

HILLTOWN TOWNSHIP BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
REGULARLY SCHEDULED PUBLIC MEETING
Monday, June 22, 1992
7:30PM

The meeting of the Hilltown Township Board of Supervisors was called to order by Chairman William H. Bennett, Jr. at 7:35PM and opened with the Pledge of Allegiance.

Also present were: Kenneth B. Bennington, Vice-Chairman
Jack C. Fox, Supervisor
Bruce G. Horrocks, Township Manager
John Rice, Township Solicitor
C. Robert Wynn, Township Engineer
George C. Egly, Chief of Police
Lynda Seimes, Township Secretary

Chairman Bennett announced the Board met with the Township Solicitor in Executive Session prior to this meeting to discuss personnel and legal matters.

A. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Action on the minutes of the May 26, 1992 Board of Supervisor's Meeting:

Supervisor Fox noted the following corrections:

Page four, second paragraph should state "Supervisor Fox was in agreement about not selling the parcel located on Rt. 113 and Callowhill Road, however he noted the Park and Recreation Board felt a small neighborhood park could possibly be developed."

Page six, first paragraph should read "A decision was made by the Zoning officer, which cannot be overruled by the Board of Supervisors, but in effect, the Supervisors can choose to not enforce the order, if they so desire." Supervisor Fox noted the Code Enforcement Officer's decisions can only be overruled by the Zoning Hearing Board.

Page seven, third paragraph, last sentence, should state "Supervisor Fox felt Mr. Applegate was now interpreting the Ordinance the way it should have been interpreted."

Motion was made by Supervisor Fox, seconded by Supervisor Bennington, and carried unanimously to approve the minutes of the May 26, 1992 Board of Supervisor's meeting, as corrected.

B. APPROVAL OF CURRENT BILLING:

Chairman Bennett presented two Bill's List for payment. The first is dated May 27, 1992, and totals \$80,050.89 of regular payments, with State Highway Aid payments in the amount of an additional \$1,059.11, for a grand total of \$81,110.00. The larger bills were payment on the previous loan to Union National Bank of \$25,000.00.

Chairman Bennett advised this was a loan in the amount of \$100,000.00, and this payment reduces the Township's outstanding debt to \$50,000.00. One of the most significant bills on this list is for Workman's Compensation in the amount of \$14,571.00, and also a monthly hospital insurance payment in the amount of \$10,233.53.

Motion was made by Supervisor Fox, seconded by Supervisor Bennington, and carried unanimously to approve the Bill's List dated May 27, 1992, subject to audit.

The second Bill's List is due June 10, 1992, and totals \$156,972.27. The major item was for the State Highway Aid account to purchase a 1992 GMC pick-up truck in the amount of \$50,884.00. This truck replaces a 1975 truck. Chairman Bennett feels the Public Works Department did an excellent job in making it last as long as it has. Chairman Bennett mentioned there was a bill from Wampole-Miller in the amount of \$3,850.00 for the Rt. 113 and Diamond Street flashing 'Stop Ahead' light. There was also a payment out of the Debt Service account on the outstanding Bond in the amount of \$79,207.00, which is a payment that is made twice a year.

Motion was made by Supervisor Fox, seconded by Supervisor Bennington, and carried unanimously to approve the Bill's List dated June 10, 1992, subject to audit.

C. TREASURER'S REPORT;

Mr. Horrocks, Township Manager, presented the Treasurer's Report with the following balances, as of June 22, 1992:

General Fund Checking Account - \$282,096.61
Payroll Checking Account - \$182.82
Fire Fund Checking Account - \$120,440.52
Debt Service Checking Account - \$92,815.32
State Highway Aid Checking Account - \$133,561.15
Escrow Fund Checking Account - \$122,160.11

For the Board's information, in this week's General Fund checks, there will be a check written to Union National Bank for the balance of the \$50,000.00, which is the total outstanding amount on the Tax Anticipation Note. Mr. Horrocks advised this is possibly due to a combination of increased revenues and reduced expenditures.

Chairman Bennett asked if the amount listed in the Fire Fund Checking Account was before or after the July 1, 1992 disbursement to the fire companies. Mr. Horrocks replied it was before the payments to the fire companies. Those particular checks were dated June 24, 1992. The total of the payments to the fire companies is approximately \$42,500.00.

Motion was made by Supervisor Fox, seconded by Supervisor Bennington, and carried unanimously to accept the June 22, 1992 Treasurer's Report, subject to audit.

D. RESIDENT'S COMMENTS ON AGENDA ITEMS ONLY: None.

E. CONFIRMED APPOINTMENTS: None.

F. MANAGER'S REPORT - Mr. Bruce Horrocks, Township Manager:

1. Bids were opened at the June 15, 1992 Board of Supervisor's Worksession, including the following:

- Bid #92-2 - Binder and Wearing Course - Installed
- Bid #92-3 - Binder and Wearing Course - Pick-up Materials
- Bid #92-4 - Aggregate (Stone)
- Bid #92-5 - Bituminous Seal Coat - Installed

The low bidder on Bid #92-2 was M and M Stone, in the amount of \$12,112.50 for Binder, and \$13,846.00 for Wearing Course.

The low bidder on Bid #92-3 was H and K Materials, in the amount of \$8,250.00 for Binder, and \$22,812.50 for Wearing Course.

The low bidder on Bid #92-4 was H and K Materials, in the amount of \$9,150.00 for 1B C Stone, \$2,350.00 for 2A M Stone, \$305.00 for 2C Stone, \$250.00 for 3A C stone, \$970.00 for 3A M Stone, \$1,000.00 for 4C Stone, \$880.00 for 5M Stone, and \$1,000.00 for Surge.

The low bidder on Bid #92-5 was Hi-Way Maintenance in the amount of \$28,377.40.

Motion was made by Supervisor Bennington, seconded by Supervisor Fox, and carried unanimously to award Bid #92-2 (Binder and Wearing Course - Installed) to M and M Stone, Bid #92-3 (Binder and Wearing Course - Pick-up Materials) to H and K Materials, Bid #92-4 (Aggregate) to H and K Materials, and Bid #92-5 (Bituminous Seal Coat - Installed) to Hi-Way Maintenance.

2. The Board received two recommendations from the Park and Recreation Board, which follow:

Recommendation #92-6 - The Park and Recreation Board recommends that a sign be purchased and installed at the Civic Field indicating it to be a "FUTURE SITE OF THE HILLTOWN TOWNSHIP PARK AND RECREATION COMPLEX". It should also indicate that the land was donated by the Hilltown Civic Association and acknowledge the Hilltown Township Park and Recreation Board.

1247

Recommendation #92-7 - The Park and Recreation Board recommends that the Supervisors approve the following improvements to the Blooming Glen Park and authorize sufficient funds to: 1) Install a Tot Lot in or adjacent to the picnic grove; 2) Install two basketball backstops and lay down lines in the Old Hilltown High School parking lot; 3) Upgrade the baseball field, replace the backstop and remove the old light standards; and 4) Repair the picnic tables in the picnic grove. It is estimated that the total cost for all of these improvements would be approximately \$20,000 and the Park and Recreation Board recommends that \$20,000 be authorized.

