

Milford Township
Planning Commission Meeting Minutes of August 26, 2026
7:00 P.M.

Attendance: Planning Commission Members Present: Fran Murray, Chair; Edwin Bolton, Vice Chair, Susan Edwards, Secretary; Jerry Hertz, Member;

Staff Present: Jeffrey Vey, Township Manager; Devan Ambron, Assistant Manager/Secretary/Treasurer; Todd Baldwin, Pennoni; Joe Fiocca, Safe Highway Engineering; and Matthew Walters, Bucks County Planning Commission.

Call to Order: Mr. Murray called the August 26, 2026 meeting to order at 7:00 pm.

Minutes: The meeting minutes of July 29, 2026 were accepted and approved as presented.

Plan Acceptance:

Boris Tatunchak, Preliminary Plan of Subdivision, 2454 Old Bethlehem Pike, TMP No. 23-015-066. Minor subdivision creating two lots in the VC-1, Village Commercial, Zoning District. The applicant proposes a Use B4-Village Twin. The Boris Tatunchak Preliminary Plan was accepted for review.

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. The applicant proposes a B6 Performance Standard Subdivision consisting of 106 single-family detached dwellings. The applicant attended the previous Planning Commission meeting, at which several items were identified for further discussion or resolution prior to the application being forwarded to the Board of Supervisors. Mr. Nate Fox, attorney for the applicant, presented a revised rendering of the plan. Mr. Murray stated that the proposed road connection had been addressed. Mr. Vey provided an overview of the proposed realignment of Pumping Station Road for the audience. Mr. Kutz explained that the revised plan provides additional detail, including a 200-foot-radius curve along the western property line and a proposed three-way intersection that could potentially accommodate a four-way intersection. Mr. Vey explained that the existing Pumping Station Road meets East Swamp Road and continues south. Mr. Kutz confirmed that the proposed roadway would terminate at a T-intersection with a stop sign and include a pedestrian trail connection to Old Bethlehem Pike. He noted that the connection is near the former Brown property, now owned by Alpas. The survey has been completed, and the proposed alignment across Old Bethlehem Pike is intended to provide a safe, perpendicular crossing. Mr. Kutz discussed the proposed 30-mph speed limit, stating that it would help address traffic-calming concerns and encourage traffic away from East Swamp Road. He noted that there are no single-family residences along the roadway frontage and that 30 mph was considered a reasonable middle ground. The intent is not to discourage motorists from using the roadway or create enforcement issues. Mr. Fox clarified that the previously discussed concept of blocking off East Swamp Road is no longer proposed. Mr. Kutz confirmed that the roadway would remain open and noted that speed humps had been discussed at the previous meeting. He asked Mr. Fiocca whether he had reviewed the concept. Mr. Fiocca, traffic engineer for the township, stated that he had visited the site and observed that the roadway is a straight shot. He suggested incorporating a physical feature to make the roadway appear less like an extension of East Swamp Road and stated that he would be agreeable to speed humps or speed tables. He also noted that the proposed alignment would require motorists traveling from East Swamp Road toward southbound Old Bethlehem Pike to follow the curve rather than continuing straight through. Mr. Vey stated that speeding has been a concern along Pumping Station Road. He noted that improvements near the church are difficult because of the cemetery and Triple C and that widening the roadway would be problematic. He also referenced accidents near Brick Tavern Road and Old Bethlehem Pike, noting that the intersection is now a four-way stop. Mr. Vey explained that the proposed configuration is intended to redirect through traffic away from that area. He noted that there are plans to eventually align the roadway into Milford Village near the hospital, with a future connection extending from Mill Hill Road toward a traffic signal on Route 663. The proposed Pumping Station Road connection

