

Milford Township
Planning Commission Minutes of July 29, 2026
7:00 P.M.

Call to Order: Mr. Murray called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Minutes: The meeting minutes of June 24, 2026 were accepted as presented.

Conditional Use:

D.R. Horton Inc., Brookfield Subdivision, West Pumping Station Road & Old Bethlehem Pike, TMP Nos. 23-015-036, 23-015-037, and 23-015-039. B6 Performance Standard Subdivision of 106 single family detached dwellings. Mr. Fox of Obermayer Rebmann Maxwell & Hippel presented the Conditional Use Plan, explaining that the Conditional Use application is for the overall subdivision plan, which is classified as a B6 use permitted under Ordinance No. 184. The applicant has submitted documentation demonstrating that the applicable ordinance requirements have been met. The proposed development consists of a tract of approximately 122 acres and adjoins an area zoned VC-1, satisfying the applicable location requirements. Mr. Fox also reviewed the requirement to provide traffic improvements associated with the Conditional Use. One of the items being addressed as part of the Conditional Use involves improvements along Portzer Road and Pumping Station Road, including coordination with the Archdiocese. Mr. Murray asked for an update regarding the status of this matter. Mr. Tallman stated that the property survey was completed on Monday and that a meeting was scheduled. Formal documents are expected to be provided to the Archdiocese for review and comment within the next 48 hours. Mr. Klein asked whether there was an agreement of sale. Mr. Tallman clarified that this was the matter he was referring to and stated that, while there is not currently an agreement of sale, there is a letter of intent. He noted that coordination with the Archdiocese takes time, but the parties are moving in the appropriate direction. Mr. Murray noted that the discussion had occurred the previous week. Mr. Fox stated that the survey could not have been completed without the Archdiocese's consent. He further stated that, if the Conditional Use is approved, the coordination with the Archdiocese and the associated improvements could be made a condition of approval, as this had been strongly suggested. Mr. Murray asked whether any problems were anticipated as a result of the survey. Mr. Tallman stated that no problems were anticipated. Mr. Fox explained that a Highway Occupancy Permit (HOP) will be required because the roadway is a PennDOT road. As part of that process, financial security will also need to be posted with the Township to ensure that the required improvements are constructed as part of the Conditional Use and Land Development approvals. If the Township ultimately desires dedication of the improvements, that requirement could also be included as a condition of approval. Mr. Kutz stated that he has been in contact with Pany & Lentz Engineering regarding a proposed four-way intersection, including alignment on both sides of the roadway, with the goal of developing one cohesive design. He noted that some of the traffic-related items have been coordinated with the applicant's traffic engineer. Mr. Fox reviewed the specific and general Conditional Use criteria. He stated that the proposal had been reviewed in relation to the Quakertown Area Planning Committee and is generally consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. He noted that a similar development has previously been approved in the area, dating back to approximately 2007–2008. Mr. Fox stated that the current proposal provides less impervious coverage and more common open space than previous plans. He further stated that the proposal appears to be in the best interest of Milford Township based on the traffic improvements and other improvements being discussed. Mr. Fox stated that the proposed use would remain in harmony with the surrounding area, which is primarily zoned for single-family residential development. He noted that the applicant is not requesting any zoning relief. The development will also remain subject to the Land Development approval process and must satisfy applicable requirements concerning highway capacity, traffic, and safety. A Traffic Impact Study (TIS) has been submitted in connection with the proposed development. Mr. Fox noted that the proposed development has two access points, providing alternative means of access to the development. Mr. Fox stated that the applicant's objective for the meeting was to obtain a recommendation from the Planning Commission regarding the Conditional Use application. He explained that one additional resubmission of the Land Development plan is anticipated, which will proceed subject to Mr. Baldwin's review. Mr. Murray stated that the Township had received comments from its traffic safety engineer regarding the Traffic Impact Study. Mr. Kutz stated that he had briefly reviewed the comments and forwarded them to Bowman for further consideration. Mr. Murray questioned how the Board of Supervisors could approve the Conditional Use if traffic

