

Board of Supervisors Regular Meeting

Monday, April 7, 2025 | 7:00 p.m.

1) Call to Order, Pledge of Allegiance

Mr. Ksiazek called the meeting to order at 7:02 p.m.

2) National Anthem performed by Carl Sandberg Middle School

Mr. Ksiazek extended a warm welcome to the Sandburg Soundwaves Choir, who performed the National Anthem. He thanked them for their performance.

3) Roll Call

After the Pledge of Allegiance, Ms. Quirple called roll. Supervisors Ksiazek, Hannah, Kane, and Strouse were in attendance. Also present were Township Manager Stephanie Teoli Kuhls, Assistant Township Manager Nick Valla, Solicitor James Esposito, Township Engineer Isaac Kessler, Chief Joseph Bartorilla, Director of Building and Zoning, Jim Ennis, Director of Public Works, Eric Gartenmayer, Director of Finance, Laura Hucklebridge, and Director of Parks & Recreation, Paul Kopera.

4) Upcoming Meetings

a) Next Board of Supervisors Meeting – Monday, May 12, 2025, at 7:00 p.m.

5) Special Items

a) Recognition of Langhorne Lady Rebels (4th Grade) and Langhorne Spiders (8th Grade)

Mr. Ksiazek announced that the Middletown Township Board of Supervisors is proud to recognize two youth basketball teams from the Langhorne Athletic Association for their outstanding performance at the Pennsylvania State Basketball Championships in March.

Mr. Ksiazek shared that The Fourth Grade "Lady Rebels," coached by Bill Tschirlig, finished 3rd in the Top Division with a record of four wins and one loss. The Eighth Grade "Spiders," coached by Jason Trespalacios, went undefeated and secured 1st Place in the Top Division with an overtime win in the championship game. Both teams were invited on stage to receive Certificates of Achievement.

b) Recognition of Natalie DiCrosta, Girl Scouts Gold Award, Troop#21603

Mr. Ksiazek explained that the Girl Scout Gold Award is the highest honor in Girl Scouting, recognizing young women who lead projects that create lasting, positive change in their communities.

He acknowledged Natalie DiCrosta as a Gold Award recipient for creating a YouTube video promoting cat and kitten rescue over purchasing, and for assembling 75 starter kits for new pet adopters at Lovat Cat Rescue, where she volunteers weekly.

Mr. Ksiazek congratulated Ms. DiCrosta on her achievement.

- c) Local Government Month Proclamation.
- d) Autism Awareness Month Proclamation
- e) Earth Day/Arbor Day Proclamation

Mr. Ksiazek, Ms. Hannah, and Ms. Strouse each took turns reading the proclamations aloud.

6) Announcements

- a) Earth Day – Saturday, April 26, 2025 from 11:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m. – Core Creek Park

7) Consent Agenda Items

- a) Consideration of authorizing payment of April 12, 2025, Bills List in the amount of \$1,249,799.24.
- b) Consideration of approving the March 10, 2025, Minutes of the Public Meeting of Middletown Township Board of Supervisors.
- c) Consideration of approving Resolution#25-09R, applying to the Department of Community and Economic Development (DCED) PA Small Water & Sewer Grant.
- d) Consideration of Approval of Stipulation of Settlement of Tax Assessment Appeal of McStome c/o Kravco, Inc. for Tax parcel # 22-057-043

Action: Ms. Strouse made a motion to approve consent agenda items A-D seconded by Ms. Hannah. A motion carried by a vote of 5-0.

8) Consideration of Preliminary/Final Land Development Approval, Pereira, 2351 Big Oak Road, proposed Contracting Office w/ Accessory Warehouse & Outside Storage Area, M-1 Light Manufacturing Zoning District, S/LD 24-2.

Edward Murphy, Attorney for the applicant Carl Pereira and Pereira Properties, explained that the Applicant proposes the construction of a 26,428 SF warehouse and contracting office, which will include a material and equipment storage area. He also outlined the reliefs granted for the project.

Mr. Murphy explained that, Carl Pereira, a Middletown resident for nearly 40 years, has operated his business on Big Oak Road for 35 years. The proposed development is an expansion of that business, featuring a new facility that is nearly a mirror image, slightly larger, constructing a new

contracting office, accessory warehouse, and outdoor storage area, located across the street from the current site.

