

**Towamencin Township
Board of Supervisors
Work Session Meeting
July 8, 2026
7:00 PM**

Present:

Joyce F. Snyder, Chair
Vanessa Gaynor, Vice Chair
Kofi Osei, Secretary
Kristin Warner, Treasurer

Staff:

David G. Kraynik, Township Manager
Mark A. Hosterman, Esq., Township Solicitor
Mary Stover, Township Engineer
Henry Sekawungu, Director of Planning, Zoning & Code Enforcement
Niral Modi, IT Specialist
Tim Troxel, Chief of Police

Absent:

Courtney Morgan, Asst. Treasurer/Asst. Secretary

Chair Snyder called the meeting to order at 7:01 pm and led the assemblage in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Opening Comments

- This Board meeting is being provided via Zoom for residents unable to attend in person but who wish to view and hear the meeting live remotely. Public comments submitted by 4:30 pm on the day of the meeting will be read at the start of the meeting. For those physically present, public comment will be available at the beginning of the meeting.
- The Board met in Executive Session prior to this meeting to discuss personnel matters.
- Thank you to all who joined us for our America 250 celebration on June 25 to make it a success. We had a great turnout, with an overwhelming display of patriotism and love for our community and country. We are deeply grateful to our volunteers, committee members and participants whose dedication and teamwork made this celebration possible, from the earliest planning stages through the day of the event.
- Our Summer Concert Series continues through August 6th. Concerts are free at Fischer's Park. Our next concert is tomorrow, July 9th, featuring Mike Greer & Company. Concessions are available for purchase beginning at 6 pm and concerts start at 7 pm. Weather-related cancellations are announced by 1 pm on the day of the event.

Emailed Public Comments:

Resident Lynn Sweet-Reimel commented residents have heard a developer may return with a high-density proposal for the Freddy Hill property, but no agenda had been posted, leaving the public without clear information about what may be discussed. She expressed concern that scheduling a potential development discussion immediately after a holiday weekend without an agenda limits meaningful public awareness and participation, raising questions about the transparency of decisions that could permanently reshape Towamencin. She stated many residents are concerned the Township is moving toward supporting higher-density development and argued that approving density beyond what is permitted by right would set a precedent for future proposals, affecting not only Freddy Hill but also larger properties, such as the bird farm that may be developed. She claimed residents were told the Troxel/Sumneytown realignment is a project benefit but declared, to her understanding, PennDOT would require improvements regardless of development. She stated that presenting it as a concession to justify increased density is misleading, adding that any traffic plan should also address the long-standing safety concerns on Kriebel Road. She asked the Board to demonstrate transparency, avoid scheduling major development discussions when public participation is reduced, and carefully consider the long-term consequences of approving increased density.

Resident Augustus Fox commented his wife submitted a public comment before the Township released the agenda as she heard that a major development discussion was planned. He claimed the agenda was posted last minute, confirming concerns a developer presentation would be featured after a holiday weekend. He noted residents should not have to rely on speculation or submit comments before basic information is made public. While the agenda may have met the Township's minimum posting requirements, the combination of its late release, the holiday timing, and the scale of the development did not provide adequate time for residents to review the proposal, ask questions, or prepare informed comments. He opined residents have observed a pattern of late agendas, scheduling major development discussions when public participation is naturally reduced, with developers appearing to have more advanced knowledge than the public. He feels this creates the appearance of an unfair process, transparency concerns, equal access to information, and public trust. He continued the Board should not vote on any matter related to this presentation as residents were not given enough time to prepare for a project of this scale. Delaying action allows meaningful public participation and helps rebuild confidence.

Residents Val Skripek & Mike Gawell thanked the Board for hearing from constituents, whether in person or by email. They stated they are longtime residents who live near the proposed development and, while they oppose developing the parcel, have accepted that development is likely inevitable. Their key question is how to manage it responsibly. They noted that fewer homes are not necessarily the better option, citing the benefits of preserving more open space and wildlife corridors, as well as providing road improvements at the developer's expense. They also referenced the significant differences in Township and school revenues between the 210-home and 140-home plans. For those reasons, they expressed support for the plan allowing more homes while preserving more open space.

Resident Jenn Foster commented on the MRC plan for the Freddy Hill property, recognizing the contentious discussions and she shares many of the resident concerns. However, she believes those discussions should have occurred a year ago, when the Board was considering the 300-unit MRC proposal and by-right plan with 140 homes. Instead of working to improve the MRC proposal through negotiations, she noted Supervisors Snyder and Warner voted against studying it, effectively accepting the by-right plan with no negotiated improvements, intersection or road upgrades, traffic directed entirely onto Kriebel Road, and less emphasis on open space. Adding

they approved the PSDC proposal for 200 units, behind Margaritas, on a smaller property without much scrutiny, despite longstanding concerns about the developer. She feels those decisions resulted in 300 new homes with virtually no negotiated improvements for traffic, stormwater management, environmental protection, or the community, describing this as lazy governing. Updated traffic studies show the proposed development can connect directly to Troxel Road at the existing traffic signal, reducing reliance on Kriebel Road while providing additional neighborhood connections. She urged the Board to require the developer to fund necessary signal and turn-lane improvements as a condition of approval. She encouraged the Township to work with the County to evaluate additional traffic signal options along Sumneytown Pike. She noted the revised proposal would provide significant financial benefits to the Township and School District, to support schools, roads, police, fire, parks, and other municipal services. The plan preserves 66.5 acres of open space, protecting the creek corridor, adding a walking trail, improving stormwater management, and connecting neighborhoods. She urged the Board to hold the developer to a high standard for construction practices and environmental buffer protection. While additional studies and due diligence are still needed, the latest information reviewed is positive and suggests the MRC proposal is the stronger option. She thanked the Board for allowing the review process to continue and urged a thorough evaluation before making a final decision.

