

Milford Township
Planning Commission Minutes of August 27, 2025
7:00 P.M.

Attendance: Planning Commission Members Present: Fran Murray, Chair; Edwin Bolton, Vice Chair; Susan Edwards, Secretary; and Merv Afflerbach, Member.

Staff Present: Jeffrey Vey, Township Manager; Devan Ambron, Assistant Manager/Secretary/Treasurer; Todd Baldwin, Pennoni; and Bryn-Erin Kerr, Bucks County Planning Commission.

Call to Order: Mr. Murray called the Milford Township Planning Commission meeting of August 27, 2025 to order at 7:00 p.m.

Minutes: The Minutes of July 30, 2025 were approved and accepted as presented.

Subdivision/Land Development Plan Review:

Gabriel, Preliminary Plan of Minor Subdivision, 2065 Old Woods Road, TMP No. 23-020-120-001. Mr. Tyler Freed of Mease Engineering was in attendance to present the proposal on behalf of the applicant. The applicant proposes to subdivide a 9.55-acre parcel into two lots. Lot 1 will contain 8.142 acres and an existing single-family dwelling. Lot 2 will contain a .0904-acre lot with a proposed single-family dwelling, detached garage, and shared driveway. The site will be served by on-lot water and a septic system. Mr. Freed said a B5 Single Family Cluster is proposed, which was discussed prior to proceeding with the Preliminary Plan submission. Open Space is required for a B5 use with a section in the ordinance for minor subdivisions which exempts a minor subdivision from open space requirements. A B5 use has been done with a previous minor subdivision in Milford Township, Stanford on Canary Road. This subdivision consisted of 2 existing lots with a lot line adjustment to make one lot and a minor subdivision to cluster the lots. Mr. Freed said based on the facts he believes this plan meets the requirements of the zoning ordinance. Mr. Vey stated that a B5 requires open space, and such open space must be provided as part of any subsequent subdivision of either lot created through an exempt subdivision, based on open space calculations performed for the entire tract as it originally existed. Mr. Vey further stated this is a way to circumvent the open space requirements. Mr. Freed said no, the dwelling units comes out to 3.5 per the site capacity calculations and lot 1 could be further subdivided. Mr. Vey asked if the open space would be put on the larger lot for a future subdivision to which Mr. Freed replied that is correct per the provisions made in 530.c 3 & 4. Mr. Vey inquired regarding the size of Lot 2, noting it as 30,000 square feet. Mr. Freed stated that 30,000 square feet is the minimum lot size and that the proposal is for 40,000 square feet. It was reported that 0.52 acres of woodlands are proposed to be cleared, which exceeds the permitted amount. Mr. Freed explained that woodland allocation is calculated based on the parent tract, with more assigned to Lot 2 as Lot 1 has already been developed. Mr. Vey referenced Section 504, which restricts alteration, regrading, clearing, or building to no more than 20% of existing woodlands. Mr. Freed reiterated that the 20% standard applies to the parent tract as a whole, not to individual lots. Mr. Vey asked whether the 20% limitation is being evaluated on a site-wide basis rather than on a per-lot basis. Mr. Freed confirmed that it is. Mr. Vey then inquired whether the plan includes a note indicating that an open space requirement applies to any future subdivision. Mr. Freed said there is, note 12 on the plan states “This subdivision is exempt from the open space requirements as provided by zoning ordinance section 530.c. Any subsequent subdivision or land development of Lot 1 shall provide open space based on a site area of 9.046 acres which existed at the time this lot was created and calculated in accordance with Zoning Ordinance Sections 501.f, 502, and 530. Mr. Vey asked why this wasn’t pursued as a use B1. Mr. Freed said the unusable land value becomes 6.577 acres. When you net out the buildable site area there is only one lot permitted with open space not being able to be netted out. Mr. Vey noted any subsequent subdivision is to be a use B5 and asked if there is a subsequent subdivision if that is possible and if the site capacity calculations end up with the required open space. Mr. Freed said they do and the open space gets tacked on to lot 1 with 8.1 acres remaining and 4.5 acres of required open space which leave essentially 50% of the lot. Mr. Vey commented on the Natural Resource Plan and noted they should