Motion was made by Supervisor Bennington, seconded by Supervisor Fox, and carried unanimously to adopt the Park and Recreation Board Recommendation #92-6 to purchase and install a temporary sign at the former Civic Association Field, during construction of the park.

Discussion took place concerning Recommendation #92-7. Originally, Chairman Bennett noted, funds in the amount of \$25,000.00 were allocated and available in the Bond Issue for renovations at the Blooming Glen Field. Supervisor Bennington asked if Mr. Wynn, in his expert opinion, thought the \$20,000.00 requested would cover these suggested improvements. Mr. Wynn replied he is not sure to what extent the Tot Lot would be, or the upgrading of the baseball field. He would imagine the Park and Recreation Board obtained some estimates for this specific work. Supervisor Fox advised the Park and Recreation Board did obtain estimates for the backstop, and discovered to repair it would probably be costlier than to replace it.

Chairman Bennett asked if it was likely that the Park and Recreation Board will have further recommendations in the future for this particular site. Mr. Horrocks believes the Park and Recreation Board realizes that the former Civic Field, in all likelihood, would be out of commission for at least 1 1/2 or 2 years, due to the amount of ground work that is being done. With that in mind, the Park and Recreation Board wished to offer the residents of the Township the alternative of some sort of recreational park, during the construction period of the former Civic Field. Chairman Bennett noted the Park and Recreation Board should be aware that the Board of Supervisors had originally authorized \$25,000.00 towards improvements on that site.

Supervisor Bennington is concerned about the funds for this project coming from the Bond Fund, since a large sum of money will be spent for renovations to the former Civic Field, and he would like to receive a bit more information before voting on the matter. Supervisor Fox attended the last Park and Recreation Board meeting, and he stated it was the feeling of that board that they would save over \$100,000.00, by not having to drain or resurface the entire field. Supervisor Fox believes Carter Van Dyke's figure was

approximately \$192,000.00. The Park and Recreation Board feels they will save at least \$100,000.00 by not going through all the drainage, therefore making that money available.

Chairman Bennett commented if the Board were to table action on the Park and Recreation Board's request this evening, construction on the site would be delayed at least another month.

Chairman Bennett is inclined to vote in favor of Recommendation #92-7, with the Park and Recreation Board's understanding that the \$20,000.00 they have requested for improvements at the Blooming Glen Park is the major part of the \$25,000.00 originally allocated for that site.

Motion was made by Supervisor Fox, and seconded by Chairman Bennett to approve Park and Recreation Board Recommendation #92-7, to improve the Blooming Glen Park and authorize sufficient funds, as outlined above. Supervisor Bennington abstained, pending receipt of additional information. He believes that to replace the backstop, rather than repairing it, would be much more costly. Supervisor Bennington wishes to view cost estimates and quotes for the work that is specified in the Park and Recreation Board recommendation.

Chairman Bennett would like it understood that the cost of improvements has been limited to \$20,000.00. If the recommended improvements cannot be completed staying within the \$20,000.00 limit, the Park and Recreation Board may have to modify their original request.

3. Mr. Horrocks requested the Board's input concerning the recommendation from the Park and Recreation Board, to himself, as the Construction Manager of the former Civic Field project, to bury the power and telephone cable, in from Rt. 152 to the existing concession stand. The exact cost through PP&L would be \$3,385.00. Again, these funds would be coming from the Bond money that has been allocated for that park.

Chairman Bennett asked if this was a "cosmetic improvement". Mr. Wynn replied placing these cables underground also has the benefit of not requiring replacement in the future. The existing line will ultimately be replaced, including the pole and the line. Once a cable is buried, it would be permanent, and would require no replacement in the future. Discussion took place concerning this issue. Chairman Bennett and the Board felt it was a low priority at this time.

4. Mr. Horrocks publicly thanked Mr. Samuel Pierce for his donation of approximately fifty loads of fill and topsoil for construction of the park at the former Civic Association field site.

5. Mr. Horrocks presented the following twenty Escrow Releases for the Board's approval. Of the twenty releases, three releases for the Stone Subdivision are cash funds retained by the Township:

BFI	Voucher 10	\$ 4,185.00
BFI	Voucher 11	\$ 1,724.33
Cefelli	Voucher 8	\$ 290.18
Cheeks, Inc.	Voucher 11	\$ 357.33
Cheeks, Inc.	Voucher 12	\$23,003.23
Deerfield	Voucher 29	\$ 7,936.20
Garges Land Development	Voucher 02	\$ 183.05
Orchard Station	Voucher 22	\$ 180.90
Pleasant Meadows, Phase II	Voucher 24	\$ 248.58
Richter Drafting	Voucher 02	\$ 6,516.40
Skyline Estates	Voucher 08	\$ 339.30
Skyline Estates	Voucher 09	\$ 5,959.32
Sterling Knoll, Phase II	Voucher 47	\$12,085.37
Stone Subdiv. (Lot #1)	Voucher 05	\$ 3,217.50
Stone Subdiv. (Lot #1)	Voucher 06	\$ 370.13
Stone Subdiv. (Lot #2)	Voucher 03	\$ 2,767.50
Stoneycrest	Voucher 08	\$ 579.55
St. Philips Church	Voucher 01	\$25,674.75
St. Philips Church	Voucher 02	\$ 2,852.75
St. Philips Church	Voucher 03	\$ 1,223.83

Motion was made by Supervisor Fox, seconded by Supervisor Bennington, and carried unanimously to release the twenty Escrows listed above.

6. Mr. Horrocks is requesting the Board's decision in the naming of the former Hilltown Civic Association field. A contest was sponsored in late 1991, by the Park and Recreation Board, and their plan was to award a \$50.00 Savings Bond to the winning entry. The entrants have been narrowed down to the following:

Hilltown Civic Association Park
 Hilltown Township Memorial Park
 Hilltown Civic Association Field

Motion was made by Supervisor Bennington, seconded by Supervisor Fox, and carried unanimously to adopt the first recommendation of the Park and Recreation Board, which is "Hilltown Civic Association Park" as the name for the future park. Supervisor Fox also recommended that the name chosen by the Board be added to the temporary construction sign to be placed at the future park.

Mr. Horrocks announced the resident who had submitted the winning entry was Mrs. Alice Camburn.

G. CORRESPONDENCE;

1. Mr. Horrocks mentioned that the iron bridge on Quarry Road, located between Rt. 313 and Forest Road, will be closed from 9:00AM until 4:00PM daily from July 6, 1992, through July 31, 1992. The bridge will be open for travel during evening hours. Bucks County forces will commence with repairing the bridge.

2. Hilltown Township has received the Bucks County Planning Commission's Transportation "12 Year Plan" Update - dated 1992 to 2004.

3. Correspondence was received this date from Franconia Township, requesting Hilltown Township to sign on a Mutual Aid Agreement, which is strictly for emergency services. Mr. Horrocks requested that Chief Egly and the Township Solicitor review the Mutual Aid Agreement, along with the Board of Supervisors.

4. A grant of a 90 day extension was received from Mrs. Mary Lou Wagner concerning her subdivision.

5. For the Board's information, the Township was notified of a change in Bonding companies from Berkheimer Associates on the Earned Income Tax and the Occupational Privilege Tax. This is a something they bond themselves for Hilltown Township funds.