Resident Tiffanie Stanton commented on the County's memo presented last month, which recommended changes to Towamencin's zoning and ordinances to allow greater housing density. She believes the recommendations were made without sufficient analysis of their impact on township resources or finances. She expressed concern that a significant increase in density would place additional strain on schools, roads, police, and fire services. She believes that if new developments do not generate tax revenue at a rate that keeps pace with increased service demand, existing homeowners will ultimately face higher taxes. She had concerns that increased traffic and changes in the township's character could negatively affect property values and residents' quality of life. She opposes the contract with Montgomery County, arguing that it would require the Planning Commission to consider the county's recommendations. She questioned paying the county to promote changes that she believes could increase taxes, lower home values, and alter the community's character, urging the Board to reject the contract. She acknowledged that members of the Open Space and Environmental Advisory Committees have expressed interest with assisting updates to the township ordinances and thanked them for their volunteer service. Instead of spending annually on a contract with the county, the township may consider hiring a college intern or co-op student, who could provide current knowledge of planning practices, technology, and AI tools while gaining valuable work experience. The township should be able to select an independent consultant whose focus would be helping Towamencin achieve its own goals rather than the County's priorities. The community has been built through residents' investments in their homes, payment of taxes, volunteer service, participation in schools and churches, community involvement, and neighborly support. She believes rising home values reflect the success of those collective efforts. Finally, she observed that many residents cannot attend township meetings due to work and family commitments, suggesting major zoning and ordinance changes should instead be decided by an advisory referendum. She cites section 401.3 of the Home Rule Charter may grant the Board that authority. She encouraged the supervisors to consider allowing all residents to have a voice in significant decisions affecting the township's future.

Resident Lori Morrissey commented on Pinnacle's revised Freddy Hill property proposal, noting she prefers it to the original "by-right" plan for 140 single-family homes. Towamencin has a shortage of lower-priced, starter, and low-maintenance homes, particularly newer units. The revised plan includes smaller single-family homes and carriage houses, offering housing options for young families and seniors looking to downsize. She believes the township already has an ample supply of million-dollar-plus homes. She also emphasized the importance of the proposed main intersection at Troxel Road, which would distribute traffic more effectively than directing it all onto Kriebel Road. In addition, the revised plan appears to include less paved surface - fewer roads and driveways—than the 140-home proposal, along with more open space and walking trails. She feels these amenities would make the property more accessible and enjoyable for the entire community, rather than benefiting only the residents of large homes. She acknowledged some residents continue to oppose any development on the property but noted the property has been sold. She believes the township should support a plan that provides needed housing choices for people starting out or beginning a new chapter with smaller, more attainable homes.

Resident Corina Fiore expressed support for the proposed 210-unit MRC plan for Project Hilltop, she believes it is superior to the by-right development based on the available data. She noted the MRC plan provides more and better-connected open space, preserves more of the eastern grassland habitat, and offers greater ecological value despite lower minimum open space requirements. As a member of the Environmental Advisory Committee, she recommended that the Board require preserving as much of the existing riparian buffer canopy as possible - where the proposed road crosses Towamencin Creek, particularly mature trees, to reduce erosion and protect habitat. Fiore acknowledged the MRC plan would generate more trips but characterized the increase as modest and noted the proposed Troxel Road connection would improve traffic distribution. She also cited projected fiscal benefits, stating the MRC plan would generate more than twice the annual net revenue for the township and school district compared with the by-right plan. While recognizing the project would add an estimated 28 students, she believes the school district can accommodate that growth and that the benefits of increased open space, improved stormwater management, and better transportation connectivity outweigh the impact. Although she would have preferred permanent preservation of the property, she believes development is inevitable and that the MRC proposal represents the stronger overall plan. She encouraged the Board to approve the project with the recommended riparian buffer preservation condition.

Supervisor Osei asked the Township Manager if there was anything different about how the agenda was posted or about this meeting compared with other meetings. Mr. Kraynik indicated no, rather the agenda was posted a day early, on Thursday rather than Friday, due to the holiday.

In-person Public Comments:

Resident Barry Kenyon questioned the need for the Montgomery County Planning Commission contract agreement given that the Township already has a Planning Commission and residents already fund the Montgomery County Planning Commission through their taxes. For item 6.2, he questioned whether the proposed housing prices align with the goal of affordable housing, citing the plan's projected lot sizes and costs. He raised concerns about the cumulative traffic impacts of the proposed development, the Town Center project, and the North Penn School District high school additions. Additionally, he expressed concern about the impact that new residential development would have on the school district's enrollment.

Resident Steve Hull supported preserving the Seipt property home (formerly known as the Lukens Inn), emphasizing its significance to Towamencin's history. He referenced the property's historical background, urging the Township to preserve and honor its historical value.

Resident Richard Detwiler continued referencing the historical significance of the Seipt home, formerly known as the Lukens Inn, emphasizing its importance to Towamencin's history and advocating for its preservation. He expressed concern that the proposed development includes demolition of the historic structure and encouraged the Board to work with the developer to incorporate the property's historical significance into the project while allowing for future growth. He also shared additional historical details and examples of other communities that have preserved historic resources as part of new development.

Resident Leon Kashishian expressed disappointment with the revised development plan, stating he expected the previously discussed 141-unit by-right plan to move forward. He questioned the process by which the new plan was developed, understanding that development proposals should originate with the developer. He stated that many residents had supported the by-right plan, opposing additional housing, expressing concern that the proposed homes would not be affordable. He then advocated to preserve the historic Seipt House, questioned its proposed demolition, referenced prior commitments to preserving open space, and raised concerns about the plan's impacts on historic resources, the silo, and environmentally sensitive areas.