Mr. Murphy provided the Land Development background that the Pereiras have owned the new site for some time, and the development plan received a favorable review from the Planning Commission last fall, along with minor zoning relief from the Zoning Hearing Board.

Importantly, he confirmed that the existing facility will not be sold, especially not to a neighboring property owner with whom there have been ongoing environmental and neighborly concerns. He explained that the existing building will instead serve as a back office and continue to be part of Pereira's operations. Noting that the intent is to remain a committed, long-term business presence in Middletown.

Mr. Murphy confirmed that all comments in the review letters have been addressed as "will comply" items and that the Applicant is seeking approval is being sought to move forward with the next steps in development.

He concluded by stating the plan reflects Pereira's goal to support the next generation of their family business while maintaining a strong and respectful presence in the community.

Mr. Ksiazek confirmed that the Applicant is proposing to build on is the side of Big Oak Road that abuts the train tracks.

Ms. Hannah questioned the proposed tree replacement and requested further explanation.

Justin Geonnotti, Engineer for the Applicant explained that a zoning variance has been granted regarding tree replacement requirements, which are based on the number of trees removed per acre—typically requiring 100 replacement trees per acre.

Mr. Geonnotti added that due to site constraints and the presence of existing trees that will not be disturbed, only a limited number of new trees can be planted on-site. As a result, the variance allows for flexibility in meeting the tree replacement requirement. He shared that options discussed with the Township and the Township Engineer include either planting the remaining required trees elsewhere within the township or making a fee-in-lieu contribution to the Township.

Ms. Hannah then requested that Township Engineer explain how the location of those trees is determined. Mr. Murphy confirmed that the Applicant will try to maximize the number of onsite plantings possible.

Isaac Kessler, Township Engineer, advised that the Applicant should first determine the number of replacement trees that can be accommodated on the project site. For any remaining required trees that cannot be planted on-site, coordination with Township staff will be necessary to identify appropriate off-site planting locations within the Township.

Mr. Kessler confirmed that a variance was granted by the Zoning Hearing Board.

Mr. Ksiazek noted that the property is currently vacant and contains wetlands. He referenced a prior issue before the Zoning Hearing Board regarding potential disturbance of those wetlands and asked for clarification on the environmental impact.

Mr. Geonnotti noted that some concerns in the review letter were related to a proposed fence line that would have gone through the wetlands. After discussions with Ms. Kessler and Township staff, it was confirmed that the fence will no longer cross the wetlands.

Furthermore, Mr. Geonnotti explained that all planned improvements—including the building, laydown yard, and parking lot—are located outside the delineated wetlands, ensuring those sensitive areas remain undisturbed.

Ms. Kane requested clarification as to why nearly double the required number of parking spaces are being included in the plan.

Mr. Geonnotti responded that the proposed 67 parking spaces are based on the operational needs of the business. The number reflects the staff size and the nature of the work, which includes employees arriving, parking their personal vehicles, and then taking company vehicles out onto the road. He explained that the goal is to ensure that all vehicles are parked on-site, avoiding any on-street parking or related issues, especially during times of staff turnover or peak daily operations.

Ms. Kane asked whether the wetlands and wooded areas on the property would be preserved as open space or if there was a possibility they could be developed in the future.

Mr. Geonnotti responded that the wetlands and surrounding woodlands will not be developed. He noted they are protected areas, and as noted in the review letter, the Applicant will comply with placing the wetlands within a conservation easement, meaning both the wetlands and associated woodlands will be permanently preserved.

Mr. Kessler requested that Mr. Geonnotti show on the plan where on the property the wetlands are located.

Mr. Geonnotti clarified that all woodlands along the back of the property will remain undisturbed, and the woodland line extends around the perimeter of the site up to the road. He noted that the area near the railroad tracks is designated as a wetland and will be preserved. He reiterated that all proposed improvements and disturbances are outside of this wetland area.

Mr. Geonnotti confirmed that the conservation easement will follow the perimeter of the site and encompass the areas not being developed, effectively preserving the woodlands and wetlands outside of the designated development zone.

Ms. Strouse asked what residents of the nearby Apple Valley neighborhood should expect in terms of increased noise and truck traffic because of the proposed development.

Mr. Geonnetti explained that the building will be positioned closer to the street with landscaping along the front to help shield the more industrial aspects of the site from view. Noting that the equipment storage and the laydown yard will be located behind the building, farther from residential areas.