would provide access for motorists traveling to the church without creating a direct route that would encourage through traffic. Mr. Vey stated that two traffic-calming locations were being considered: one near the tighter curve toward East Swamp Road and another farther along the roadway near the church access points. Mr. Kutz stated that Mr. Vey had provided a good overview of the proposed configuration. Mr. Paul Morgan, East Swamp Road, asked whether the existing segment of Pumping Station Road would simply pass through. Mr. Vey confirmed that it would. Mr. Morgan asked whether two speed tables were proposed between the curve and the Pumping Station Road connection. Mr. Vey confirmed that this was the concept under consideration. Mr. Morgan expressed concern regarding the impact of speed tables on tanker trucks and asked whether standards govern their design. He also noted that speeding is a concern on East Swamp Road, particularly toward Brick Tavern Road, and asked whether speed tables could be placed there to discourage motorists from using that route. Mr. Morgan asked whether the traffic study would estimate the percentage of traffic expected to use the proposed roadway compared with the existing route. Mr. Fiocca stated that Ms. Sandy Koza Bowman would need to complete a traffic analysis to evaluate the anticipated traffic distribution. He noted that determining the exact percentage of motorists who would choose one route over another would be difficult, although the necessary improvements have been identified. Mr. Morgan commented that motorists traveling from Brick Tavern Road tend to accelerate while traveling up the hill. Mr. Murray agreed. Mr. Fiocca stated that speed cushions or full-width traffic-calming devices could help discourage excessive speeds and encourage use of the alternate roadway. He noted that traffic distribution would need to be evaluated now that the roadway connection is proposed to remain open. Ms. Koza, Bowman traffic engineer for the applicant, stated that the traffic study is being updated following review of the previous study. She confirmed that traffic counts have been conducted and that a speeding issue has been identified. Mr. Morgan asked whether an average speed had been determined for East Swamp Road. Ms. Koza clarified that the available speed data was not specifically for East Swamp Road. Mr. Kutz revisited the previous discussion regarding primary road classifications. He stated that, based on the discussions to date, the proposed design deviates from certain ordinance requirements and will result in waiver requests. Mr. Murray stated that the deviations resulted from the traffic engineer's review. Mr. Baldwin stated he would be in support of the requested waivers from the traffic engineer. Mr. Fox raised pedestrian concerns, including crossings and trail connections, and asked Mr. Kutz how these would be addressed on the site. Mr. Kutz stated that the off-site pedestrian connection would provide a future opportunity to connect the development with Milford Village. Mr. Murray noted that the connection to Milford Village would not occur until a later date. Mr. Kutz agreed. Mr. Kutz then reviewed the proposed on-site trail system. The existing trail runs along the frontage of St. Isidore's property and connects to the parking lot. The proposal would provide a crossing at the driveway and connect to the point where the existing trail currently ends. Mr. Kutz explained that the interior trail network would connect toward Richland Marketplace, with additional trails through the western open-space areas connecting to the realigned Pumping Station Road and an additional northern loop. The applicant is also agreeable to a future trail connection to the proposed mixed-use development if trail access is established. Mr. Fox stated that the roadway and pedestrian items discussed represented the outstanding matters requiring follow-up regarding the applicable ordinance requirements. Mr. Murray identified stormwater facilities within the proposed open-space area as another outstanding item. Mr. Kutz stated that additional stormwater calculations would be provided with the next submission. He explained that the current proposal includes a permanent pool of water rather than a dry basin and stated that, if permitted, the feature could be consistent with the character of the open-space area. Mr. Kutz explained that the dry detention basin, utility easements, and the right-of-way being offered to the Township for a potential future Portzer Road extension would be excluded from the open-space calculation. He stated that sufficient open space would remain to satisfy the applicable requirements. Mr. Kutz also noted that spray irrigation areas currently overlap portions of the proposed trails. The applicant will address this issue, along with the grading of the proposed recreational areas, with the next submission. Mr. Vey asked whether all operational equipment associated with the stormwater facilities would be located underground and maintained by the homeowners' association. Mr. Kutz confirmed that it would. Mr. Vey asked about DEP permitting. Mr. Kutz stated that the project is subject to DEP and Bucks County Conservation District review and permitting and that the applicant has already had discussions with both agencies. Mr. Vey asked who would be responsible for operating the stormwater facilities. Mr. Kutz stated that the homeowners' association would be responsible. He explained that, upon completion, the facilities would be inspected and undergo the applicable close-out process to verify that they were constructed in accordance with the approved plans and permits. Mr. Vey asked whether the maintenance and operational requirements would be recorded with the deeds. Mr. Fox confirmed that they would be included in the recorded documents. Mr. Fox