concerns remained unresolved. He stated that the traffic issues need to be addressed before the Board could favorably consider the application. Mr. Kutz explained that, based on his understanding of the Bowman review, Comment No. 2 was an item that needed to be discussed with the Township's traffic safety representative. He referenced the nearby Wawa, LVHN, Route 309, and Pumping Station Road intersections. He explained that PennDOT criteria were used to evaluate the anticipated delay for vehicles at the signalized intersection and questioned whether the anticipated increase in delay from the proposed development would be considered de minimis. Mr. Fiocca explained that the affected intersection is located in another municipality and that the Township does not have authority to require changes to another municipality's roadway system. He stated that the traffic analysis indicates an increase in vehicle movements and that, while the increase may be relatively minor, the purpose of the review was to make the Township aware that the additional trips could affect the neighboring municipality. Mr. Kutz stated that the projected increase appeared to be approximately one to two percent and, in the overall context, was relatively minor. Mr. Murray referenced additional concerns in the traffic report, including vehicle speeds on Pumping Station Road. Mr. Kutz stated that traffic-calming measures could be discussed. He explained that the realignment of Pumping Station Road presents certain challenges. He stated that the roadway could be designed to provide appropriate geometry, but that additional consideration would be necessary regarding traffic speeds and sight distance, particularly near the intersection with East Swamp Road. Mr. Fiocca stated that traffic calming should be used to address an identified problem rather than as a means of correcting a roadway that was initially designed to encourage excessive speeds. He noted that a straight roadway could result in higher vehicle speeds and that the proposed curve may naturally reduce speeds. Mr. Murray stated that the traffic and safety issues should be worked out before the applicant asks the Board of Supervisors to vote favorably on the Conditional Use. Mr. Fox explained that the Conditional Use and Land Development processes involve multiple steps. He stated that the Conditional Use is intended to address the proposed type of subdivision and that, if necessary, specific traffic and safety requirements could be incorporated as conditions of approval. Mr. Fiocca explained that, from a traffic-engineering standpoint, field observations could be conducted to determine actual travel speeds and establish an appropriate target speed, generally within approximately five miles per hour of the desired operating speed. Mr. Fiocca further stated that widening a roadway could make drivers feel more comfortable traveling at higher speeds. He recommended that the proposed roadway design be reviewed carefully before determining whether additional traffic-calming measures are necessary. Mr. Kutz stated that the current plan is substantially similar to the plan presented in October of the previous year. He explained that the property shown in pink is owned by Archdiocese and that the information previously shown was based on County parcel data. The applicant has now obtained a boundary survey based on the actual property information. Mr. Kutz reviewed the conceptual roadway connection, shown in orange and blue, which is intended to provide a connection toward Old Bethlehem Pike and a T-intersection. The concept would provide a break along Pumping Station Road between several existing driveways and would affect the connection to East Swamp Road. Mr. Bob Smith of Hillcrest Road stated that the proposal appeared to be returning to a plan discussed approximately a decade ago. He expressed concern about closing or restricting the roadway and stated that he recalled the prior plan leaving the road open. He believed the proposed roadway connection could help slow traffic. Mr. Kutz explained that there had previously been concern that the roadway could become a cut-through route. He stated that the proposed configuration could be designed to reduce cut-through traffic while maintaining access to East Swamp Road from both directions. Mr. Smith expressed concern that restricting access could cause traffic to be rerouted through the church parking lot. Mr. Kutz stated that Mr. Vey had been discussing the matter with the church. Mr. Kutz stated that the proposed configuration could result in a significant reduction in cut-through traffic. Mr. Smith noted that if gates were used, the church parking lot could become congested, and vehicles could have difficulty accessing the rear portion of the property. Mr. Smith asked who would be responsible for maintaining any gates or other access-control measures. Mr. Klein asked whether Mr. Smith was associated with the church, and Mr. Smith confirmed that he was. Mr. Tallman stated that another consideration was traffic on the section shown in blue and that the proposed configuration could naturally slow traffic. It was stated that the intent was to establish a method of maintaining East Swamp Road access from both ends. He noted that a curb could be one way to accomplish this but acknowledged that there is no perfect solution and that through traffic cannot be completely prevented. He stated that driver education and appropriate roadway design would also be important. Mr. Morgan and Mr. Kutz discussed the Township's suggestion to provide a break in the roadway based on a plan from more than 20 years ago, which previously included a break and cul-de-sac. Mr. Tallman clarified that gates are not part of the current plan. Mr. Klein stated that the gate issue is outside the scope of the current plan and is not the applicant's responsibility. Mr. Fiocca stated that, before reviewing the conceptual connection, he had been concerned about sending additional traffic toward the nearby intersection. He asked