6. A letter was received from PennDot concerning illegal signs on State roads within Hilltown Township. Mr. Horrocks has forwarded a copy to the Code Enforcement Officer today to receive his recommendations. If the numbers indicated by PennDot are correct, there is a rather significant amount of illegal signs on Rt. 309, Rt. 152, Rt. 113, and Rt. 313 in Hilltown Township.

H. SOLICITOR'S REPORT - Mr. John Rice, Township Solicitor's Office:

1. Mr. Rice presented two Resolutions for the Board's consideration this evening, relating to the Ludlow Subdivision. One is to accept the Deed of Dedication, and the second would be to declare public purpose for the Deed of Dedication, and notifying the Bucks County Board of Assessment of acceptance and filing for the Ludlow Subdivision.

Motion was made by Supervisor Bennington, seconded by Supervisor Fox, and carried unanimously to adopt Resolution #92-25 to accept the Deed of Dedication for the Ludlow Subdivision, and to adopt Resolution #92-26 to declare Public Purpose for the Ludlow Subdivision.

I. PLANNING - Mr. C.R. Wynn, Township Engineer:

1. Finkelstein Subdivision - Mr. Wynn advised this is the final plan of subdivision for the Finkelstein property located on Diamond Street. Previously, the preliminary plan received approval by the Board of Supervisors on March 23, 1992. The plan proposes four lots, with two of those lots consisting of three acre parcels, and two lots consisting of approximately three quarters of an acre each, located in the Country Residential Zoning District. All four lots are to be served by public water and sewer from the Hilltown Township Water and Sewer Authority. The rear of the property contains floodplains and wetlands, and is proposed to remain open.

Mr. Wynn advised this was the property in which the applicant had requested and received waivers from street improvements during the preliminary plan stage. In consideration of the waiver of those street improvements, the applicant has offered a capital contribution in the amount of \$16,250.00, which still must be received. In addition, some trees along the roadway were to be removed. Those trees have been cut down, however the stumps are still remaining. The stumps will be removed because the Authority discovered that the water line is to be constructed directly beneath those stumps. Receipt of Planning Module approval from DER and final approval from the Hilltown Township Water and Sewer Authority is still required. The applicant must apply for an Escrow Agreement for the installation of the water line extension along the frontage of the site, as well as restoration of the roadway for sewer laterals.

Some of the remaining conditions recommended by the Planning Commission include approval from PennDot for the driveway accesses, and the utility construction. Installation of property pins and monuments at the outboundary of all lots, and dedication of the roadway right-of-way to the Township is also required. The Township has received the legal description, which will be forwarded to the Township Solicitor for preparation of the dedication documents. There was one item included in the Planning Commission recommendation, which is not noted on the Board's summary this evening, because it was received immediately following the meeting, and that is the approval from the Bucks County Conservation District. The approval was actually dated in February, however, neither the Township nor Mr. Wynn's office was copied on that at the time.

Motion was made by Supervisor Bennington, seconded by Supervisor Fox, and carried unanimously to grant final plan approval to the Finkelstein (Diamond Street) Subdivision plan, with the conditions set forth by the Planning Commission's recommendations, as noted in Mr. Wynn's engineering review letter.

J. ENGINEERING - Mr. C.R. Wynn, Township Engineer:

1. Reliance Road/Bethlehem Pike Intersection - Mr. Wynn explained BFI is close to completing the construction improvements to Reliance Road, including the intersection of Reliance Road and Bethlehem Pike, which was widened and had an extra turn lane added. One of the requirements of the BFI plan approval is the installation of a traffic signal at Reliance Road and Bethlehem Pike. During the planning stages, a study was conducted by BFI's traffic engineer, who discovered that the intersection almost, but not quite, meets the warrants established by PennDot for installation of a traffic signal. It was felt that additional traffic that occurs naturally, plus the addition of BFI traffic would most likely warrant a traffic signal.

At this time, Mr. Wynn requested that the Board adopt a Resolution for application for permit to install and operate traffic signals. It would be a Resolution for Hilltown Township to erect, operate, and maintain a traffic signal at Bethlehem Pike and Reliance Road. The Township would be responsible for providing the Department of Transportation with an engineering drawing of the location. In the event the traffic signal is warranted by PennDot, approval will be granted and the traffic signal will be installed and maintained in accordance with the regulations for traffic signs and signals, and warranted by the Department of Transportation. The adoption of the Resolution, as well as the submission of three years of accident reports is necessary, in order for PennDot to begin a warrant study at the intersection.

Chairman Bennett asked if this particular intersection was previously warranted by PennDot. Mr. Wynn replied PennDot did not complete a warrant study, rather it was a study conducted by McMann Associates for BFI, during the planning stages, which found that the traffic light did not meet the warrants at that time, but were very close. The criteria has changed, Mr. Wynn noted, which actually makes it easier to establish the need for traffic signals. In the execution of the agreements and approval of the land development plan, escrow funds were required of BFI, to provide for the design and installation of the traffic signal. Those funds total \$100,000.00, which are in escrow. Chairman Bennett asked if the total of funds includes the road improvements, or just the traffic signal. Mr. Wynn replied these funds are in addition to the road improvements. Road improvements are approximately 95% complete at this point.

Supervisor Bennington asked what will happen if a traffic light is not warranted at this particular intersection. In the case that the State would not authorize a traffic signal at the intersection at this time, Mr. Wynn replied, BFI would most likely appear before this Board again, since the agreement requires that the traffic light be installed. That would then require an amendment of some sort to the original approval.

1253
Chief Egly asked if PennDot will take into consideration the increased amount of traffic which would take place once BFI is fully operational. Mr. Wynn explained one of the problems with the BFI traffic being counted in the survey is that the trucks do not run during normal rush hour time periods. Chief Egly felt that the increased BFI traffic would still cause traffic problems or possibly accidents. Chairman Bennett felt PennDot's study would not be very accurate unless they took into consideration the increased traffic due to the BFI development. Mr. Wynn noted that information is part of the criteria involved in PennDot's study. Discussion took place concerning PennDot's jurisdiction over local and State roadways.

Motion was made by Supervisor Bennington, seconded by Supervisor Fox, and carried unanimously to adopt Resolution #92-27 to authorize application for a permit to PennDot to install and operate a traffic signal in support of the intersection at Reliance Road and Bethlehem Pike.

2. Skyline Estates - In March of 1992, the Board authorized Mr. Wynn to notify the developer of Skyline Estates to replace several dead buffer plantings, which has now been completed. Mr. Wynn wishes to alert the Board that there are dead trees on the site, which are not the trees that were planted as a course of this development, but by purchasers of lots in this development. The trees that were initially planted, as required by the buffer, have been replaced. Mr. Wynn recommends the Board approve, by motion, the acceptance of their completion.

Motion was made by Supervisor Fox, seconded by Supervisor Bennington, and carried unanimously to approve the acceptance of the completion of buffer plantings for Skyline Estates, as specified above.