reviewed the Conditional Use requirements, including the 50-acre minimum tract size, the VC-1 District, proposed traffic improvements, consistency with the Comprehensive Plan, and compatibility with the general character of the neighborhood. He stated that the applicant has presented to the Planning Commission and Township staff that the proposal satisfies the Conditional Use requirements. Mr. Fox noted that preliminary and final plan approvals and applicable outside agency approvals would still be required. Mr. Murray asked whether anyone in the audience had questions regarding the Conditional Use process or requirements. Mr. Kutz stated that the remaining comments in the Township Engineer's review letter would be addressed with the next submission and indicated that the applicant intends to comply with the outstanding requirements. Mr. Murray noted that the review is a two-part process. Mr. Vey stated that the Conditional Use is being considered pursuant to Section 404.B.6.A.5, which also addresses the permitted housing types. He noted that the applicant is proposing single-family detached dwellings pursuant to the applicable Conditional Use provisions of Section 1108.D.1.6. Mr. Vey stated that the applicable requirements primarily address buffering and screening, lighting, and natural resources. He noted that the proposed development is set back from the church and separated from surrounding uses. Mr. Vey asked how lighting would be addressed to prevent impacts to neighboring properties. Mr. Kutz stated that lighting would be limited to streetlights at the access points, mailbox area, and pedestrian access points. He confirmed that a lighting plan is included in the plan set. Mr. Dave Homer of Red Bud Lane asked where the proposed development would be located and whether consideration had been given to the potential impact of vehicles associated with Mass at St. Isidore's Church. Mr. Kutz stated that the applicant had adjusted the plan to align the proposed driveway with the existing St. Isidore's driveway and that a second access point is also proposed. Mr. Victor Bartholomew asked how the development would affect the homes on Clover Lane. He noted that the area behind the homes is wet and undeveloped and expressed concern about runoff from the hill, particularly if the property is disturbed. He asked where the stormwater would go and whether drainage piping would be installed to direct water away from Clover Lane. Mr. Kutz explained that a ridge line runs through the property and that a substantial portion of the site does not drain toward Clover Lane. He stated that the northernmost proposed homes are located behind BJ's and farther from Clover Lane. Mr. Fox reiterated that the proposed development is located away from Clover Lane. He explained that some spray irrigation would occur in the field area beginning the day after a storm event and would be applied gradually over approximately six days. Mr. Fox stated that agricultural fields can promote runoff and generate higher runoff volumes. The areas currently used as farm fields would be converted to meadow or grass, which would promote infiltration. He stated that, although impacts to Clover Lane are not anticipated, the stormwater design would use a conservative approach. Mr. Murray asked whether there were any additional questions or comments. There was no further discussion at this time.

Mr. Bolton made a **MOTION**, seconded by Mr. Hertz, and unanimously carried, to recommend issuance of a letter to the Board of Supervisors recommending approval of the 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 Conditional Use Application.

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. The applicant proposes the subdivision of three tracts totaling approximately 122.7 acres into 106 single-family detached dwellings, five open space areas, and associated site improvements. Mr. Fox stated that it made sense to discuss the requested waivers. Mr. Kutz stated that, other than the ongoing traffic discussion, the Commission could work through the waivers to determine whether there were any issues with granting them. He referred to the items identified in bold in Mr. Baldwin's review letter dated July 21, 2026. Mr. Kutz referred to Page 6, Comment #13, regarding the requirement that roof drains and sump pumps be connected directly to the storm sewer. He explained that the intent is generally to disconnect roof drainage where possible to allow infiltration into the groundwater. Mr. Vey stated that the Township has experienced problems at Valley View where sump pump discharges were located immediately outside the foundation. He stated that the primary concern is getting the water away from the house and ensuring that water is not discharged onto a neighboring property. He also noted that, in actual practice, homeowners may plant trees over the piping, creating maintenance issues. Mr. Vey stated that this illustrates the difference between the concept and the reality of the requirement. Mr. Kutz asked how other subdivisions have handled the issue. Mr. Vey stated that piping or swales have been used. Mr. Kutz stated that it appeared a swale may need to be delineated between the houses. Mr. Vey