Resident Casey Hannings presented photographs documenting wildlife at Freddy Hill Farms and advocated for preserving the property's trees, wetlands, grasslands, and wildlife habitat. He cited Township code and the Pennsylvania Constitution in support of protecting natural resources and argued that the development could be designed to better preserve these features. While acknowledging the need for additional housing, including smaller homes and townhomes, he expressed concern that the current proposals would have unacceptable environmental impacts. He also discussed opportunities for open space preservation and recreational use, urged the Board to pursue an open space referendum to help preserve the remaining land at Freddy Hill and concluded by emphasizing the property's ecological value and calling for its preservation.

Resident Joe Silverman thanked the Township for its America 250 celebration, complimenting the event and its organization. He then commented on the proposed development, expressing concerns about the lot sizes and home prices, stating they do not reflect the value buyers would expect at those price points. He also spoke in support of preserving the historic Lukens House, citing its quality of construction, and expressed support for the 141-unit by-right plan, suggesting that an even lower density would be preferable.

Resident Shannon Main questioned whether the property meets the minimum acreage requirements for the proposed zoning changes, noting her understanding that the primary parcel is less than the required 100 acres and that the developer combined multiple parcels to meet the threshold. She referenced a previous Planning Commission meeting at which the proposed hybrid plan was not supported and stated that residents left with the understanding the developer would proceed with the 141-unit by-right plan. She further stated that records obtained through a right-to-know request indicated subsequent discussions between Township staff and the developer regarding a new proposal and expressed concern that she learned of those discussions through the right-to-know process rather than through the public process.

Resident Peter Van Thuyne praised Casey's wildlife presentation and encouraged the Board to consider its significance. He expressed concern that the Board was considering development

proposals that had previously been rejected by the Planning Commission, questioning why the Planning Commission's recommendations were not being followed. He also raised concerns about the public process, transparency, and communications regarding the proposal. Additionally, he questioned whether the proposed homes would be affordable, expressed skepticism about the traffic analysis and its assumptions, and urged the Township to work collaboratively with the Planning Commission and the public to develop a transparent, community-supported plan.

Resident Kris Kazmar stated his experience attending Township meetings, many residents oppose higher taxes, increased utility costs, and higher-density development. He questioned why the Township has zoning regulations if developers can seek higher-density projects that differ from those standards. He expressed concern that the County's Planning Commission promotes higher-density development and urged the Board to vote against the proposed contract.

Resident Patrick McNally commended the previous speakers for their comments and expressed disappointment that the development discussion had returned after he believed the matter had been resolved. He questioned the benefits the Township would receive from the proposal and expressed concern about increased traffic, vehicle volume, and guest parking impacts. He also criticized the potential environmental impacts of the development and urged the Township to work collaboratively with residents rather than moving forward without their input.

Resident Martha Wolgemuth stated that the meeting and information presented had been valuable. She directed a question to Supervisor Osei regarding the impact of additional housing on the Township's sewer system, referencing his prior outreach regarding the sewer sale and asking how future sewer needs would be addressed if the proposed development moves forward.

Resident Kathleen Hangey stated that her primary concern is not the 141-unit plan itself, but the proposed zoning change and the potential precedent it could set for other properties in Towamencin Township. She expressed concern that such changes could put open spaces and parks at risk of future development. She encouraged collaboration between the Township, residents, and stakeholders to find an appropriate approach to growth. She also raised concerns about increasing North Penn School District enrollment, whether the proposed lot sizes provide adequate outdoor space for children, and the need for further consideration of the proposal. She thanked Casey Hannings for his presentation.

Resident Lisa Lieb commented on the Montgomery County Planning contract, stating she does not believe additional government oversight is needed and that the Township has managed its planning responsibilities effectively, expressing concern about County involvement in local land-use decisions. Regarding the Pinnacle proposal, she reiterated her support for maintaining the R-175 zoning designation and the 141-unit by-right plan. She stated the connection to the Troxel signal should not be used as leverage in discussions for the 210-unit plan.

Approval of Minutes

On a motion by Supervisor Osei, seconded by Supervisor Gaynor, the Board approved the June 24 meeting minutes.

Voting Yes: Joyce F. Snyder, Kristin Warner, Kofi Osei, Vanessa Gaynor

Voting No: N/A

Abstaining: N/A
Absent: Courtney Morgan

Zoning, Subdivision and Land Development

Consider Approving Montgomery County Community Planning Assistance Contract

At the request of staff, the Montgomery County Planning Commission prepared a proposed contract to provide planning services for the Township. This partnership will benefit the Township with increased planning resources for staff and the Township's Planning Commission. More than half of the 62 Montgomery County municipalities contract with the County for planning assistance. The contract pricing is offered through the County's municipal cost-sharing program, in which the municipality pays 50% of the overall contract costs. The contract would be a 3-year term, beginning September 1, 2026, with an overall contract cost of \$58,814.50. The first installment would be due in April 2027. Eric Jarrell, Montgomery County Planning Manager, reviewed the proposed contract services and answered questions.

Supervisor Osei asked Henry Sekawungu, Director of Planning, Zoning and Code Enforcement, who had prior experience working in municipalities with County planning assistance contracts, to clarify that the Montgomery County Planning contract is similar to a consultant contract like Simone Collins, referencing the concerns the County would be taking over the planning process. Mr. Sekawungu clarified that the County would serve as a resource to support the Township's planning process, working with the Planning Commission to better understand community goals, projections and align review comments with Township objectives.