3. Richter Drafting Land Development - Mr. Wynn stated Richter Drafting Land Development has completed all their requirements, with the exception of the planting of two trees. The applicant is requesting that the Board accept the improvements and commence the 18 month maintenance period, without the installation of the trees along the frontage of the site. The two trees, noted on the landscape plan, were proposed in front of the existing twin home. The site is located on Rt. 113, across from Souderton Shopping Center. The applicant has managed to maintain a maple tree on one side of the driveway. There are also some rather large trees in front of the other half of the twin home. Required buffer plantings have been installed to the rear of the site.

Motion was made by Supervisor Fox, seconded by Supervisor Bennington, and carried unanimously to grant Richter Drafting Land Development relief from installation of the two trees, as discussed above, and accepts the commencement of the 18 month maintenance period, as specified by Mr. Wynn.

4. Cheeks, Inc. - This site is located next to Keyser-Miller Ford. The applicant has installed all of their public improvements and has requested the maintenance period to begin. The applicant had previously requested not to install some of the plantings, but did not like the response from the Board, and decided to do it. The applicant has installed the plantings that were required by the plan, and all other improvements.

Mr. Wynn commented one other non-public improvement which has not yet been installed is the driveway which gives access to the dwelling at the front of the site. This was not a required public improvement, however just a design feature of their plan, and it was all graded as grass. Apparently, the applicant may be having a change of heart of what they will eventually do with the building, and have indicated they will install that in the future, if they utilize the building. The building is vacant at this time. There is presently a curb cut for the driveway, however the asphalt was never installed. Roadway widening improvements, the basin, and tree plantings are complete, and the right-of-way fence has been replaced. Mr. Wynn recommended the 18 month maintenance period commences.

Motion was made by Supervisor Fox, seconded by Supervisor Bennington, and carried unanimously, that the 18 month maintenance period for Cheeks, Inc. commence, and the escrow be reduced to 10%.

5. Underground Storage Tanks - In the past, Mr. Wynn stated, the Board had discussed underground storage tank removal. There are presently three tanks involved, with one located at the former Township Building and two located at the Public Works building. Mr. Wynn understands the Township desires to do much of this work themselves in order to reduce the cost. Mr. Wynn suggested the Board seek proposals for the cutting open and cleaning of the tanks, with the Township Public Works Department doing the excavation, and stock piling of any contaminated soils. The Township could then prepare the closure report, take the necessary soil samples, and seek another contractor to remove the contaminated fill, once the exact amount has been determined. The contaminated fill may be stored on-site for up to one year.

Supervisor Bennington asked who makes the determination of how far down the soil is contaminated. Mr. Wynn replied his office would do that. Discussion took place concerning testing for contaminated soil. Chairman Bennett asked if it was safe to assume the soils in these areas are contaminated. Mr. Wynn noted his office has been involved with a number of tank removals, and to this point, there has not been one that did not have some contamination of soils.

Supervisor Fox asked if the tanks will be replaced with an aboveground tank. Mr. Horrocks replied that decision is up to the Board of Supervisors, and there are funds available in the budget

for that purpose. It is planned that an aboveground tank containing gasoline would be located here at the Municipal Building, and a tank containing diesel fuel would be located at the Public Works Building. Chairman Bennett commented the idea of installing a lock station, such as the one at West Rockhill Township, has been abandoned due to the high cost involved. Mr. Horrocks noted it would cost approximately 11 cents per gallon more to utilize the same system that West Rockhill presently uses, though the cost varies.

Mr. Wynn explained some preliminary testing has been done to check for DEX and total hydrocarbons in the water at both the Public Works building and the former Municipal Building. The findings reported that both wells were clean. Supervisor Bennington asked if the work were to begin on the tank removal in August or September, how long it would take to actually complete the job. Mr. Wynn replied it would be a matter of scheduling between the Public Works Department and the contractor. Cleaning the tanks themselves, if they are prepared beforehand, is normally a two day job. After that takes place, it is a matter of the Public Works Department being available to do the excavation.

Chairman Bennett asked where the contaminated soils will be hauled to. Mr. Wynn stated the dump sites vary, anywhere from Michigan to Plainfield Township, Northampton County, to Baltimore, Maryland.

Mr. Wynn will meet with Mr. Horrocks and Mr. Buzby to proceed with the plans for underground storage tank removal.

6. Supervisor Bennington asked Mr. Wynn to explain the history of the Rt. 152 and Orchard Road intersection, and why construction was originally proposed.

Mr. Wynn stated the situation actually started when the Phinney Subdivision (which is Tice Lane) was constructed across the street from this intersection. Mr. Phinney had requested a waiver of curb and sidewalk along the frontage of his development. One of the concerns of the Township Supervisors and of the Planning Commission was the poor alignment Orchard Road and Rt. 152 (Walnut Street). Mr. Phinney made a contribution to the Township for improvements he would have been required to do along the frontage of the site. That contribution was for the purpose of realigning the roadway. At that time, there was a State act which provided for Impact Fees, based upon transportation impact studies. The Township, interested in completing a transportation study, began the work necessary to pass an Impact Fee Ordinance for new development. There were two Ordinances already passed in the lower end of Bucks County.

Mr. Wynn's office had borrowed traffic counters from PennDot and began to determine traffic volumes at various Township intersections. Of the roadways which were studied, Orchard Road, between Rt. 152 and Diamond Street, was the heaviest traveled

Township road at the time. In doing traffic counts, Mr. Wynn's office observed that there were delays at the intersection of Orchard Road and Walnut Street. Much of the delay was caused primarily by motorists making left turns when entering Rt. 152. Right turns did not appear to cause any problems.

Mr. Hackett, seeking relief from some improvements to Diamond Street, donated funds which were not specifically earmarked for any project, however it was his intent to use it at this particular intersection. In the meantime, these funds had been placed in the General Fund and spent. They were not reserved for improvements at this intersection. Therefore, the initial design work, which began some time ago, was put "on hold" because the Township was out of funds.

A requirement of the Toth Brother's Hawk Ridge Subdivision was improvements towards the Swartley Road bridge. The Swartley Road bridge improvements were estimated at approximately \$88,000.00. This Board, with the exception of Supervisor Fox, who was not a Supervisor at the time, decided this particular intersection was a higher priority job than the Swartley Road bridge. Toth Brothers agreed to contribute the funds for this project, rather than improving the Swartley Road bridge. The Township preserved these monies in a separate account and the funds have been held for the specific purpose of the completion of this project. Finalization of the design work for this project was then completed, and a valid PennDot permit was received for the intersection alignment. The alignment is such to provide for a left and right turn lane, and is narrower and less imposing than initially desired by PennDot. PennDot originally requested a 4 ft. concrete center island at the intersection, an idea which Mr. Wynn's office persuaded them to drop.

Initially, Mr. Wynn explained, it was discussed that the improvements were originally proposed as a single lane, however in the design process, his office never proposed a single lane. The biggest problem with the intersection at this point is the intersection angle. Currently the roadway is approximately 19 ft. wide, and the roadway at the intersection is 40 ft., which provides for a right and left turn lane in the opposite direction. Supervisor Bennington asked if a school bus can make that turn without the possibility of toppling over, which is his biggest concern. Mr. Wynn replied whether it is proposed as one lane or as two lanes at the approach to Rt. 152, the alignment is such that it is a perpendicular alignment of approximately 35 degrees, so that a truck or a bus could make the turn. There is still a significant amount of encroachment within the frontage of the Sarnese property, as well as a significant cost for the project.