asked whether there were any projections regarding which lots could have basements due to the amount of surface rock. Mr. Kutz stated that, as currently laid out, all of the lots could accommodate basements, either walk-out or fully buried. He stated that the plans provide for a 2% drainage slope away from the houses. The intent is to keep basements out of rock, and no water tables were identified. Mr. Vey stated that he was trying to determine where the drainage would ultimately go and suggested that some of these details may be addressed at the building permit stage. Mr. Kutz asked whether there was a requirement for a grading plan for each individual lot. Mr. Vey stated that there was not. Mr. Kutz stated that the discussion was in response to the waiver request. Mr. Fox stated that the applicant wanted to demonstrate the work that had been done before the Commission took a position on the waiver. Mr. Kutz referred to Page 6, Comment #18, regarding piping. He stated that the proposal is to use reinforced concrete pipe (RCP) in all roadway areas and to continue using RCP for basin outfalls. Mr. Vey summarized the issue as the Township preferring concrete pipe while the applicant is proposing plastic pipe in certain areas. Mr. Kutz referred to Page 7, Comment #23, regarding storm sewer structures and utility separation. He explained that, for water and sanitary sewer, state requirements call for 10 feet of separation. The proposed roadway has a 36-foot cartway width in accordance with the Ordinance. With gas and storm sewer also proposed along the curb line, it is not possible to maintain 10 feet of separation between all utilities in every location. Mr. Kutz stated that there may be some utility crossings, but the required separation between water and sanitary sewer would be maintained. He characterized the request as a partial waiver. The Planning Commission indicated that it had no issue with the proposed approach. Mr. Vey clarified that this should not be considered a blanket waiver and that the engineers should work through the individual locations. Mr. Hertz asked whether there was a way to provide additional separation or baffling between the storm utilities. Mr. Kutz stated that the utilities would be subject to pressure testing and applicable backfill requirements, which should be sufficient. If a crossing is necessary, concrete casing could be used where appropriate, potentially at one or two isolated locations. Mr. Kutz referred to Page 7, Comment #26, concerning residential blocks and the maximum length requirement. He stated that the applicant did not believe it made sense to have a road connection in the interior of the site. The proposed design includes stop signs at pedestrian crossings to break up the roadway, and the traffic using the roadway would be generated by the development. Mr. Murray stated that signage would be provided at the pedestrian crossings. Mr. Vey asked whether pedestrian crossing markings would be painted on the roadway. Mr. Kutz confirmed that they would. Mr. Kutz then discussed the residential lot width requirement. He stated that there are a few isolated lots where the lot configuration exceeds approximately a 4:1 ratio. He explained that the slopes drop off considerably as the roadway grade shifts. Requiring the lots to conform more closely to the ratio would result in grading into steeper slopes and create additional grading challenges. The applicant would therefore like to keep the proposed configuration as part of the lots. Mr. Kutz referred to Comment #34 regarding street trees. He stated that a partial waiver was requested. Trees are required along two frontages on East Swamp Road; however, there are already substantial existing trees along the East Swamp Road frontage. Mr. Kutz referred to Page 10, Comment #47, regarding open space configuration. He explained that the proposal includes five open space parcels, including one large area and several smaller areas with access points. Areas C, D, and E are separated primarily because of the Portzer Road easement. He stated that the overall configuration generally complies with the required geometry. Mr. Murray asked about the amount of open space required and the amount proposed. Mr. Kutz stated that just under 65 acres are required and approximately 68 acres are proposed. Mr. Kutz referred to Comment #55 regarding monuments. A partial waiver was requested to provide monuments along the right-of-way and to use iron pins as shown on the plan. The Planning Commission indicated support for the partial waiver. Mr. Murray stated that one important issue was the location of the trail behind the houses. He noted that residents may otherwise believe that they own more property than they actually do. Mr. Kutz stated that the buffer and fence areas should clearly delineate the open space. He added that the shrubs along the rear of the lots should provide substantial screening within approximately five years. Mr. Hertz stated that the landscaping would still provide privacy. Mr. Kutz referred to Page 12, Comment #73, concerning the site context map and the requirement to show certain features outside the property. He stated that the intent is to show properties and easements; however, other than surveying the properties, there is no practical way to obtain all of that information. The plan does show existing driveways and roads. Mr. Kutz stated that the plans also identify vegetation and existing trees in excess of 15 inches in caliber. The property edges and interior hedgerows are shown and identified as to their existing condition. The applicant requested a waiver limited to the area that will be disturbed. Mr. Kutz referred to Comment #77 concerning the requirement to show existing features separately. He stated that there is significant overlap between the two requirements because the plans show the proposed features