Supervisor Osei asked Solicitor Hosterman to explain the revisions made to the Montgomery County Planning contract. Solicitor Hosterman stated concerns were raised at the Planning Commission meeting regarding the County potentially directing Township decisions related to zoning, subdivision, and land development ordinances. He explained that, based on his experience with similar contracts in other municipalities, he revised the language to clarify the County's role as advisory only, that the Township will provide information and feedback, and that the Township will retain full autonomy over its decisions.

Supervisor Osei asked Mr. Jarrell to provide examples of recent projects and describe the process used when working with municipalities and their Planning Commissions. Mr. Jarrell explained that the County is currently assisting several communities with Comprehensive Plans, followed by updates to zoning and subdivision ordinances. He noted that the County works directly with local Planning Commissions to gather feedback and support the adoption process. He cited Lower Gwynedd and Hatfield Townships as examples and emphasized that the County's role is to provide information and resources to help municipalities make informed decisions.

Supervisor Osei asked Mr. Jarrell to explain the cost-sharing component of the proposed contract. Mr. Jarrell stated that the three-year agreement functions similarly to a consulting arrangement, allowing the Montgomery County Planning Commission to serve as an extension of Township staff and provide access to County resources and departments. He explained that the contract includes standard planner day rates and attendance at 10 meetings annually, with a fixed cost structure. He added that the County's goal is to provide a valuable service and ensure the Township is satisfied with the support provided at the conclusion of the agreement.

Supervisor Warner expressed initial concerns about preserving Township autonomy and emphasized the value of local Planning Commission members with professional experience and a vested interest in the community. She stated that, while she remains cautious, the County has clarified it will not direct Township decisions. She asked about the qualifications of the County representative. Mr. Jarrell explained that the minimum requirement is a master's degree in planning, noting that the individual under consideration has a planning degree from Temple University and seven years of experience. Supervisor Warner questioned potential redundancy in fees, noting that residents already fund the County and that MCPC reviews Township submissions. Mr. Jarrell explained that the contract would provide additional assistance with planning efforts, such as zoning, ordinances, codes, and land development updates, beyond routine reviews. She asked whether the County could help with individual projects without the contract, and Mr. Jarrell stated that MCPC does not provide project-specific consulting services, as it does not compete with private consultants. Supervisor Warner reiterated concerns about ensuring the County's role remains advisory and supportive of Township goals. Mr. Jarrell confirmed that all decisions would continue to require approval by the Board.

Supervisor Gaynor asked about the benefits other communities have experienced through early MCPC engagement and collaboration with staff. Mr. Jarrell stated that continued contract renewals from municipalities demonstrate the value of the partnership, citing Plymouth Township as a recent example.

Resident Steve Hull expressed concern that the MCPC contract may have an underlying agenda referencing previous discussions, noting the Township continues to revisit the same development issues. He stated that residents have consistently supported limiting density, while developers continue to propose increased development. He questioned the decision to hire MCPC given the cost and the Planning Commission's prior recommendations, expressing concern the Board is not considering community feedback and is using taxpayer funds to pursue additional density.

Resident Vicky McNally asked whether MCPC was involved in the approved 2025 development plans for the Willow Grove air base, citing concerns about contamination by forever chemicals. Mr. Jarrell explained that the process began 15–20 years ago, with an established authority in Horsham overseeing the project. He stated that MCPC assisted at the request of the Horsham Township Board of Supervisors but did not replace or undermine the required environmental review process.

Resident Gabe asked how MCPC would advise the Township on a hypothetical zoning request for 140 homes if retained as a consultant and attending 10 meetings. Mr. Jarrell stated that he was unclear about the question.

Resident Joe Silverman stated he regularly attends Township meetings and listens to discussions by the Board and Planning Commission. He expressed dissatisfaction with MCPC, questioned the need for additional consultants, and stated that he believes the Township already has sufficient oversight. He also shared concerns, based on his prior experience with MCPC during a subdivision process, and suggested that County resources should instead focus on local infrastructure needs.

Resident Tiffanie Stanton asked whether the communities listed as MCPC clients are charged the same rate proposed for Towamencin, noting that Towamencin is a smaller municipality. Mr. Jarrell explained that rates are adjusted annually based on community size and service needs, and that Plymouth Township is comparable to Towamencin. He stated that service levels are determined

by the Township's requests and that rates are set by the MCPC Board. She questioned whether improving the existing process would be preferable to spending additional funds on the contract.

Resident Terry Cooney asked why the MCPC contract has a three-year term and whether an exit option exists if the Township is dissatisfied with the service. Mr. Jarrell explained that the term reflects a community-focused partnership rather than project-specific assistance and that either party may terminate the agreement with 60 days' notice. She questioned the need for MCPC involvement and whether it provides additional analysis or support beyond current services. Mr. Jarrell explained that the program is offered to municipalities as a planning resource and provided examples of available assistance. She feels the Township's greater need may be additional engineering or staff support rather than MCPC services. She asked whether residents would have opportunities to comment on any future zoning changes, and staff confirmed that they would.

Resident Patrick McNally asked for clarification regarding whether the Township already receives planning services from the County through the Planning Commission. Mr. Jarrell explained that MCPC provides land development and subdivision reviews as required under the Municipalities Planning Code, with review fees paid by applicants. Mr. McNally commented that the proposed cost appeared significant.

Resident Shannon Main stated that although MCPC has received significant attention, the Board initiated the request for its involvement. She expressed concern about proposed higher-density development, citing an apartment complex proposal for the Bird Farm property that the Township Planning Commission denied. She questioned if the contract could be perceived as an effort to bypass the Planning Commission, stating her preference for an independent consultant if needed. She noted that the Township already has a Comprehensive Plan and limited undeveloped land, and emphasized the importance of resident involvement in local decisions.