Supervisor Bennington asked if the turning lane is not put in, will the project still cost the same amount of money. Mr. Wynn replied the lack of the turning lane may reduce the cost of the project by

1257

approximately 10%. Supervisor Bennington asked if the turning lane would be added due to future development on Hillcrest Road and Diamond Street. Mr. Wynn noted future development is not the only reason for the addition of a turning lane, as there are presently traffic delays at this intersection during rush hour periods. There is also a pending proposal for an additional development on Orchard Road, including Elysian Fields, and possibly the Finkelstein property. In addition, surveys have been done on the 90+ acre parcel between Hillcrest Road and Diamond Street, though Mr. Wynn does not know of any actual plans for that parcel at this time. The likelihood of increased traffic is certainly significant, and personally, Mr. Wynn would recommend installation of the turning lane.

Supervisor Fox asked if those monies still available to complete the project. Mr. Horrocks replied the money is available in the Escrow Fund.

Supervisor Bennington questioned the curbing which will be placed from Pleasant Springs Lane to the intersection. Mr. Wynn explained one reason for the curbing is that it will prevent the quick deterioration of the roadway. Also, curbing defines the roadway, and defines the intersection so that vehicles will not cut the corner short, and it helps with drainage as well. The proposed curbing would be an extension of curbing that, under the Elysian Fields plan, was to extend from Pleasant Springs Lane all the way to Hillcrest Road. Eventually, the entire span of Orchard Road from Diamond Street to Rt. 152 will need to be widened.

K. RESIDENT'S COMMENTS:

1. Mr. David Schmidt - 16 Orchard Road - Mr. Schmidt expressed his concerns, as one of the directly affected homeowners of the proposed project at Rt. 152 and Orchard Road. Since the issue of safety came up earlier, Mr. Schmidt commented that moving the street closer to the crest of the hill, at a right angle would be very dangerous, as there are now cars that come over that hill very quickly. If Orchard Road is moved closer to the crest of that hill, Mr. Schmidt wondered if the car that is waiting to make a left hand turn onto Orchard Road from Rt. 152, would be jeopardized. Mr. Schmidt asked if there is some way to accomplish what is being proposed for this intersection, without going to such an extreme cut in that corner. The Sarnese property will be losing roughly 25% as the improvements are proposed at present. Mr. Schmidt asked if there was a way to accomplish the safety aspect of the intersection, without taking so much of the Sarnese property.

Mr. Wynn commented sight distance is one of the first things that PennDot looks at to review any proposed intersection change. On this particular roadway, we are already approaching the limits of available sight distance by moving in that direction. There is,

however, 475 ft. of sight distance, and since 460 ft. is required, the Township still meets the State requirements.

Concerning the amount of property that Mr. and Mrs. Sarnese will be losing, Mr. Wynn stated a lot of the property is a temporary construction easement, which can be significantly reduced if the slopes of the embankment are steepened. Part of this requirement came as a request from the Sarnese' family to flatten their bank so that they could mow it.

Mr. Schmidt understands there are water lines which must be lowered in the area. Mr. Wynn replied that is correct, however that cost will not be covered by the Township. The Hilltown Township Water and Sewer Authority has a separate project in this area to extend the water line along Rt. 152, and to make water line improvements. Mr. Wynn is not sure of the exact extent of all the work involved in the Water and Sewer Authority's project.

Mr. Schmidt asked the total cost of the roadway improvement project for this intersection. Mr. Wynn had estimated construction costs of \$77,000.00 to \$80,000.00 quite some time ago. Mr. Schmidt asked if that took into account costs for easements. Mr. Schmidt understood that there are very few temporary easements, that most of them are permanent. Mr. Schmidt asked if that means at some future time the roadway will be widened, and if so, when. Mr. Schmidt asked if new deeds, title searches, or surveys will be required. Mr. Schmidt also fears disturbance or possible destruction of root systems of existing trees and shrubs. Another concern Mr. Schmidt had was regarding the relocation of all mailboxes due to the placement of the driveways.

Mr. Schmidt spoke to a landscaper who said the value of his dogwood tree is approximately \$600.00 if it is cut down, and to replace it would be \$900.00. Mr. Schmidt also has a cherry tree which he was told was worth \$1,200.00, and to replace that would be an additional \$300.00. Mr. Schmidt has two pin oak trees which have been there since 1955, which the landscaper advised are priceless. If digging is done for the construction easements, Mr. Schmidt fears root systems will be disturbed and questioned how he would be compensated for the damage that could ultimately be done to any of these trees, shrubs or plants. The amount of money that is set aside for this project does not appear to be enough to cover the losses that some people might incur.

Mr. John Rice, Township Solicitor, addressed Mr. Schmidt's comments and stated the easements will be defined areas. As Mr. Wynn previously stated, the Hilltown Township Water and Sewer Authority, which is a separate body, has a project in this area, involving lowering the water lines. In conjunction with that, the Water and Sewer Authority intends to pay for the land acquisition costs for this project. This will not be a Township cost. The Township would be getting the easement, and in some cases, the Township

and the Authority will be getting the easements. Mr. Rice asked Mr. Schmidt if he has received an easement document. Mr. Schmidt replied the he has not, however, he will be meeting with Mr. Wynn on Wednesday night. In speaking with his neighbors, Mr. Schmidt noted they have an easement of 10 feet from the new curb line, and he suspects his will be very similar to that. If that easement is correct, this will directly affect Mr. Schmidt's dogwood tree and the root systems of his other three trees.

Mr. Wynn stated the actual curb line is within the legal right-of-way, and the Township could install the curb line and the road widening without any easement from Mr. Schmidt. However the Township can not make the transition of his yard to the curb, because that would have to occur beyond the right-of-way. Therefore, the only work being done in the easement area will be basically either a transition in Mr. Schmidt's driveway, or topsoil placement, so that the yard is graded to the curb, and can be maintained. The digging will be at the existing curb, at the radius, with all other excavation taking place on the road side of that. Mr. Wynn felt Mr. Schmidt's trees are located back beyond that line.

Another question Mr. Schmidt proposed was concerning the drainage. With water rushing down now, without curbing, the water runs off onto the ground. In Mr. Schmidt's particular case, because his driveway is downhill, water would rush down into his driveway once curbing is installed. Mr. Schmidt asked what will be done to remedy this problem. Mr. Wynn replied there will be a lip, approximately 1 1/2 inch in height, on the concrete curb to control the flow onto the street. The water should then flow down into the inlet system provided at the intersection. Mr. Schmidt advised there is an existing culvert in front of his driveway, and asked what will happen with that. Mr. Wynn stated that culvert is something a prior homeowner installed, and it will be removed because it is in the right-of-way. Mr. Schmidt asked why the 1 1/2 inch concrete lip could not be used all along the edge of the property, instead of being a full height curb. Mr. Wynn explained traffic would not be controlled to the roadway.

Another of Mr. Schmidt's concerns is regarding parking. The residents of Orchard Road have no place to park their cars, off-street, other than their driveways at this time. In Pleasant Meadows, the residents are able to park their vehicles on one side of the street. If full curbing is to be installed in front of their homes, Mr. Schmidt has spoken to several neighbors and they are agreeable to installation of a lower curb, which would allow them access to off-street parking. However by constructing a full height curb, it will eliminate completely, the possibility of the residents having access to off-street parking. Pleasant Springs Drive currently has "No Parking" signs erected on both sides of the street.