and their impacts. Due to the size of the project and requirements from the Bucks County Planning Commission, the applicant requested to consolidate the information rather than provide an additional separate set of sheets. Mr. Kutz then discussed the stormwater requirements shown on Pages 18, 19, and 20 concerning drawdown times for the basins. He explained that there are three sections addressing drawdown requirements. One requirement calls for a 24-hour drawdown, while wet ponds are required to return to normal conditions within 12 hours and have a drawdown period of 24 to 72 hours. Mr. Kutz stated that the applicant cannot comply with all of those requirements as written and that doing so would not necessarily provide a benefit to the community. Mr. Kutz explained that the wet pond is designed to store the two-year storm event and draw down approximately one day after the event, with storage maintained for approximately six days. The detention basin will be designed to comply with the 24- to 72-hour drawdown requirement to the extent possible and will be subject to NPDES requirements. Mr. Bolton asked about calculations related to spray irrigation and asked if the information would be recorded. Mr. Hertz stated that permeability would be a factor in determining the capacity of the system and ensuring that it is not overwhelmed. Mr. Kutz agreed and stated that downstream capacity would also need to be evaluated. He stated that there are no anticipated discharge or overflow issues but that the applicant would need to demonstrate adequate downstream capacity. Mr. Kutz then discussed four related items involving off-site improvements that had been outlined in a letter previously submitted to the Township. He referred to the remnant portion of Pumping Station Road extending toward East Swamp Road. The existing cartway is approximately 24 feet wide. The applicant proposes a marginal access street with approximately 24 to 25 feet of cartway to tie into the existing roadway. A waiver was requested from the 34-foot cartway requirement. A second waiver was requested to permit a 100-foot radius curve rather than the required 150-foot radius. Mr. Fiocca stated that he was more concerned with making the roadway look and function like a different type of road and was not particularly concerned with the radius. Mr. Bolton stated that this was the purpose of the proposed configuration, to slow traffic. Mr. Kutz stated that the two cartway waivers involved reducing the required width from 40 feet to 34 feet. He also explained that another ordinance requirement calls for a 50-foot straight course into an intersection; however, the proposed intersection occurs on a curve, which eliminates the ability to provide the required straight course. Mr. Kutz stated that, based on the discussion, there did not appear to be opposition to the requested waivers, with the possible exception of the roof drain and sump pump issue. Mr. Fox stated that the Conditional Use application would be before the Board of Supervisors the following week. He anticipated another level of resubmission and noted that the applicant had addressed the zoning requirements related to open space. He stated that he hoped the next submission would address the remaining issues for the preliminary plan. Mr. Murray clarified for those in attendance that the discussion did not constitute approval of the waivers. The applicant would be required to return with revised plans addressing the concerns discussed by the Commission. Mr. Murray stated that, if there were additional matters to discuss, this was the appropriate time to raise them. Paul Morgan asked whether there was any provision for using the wet pond for irrigation and whether doing so would be beneficial, including with respect to controlling insects. Mr. Kutz explained that the wet pond would be designed in accordance with the state BMP Manual. He stated that several factors are considered, including depth, aeration, and safety benches. Some areas may be approximately six to eight feet deep, with safety benches and 10:1 slopes extending approximately 15 feet in either direction. He noted that the pond would be heavily planted and would not have a steep drop-off. Mr. Morgan asked how large of a storm event the pond could accommodate. Mr. Kutz stated that the system is designed for the 100-year storm event for rate-control purposes. He stated that the applicant must demonstrate that the rate of water leaving the site is equal to or less than the existing rate. Mr. Robert McLain of Angstadt Road stated that it was not clear how the proposed development would affect access to either church. Mr. Murray stated that, based on his understanding of the plan, access to either church would not be impeded. Mr. Kutz stated that there are three access points for the East Swamp Road church and that access would remain available from either direction. He explained that the roadway configuration is intended to discourage traffic not associated with the development from traveling through the site. Mrs. Morgan asked whether the Township could ensure that grading and excavation activities would not result in water washing toward existing houses. She also stated that traffic was a concern and noted the importance of properly directing water through swales or according to the existing direction of the land. Mr. Kutz explained that, under the NPDES permit, the wet pond and detention basin are designed to collect stormwater from the site. The applicant must also demonstrate that construction activities will not create stormwater issues. It was noted that the site would be inspected following significant storm events. Mr. Bartholomew asked whether underground springs are considered when determining how much water the stormwater facilities can accommodate. He stated that during heavy rain, a yard may appear to dry while water continues to run