Resident Peter Van Thuyne questioned the purpose of the MCPC contract, noting that he understood it involves developing plans and updating ordinances and zoning, which he believes overlaps with the Township's nearly completed Comprehensive Plan process. He expressed concern about paying for services that may duplicate recent work and questioned the need for MCPC involvement with the Planning Commission. He emphasized the Comprehensive Plan reflects community priorities, including preserving parks and open space while supporting appropriate commercial opportunities. He added the two major development parcels under consideration do not align with those goals.

On a motion by Supervisor Gaynor, seconded by Supervisor Osei, the Board approved the Montgomery County Community Planning Assistance Contract.

Voting Yes: Joyce F. Snyder, Kristin Warner, Kofi Osei, Vanessa Gaynor
Voting No: N/A
Abstaining: N/A
Absent: Courtney Morgan

Supervisor Osei stated that one of the purposes of the MCPC contract is to support implementation of the Township's Comprehensive Plan. Thereby avoiding the need to hire another private consultant. He noted that recent ordinances, including those related to data centers and native planting, may warrant additional review and coordination. He emphasized that the Board of

Supervisors remains the final decision-maker and that MCPC's role would be to support, not direct, the Township's planning process.

Supervisor Gaynor supported Supervisor Osei's comments, noting that the Township is nearing completion of its Comprehensive Plan and that implementation will require additional work and resources. She added that early expert input can strengthen the process while emphasizing that the Township retains control. She reiterated that the Planning Commission remains advisory, the Board of Supervisors remains the decision-maker, and MCPC would serve only as a resource.

Supervisor Warner stated she is voting for the County's planning contract because based on the answers to her questions, the board remains autonomous. Therefore, if any extreme zoning changes are made to Towamencin's current map, it will be the current board's choice to do so.

Pinnacle Realty Development/Hilltop Presentation

Pinnacle Realty Development presented an updated sketch plan for their Hilltop Project that includes a configuration of 210 units consisting of single-family detached units, carriage townhomes, and small lot singles. Anthony Maras, Principal of Pinnacle Realty Development, was present to review the new plan and associated impact assessments to the Board, along with assistance from Greg Edyleman, Esq., Susan Rice, P.E., and Matt Hammond, P.E. Mr. Maras shared two updates - a longtime colleague, who has been with him on many of the presentations had recently passed away, and that the Seipt Family has moved from the residence.

Mr. Maras responded to comments regarding the Planning Commission process, stating that he is not attempting to bypass the Commission but is seeking feedback from the Board before proceeding. He addressed concerns about the potential demolition of the Seipt home, stating that preservation options are being considered. He clarified that PennDOT and the County did not require changes to the Troxel Road intersection and explained that aligning the roads would require removal of the home. He wanted to clarify what he believes are misconceptions about the project and the reasons for the current discussions.

Mr. Maras presented the proposed plan, which includes 73 single-family lots, 50 carriage homes, and 87 small lots, for a total of 210 units. He noted that while density has increased, the plan increases open space and incorporates requested setbacks and preservation measures. He shared anticipated price points, current housing market conditions, and the data and analysis used to develop the proposal. He emphasized that the presentation was informational only and that no Board action is being requested, but rather confirmation that the plan could proceed to the Township Planning Commission for review.

Supervisor Gaynor suggested organizing the discussion into segments, such as traffic and engineering, to streamline the conversation and keep topics focused. Supervisor Warner agreed.

Traffic Questions

- Supervisor Gaynor asked whether an executive summary with recommendations had been prepared for the R-175 plan, like the one provided for the MRC plan. Matt Hammond confirmed that one was available and explained where the information could be found. She

asked whether a fourth leg at the Troxel Road and Sumneytown Pike intersection was recommended for the R-175 plan.. Mr. Hammond confirmed it did not. Supervisor Gaynor noted that the R-175 plan does not include the Seipt property and asked how the Township could address future widening of Sumneytown Pike between Kriebel and Troxel. Mr. Hammond explained that without the dwelling, there would be more flexibility for future road improvements, as the existing home creates constraints. He stated that the County is evaluating future widening options and would coordinate with the Township regarding potential right-of-way needs. Supervisor Gaynor summarized that the R-175 plan would preserve the home but limit future widening options. Pinnacle acknowledged. She then asked Pinnacle to summarize proposed Kriebel Road improvements under the MRC plan. Pinnacle provided an overview of improvements along the Freddy Hill property.

- Supervisor Osei asked whether Pinnacle could provide traffic counts for Kriebel Road if the project moves forward. Mr. Maras stated that their consultant could prepare any requested traffic studies or options for review.
- Supervisor Osei asked whether Pinnacle had projected traffic volumes for the connection to the WB property. Mr. Hammond stated that this information would be provided as part of the future traffic study.
- Chair Snyder asked about the need for new traffic signals and upgrades to existing signals, and whether Pinnacle would be responsible for the associated costs. Pinnacle stated that it would cover all required improvements. Supervisor Snyder expressed support for traffic signal improvements. Mr. Hammond clarified that the signal is part of the proposed plan and that Pinnacle would coordinate with the appropriate parties to ensure it meets required standards due to its proximity to the existing signal.
- Supervisor Osei raised concerns about safety issues on Kriebel Road and throughout the surrounding area and asked whether Pinnacle would work with WB Homes and the Township Traffic Engineer to develop a broader traffic-calming plan. Pinnacle agreed to participate. Supervisor Warner asked whether such improvements would already be required, and Mr. Maras explained that developers are typically responsible only for improvements along their own frontage. He clarified that Pinnacle's willingness to assist beyond those requirements was in response to Supervisor Osei's request.
- Supervisor Osei asked whether Pinnacle or the State would need to acquire property on the opposite side of the Sumneytown Pike intersection to complete the proposed improvements. Mr. Hammond stated that this is to be determined and would require coordination with affected property owners. Mr. Maras noted that if permission could not be obtained, Pinnacle would not be required to complete that work, and the project would not be prevented from moving forward. Supervisor Osei referenced a resident concern about potential impacts to property frontage. Mr. Hammond explained Troxel Road is a state road and any future state-led right-of-way acquisition process would be separate from Pinnacle's proposed improvements.
- Supervisor Osei asked if the "no build" scenario in the executive summary assumed the 140-unit plan on the property. Mr. Hammond explained that traffic studies typically evaluate existing and future conditions, as well as, projected build-out scenarios, incorporating current and known developments, anticipating traffic changes through 2035. He stated that impacts