In the Perkasio Fire of 1987, several streets in Perkasio had to be re-configured and re-designed to currently allow parallel parking on both sides of the street in that affected area. Mr. Schmidt would like to see the residents of Orchard Road be afforded that same courtesy. Perhaps the signs that say "No Parking" on one side of Pleasant Springs Drive could be removed.

Supervisor Bennington did not see any problem with installing the lower curb, as Mr. Schmidt had suggested, and asked Mr. Wynn for his opinion. Mr. Wynn replied the Township would be installing curbing that conforms to State standards, as well as Township standards, which has an 8 inch reveal. It serves the purpose of controlling traffic to the road, as well as protecting the edge of the road. Most likely a lower curb would protect the edge of the road, however one thing the Board may not wish to encourage is the ability for vehicles to park along the roadway in front of these homes. If there is a curb that is mountable, some vehicles may not park completely off the road, and there will then be uncontrolled access to the property, with people actually backing out into the roadway. Mr. Wynn feels that would be a lot less desirable than attempting to accommodate parking at a nearby location, with some flexibility, perhaps on Pleasant Spring Lane.

Chairman Bennett commented there is a concern for emergency services in this area also. As long as there is still only one entrance/exit for Pleasant Meadows, there could be difficulty in emergency vehicles gaining access to the development. Several years ago in the wintertime, Chairman Bennett was in the area when the roadway into Pleasant Meadows was a sheet of ice. Chairman Bennett thought, at the time, if there had been need for an emergency vehicle to enter the development that morning, it would not have been possible. Mr. Schmidt understood that, but felt if just one side of that street could be donated to parking, with the traditional "No Parking Here to Corner" sign, it would give the residents of Orchard Road some place to park their vehicles.

Supervisor Fox asked Mr. Wynn the status of the other Pleasant Meadows bridge. Mr. Wynn replied it is presently being advertised in the Pennsylvania Bulletin, by letter from the Army Corp. of Engineers. They have 60 days from the date of the advertisement to either approve or deny the project. The Army Corp. of Engineers has indicated they have received responses from every agency, except two which typically do not give responses until the project is advertised. Those two agencies include the U.S. Wildlife Department and the Environmental Protection Agency. The permit from DER was issued 1 1/2 years ago, and actually expires in January. The delay has been caused by the Army Corp. of Engineers, who, as this Board knows, required two ft. deep monitoring wells in the mitigated wetland area that is being constructed on the site. Mr. Wynn noted there is 1/3 acre of wetland acre being developed on the site, with the monitoring wells used so that the Army Corp. of Engineers can determine how well the wetland area is

1261

working. There was also quite a bit of delay because of their concerns that DER issued the permit over the objection of the Pennsylvania Fish Commission, which was the only agency that objected to the proposed bridge. The Pennsylvania Fish Commission objected to the bridge because of the stream containing certain fish, which have since been relocated. Based upon information from the Army Corp. of Engineers, it is Mr. Wynn's estimate that if no new objections are raised, the permit will be issued within 60 days of the advertisement.

Mr. Wynn commented Mr. Garis presently has an escrow for this project, which is bank held, in the name of the Township and himself, in the approximate amount of \$109,000.00. Mr. Garis was before this Board last fall seeking to reduce that escrow because he had contractor estimates that indicated he could construct the bridge for approximately \$72,000.00, however the Township refused to reduce the escrow because he did not yet have a permit from the Army Corp. of Engineers.

Mr. Schmidt asked if the new bridge for Pleasant Meadows is constructed, would the Board consider the resident's request for parking on one side of Pleasant Springs Drive. Supervisor Bennington asked Chief Egly if there would be any problem with having "No Parking" signs on one side of that street only. Chief Egly explained the only reason "No Parking" signs were originally posted was due to that particular development having only one entrance/exit. Chairman Bennett commented the Board will take this request under advisement, however they would like to see the second entrance to Pleasant Meadows open before any changes were made. Mr. Schmidt noted he would also like to see the curb lowered as well.

2. Mr. Robert Cameron - 12 Orchard Road - Regarding the easements, Mr. Cameron asked why the easements are permanent, rather than temporary, if the Township intends to only disturb some topsoil. Mr. Cameron is concerned that widening of the roadway will take place in the future, and he will then have a very short front yard.

Mr. Wynn does not believe the Township will be widening the road in the near future, after this expenditure. Quite honestly, Mr. Wynn does not see why the easements could not be temporary rather than permanent. He is not sure how difficult it would be to change the easements from permanent to temporary. Mr. Wynn pointed out, on the plan, where the easements are located.

Supervisor Bennington asked the benefit of a temporary easement as opposed to a permanent easement. Mr. Wynn replied with the curb being located near the existing right-of-way line, if someone did place a fence or an obstruction, or planted shrubbery, which would affect visibility, the Township would have a permanent easement to clear it. Mr. Wynn did not see a problem with a temporary easement

as opposed to a permanent one. Solicitor Rice felt it was an engineering decision, and the project could be completed with a temporary easement.

With regards to the traffic study completed by Mr. Wynn's office, Mr. Cameron asked if the proposed Pleasant Meadows bridge opening would ease some of the traffic at the Orchard Road and Rt. 152 intersection. At the time his office did the traffic counts, Mr. Wynn does not believe the Pleasant Meadows development was complete. Certainly there were not as many homes in Orchard Station, and Mr. Wynn does not know, realistically, how much of the traffic would use Hillcrest Road to go into Perkasio, once the Pleasant Meadows bridge is open. Mr. Cameron felt the opening of that bridge might warrant another traffic study. Quite honestly, Mr. Wynn remarked the volume of traffic is such that it appears Pleasant Meadows does not generate the majority of traffic at the intersection, by any means. There are 110 homes in that development, and 110 homes can be expected to generate over 1,000 trips per day, which is only a small fraction of the vehicles that travel Orchard Road, according to the study.

3. Mrs. Patricia Garland - 8 Orchard Road - Mrs. Garland disagreed with some of the points Mr. Wynn has made this evening. Mrs. Garland has never had a problem making a left hand turn off Orchard Road onto Rt. 152, and she has lived there for five years. Mrs. Garland very rarely has to wait more than one minute to make a left hand turn onto Rt. 152. Another point of concern Mrs. Garland has is safety. Vehicles traveling on Rt. 152 rarely do so at the posted speed limit, but rather at speeds of approximately 60 or 55 mph. When vehicles crest that hill on Rt. 152, doing excessive speeds, Mrs. Garland is concerned from the safety aspect.

Mr. Wynn asked how many accidents have taken place at the intersection of Tice Lane and Rt. 152, which has even less visibility. Mrs. Garland felt the proposed improvements to the Rt. 152/Orchard Road intersection will have even greater impact on the right hand turns from the Tice Lane intersection. Mr. Wynn commented sight distance is a very important aspect of PennDot's studies, and is usually one of the major hurdles to get over in the review process. Mrs. Garland asked if PennDot completes the study using the speed limit of 40 mph. Mr. Wynn thought PennDot used 45 mph. as the speed limit in their study. Mrs. Garland advised vehicles do 50 or 55 mph. on that roadway, not speeds of 40 or 45 mph.