He added that the operations will be relocated to the south side of Big Oak Road, moving away from the Apple Valley residents, and the more manufacturing-heavy operations will be situated closer to the railroad tracks.

Additionally, Mr. Murphy clarified that trucks will not use Woodburne Road; they will use Big Oak Road and head directly to the highway.

Ms. Quirple questioned what the hours of operation would be identical to the current hours of 6:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m.

Action: Ms. Strouse motion to grant Preliminary/Final Land Development Plan Approval for Pereira Properties LP, Proposed Warehouse & Contracting Office, Big Oak Road, Langhorne, PA 19047, S/LD #24-2, with the following conditions:

- 1. Applicant shall comply in full with all requirements of the Middletown Township subdivision and land development ordinance and the Middletown Township zoning ordinance, unless relief was granted by the body having jurisdiction.*
- 2. Any remaining review comments shall be addressed in full.*
- 3. Partial waiver from Section 440-510.B of the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance to provide curbing and cartway widening along Big Oak Road. Partial waiver is based on the applicant providing a financial contribution to the estimated cost of the improvements along the frontage of 2350 Big Oak Road. Estimated cost will be determined by the Township Engineer and Township Traffic and Transportation Engineer.*
- 4. Applicant will pay a fee-in-lieu for the installation of sidewalk along 2350 Big Oak Road. Cost estimate for the installation will be determined by the Township Engineer.*
- 5. Applicant will coordinate with the Township Engineer to determine the number of replacement trees that can be accommodated on site. This is covered in the testimony and evidence contained in the June 14, 2023 Zoning Hearing Board Decision and Order. Additionally, applicant will provide off-site replacement trees at locations determined by the Township or, in the event the Township determines there are no appropriate locations for the replacement trees, the applicant will provide a fee-in-lieu determined by the Township, as required under condition 3 of the June 14, 2023 Zoning Hearing Board Decision and Order.*

Mr. Murphy noted that the Applicant accepts all those conditions.

Seconded by Ms. Ms. Quirple.

Lauren Lareau, 18 Seckelspear Road, Chairperson of the Environmental Advisory Council (EAC), cautioned against approving the plans, arguing that she believes the proposed tree replacement and the development's potential impact on flooding and safety are not adequately addressed.

Ms. Lareau expressed her opinion that the development could exacerbate flooding issues along Big Oak Road, especially with the train's proximity.

She requested clarification regarding the adequacy of the tree replacement plan and voiced strong opposition to the approval of the plans.

Ms. Kane requested clarification around the comments around the amount of replacement trees.

Mr. Kessler confirmed that the Zoning Hearing Board decision stated that variance granted on June 14, 2023, "to limit the number of replacement trees required for planting to those which can be reasonably accommodated on the property whereas the planting of 411 replacement trees would otherwise be required."

Mr. Kessler confirm that the Applicant did get a reduction of the required number of trees with that variance which was described by the applicant

Mr. Ksiazek questioned how many replacement trees will be planted throughout the Township. Mr. Murphy confirmed that difference that can't be accommodated on site will be either plant offsite or pay fee in lieu of.

Mr. Kessler confirmed that 411 trees are proposed to be taken down.

James Esposito, Township Solicitor, confirmed that the variance itself says "100 replacement trees for every acre."

Mr. Ksiazek asked Mr. Geonnotti to speak to Ms. Lareau's comments regarding stormwater and potential flooding. Mr. Geonnotti addressed the stormwater management plan for the project, confirming that all stormwater improvements would be handled as proposed.

Mr. Kessler confirmed that the stormwater plan would comply with the required regulations and that the current site has no stormwater management facilities.

Ms. Lareau requested that the Township could review the placement of the 400 trees. She noted that as a member of the EAC and based on their experience with township tree planting efforts, that they often struggle to find suitable locations to plant trees, raising serious doubts about the feasibility of accommodating the hundreds of off-site replacement trees required due to the granted variance.

Ms. Lareau expressed approval of the development should be contingent on identifying actual locations for those trees in advance, rather than assuming it can be done later. She urged the board to act as responsible stewards of the land, cautioning against approving the project without a clear and realistic tree replacement plan.

Ms. Hannah asked about the locations for the proposed trees. Mr. Murphy noted that can be discussed with his Applicant.

Ms. Teoli Kuhls this type of situation is common in development approvals. Ms. Teoli Kuhls assured that Mr. Murphy will coordinate with Township staff to identify suitable locations for the off-site tree plantings.