are identified by comparing baseline and projected conditions. Mr. Hammond noted that traffic data was collected in October 2025. Chair Snyder and Supervisor Warner expressed concerns that some reports were completed during summer months and requested peak school-period data. Mr. Hammond stated additional traffic counts were provided beyond July.

- Supervisor Warner appreciates that traffic signals and upgrades are costly but questioned whether the proposed Troxel Road and Sumneytown Pike improvements primarily benefit the new development. She asked about County involvement in future Sumneytown Pike widening and noted that the Township Traffic Engineer has indicated expansion is anticipated from Forty Foot Road to Route 363. Mr. Hammond stated that additional access at Troxel would benefit the broader area by providing another route and helping address existing traffic concerns. Mr. Maras added that County-led improvements would require time and funding. Supervisor Warner stated that additional traffic studies are needed, noting that there are still many unanswered questions and it is difficult to determine which plan is preferable. She also asked about ownership of the Seipt family home at Troxel Road. Mr. Maras clarified that acquisition of the property is contingent upon approval of the 210-unit plan. Chair Snyder noted that the home is currently a privately owned parcel that could be sold to another buyer regardless of the Board's decision, and Mr. Maras agreed. Mr. Hammond stated that the traffic study provided sufficient information to support the recommended improvements. Mr. Maras concluded that the Board's consideration is whether it wants the opportunity to obtain a Troxel Road signal and fourth intersection leg that would not otherwise be required by the County.

Engineering/Layout Questions

- Supervisor Gaynor asked for a comparison of the quantity and quality of open space between the two plans. Ms. Rice provided an overview, and Supervisor Gaynor noted that the MRC plan appears to place homes closer to the road while reducing impacts to the grasslands, which Pinnacle confirmed. She also asked about a property remaining within the riparian buffer, and Ms. Rice explained that the area is protected and cannot be developed. Supervisor Gaynor asked about the feasibility of proposed open-space recreation ideas discussed with the Township OSPAC and whether they differ between the MRC and R-175 plans. Mr. Maras stated that the concepts are not fully developed, would likely require Township acceptance of dedicated land, and would require further discussion and feedback.
- Supervisor Warner requested clarification on the amount of open space provided under the 141-unit and 210-unit plans, specifically the acreage. Pinnacle stated that the 210-unit plan provides approximately 2.5 additional acres of open space and noted that it offers improved connectivity. Ms. Rice explained the differences between the plans. Supervisor Warner asked if stormwater drainage systems were the same style under each plan and whether they were shallow, naturalized like rain gardens, or deeper drainage pits. Mr. Maras answered they would be naturalized like a rain garden.
- Supervisor Osei asked whether acreage and impervious surface calculations were available for comparison between the two plans. Ms. Rice stated that she did not have those figures available and agreed they could be provided. He stressed the additional 2.5 acres of open space should not be overlooked and asked if the Seipt family had ever offered the Township an opportunity to purchase any property. Mr. Maras was unsure. Supervisor Osei highlighted the per-acre value of the property and emphasized the importance of ensuring it was not

discounted. He also referenced his ongoing email discussions with Pinnacle regarding potential improvements, and Pinnacle provided responses to those suggestions. The group briefly discussed the proposed improvements. Mr. Maras explained the methodology used to evaluate school and traffic impacts. Supervisor Warner asked additional questions regarding those calculations.

- Supervisor Warner asked about parking locations and the amount of parking provided for each home type. Parking provisions were provided for the various property types.
- Supervisor Osei requested that Lot 1 be relocated outside of the riparian corridor.
- Chair Snyder asked whether sidewalks would be provided along all roads. Ms. Rice stated that sidewalks would be included throughout the development except along Canterbury Way, where a pedestrian crossing is proposed for use instead.

Fiscal Impact Questions

- Supervisor Gaynor asked for clarification on the footnote calculations regarding projected school enrollment and expenditures for the school district and Township. Mr. Maras explained that the analysis uses publicly available information and additional data obtained from the school district and Township, following an established methodology.
- Supervisor Osei asked about the pricing differences among the single-family lots and why similarly sized lots would have different costs. Mr. Maras explained that pricing is based on factors including location, lot size, market trends, and options selected for each home.
- Supervisor Osei asked whether school enrollment projections accounted for bedroom counts. Mr. Maras stated that home sizes were included in the analysis and would have been factored into the projections. He also asked about the anticipated annual percentage of homes to be sold; the information was not immediately available. He requested that the Fiscal Impact Statement include the sewer system and County impacts. Chair Snyder asked whether the North Penn Water Authority had also been contacted. Mr. Maras confirmed that the North Penn Water Authority has the ability to serve the project.
- Supervisor Warner requested clarification on a slide comparing income projections impacts between the 141-unit and 210-unit plans, stating that the information appeared unclear. Mr. Maras stated they would provide additional clarification.

Resident Casey Hannings stated that preserving and widening the improved riparian corridor area is important and expressed opposition to a restricted corridor. He clarified that he was not endorsing one plan over another but was encouraged finding a solution that incorporates habitat protection and better aligns with community needs.