how much traffic was anticipated to use that route. Mr. Kutz explained that the Traffic Impact Study assumed that cut-through traffic would be restricted near the church. Mr. Kutz stated that the applicant is continuing to work on traffic-calming concepts and that the boundary survey is currently being drafted, with completion anticipated within approximately two weeks. He noted that the Township's ordinances establish roadway classifications and corresponding width requirements. Mr. Fiocca stated that he could not provide an opinion on the conceptual connection without seeing the actual design. He noted that the current plan only depicts a conceptual line and that he would need to review the proposed geometry and improvements to determine whether the concept is appropriate. He stated that the proposed configuration may help reduce the impact on the church property. Mr. Kutz explained that another constraint resulted from changes made by the adjacent property owner. The original concept anticipated a connection, but the adjacent property's layout has since changed, with what had previously been a driveway becoming a full street. The proposed roadway will be aligned with that street once the boundary survey is finalized. Mr. Kutz stated that Archdiocese has requested that as much of its property as possible remain undisturbed to minimize the impact. He also referenced the proposed stormwater basin along Old Bethlehem Pike. Mr. Klein asked about Items 12 and 13, which references safe and direct pedestrian connectivity and crosswalks, particularly the proposed traffic-calming measures along the straight section of roadway. He also asked whether there was a concept for connecting the proposed trail to St. Isidore and, if so, where the connection would be located and what it would look like. Mr. Klein stated that, given the anticipated amount of traffic and vehicle speeds, the comment regarding pedestrian safety was reasonable and that any pedestrian connection should be clearly marked. He noted that the trail connection could also provide an opportunity for additional traffic calming. Mrs. Morgan asked whether a four-way stop sign could be installed if the proposed yellow-line connection does not proceed. Mr. Murray stated that the discussion was moving beyond the immediate Conditional Use review and recommended returning to the Conditional Use criteria. Mr. Murray noted that there are approximately 178 comments from the Township Engineer that have been addressed by the applicant. He stated that he believed Mr. Klein was attempting to address the same underlying concern—ensuring that the traffic and safety issues are adequately resolved. Mr. Murray emphasized that traffic concerns must be addressed before the Planning Commission can provide a favorable recommendation on the Conditional Use. Mr. Fox offered to coordinate a meeting with Mr. Fiocca to discuss the outstanding traffic and safety issues. He stated that it would not be fair to expect Mr. Fiocca to provide immediate comments because the applicant had only become aware of the traffic safety engineer's letter that day. He reiterated that the applicant wants to work through the process and ensure that the plan addresses the concerns to the Township's satisfaction. Mr. Kutz stated that the project is not currently scheduled before the Board of Supervisors until September and suggested returning to the Planning Commission at its next meeting. Mr. Fox stated that the applicant intends to continue working toward Conditional Use approval while simultaneously addressing the remaining Land Development comments. Mr. Murray stated that the Board of Supervisors will ultimately make the final decision regarding the Conditional Use. Mr. Klein stated that there are also numerous comments that need to be addressed and that a response regarding pedestrian safety should be available for the next meeting. Mr. Fox referenced the proposed trail connection near Portzer Road and West Pumping Station Road. He suggested that the location could potentially address two concerns by providing both a trail connection and a safe pedestrian crossing at the beginning of the straight roadway section. Mr. Fiocca stated that there had been concern regarding pedestrians walking to the church and the need to provide a safe location for them to cross the roadway. Mr. Morgan stated that the primary speed concern is not necessarily along the straight section of roadway, but rather near the church. After further discussion, the Planning Commission indicated that the Conditional Use application should be revisited at the next meeting after the outstanding traffic, roadway, and pedestrian safety issues have been further reviewed and addressed. There were no further comments at this time.