Motion carried by a vote of 5-0.

9) Consideration of Minor Subdivision Plan Approval, 580 Middletown Blvd, TMP 22-057-056, 22-057-057 & 22-057-059, GB – General Business District, S/LD 25-2.

Edward Murphy, Attorney for the Applicant, explained that the Applicant is proposing a minor subdivision involving four existing buildings. Currently, he explained three buildings share a single parcel, while the fourth is on a separate one. The proposal involves drawing a new subdivision line to separate the group of three buildings from the fourth, creating a new lot for mortgage financing purposes. He noted that the Township ordinance specifically allows for this type of subdivision, likely anticipating such scenarios when the ring road was constructed.

He emphasized that the Township review letters raised no issues and clarified that no Land Development or improvements are planned—it's strictly a minor subdivision.

Mr. Kessler confirmed that the request is for a Minor Subdivision Plan Approval, correcting the agenda item, which had incorrectly referred to it as a Preliminary/Final Land Development Approval.

Mr. Murphy commented that the Township review letters addressed the need for cross easement and cross access agreements, which will be reviewed by Township staff to ensure that existing traffic patterns remain unchanged following the subdivision. He added that the Township is fully agreeable to this requirement.

Action: Mr. Ksiazek moved to grant Minor Subdivision Plan Approval for 580 Middletown Blvd, Langhorne, PA 19047, S/LD #25-2, with the following conditions:

1. Applicant shall comply in full with all requirements of the Middletown Township subdivision and land development ordinance and the Middletown Township zoning ordinance, unless relief was granted by the body having jurisdiction.

2. Any remaining review comments shall be addressed in full.

Seconded by Ms. Quirple. A motion carried by a vote of 5-0.

10) Consideration of Petition on behalf of Woods Schools to Rezone Woods Services, Inc., and Woods Services Foundation to Create an Overlay District for Certain Parcels in Middletown Township, Woods Schools, Langhorne, PA 19047.

Dawn Diamond, CEO of Woods Services, expressed gratitude for the opportunity to present and emphasized the importance of the proposed ordinance—both to Woods Services and the community. She noted that this effort began around six years ago and has involved significant collaboration, especially in recent months, to develop an ordinance that aligns with their mission and benefits the community.

She highlighted that Woods Services, in partnership with its affiliates, now serves over 50,000 individuals across southeastern Pennsylvania and New Jersey, focusing primarily on healthcare, intellectual disabilities, autism, and traumatic brain injury services. The core of these services, particularly healthcare, is based on their Langhorne campus, concentrated within a specific corridor.

Ms. Diamond pointed out that Woods Services has significantly evolved over the past decade and introduced a brief video to provide a clearer understanding of their current operations, the importance of their Langhorne campus, and why this ordinance is essential for their future.

Mike Meginnis, Attorney for Woods Services introduced the Community Development Transitional (CDT) Overlay District Ordinance, an overlay zoning proposal designed to apply to a portion of Woods' Langhorne campus. Mr. Meginnis emphasized that this ordinance is critical to Woods' future and reflects years of effort and collaboration.

He added that this proposal is a revised version of one initially submitted to the Township and presented to the Planning Commission over five months ago. Since then, it has been significantly scaled down—removing over 100 acres from the proposed overlay district and most nonresidential uses originally proposed.

He explained the core issue: the entire Woods campus is currently zoned R1 (single-family residential), which does not reflect its historic or current institutional and healthcare uses. Under the current zoning, every improvement—whether a new building or an addition—requires zoning relief as a pre-existing, non-conforming use, which he argued is not good planning. Rather than repeatedly seeking relief through the Zoning Hearing Board, Woods is proposing a long-term solution. Initially, they considered a map amendment to rezone the campus to existing categories like Professional or General Business, but those did not accommodate the diverse range of services and uses on campus.

He acknowledged that no Zoning Ordinance is perfect but stated that this overlay is a far better fit for the campus and a forward-looking solution for both parties. He explained that this allows Woods Services to remain a strong and stable part of Middletown Township and resolves a long-standing zoning mismatch.

Mr. Meginnis explained key sections of the proposed CDT ordinance which are often a concern with overlay ordinances. He emphasized that all proposed uses in the ordinance would require conditional use approval, except for one notable exception: the proposed apartment building outlined in Section 500-2205.2.