attempt to maintain woodlands in the area of the roadway so the neighborhood isn't left with an open lot. Mr. Freed said the intent is for the subdivision to be as less intensive as possible and they will only be removing the trees to construct the house, driveway and septic. Mr. Freed asked if there were any comments on the requested waivers. Mr. Baldwin stated he has no objections to the requested waivers. Mr. Murray stated he would like the Road Master to look at the clearing of the right of way to see what may be needed. Mr. Freed said that is a request they will comply with. Mr. Gabriel noted they are widening the entrance, about 30' and paving 25' back, and he has spoken to Mr. Winkler. Mr. Vey asked if there are any boulders in the right of way. Mrs. Edwards states she thinks there is along with at least one large dead tree. Mr. Murray asked what the space is between the lot line of lot 2 and the original property line. Mr. Freed said approximately 46' and there isn't room for a 50' right of way. Lot 1 has the entire lot frontage on that side. Mr. Vey noted this is not a lane lot. Mr. Baldwin said there is shared access from the existing drive to lot 2 and identified there is a need for an easement for the shared driveway. Mr. Vey said that should be a waiver request and noted a cross easement is very important. Mr. Freed stated typically, a waiver is not required for a shared driveway. Mr. Vey said it is belts and suspenders. Mr. Freed said he will revise the waiver letter as this will also cover SALDO Comment 6 and 7 pertaining to driveway easement and compliance with driveway standards. Comment 5 notes the lot depth shall not be less than nor more than three times the lot width. Mr. Freed stated a waiver is requested from that section. The width at the rear would comply. The width is defined in zoning and ratio is noted in SALDO. Mr. Baldwin stated he agrees with the justification of the geometry. Mr. Freed said the only other comment up for discussion is Comment 9 which notes all subdivision and land developments shall provide for recreation facilities or a fee-in-lieu of providing recreation facilities. Mr. Freed said the applicant is proposing a fee-in-lieu and everything else is will comply. Mr. Vey stated typically with residential development there is a traffic contribution and recreation contribution at the time of building permit which typically satisfies the ordinance requirements. Ms. Kerr noted the Bucks County Planning Commission review letter dated August 21, 2025 touches on the requested waivers, which include roadway improvements, curbs, sidewalks, street trees, and streetlights. The review letter outlines the need for shared maintenance of the shared driveway, and the need to submit a Sewage Facility Planning Module to DEP. Mrs. Edwards asked where the driveway comes into lot 2. Mr. Freed noted the existing driveway will be utilized. Mr. Murray questioned the alternate septic system and if it will fit by the area of the garage, based on the size of the original system the area does not look big enough. Mr. Freed noted in an emergency situation, a septic system can be 2 to 1 and they will use what area they have. There were no further comments at this time.

Mr. Bolton made a **MOTION** to recommend Preliminary/Final approval of the proposed Minor Subdivision for the Gabriel Tract located at 2065 Old Woods Road, TMP No. 23-020-120-001, with the condition the plan be revised to comply with the Pennoni review letter dated August 21, 2025, open space requirements be located in the record, and inspection of the right of way by the Road Master. The Planning Commission is in support of the requested waivers. The motion was seconded by Mr. Klein and passed unanimously.

Public Comment:

Christian Hunsberger of North Main Street in Trumbauersville Borough, inquired as to the proposed Trumbauersville Borough Zoning Ordinance. Mr. Bolton stated a motion was made at the prior meeting and he is unsure where the ordinance stands with Trumbauersville.

Adjournment: With there being no further business the August 27, 2025 meeting of the Milford Township Planning Commission adjourned at 7:29 p.m.