Subdivision/Land Development:

D.R. Horton Inc., Brookfield Subdivision, West Pumping Station Road & Old Bethlehem Pike, TMP Nos. 23-015-036, 23-015-037, and 23-015-039, RD Zoning District. Subdivision of three tracts totaling 122.7 acres into 106 single family dwellings, five open space areas, and associated site improvements. Mr. Baldwin reviewed the July 21, 2026 review letter comments and identified the primary areas of concern as Zoning Comments 1 and 2, Zoning Comment 13, and several SALDO comments. Zoning Comments 1 and 2 address stormwater facilities proposed within the open space area. Mr. Baldwin stated that there are a couple of options, including seeking relief or revisiting the site design. Zoning Comment 13 addresses the required recreation land. Mr. Kutz stated that, based on the calculations, the plan provides approximately 68 acres of open space. After excluding one detention basin and one utility easement, the

plan remains approximately three acres above the required 65 acres. Stormwater features, including detention basins, are excluded from the open space calculation. Mr. Kutz noted that the plan provides close to 55% of the property as open space, compared to the 50% requirement. Mr. Baldwin stated that there are four zoning comments and five SALDO comments addressing the items identified in the review letter. Regarding the proposed wet pond, Mr. Kutz explained that the wet pond is being treated differently from the other stormwater facilities. If the area is designed as a wet pond, it would be the only remaining stormwater feature within that portion of the open space. All other stormwater features have been excluded from the calculation. Mr. Baldwin questioned whether the wet pond would be a concern with respect to the open space requirements. Mr. Bolton asked whether the pond would contain standing water permanently. Mr. Kutz confirmed that it would. Regarding Zoning Comment 13 and SALDO Comment 1, Mr. Kutz stated that the design will be revisited to achieve a balanced site plan. Mr. Kutz stated that he had left several prior meetings with the understanding that recreational trails could potentially count toward the required recreation space. He noted that he has not seen many recreational facilities incorporated into other subdivisions and asked what the Township is expecting in terms of recreation facilities. Mr. Murray stated that a previous version of the plan included a pickleball court and a dog park, whereas the current plan includes only a trail. Mr. Kutz stated that he could not recall all of the prior discussions. Mr. Bolton asked whether there is sufficient space on the property to provide additional recreation facilities. He noted that the entire lower field, the area behind the first row of lots, and the upper area remain open. Mr. Bolton stated that grading could be designed to provide recreation space. The Commission discussed SALDO Comment 26 regarding residential block length with a maximum length of 1,600 feet. Mr. Murray stated that the traffic engineer had previously identified the second westerly entrance as a consideration. Mr. Baldwin stated that a waiver is being requested. Mr. Kutz explained that the proposed configuration is located in the middle of the site and is affected by environmental protection requirements, including hedgerows extending east to west across the property. Mr. Bolton asked whether the hedgerows are proposed to be maintained. Mr. Kutz confirmed that the applicant is attempting to maintain portions of the trail through the area. Mr. Kutz stated that wetlands have been delineated and cannot be disturbed for purposes of Chapter 105 requirements. The site topography also presents challenges. The higher portion of the site does not provide a practical location for a through connection that would provide both ingress and egress. Mr. Kutz also referenced the proposed cluster mailbox, which will be located near a stop sign. Mr. Klein noted that the proposed area is nearly three times as large as the applicable requirement. The Commission discussed SALDO Comment 44 regarding screening of open space adjacent to residential lots. The applicant indicated that the requirement would be addressed and would comply with the ordinance. Mr. Kutz asked whether the Township was envisioning a full screening. Mr. Baldwin stated that, if the ordinance does not explicitly define the provision, the applicant should provide an appropriate screening solution. Mr. Bolton noted that one of the challenges with landscaping is that it can take many years before the screening becomes effective. He suggested using markers at the transition between the rear of the lots and the open space and stated that the applicant is attempting to provide screening consistent with the ordinance. Mr. Baldwin suggested focusing additional screening in the area where the proposed trail is located between the lots. Mr. Kutz asked whether a gap between two lots would require screening. Mr. Hertz stated that the selection of screening materials should consider both the immediate benefit and how the landscaping will develop over the next ten years. Mr. Kutz stated that he would need to review the matter with the landscape architect. Mr. Hertz noted that the long-term effectiveness of the landscaping is an important consideration. Mr. Kutz stated that the applicant is attempting to provide a diversity of plantings that complement one another and provide a practical balance that meets the Township's needs. Mr. Bolton noted that a fence corner could potentially be used to delineate the trail, with shrubs planted around it. The Commission discussed SALDO Comment 80, conveyance of land identified as parcel 'A' to be conveyed to TMP No. 23-015-036-001 (now or formerly of Wark), providing a connection to proposed Road A. The plans shall be revised to demonstrate the consolidated parcel meets zoning standards and clarify the intent to provide access and utility services from the subdivision to the parcel. Mr. Kutz stated that the intent is to show a water lateral to the property and a sewer lateral, along with a curb cut. He was uncertain whether the driveway would extend all the way to the property. Mr. Kutz explained that water and sewer are currently shown to the curb stop along the street rather than directly to the property. Due to the lower elevation of the property, a grinder pump may be necessary because there is no practical way to connect by gravity sewer. Mr. Murray asked whether only a curb cut would be provided at the street. Mr. Kutz confirmed that this is currently shown on the plan but stated that he would review whether the utilities could be extended farther to the property. Mr. Mancini asked for clarification regarding the curb cut and whether it would be connected to the utilities. Mr. Kutz stated that he would need to review the matter. Mr. Murray stated that the parcel would be set up similarly to the other driveways along the roadway, including water and sewer service. Mr. Kutz agreed that the utilities could be provided in that manner. Regarding E&S Comment 7, Mr.