through the property. Mr. Kutz explained that individual springs are not included in the analysis unless there is a defined channel. The analysis does account for soil mapping, which categorizes soils into hydrologic soil groups based on runoff characteristics. He stated that areas with Hydrologic Soil Group D soils have significantly higher runoff rates that must be managed and are accounted for in the design. Robert McLain stated that he believed Bucks 2040 included recommendations from the Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission and asked whether the Township was required to follow those recommendations. Mr. Walters stated that the Township has its own SALDO and zoning regulations and is not required to follow those recommendations. Mr. McLain characterized the Bucks 2040 recommendations as suggestions. Mr. Murray stated that the Township would receive a report from the applicable agencies with each submission. Mr. Walters explained that the reviews are based on the applicable documents, plans, and ordinances. Mr. Terry Wark, East Swamp Road, stated that he wanted to ask about the wetland area. He explained that on the East Swamp Road side of his house there is a gutter or drainage ditch that runs through the field and has been subject to erosion from agricultural activity over the past 50 years. He asked whether the Township should have concerns regarding the condition of the area. Mr. Kutz stated that the area is significantly eroded and estimated that portions of the ditch are approximately five to six feet deep. Mr. Bolton asked whether the proposed stormwater improvements would alleviate the issue. Mr. Kutz stated that he had previously provided photographs of the area and described it as an unusual drainage area. He stated that MS4 requirements may be applicable. Mr. Vey stated that the area is outside the urbanized area. Mr. Kutz stated that he was not certain that there was a specific answer for addressing the existing drainage area. He noted that the development would change the amount and direction of water flowing toward the area. Mr. Bolton stated that, over time, the area could be stabilized through vegetation. Mr. Murray stated that the existing ditch could not simply be filled in and noted that there are two similar drainage areas behind his own house. The Township expressed concern regarding the potential safety hazard associated with the depth of the ditch and who would ultimately be responsible for the area. Ms. Mancini returned to the discussion of springs and stated that, based on her experience growing up on a farm, the existing pond is spring-fed and that there are numerous springs in the area that may contribute water to the site. Mr. Murray stated that the proposed development would not be located near those springs. He noted that the existing house was built in that location because of the spring, including the spring house. It was further noted that the pond at St. Isidore's has historically maintained its water level and has not dropped more than approximately six inches, even during drought conditions. Mr. Wark stated that the deed identifies the water source as spring-fed and noted that the spring historically supplied water to the brick tavern/hotel. There was no further discussion at this time. The applicant stated that the plan would be revised and resubmitted for further review.

Adjournment: With there being no further business Mrs. Edwards made a **MOTION** to adjourn the August 26, 2026 Planning Commission meeting at 8:30 p.m. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hertz and passed unanimously.