Resident Steve Hull commented on the prior MCPC presentation and expressed concern that the Township is moving toward increased density and urbanization rather than preserving its existing suburban character. He questioned whether adding ADU's and additional housing would improve affordability, stating that the proposed new homes are priced significantly higher than what many residents could afford. He stated that if the goal was to address affordability, the current approach would not achieve that objective. He expressed concern that the Board is not listening to residents'

concerns about limiting development and is pursuing additional housing and increased tax revenue. He referenced industry-standard construction costs and estimated developer profits associated with the proposed project, stating that the financial benefit would come at the expense of the Township. He urged the Board not to repeat past discussions without addressing community concerns and to keep development at a minimum. He also referenced comments regarding the Seipt home, stating that he understood prior to the meeting that the home could not be saved but heard a different message during the discussion.

Unidentified resident asked for clarification on a feature shown on the plan. Mr. Maras explained that it is an existing sanitary sewer easement serving the current home and is not part of the proposed development. He also asked about the “emergency only” designation. Mr. Maras explained it is temporary emergency access required under Township ordinance for Wagon Wheel during construction and would be removed once the connection to Sumneytown is completed.

Resident Shannon Main questioned the Traffic Planner’s comments on the proposed bridge crossing the stream, noting that it was not part of the original 141-unit plan and asked whether traffic from the Anders area would be unable to exit via that route. Mr. Maras confirmed that was correct. She suggested that a traffic signal be considered at the new Sumneytown Pike access rather than at Kriebel Road to reduce traffic impacts on Kriebel. Mr. Maras explained that PennDOT establishes requirements for traffic signal locations and has final authority. She also addressed comments regarding resident participation, stating that decisions impact all 18,000 Township residents and noting voter participation and prior petitions as examples of the importance of transparency. She stated that she intends to submit another Right-to-Know request regarding communications between Mr. Maras and the Supervisors related to increased housing numbers. She also referenced research she conducted regarding Mr. Maras and his company and raised concerns about shady dealings and similarities between prior project commitments and the current proposal for Towamencin. Mr. Maras responded, providing his perspective on the matter, stating the circumstances involved a sale agreement, escrowed funds, and conditions that were not met. He objected to the characterization of his actions as “shady,” and requested an apology.

Resident Trisha Cressman asked whether maintenance would be performed on the property, noting its current condition since the sale. Mr. Maras stated that maintenance would be addressed. She questioned the traffic impacts of the proposed left-turn lane on Sumneytown Pike and how traffic would be handled beyond Troxel Road, given the continued one-lane conditions. Mr. Maras stated that additional information on that issue would need to come from another source. She expressed concern that potential road improvements could impact her property through acquisition or eminent domain and stated that even receiving twice the property value would not allow her to afford a home within the proposed development. She questioned why alternatives were not explored to preserve the Seipt home and asked whether the property on the opposite side of Troxel Road had been considered for acquisition. Mr. Maras explained that the property was on the opposite side of the road and was not available for sale. She stated that it was her property and that she would have considered an offer.

Resident Tiffanie Stanton questioned whether a comprehensive traffic study should be conducted for the entire area, regardless of which development plan moves forward, rather than assuming a traffic signal at Troxel Road is the best solution, adding all possible traffic patterns should be evaluated to determine the best option for the community. Mr. Maras responded that his professional consultants have determined the improvement has value. She also questioned

whether the purchase option for the Seipt property is contingent on approval of the 210-unit plan and suggested the decision may be driven by profitability. Mr. Maras stated that the 210-unit plan is necessary to support the purchase of the property, construction of the fourth leg at Troxel, and associated improvements, noting that profitability is a factor, but that the improvements do not provide a benefit to the 140-unit plan. Mr. Hammond responded that multiple traffic scenarios were evaluated and explained that utilizing an existing traffic signal is generally preferred. He stated that the proposed signal improvements would include reviewing and optimizing overall traffic movement to ensure the system functions effectively.

Supervisor Osei stated that the Township has historically explored options for creating a fourth leg at Troxel Road. He believes achieving this improvement would require removal of the Seipt home and additional property acquisition along Kriebel Road. He noted that property owners he has spoken with do not want to lose portions of their properties and stated that, from the Township's perspective, routing the improvement through the new development may be the most practical option.

Resident Leon Kashishian asked Mr. Maras to identify who purchased the Seipt property for \$1.2 million, referencing the agreement of sale. Mr. Maras stated that he could not disclose that information due to a confidentiality clause in the agreement. He also asked about ownership and plans for the silos on the Freddy Hill property. Mr. Maras stated that his company owns the silos; one will be removed, and one will remain due to an active cell tower lease. He noted that if his company owns the property, it benefits from existing uses on the site.

Resident Terry Cooney echoed what Casey Hannings stated regarding open space. She appreciated that there is more proposed in the new plan. However, she would like to see fewer homes built and more open space preserved. Mr. Maras stated that he believes they have shown a strong commitment to preserving open space, comparing them to other developments, and that they have done as much as they can in that regard.

Resident Lisa Lieb expressed continued concern about traffic on Kriebel Road, stating her preference for the lower-density plan to reduce traffic. She suggested that if the 210-unit plan moves forward, the lower connection point should be closed to direct traffic to Sumneytown Pike, stating that Kriebel Road is not wide enough to handle the additional volume. Mr. Maras explained that the connection is included because it is required by Township ordinance, but if the Board grants a waiver, the connection could be removed. He noted that traffic consultants generally support maintaining the connection, but the final decision rests with the Board.

Resident Joe Silverman commented on the cell tower near Troxel Road and expressed concerns about potential impacts of living near cell towers. He also questioned the density of the 140-unit plan, stating that the higher-priced homes should include larger lots. He suggested reducing the number of homes to approximately 80–100 units to provide more space.