He explained that the apartment building is a specific, immediate need. Noting that this will be located internally within the campus, on a 3.78-acre parcel, and designed as attainable housing. He noted that the initial phase will include 42 units, with 9 dedicated to individuals with intellectual disabilities. Adding that this location was chosen to minimize any impact on neighboring communities, especially after concerns were raised during earlier Township meetings.

Mr. Meginnis confirmed that this is the only component of the ordinance that Woods Service has full development plans for, and that any future development will go through the full conditional use process, with Township oversight at every step. That includes ensuring open space, buffering, and other performance standards are met.

He explained that the remaining permitted uses under the ordinance—such as existing offices, medical services, small-scale retail, and educational facilities—are already in operation on the Woods campus or closely tied to its mission. Noting some newer uses like a pharmacy or small guest house are modest in scope and serve to support Woods families and clients.

Mr. Meginnis noted that Woods Services has taken feedback from the Township Planning Commission seriously and has agreed to update a provision to require "best efforts" rather than just "reasonable efforts" to incorporate open space features. He explained that Woods Services has agreed to reduce the cap on impervious surface for non-residential uses from 75% to 60%.

In Mr. Meginnis closing, he shared that this ordinance is mission-driven, tailored to Woods Services, and not a tool to open the floodgates to unrelated development. He commented that Woods Services the clarity and flexibility it needs to continue providing vital services, while giving the Township the protection it needs moving forward.

Mr. Esposito noted one minor revision that was suggested and incorporated on page two, under section A.1, where the business or professional office use is limited to 50%, it should be clarified that this percentage is based on square footage. Mr. Meginnis confirmed that was a clarification as drafted and Woods Services is agreeable.

Eric Clase from Gilmore and Associates explained that when considering the development requirements, which are outlined on page four of the overlay ordinance under Section 2205.4, it's important to understand the overall theme: the entire 113-acre Woods campus is being considered as an overall tract.

He further explained that each individual land development plan would come before the Board of Supervisors and there would be a tracking mechanism—whether that relates to natural resources, impervious coverage, or other key elements. The overarching requirement is that the entire 113-acre tract will always comply with the ordinance standards, regardless of the specifics of any single

phase. He briefly touched on various aspects of Section 2205.4(A); Under Section 2205.4(B); Section 2205.4(C); Section 2205.4(D): Natural Resources; Page Five – Buffers; Section F – Stormwater Management; Section G – Connectivity and Coordination.

Ms. Kane inquired about the phasing of the apartment units, referring to a Bucks County Planning Commission recommendation to reduce the total number of units from 75.

Mr. Meginnis responded that Phase 1 of the apartments will include: 29 one-bedroom units; 8 two-bedroom units; 5 three-bedroom units. He explained that Phase 2 is projected to include: 16 one-bedroom units; 8 two-bedroom units; 4 three-bedroom units. Noting that this brings the total to 70 units, which is below the originally proposed 75 units. He also clarified that the ordinance limits development to no more than one apartment building, meaning that additional units in Phase 2 would be incorporated into the same structure—not a separate building in a U-shaped.

Ms. Kane expressed concerns about the maximum building height. Mr. Meginnis reflected on the initial application submitted approximately four years ago and emphasized that, based on their team's analysis, the proposed four-story apartment design remains the most appropriate solution. He acknowledged that while he may not fully agree with the concerns previously raised by the Zoning Hearing Board, he does understand their perspective, particularly regarding the building's original proximity to neighboring residential properties.

However, he noted that the building has now been relocated to a more internal part of the Woods campus, significantly reducing its visibility and potential impact on nearby properties. He explained that minimum acreage requirements are often tied to building height to ensure that taller buildings do not negatively affect neighboring viewsheds. In this case, because the surrounding area is entirely part of the Woods campus, he argued that the four-story building would not disrupt adjacent properties or cause adverse visual impacts.

He concluded by stating that this is a unique situation—the Woods campus is effectively its own neighbor in this area—so height-related concerns that typically arise in other zoning contexts should not apply in the same way here.

Ms. Kane expressed concern regarding the amount of impervious coverage permitted under the proposed overlay district, particularly in comparison to the limitations currently established under existing zoning regulations. Mr. Meginnis responded that the proposed impervious coverage would be 26.5%, and he provided a detailed explanation outlining how that percentage was calculated.