Baldwin stated that supporting calculations were not provided for temporary sediment basins. Mr. Kutz agreed and stated that the applicant would review the issue. Mr. Murray requested that the revised plan demonstrate what the proposed outfall is currently doing. Mr. Kutz stated that the stormwater design will be completed conservatively and in accordance with NPDES requirements. He explained that a significant portion of the stormwater calculations is attributable to the existing land cover on the property. Mr. Murray noted that approximately 20% of the site currently drains naturally to the area, whereas the proposed development may result in approximately 70% of the site draining in that direction. Mr. Kutz stated that the applicant will demonstrate compliance with the applicable requirements and is not dismissing the concern. Regarding Post Construction Stormwater Management Comment 1, the Commission discussed clarification of the post-construction stormwater management requirements. Mr. Klein identified the spray irrigation system as a significant consideration. Mr. Kutz stated that the operation and maintenance requirements will be further developed through the NPDES process. He noted that an HOA declaration will address maintenance responsibilities because the stormwater facilities will be privately owned and managed. Mr. Fox stated that the matter had been discussed during a staff meeting, including the need for reserves to address stormwater facilities and long-term operation and maintenance. He stated that the stormwater fund and other mechanisms could be used to address these responsibilities. The Commission also discussed Post Construction Stormwater Comments 6, 7, and 11, all dealing with stormwater discharge onto adjacent properties and the need to revise stormwater calculations, with the applicant indicating that the revised plan will address the comments and demonstrate compliance. Mr. Baldwin stated that these represented the high-level concerns identified in the review. No further questions were raised at that time. Mr. Kutz discussed the comment regarding fire hydrant locations, noting that the issue had been addressed previously. He also discussed the requirement for metes and bounds descriptions for easements and whether separate legal descriptions would be required for each lot. Mr. Kutz questioned whether providing the location and legal descriptions on the plan would be sufficient or whether separate documents would be required. Mr. Baldwin stated that the requirement could be defined without making the process unnecessarily complicated. Mr. Kutz discussed the proposed trail location in the vicinity of Pumping Station Road and the gap between the roadway and the first row of lots. Mr. Baldwin stated that the Township's traffic reviewing agency had identified the same concern. He explained that the approach was based on the prior plan and the desire to avoid placing the trail on individual residential lots. The ordinance requires a minimum trail width of 25 feet and a minimum area of 75 feet in the applicable location. Mr. Kutz stated that the intent is to match the character of the existing trail along Portzer Road. The applicant did not want the trail immediately adjacent to the curb because the intent is to provide more of a trail setting. The current design provides approximately 25 feet between the residential row and the trail. Mr. Bolton noted that no sidewalks are currently proposed. Mr. Kutz stated that if sidewalks are required to be treated as traditional sidewalks, the proposed trail alignment would need to be adjusted. Mr. Murray stated that the proposed 25-foot trail configuration is acceptable as currently designed. Mr. Kutz explained that the trail will extend and connect to the parking lot at St. Isidore and will continue toward Old Bethlehem Pike. A portion of the trail will need to be located within the roadway right-of-way and will come closer to the curb in that area. Mr. Mancini asked about the trail proposed in the northern portion of the property and whether the existing mature trees would be preserved. Mr. Kutz stated that preservation of the existing mature trees is the intent. He stated that the proposed trail will be approximately eight feet wide and that a portion will pass through a wooded area. Mr. Mancini asked whether rocks and existing trees could be retained in that area. Mr. Kutz indicated that the applicant intends to preserve existing natural features where feasible. Mr. Hertz asked whether the trail design had considered issues associated with electric bicycles. He noted that the Township has experienced concerns with e-bike use on other trails and that a volunteer group has had several instances where volunteers were nearly struck. Mr. Hertz stated that signage and an awareness campaign could help address the issue and suggested that certain design features or obstructions could be incorporated to discourage high-speed bicycle use while maintaining accessibility. Mr. Klein suggested that bollards may be an option. Mr. Hertz stated that there are several relatively simple solutions that could be considered. Mr. Bolton stated that the intent should not be to exclude manually powered bicycles. Mr. Fiocca asked whether the roads and trails would be maintained by the HOA. Mr. Kutz stated that the intent is for the roads and open space to be dedicated and maintained by the HOA. Ms. Judy McGovern of West Pumping Station Road stated that she understood there had previously been discussion regarding the proposed sewer connection. She explained that the property is located on the south side of Pumping Station Road to the west. Mr. Kutz stated that, prior to receiving information from the authority, it had been assumed that utilities could be extended through the area. He noted that there is a low point on the property and that running gravity sewer all the way to Portzer Road would require approximately 15 to 20 feet of excavation, with rock encountered at approximately five feet. He explained that the original suggestion was to use a low-pressure sewer connection with individual grinder pumps. However, the authority has experienced issues with low-