Resident Jason Hannings expressed support for his son Casey's efforts and commitment to providing information on the project. Based on the meetings he has attended, he feels decisions appear predetermined and that public discussions may be intended to appease residents rather than consider their input. He expressed concern that the Board may be raising residents' expectations while ultimately moving forward with decisions already made. He stated that Casey is attempting to mitigate impacts on the property and urged the Board to make decisions they believe are truly in the best interest of Township residents. Mr. Maras responded that he disagrees with the characterization that the Board has predetermined the outcome or simply

approved proposals without consideration. He noted that the Board has rejected previous versions of their plans and stated that the process has included consideration of resident concerns and feedback to develop a better plan.

Resident Peter Van Thuyne clarified a previous comment regarding Pinnacle's interaction with the Planning Commission, stating that the plans were presented to the Commission twice and were not approved before being brought to the Board for review. He expressed concern that the proposed Troxel Road traffic signal improvements primarily benefit the development rather than the broader community. He raised concerns about increased traffic for nearby neighborhoods, noting the lack of sidewalks and existing infrastructure limitations. He questioned whether residents would use the proposed bridge and signal as intended, stating that traffic may instead travel through neighborhoods and create additional safety concerns. He asked the Board to consider these potential impacts.

Resident Kathleen Hangey supported the previous comments and provided examples of narrow roadways and speeding concerns. She noted that drivers increasingly use traffic apps to avoid congestion, resulting in more vehicles traveling through residential neighborhoods. She suggested that traffic-calming measures, such as speed bumps, may be needed.

Supervisor Osei stated that he expected the discussion to be extensive and believes the Board is nearing a final decision. He emphasized his commitment to involve the community and noted that resident feedback has influenced his approach and decision-making process. He intends to make a thorough, data-driven decision and contrasted this with a prior decision on a PSDC development plan, which he characterized as being made without sufficient information or a concept plan. He expressed support for a process involving the Board, Planning Commission, and community members reviewing the available information before making a final decision.

Supervisor Gaynor stated we know development is going to happen, but the question is how it is going to happen. She feels it is incumbent upon them to take the concerns raised and give them consideration, but we can't consider options if we don't move forward with this plan. She feels that if this plan does not go to the Planning Commission, the Township will not get a fourth leg on Troxel Road, but she feels we can't see all options unless this plan moves forward. Therefore, she favored moving the plan forward to the Planning Commission.

Supervisor Warner stated she is in favor of a thorough review of the R-14, as with the Walton Farm tract. She believes that the R-14 is a good compromise that provides for greater open space in exchange for smaller lot sizes. She believes prior boards intended single detached for this area of the Township should it be developed, and, in her opinion, that fits this property. She added that when the 210 concept was presented to the board, she voted for it to go through the review process. She objected to altering the order of presentation from the way land development has always been presented; past boards had concepts vetted by the Planning Commission and our professionals before bringing them before the BOS, and she is against altering that process.

Chair Snyder stated that tonight's proposed plan will move forward to the Planning Commission for consideration. She thanked Pinnacle for its presentation.

Old Business: None

New Business:

Consider Authorizing Bid Release: Green Lane Park Parking Lot Expansion

At our February 11th meeting, the Board approved the Township Engineer's proposal for services required to prepare design plans, construction specifications, bidding documents and to provide bid administration services in conjunction with the Green Lane Park parking lot expansion project. The bid documents have been prepared and are ready for release.

On a motion by Supervisor Gaynor, seconded by Supervisor Osei, the Board authorized the bid release for the Green Lane Park parking lot expansion.

Voting Yes: Joyce F. Snyder, Kristin Warner, Kofi Osei, Vanessa Gaynor
Voting No: N/A
Abstaining: N/A
Absent: Courtney Morgan

Consider Engineering Services Proposal: Storm Sewer Replacement (Stephen Lane, Reiff & Quarry Roads)

The Township Engineer has submitted a proposal for services required to prepare design plans, construction specifications, bidding documents, and to provide bid administration services in conjunction with a project to replace existing storm sewers at two locations. Location one is along Stephen Lane, and the second is along Reiff and Quarry Roads. The proposed work is estimated to be \$53,500.

On a motion by Supervisor Warner, seconded by Supervisor Osei, the Board approved the engineering services proposal for the noted storm sewer replacement work.

Voting Yes: Joyce F. Snyder, Kristin Warner, Kofi Osei, Vanessa Gaynor
Voting No: N/A
Abstaining: N/A
Absent: Courtney Morgan

Consider Rockledge Borough Fire Police Request – September 13

Rockledge Borough is requesting assistance from the Towamencin Fire Police for traffic control for its car show on September 13.

On a motion by Supervisor Warner, seconded by Supervisor Gaynor, the Board approved Rockledge Borough Fire Police Request – September 13.

Voting Yes: Joyce F. Snyder, Kristin Warner, Kofi Osei, Vanessa Gaynor
Voting No: N/A
Abstaining: N/A
Absent: Courtney Morgan

Consider Committee Appointments

Residents have submitted applications expressing interest in serving on the Veterans Committee.

On a motion by Supervisor Warner, seconded by Supervisor Osei, the Board appointed Ken Stout, Albert Kaminskas, and Brian Hagey to the Veterans Committee for the indicated terms.

- Ken Stout for a term expiring 12/31/27
- Albert Kaminskas for a term expiring 12/31/28
- Brian Hagey for a term expiring 12/31/28

Voting Yes: Joyce F. Snyder, Kristin Warner, Kofi Osei, Vanessa Gaynor

Voting No: N/A

Abstaining: N/A

Absent: Courtney Morgan

There being no additional business, the meeting was adjourned at 10:57 pm.

Respectfully submitted,



Colleen Ehrle

Assistant Township Manager