Ms. Kane inquired about the absence of impact studies, specifically those addressing natural resource protection standards, transportation impact, and fiscal impact. She asked why those studies had not yet been included with the submission. Mr. Meginnis noted that although impact studies were submitted, they are not considered substantively sufficient at this point due to the lack of a specific development proposal. He explained that the submitted materials will need to be supplemented during each phase of development as plans become more defined.

Ms. Kane requested that Mr. Meginnis explain the reduction of the overlay area to 137 acres, specifically the removed portions of land that appear to be the most heavily forested and, therefore, most suitable for open space preservation.

Mr. Meginnis responded that removing those parcels from the overlay was a benefit to the Township. He explained that when land is included in the overlay, it becomes subject to the development provisions in the ordinance. By keeping these parcels in the R-1 district, they remain protected from development unless a future zoning change or variance is approved. He emphasized that Woods Services could still voluntarily commit these areas to conservation or open space through a conditional use process, but their exclusion from the overlay serves as a concrete step to preserve them in their natural state.

He acknowledged that this addressed part of Ms. Kane's concern but pointed out that the ordinance still allows flexibility for open space to be preserved anywhere within the overlay district—not necessarily within the parcel being developed. He noted that carving out those forested parcels could reduce the likelihood of open space being preserved there, which remained a concern.

Ms. Hannah requested additional clarification from the Applicant regarding the proposed apartment units. Specifically, she asked who would be responsible for managing the units and how it would be determined who would reside there. Ms. Diamond responded that the apartments would be managed by a third-party property management company, as required by the Pennsylvania Housing Finance Agency (PHFA) process. This management entity must comply with all applicable Fair Housing Act requirements.

She added that nine (9) units are earmarked for individuals with intellectual disabilities, autism, or traumatic brain injury. These individuals would apply through the same process as other applicants, with support from their case managers to ensure suitable placements. Additionally, she explained that many individuals currently supported by Woods Services are interested in applying and may do so, including some who may wish to live with roommates. The remaining units are designated as attainable (affordable) housing and are open to any eligible community members based on income qualifications, with all applicants going through the same third-party management process.

The following residents were in opposition to the project:

Joe McGrath, 257 S. Hawthorne Street
Fran Grous, 36 Green Ridge Road

Ms. Diamond responded to Ms. Grous' concerns, explaining that Woods Services is selective in their tenant applications.

Ms. Kane asked how the decision is made regarding who receives an apartment. Ms. Diamond responded that she was not aware of how the selection process works because the selection process would be administered by the third-party property management company.

Mr. Ksiazek noted that a concern was raised, both at the current meeting and previously by the Planning Commission, that the proposed overlay district would give Woods Services broad, unrestricted development rights (“carte blanche”) in the future.

Mr. Meginnis clarified that future development under the overlay would still require Township review, including conditional use applications and compliance with overlay standards such as open space and stormwater management. He added that a master plan will ensure the 113-acre tract meets overall requirements, even if individual phases vary, unlike current zoning, which may require variances or text amendments, the overlay provides a clearer, more structured, and transparent approval process.

Public Comment continued with the following residents were in opposition to the project:

Eric Bruno, 79 Sweetgum Road
Lance Sagers, 98 Queen Lily Road
Lauren Laureu, 18 Specklepear Road

In response to Mr. Ksiazek’s request, Mr. Meginnis responded by emphasizing that the intent behind the overlay is rooted in the organization’s mission and long-term sustainability, not profit or divestment. They explained that Woods’ care model has evolved significantly over time, shifting toward more integrated and community-based living arrangements that reflect national best practices, and the preferences of individuals served. The overlay is designed to support that shift by allowing for housing types and community spaces that better align with their service goals. It is not about selling off land or converting the campus into purely residential use, but rather about creating a framework that enables Woods to adapt to the changing needs of its population while remaining mission-focused and financially stable.

Ms. Hannah questioned why the proposed housing isn’t limited to just the clientele or employees of Woods Services, especially if the intent is to support their existing community.

Mr. Meginnis clarified that Woods Services doesn't see the housing issue as an either/or situation—serving only their residents versus serving the broader community. Legally, due to PHFA funding requirements, the housing can't be restricted just to Woods clientele or employees if it's to remain attainable. More importantly, he emphasized that Woods is mission-driven not just for its own residents but also because it genuinely supports the broader goal of attainable housing. Past feedback from the Planning Commission prompted revisions to the ordinance to explicitly include attainable housing, demonstrating Woods’s commitment. Ultimately, the proposed apartment building is meant to meet both the needs of Woods residents and the broader community, not one at the expense of the other.

