Supervisor Fox being a member of both boards.

As of right now, Mr. Theis asked Chairman Bennett and Supervisor Fox how they would vote on this Ordinance, so that the residents present this evening will have a feel as to whether their comments have truly been heard. Supervisor Fox stated that he can not answer that question. The law says that any changes made to this draft document must go back to the Planning Commission for further review. The Planning Commission will then forward their comments and input to the Board of Supervisors. Chairman Bennett believes those residents present at the previous meeting heard his comments on one or two of the major issues, and stated that he would not approve the proposed Ordinance at this time. The Board of Supervisors will review the comments made this evening and take into consideration all points made by residents.

19. **Mrs. Jean Bolger** of Rt. 152 wondered why the Supervisors did not answer any direct questions from residents this evening. Chairman Bennett stated it was explained at the beginning of this meeting that comments would be heard, however this meeting was not a debate. Mrs. Bolger feels the residents deserve an answer to their questions.

As a taxpayer, Mrs. Bolger stated that she and the other residents present this evening are indirectly paying Solicitor Rice's salary, yet earlier he refused to give Mr. Theis an answer to his question.

20. **Mr. Pete Ehly** of 116 Pheasant Hill Road asked how the Planning Commission determined which changes to make to the Zoning Ordinance. Chairman Bennett replied the draft document consists of the combined input of all seven members of the Planning Commission, who have been working on this project for several years. Mr. Ehly asked if the residents who asked questions at this hearing will receive responses at the meeting to be held on November 28, 1994.

21. **Mr. Tom Tincknell** of Northview Road opposes the proposal for home inspections, stating that it is not the responsibility or function of the Township.

22. **Mr. Joe Phillips** of Middle Road, who is the vice-chairman of the Planning Commission, would like to address the question raised by Mr. Ehly. Mr. Phillips explained the Planning Commission is comprised of seven members from various backgrounds and with various amounts of seniority on the commission. The Planning Commission is guided by the Comprehensive Plan which was adopted in 1991, and according to that Plan, the Planning Commission is charged to bring the Zoning Ordinance into compliance with it. Those guidelines from the Comprehensive Plan, as well as input from the Commission members, the Township Solicitor, the Bucks County Planning Commission, and the Township Engineer, has helped to mold the proposed Zoning Ordinance. Mr. Phillips stated the Planning Commission welcomes residents comments and have asked the Supervisors to submit these comments to them for review. Mr. Phillips commented the taxpayers of this Township do have a voice, and the Planning Commission does have ears. All comments made this evening are appreciated and will be taken into consideration.

B. Adjournment: The Public Hearing for the Proposed Zoning Ordinance was adjourned at 7:40 PM, and Chairman Bennett called for a ten minute recess before beginning the regularly scheduled Board of Supervisors Worksession Meeting of November 14, 1994.

Respectfully submitted,

Lynda S. Seimes

Lynda S. Seimes
Administrative Secretary

(*These minutes were transcribed from tape recordings taken by Mr. Bruce G. Horrocks, Township Manager).