Mrs. Garland also questioned the Township's priorities. At the Rt. 113 and Diamond Street intersection, there are many accidents involving fatalities. At present there is a flashing light to warn of the intersection. Also, at Rt. 113 and Callowhill Road, there have been numerous accidents and mishaps, due to very poor visibility. Mrs. Garland asked how improvements to the Rt. 152 and Walnut Street intersection can be justified when there are many

1263

other intersections within the Township that are much more dangerous. There has never been one single accident at the Rt. 152/Orchard Road intersection. Mr. Wynn explained the particular intersections Mrs. Garland mentioned are all State highways, over which the Township has no jurisdiction. Rt. 152 is also a State highway, however, the other road at this intersection, Orchard Road, which has the bad alignment, is a Township roadway.

Mr. Wynn had mentioned earlier that this would be an \$80,000.00 project, however the land acquisitions will be coming from the Water and Sewer Authority. Mrs. Garland commented this is still the resident's tax monies that would be used. Supervisor Fox noted the monies come from the users of the Water and Sewer Authority's system.

Mrs. Garland stated the original plan for improvement of the Rt. 152/Walnut Street intersection had called for "shaving off" the embankment, which Mr. and Mrs. Sarnese had been willing to donate, and asked why this original idea could not be done. Mr. Wynn advised there was never an original plan that his office completed which suggested shaving the embankment, because that was not his direction. Mrs. Garland does not understand why the Township is spending all this money to improve upon an intersection that has never experienced a traffic accident.

Chairman Bennett explained there are literally dozens of intersections in this 27 mile Township that are dangerous intersections. The Township has repaired many of them to the best of our ability, depending on whether they are State or Township roadways, by means of signage, traffic lights in some cases, etc., however Hilltown Township is still a rural community. Because of the narrow roads in the Township, Chairman Bennett does not believe some of the roadways will ever be repaired to prevent accidents.

4. Mrs. Jean Bolger - Mrs. Bolger felt the present Board of Supervisors has inherited the sins of previous Boards. The original idea concerning this proposed project at Rt. 152/Orchard Road was shaving off the berm. Mrs. Bolger was present for many of the past Township meetings when this issue was discussed, and it was due to the problems experienced by the school bus having difficulty making the turn at the site. The fact that there are presently several developments located on Orchard Road, and several others proposed in that area, has contributed to the problem as it exists today. Mrs. Bolger finds it interesting that when subdivision/land development plans are approved, several years after the developments are completed, a traffic problem develops. Mrs. Bolger does not feel the Township should be paying for these intersection improvements. Mrs. Bolger does not wish to pit new development against former residents, however she feels when plans are submitted for new developments, both the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors should plan for increased traffic, traffic lights, water and sewer, etc. All these things tend to be

dumped on the residents after the developers have made their money and are gone.

Supervisor Fox commented the monies to be used for this project was donated by the developers and placed in escrow for this specific project. Mrs. Bolger thought Mr. Wynn said earlier that the money allocated for Pleasant Meadows and other developments had been transferred to the General Fund by previous Boards, and had been "eaten up". Mr. Wynn clarified his earlier statement, advising that there were funds contributed by Mr. Phinney for the Tice Lane development, in lieu of curb and widening on the opposite side of Rt. 152. There were also funds contributed by Mr. Hackett for the Hickory Hamlet Subdivision for improvements which were waived on Diamond Street. It is Mr. Wynn's understanding that the intent for those funds was to be the development of this intersection. Neither amount of contributed funds, either separately or combined, was enough money to do the improvements. Those monies apparently had been spent in the General Fund. The money that is now appropriated for this project came from the developers of the Hawk Ridge Subdivision, and is money that was originally set aside for an off-site improvement on Swartley Road.

Mrs. Bolger asked who built Pleasant Meadows and what did he contribute to this. Mr. Wynn replied that development was constructed by Glenn Garis, though Mr. Garis did not go through the development process for that. That plan was a two phase plan, with the first phase being approved in 1977, and the second phase being approved in 1981. Mr. Garis then purchased both projects, combined them, and constructed them. Mr. Garis did not contribute towards improvement to this intersection, however he did construct the initial water system for the Township. The Calhoun Subdivision, better known as Orchard Station, also did not contribute towards this intersection. Developers of the Orchard Station Subdivision, however, did replace the bridge at the bottom of the hill on Orchard Road, going towards Diamond Street. Elysian Fields Subdivision, which was approved but not built, was, in the approval, required to remove the "hump" off Orchard Road, and install curbing from Pleasant Springs Lane to Hillcrest Road. Elysian Fields did not contribute to this intersection either. Mrs. Bolger felt there should be a standard process involved when developers apply for large housing developments concerning the impact the future development will have on traffic and roadways. Mrs. Bolger asked if PennDot did the original traffic study, or if Mr. Wynn's office completed it. Mr. Wynn explained there was a traffic study originally completed during the construction of the Phinney Subdivision, and then Mr. Wynn's office did traffic counts when the Township was considering a Traffic Impact Ordinance. The Traffic Impact Ordinance provisions were "shot down" in the courts, and the matter had then been dropped. PennDot reviewed this intersection, with respect to the Township's application, and as Mr. Wynn previously indicated, PennDot wished to construct a concrete medial barrier. Mrs. Bolger was frustrated and aggravated

with PennDot's attitude toward the whole situation.

Mrs. Bolger agreed with the statements made by Orchard Road residents earlier this evening, that when and if the second entrance/exit of Pleasant Meadows is constructed, and the traffic goes out onto Hillcrest Road, it will alleviate the traffic at the Rt. 152/Orchard Road intersection. As far as Mrs. Bolger is concerned, the traffic study completed during the Phinney Subdivision was completely null and void when it comes to discussion of the present intersection, since the other developments were not there at the time. Mr. Wynn commented most of the traffic on Orchard Road is not being generated by Pleasant Meadows. Mrs. Bolger felt the Township should authorize another, more accurate traffic study on Orchard Road.

Mrs. Bolger did not feel the residents should be responsible, through their tax dollars, for improvements to roadways or intersections, when it is not justified or necessary. Mrs. Bolger felt the Township's priorities are mixed up if there is a traffic light proposed at Old Bethlehem and Reliance Roads for trucks, but not at the Diamond Street/Rt. 113 intersection or at Rt. 113/Callowhill Road intersection, where people are being killed.

Chairman Bennett noted in the case of the possibility of a traffic light being installed at Old Bethlehem and Reliance Roads, that would be completed by BFI, as part of their final plan requirements. They have already posted an escrow in the event a traffic light at that intersection would become necessary.

5. Mr. Bill Sarnese - Mr. Sarnese owns the property on the corner of Orchard Road/Rt. 152. Mr. Sarnese stated that if the problem with this intersection is that a turn lane is needed, he does not understand why the corner cannot just be "shaved" and the turn lane installed. Mr. Sarnese would be agreeable to installing the turn lane and would gladly donate the land to shave the corner. He has lived on that corner for twelve years, and has never had a problem with waiting at that intersection, even during rush hour. Mr. Sarnese felt it would be a waste of taxpayer's money to pursue improvements to the intersection to the extent that is proposed. Mr. Sarnese would like to see the corner shaved and a turn lane added to the intersection.