Ms. Hannah further asked about how people qualify for attainable housing. Ms. Diamond explained the income thresholds for single individuals and households, with figures varying based on household size (e.g., a single person could earn up to \$48,000, and household income for a two-bedroom unit could go up to \$55,000 a year).

Ms. Strouse raised concern about the property being zoned R1, asking what would prevent a developer like Toll Brothers from developing the Woods campus into hundreds of single-family homes. Mr. Meginnis responded that nothing would prevent that possibility from happening.

Mr. Ksiazek emphasized that many concerns—like fears of large-scale development—are unfounded, as the ordinance allows only one apartment building. He said the goal is to level the playing field for Woods, not offer special treatment. He added that the conditional use process established in the ordinance actually gives the Board more control, not less. He noted the land is already zoned residential, so other development could happen regardless. He expressed trust in Woods and support for the overlay to help them remain viable

Ms. Quirple emphasized that Woods Services as a long-standing, valuable part of the community. With experience in special education and support work, she vouched for their mission and dedication. She supports the project as a much-needed step toward attainable housing, especially for younger adults. She trusts PHFA to vet tenants and noted that Woods residents already live in the community, so safety concerns are unfounded.

Ms. Strouse strongly supported Woods Services, saying losing them would be heartbreaking. She warned that selling the land could lead to dense housing, burdening schools and raising taxes—something the community doesn't want. She also honored the late Supervisor Anna Payne's legacy of advocating for attainable housing and diversity and reaffirmed her commitment to those values.

Ms. Hannah supported the conditional use for added oversight and expressed strong support for Woods Services. As a parent of a child on the spectrum, she emphasized the care Woods provides and the need for attainable housing, noting many local workers struggle to afford homes. With 30 years in education, she believes Woods's services will benefit Lower Bucks and fully support the project.

Ms. Kane reiterated her support for Woods Services, acknowledging their excellent care for those in need. However, she expressed concerns about the ordinance, wishing it provided stronger measures to preserve open space, especially given the current landscape. She felt more safeguards should have been included, rather than leaving it to future decisions.

Action: Mr. Ksiazek motioned to approve the petition for the overlay ordinance as presented, subject to the revisions by Mr. Meginnis. The motion was seconded by Ms. Strouse. Motion carried by a vote of 4-1 with Ms. Kane in opposition.

11) Consideration of awarding the N. Flowers Mill Road Drainage Project Base Bid and Alternate No. 1 to James D. Morrissey Inc. in the total amount of \$114,807.00.

Mr. Kessler reported that the bidding process for the N. Flowers Mill Road Drainage Project was completed in accordance with the Township's Responsible Contractor Ordinance (RCO). Bids were officially opened on April 1, 2025.

He explained that the Base Bid focuses on resolving drainage issues at the intersection of N. Flowers Mill Road and Detective Christopher Jones Way, where excess stormwater has led to icing hazards and roadway deterioration. The project will enhance stormwater management by installing new storm pipes and inlets to better capture and redirect runoff into the underground system.

Additionally, he noted that an Alternate Bid was included to address drainage concerns south of the Shoppes at Flowers Mill. This component proposes adding a new inlet and connecting it to the existing culvert to reduce ponding and improve safety in that area.

A total of six bids were received for the project, with James D. Morrissey identified as the lowest responsible bidder. The recommended contract award amount is \$114,807.00.

Ms. Kane inquired about the original budget for the project.

Action: Mr. Ksiazek made a motion to award the Base Bid and Alternate Bid No. 1 for the N. Flowers Mill Road Drainage Project in the total amount of \$114,807.00 to James D. Morrissey, Inc., seconded by Ms. Hannah. Motion carried by a vote of 5-0.

12) Consideration of awarding the Consortium Road Material Supplies Contract for 2025-26 to Eureka Stone Quarry, in amount not to exceed \$65,000.

Eric Gartenmayer, Public Works Director, explained that Middletown Township has long been a member of the Bucks County Consortium. The Public Works Department submitted estimates for road materials needed for the upcoming year, with all items to be purchased as needed. According to the submitted road material tabulation sheet, Eureka Stone Quarry was the lowest bidder, adding that \$65,000 has been allocated in the 2025 Budget for these materials.