pressure systems and is reluctant to use that approach. Mr. Kutz stated that, based on the current layout, it appears a gravity sewer connection could potentially be made through Old Bethlehem Pike. She asked whether the sewer would then be connected farther down Pumping Station Road toward Swamp Road. Mr. Kutz stated that, rather than routing the sewer in that manner, the intent is to connect to a main located within the proposed new roadway. Ms. McGovern expressed concern regarding where the sewer connection would ultimately discharge. Mr. Kutz stated that sewer laterals would be provided within the roadway right-of-way and that the timing and requirements for individual connections would depend on the Township's ordinance. Mr. Murray stated that the water service is being considered along a similar route. Mr. Kutz confirmed that the water system is being considered similarly but noted that providing water service is challenging due to the narrow roadway right-of-way. Ms. McGovern asked whether access to public water would follow the same route as the sewer. Mr. Kutz stated that the water system would be slightly different and that he did not believe individual water laterals would necessarily be provided in the same manner. He noted that the system is required to complete the loop and that a connection to East Swamp Church Road is required. Mr. Kutz stated that the applicant will revise the plan to address the review comments and will return to the Planning Commission next month. He stated that the applicant is working with the architect on the site layout and geometry, which remain subject to review. The applicant hopes to have a survey-grade plan available showing the Township requirements.

Adjournment: With there being no further business Mr. Klein made a **MOTION** to adjourn the July 29, 2026 Planning Commission meeting at 8:20 p.m. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Edwards and passed unanimously.