Mr. Wynn does not believe the Township could obtain a permit to add a turn lane at that intersection, because the intersection angle does not conform to State standards. Mr. Wynn's office has designed the intersection to conform to PennDot standards, which is required to obtain a permit.

Mr. Sarnese asked if he will be losing his land due to PennDot's requirements. Mr. Wynn replied it is a combination of two things, one of which is upgrading the intersection angle, and one is to provide a turn lane. Chairman Bennett asked Mr. Wynn if the

Township has a choice at this point. Mr. Wynn explained the Board has a choice of going back to PennDot and proposing less of an improvement to the intersection by applying for a new permit.

6. Mr. John Bolger - Mr. Bolger referred to the plan of the intersection, and asked if the turn lane were to be constructed, and someone was to make a left hand turn off Orchard Road, could the motorist behind that first vehicle see to make a right hand turn. Chairman Bennett commented that is a problem at most any intersection. Mr. Bolger felt the Township is creating a new, more dangerous hazard at this intersection, if they proceed as planned. Chief Egly explained that PennDot is requiring a 90 degree angle at the intersection.

Mr. Bolger asked how much the curbing will cost to complete. Mr. Wynn did not have a breakdown of the cost for the project, because a cost estimate was not made a year and a half ago. Mr. Bolger commented the Township has taken money from developers of the project across the street from the site, in lieu of curbs, and asked why the Township would require curbing in this instance, due to the rural nature of the area. Supervisor Fox noted this is a development district, where curbs belong and where many more homes will be constructed in the future, which will increase the traffic on the roadways. Mr. Bolger asked how many homes can be constructed, per acre, in this area. Supervisor Fox replied seven or eight houses per acre can be constructed in this area. Mr. Bolger asked why the Township should bother constructing curbs, since obviously the residents of this area do not want it.

On another subject, Mr. Bolger asked if many accidents have taken place at Blue School and Blooming Glen Roads, since he noticed it is a bit difficult to see at that intersection. Chief Egly replied that there have not been many accidents at that location.

7. Mrs. Jerri Schmidt - 16 Orchard Road - Mrs. Schmidt questioned the legitimacy of the figures she has heard this evening and the traffic study which was completed. Mrs. Schmidt has been a resident of Orchard Road for 25 years, and before that, she lived across the street. To the best of her knowledge, there has never been an accident at this intersection. Mrs. Schmidt also questions the study that states there are traffic tie ups in the mornings or during rush hour. As a resident, Mrs. Schmidt does not see it and does not understand where the figures are coming from. Mrs. Schmidt does not dispute that there is heavy use of the roadway, which she feels results from many issues, such as lack of kindergarten bussing, etc., which contributes heavily. Mrs. Schmidt feels the Board is forgetting that there are other streets which will bear some of the burden of the traffic that will result from future developments. Mrs. Finkelstein's property extends onto Diamond Street, and Mrs. Schmidt feels Diamond Street will bear some of the brunt of future development traffic. Mrs. Schmidt would like to see an updated traffic and speed study take place,

of their swimming pool was completed. Supervisor Fox disagreed, advising that the Zoning Ordinance states swimming pools should be enclosed to keep young children out. The BOCA Code goes even further in their requirements.

Supervisor Bennington asked Mrs. Leatherman if she has an approved Zoning Permit from Hilltown Township. Mrs. Leatherman replied that they do, however they do not have an approved Use and Occupancy Permit. Supervisor Bennington stated the Code Enforcement Officer is enforcing the BOCA Code in this situation, and it is up to the Board of Supervisors to make that determination, not the Zoning Hearing Board. In Supervisor Bennington's opinion, he has as much concern for young children as Supervisor Fox does, however he feels it is the responsibility of the homeowners to protect the children from entering the pool area from the house, if the house is being used as the fourth side of the fence, as long as the other three sides are enclosed with a four ft. high fence.

Motion was made by Supervisor Bennington, and seconded by Chairman Bennett to approve the particular philosophy he outlined above to cover these swimming pool situations. Supervisor Fox refused to vote on this motion, because the Zoning Ordinance comes first, and because he felt this was not a legal vote. Motion passed.

L. SUPERVISOR'S COMMENTS:

1. Supervisor Fox advised the Board of Supervisors was asked to read and comment on the Plumstead Township Comprehensive Plan. Supervisor Fox felt it was an excellent document, which is approximately 90% the same as Hilltown Townships, however there is a section included which addresses fees and land for recreational use. It is Supervisor Fox's understanding that when it originally came out, all that was required was to include it in the Zoning Ordinance advising that fees could be collected from developers to construct playgrounds and parks, etc.. Plumstead Township has gone one step further.

Supervisor Fox cited the instance where one individual had appeared before a previous Board of Supervisors, and suggested that the Township should require fees from the developers to pay for our parks and recreation. That individual was denied. This past week, in the "Planning Progress" publication, the Bucks County Planning Commission is adding to their new Comprehensive Plan that municipalities, according to Act 101, may collect fees from developers to be used for park and recreation within the municipality. The Bucks County Planning Commission also suggested this should be added to the Comprehensive Plan. Had we instituted this policy when the idea was originally suggested, Hilltown Township could have collected hundreds of thousands of dollars towards park and recreational facilities.

2. Supervisor Bennington noted that he will be on vacation

and will be unable to attend the July 27, 1992 Board of Supervisors meeting.

3. Chairman Bennett presented a Proclamation to the Amateur Radio Operators of Hilltown Township, declaring the week of June 22nd through June 28th of 1992 as "Amateur Radio Week".

M. PRESS CONFERENCE: A conference was held to answer questions of those reporters present.

N. ADJOURNMENT: Upon motion by Supervisor Fox, seconded by Supervisor Bennington, and carried unanimously, the June 22, 1992 Board of Supervisors meeting was adjourned at 10:10PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Lynda Seimes

Lynda Seimes
Township Secretary

1272A



To: The Hilltown Township Supervisors
From: The Hilltown Township Park & Recreation Board
Re: Recommendations 92-7 and 92-8

At it's regularly scheduled meeting on June 16, 1992 the Park and Recreation Board voted unanimously to make the following recommendations:

Recommendation 92-6 The Park & Recreation Board recommends that a sign be purchased and installed at the Civic Field indicating it to be the "FUTURE SITE OF THE HILLTOWN TOWNSHIP PARK AND RECREATION COMPLEX". It should also indicate that the land was donated by the Hilltown Civic Association and acknowledge the Hilltown Park & Recreation Board.

Recommendation 92-7 The Park & Recreation Board recommends that the Supervisors approve the following improvements to the upcoming Glen Park and authorize sufficient funds to: 1) Install a Tot Lot in or adjacent to the picnic grove, 2) Install 2 basketball backstops and lay down lines in the Old Hilltown High School parking lot, 3) Upgrade the baseball field, replace the backstop and remove the old light standards and 4) Repair the picnic tables in the picnic grove. It is estimated that the total cost for all of these improvements would be approximately \$20,000 and we recommend that \$20,000 be authorized.