Action: Ms. Quirple move to award the 2025-2026 Road Material Supplies Contract to Eureka Stone Quarry, Chalfont, PA. in an amount not to exceed \$65,000, seconded by Ms. Kane. Motion carried by a vote of 5-0.

13) Consideration of authorizing the purchase and installation of playground equipment at Lions Park.

Paul Kopera, Director of Parks and Recreation, presented a proposal to replace the aging Lions Park Playground, originally installed in 1997, with a new, inclusive Gametime playground and swing set. Located at a high-visibility intersection, the playground serves families from Snowball Gate and Deep Dale East and West. He noted that the new equipment promotes physical activity, inclusive play, and skill development.

Mr. Kopera shared that the cost is \$119,999.53 covered in part by a Pennsylvania Recreation and Park Society (PRPS) Statewide Grant awarded to Middletown Township, which includes professional installation through Marturano Recreation Company, a Costars Vendor. He noted that the 2025 Capital Budget has already allocated \$120,000 for this project.

He noted that the design qualifies as a National Demonstration Site, offering accessible and enriching experiences for children of all abilities. He also added that the playground features vibrant colors including yellow umbrellas, purples, and oranges to improve the high-visibility area, which were also selected by the Townships Parks & Recreation Board members.

Ms. Kane inquired about the possibility of fencing for safety. Mr. Kopera explained that the plan is to add four parking spaces to the area—either during or after construction. He noted that the goal is to provide a safer option for families, who currently park on the grass, allowing for safer access when exiting their vehicles. He emphasized that gates are not necessary and would introduce additional maintenance concerns, particularly with mowing.

Ms. Strouse noted that she did not see any benches were visible on site. Mr. Kopera clarified that there are currently four benches along the perimeter, with two added recently. He added that benches and trash cans are always included as part of their standard site amenities.

Action: Ms. Quirple made a motion to execute a contract for the purchase and installation of playground equipment from Marturano Recreation Company, a Costars vendor, in the amount of \$119,999.53, seconded by Ms. Hannah.

Mr. Bruno suggested adding a path from the corner to the playground for improved accessibility. Mr. Kopera confirmed that this could be included, stating that the Parks and Recreation Comprehensive Plan supports such enhancements.

Motion carried by a vote of 5-0.

14) Public Comment.

Sheldon Post, 31 Rockwood Road, expressed concerns about the Zoning Hearing Board and Planning Commission (ZHB/PC) agenda, noting that it is often unclear or difficult to understand what is being discussed. He provided examples to support his point. He suggested adding more detail to the agendas, similar to how other department requests are clearly outlined.

Mr. Post also expressed his appreciation for Tower 8, during a house fire near his home. He appreciated its availability and functionality during the incident.

Finally, he inquired whether public comment would be permanently moved to the end of meetings.

Mr. Ksiazek responded that Public Comment will be moved back to the beginning of the agenda. Additionally, Mr. Ksiazek noted that improvements will be made to the Zoning Hearing Board and Planning Commission agendas format to enhance clarity.

15) Other Business.

Mr. Esposito announced that the Board of Supervisors held an executive session prior to this meeting to discuss ongoing and potential litigation matters.

Mr. Valla shared an update about PennDOT's ongoing progress on the roundabout and improvements to Langhorne-Yardley Road at Bridgetown Pike. He confirmed that the project is on schedule, with the roundabout intersection expected to be closed during the summer season while school is out. The construction is expected to wrap up by the end of the construction year, possibly extending into early 2026. He also mentioned that more details are available on PennDOT's website for those interested.

Ms. Hannah congratulated Carl Sandburg choir for their amazing performance and congratulated the Rebels and the Spiders. She also thanked Parks and Recreation for organizing another successful community cleanup day over the weekend.

Ms. Strouse expressed her appreciation for the civic discourse and acknowledged that all the comments made during the meeting were well-reasoned, well-stated, and well-presented.

Mr. Ksiazek took a moment to honor Anne Welz, a former staff member who recently passed away. He shared that Ms. Welz had just retired after 26 years of service as a records clerk with the Middletown Township Police Department. He requested a moment of silence to remember her.

16) Adjournment.

Ms. Kane moved to adjourn the public meeting of the Middletown Township Board of Supervisors' public meeting at 9:48 p.m., seconded by Ms. Hannah. Motion carried by a vote of 5-0.