

Buckingham Township Planning Commission
Approved Meeting Minutes

The regular meeting of the Buckingham Township Planning Commission was held **Wednesday, August 6, 2008** in the Township Building, 4613 Hughesian Drive, Buckingham, Pennsylvania.

Present:	Andrea Mehling	Chairperson
	Patrick Fowles	Vice-Chairman
	Glynnis Stone-Tihansky	Member
	Marc Sandberg	Member
	Ann Sutphin	Member
	Daniel Gray	Township Engineer
	Lynn Bush	Bucks County Planning Commission
Absent:	Tom Baldwin	Member
	Rebecca Fink	Member

Ms. Mehling called the regular meeting to order at 7:37 p.m.

1. Consideration of Approving Planning Commission Meeting Minutes of July 2, 2008.

Mr. Fowles made a motion, seconded by Ms. Sutphin to approve the minutes of the July 2, 2008 meeting. The motion carried unanimously.

2. SA 2006-08 "Trayer Tract", 4820 Anderson Road, TMP# 6-10-109 & 6-10-109-1, 3.828 acres, AG-2 Zoning, Preliminary/Final Plan of Lot Line Change. Review expiration date September 5, 2008.

Representing the applicant were Mr. Richard Kempes, Attorney and Mr. Mark Smith, Project Engineer.

Mr. Kempes explained that the purpose of the lot line change was to provide access to Lot 109-1 via a driveway to be constructed with access onto Anderson Road.

Ms. Mehling explained that the Planning Commission did not typically review a plan that had not yet gone before the Zoning Hearing Board (ZHB) and asked the applicant how they would proceed if there was no relief from the ZHB. Mr. Kempes responded that they would have to be in full compliance of the zoning ordinance. Mr. Kempes provided a summary of the three variances for which they were requesting relief: 1) limestone, 2) requirement to consider any tree located within 15 feet of disturbance area as disturbed and 3) requirement that they measure setback lines from the edge of the Resource Protection Area.

Ms. Mehling noted that the Planning Commission (PC) consensus was that it would be better to access Lot 109-1 from Anderson Road. Ms. Mehling requested that the applicant return after they had a decision from the ZHB. Mr. Kempes asked that the following issues be discussed prior to the ZHB decision:

August 1, 2008 Knight Engineering Review Letter

I. 2.3 Mr. Smith explained that the applicant would rather not put a conservation easement on Lot 1. Mr. Gray explained that the ordinance required an easement on both lots and suggested requesting a waiver if they did not want the easement placed on Lot 1.

II. 2.2 Mr. Smith noted that the well could be located but that it would be difficult to locate the septic on Lot 1. Mr. Smith noted that they have kept the well and septic on the unimproved lot far enough away from Lot 1 so as not to interfere. Mr. Gray commented that they would need to locate the septic on Lot 1 to get approval for the planning module. Mr. Kempes felt that as long as they complied with the isolation distances, the Department of Health was not going to be concerned. Mr. Smith noted that the septic on Lot 2 had already been approved. Ms. Mehling recommended adding this item to the waiver list.

II. 2.3 Mr. Kempes noted that he did not think there were any 36” caliper trees on the vacant lot. Ms. Manicone commented that she had not seen any large caliper trees on Lot 2. She noted that the larger trees seemed to be down near Anderson Road and on the Trayer lot and that all would be outside of the building envelope. Ms. Manicone commented that if there was not a conservation easement on Lot 1, she would want to mark the location of all 36” caliper or larger trees with a note indicating that they would be protected.

II. 6.2 Mr. Smith noted that they have not been able to achieve the solar orientation noting that the long face was generally south facing. He explained that the site constraints drove the layout and placement of the house. The applicant will request a waiver. Ms. Sutphin noted that she was in favor of having house face Southeast with the rest of the houses.

II. 6.3, 6.5 and 6.6 Mr. Kempes noted that they were trying to limit the water that ran off site and noted that which does run off during construction would go off during an extended period of time. Mr. Gray indicated that he was looking for confirmation that the water that came down the hill could get across the driveway.

II. 9.1 Mr. Gray explained that he wanted to see that a retaining wall could be built to requirements without creating other problems. Mr. Gray felt the Project Engineer needed to specify something with general construction standards.

III. 44. Mr. Gray explained that the applicant would need to work with the Township Solicitor to come up with an agreement and tie it to a building agreement. Mr. Gray noted that this would need to be a waiver/discussion with the Board of Supervisors.

The PC reviewed the July 21, 2008 Landscape Review Consultants Letter. There were no outstanding issues.

Ms. Mehling recommended that the applicant update the waiver list before returning to the PC. The applicant will go before the Zoning Hearing Board on August 18, 2008. If they do not have a written decision in time to return to the Planning Commission in September, then they will

request an extension from the Board of Supervisors. Mr. Gray requested that the revised waiver list be submitted one week prior to the PC meeting.

Mr. Folwes made a motion, seconded by Ms. Sutphin to table consideration of SA 2006-08 "Trayer Tract", 4820 Anderson Road, TMP# 6-10-109 & 6-10-109-1, 3.828 acres, AG-2 Zoning, Preliminary/Final Plan of Lot Line Change pending the decision of the Zoning Hearing Board. The motion carried unanimously.

3. SA 2008-02 "Soroka Tract", Pineville Road/Durham Road, TMP# 6-23-55-1, 10.37 Acres, AG-1 Zoning, Revised Preliminary/Final Plan of a 2 Lot Subdivision (plan dated Rev. 7/2/08) with an extended review period expiration date of December 31, 2008

Representing the applicant was Mr. Greg Glitzer, Project Engineer, Ms. Sharon Dotts, Project Manager and Mr. Rick Gitter, DeLuca Enterprises, Inc.

Mr. Glitzer explained that they were returning to the Planning Commission because they had made a change to the building orientation (the house was flipped 180 degrees based on marketing preference). The rear of the house would now be oriented to the South and the common driveway would be moved to the North. Mr. Glitzer noted that they would go before the Board to get approval for the revision on August 27, 2008 and wanted to give the Planning Commission the opportunity to make comments prior to that meeting. Mr. Glitzer noted that the septic system testing was successfully completed. Mr. Glitzer noted that he and Ms. Manicone had discussed the removal of trees by a prior applicant and made clear that it was not DeLuca Enterprises, Inc. who had removed those trees.

Ms. Mehling asked about three notes she had from the last time the plan was reviewed:

- 1) She asked who would be responsible for the basin regarding the driveway to go onto Pineville Road. Mr. Glitzer responded that the basin was located on Lot 1 but there would be an easement that would allow runoff from Lot 2 to go onto Lot 1. He noted there would also be a blanket easement to the Township for emergency repair.
- 2) She asked if the driveway was shared to which Mr. Glitzer responded that it was.
- 3) Ms. Mehling asked if the outstanding issues with the swale along the road next to the property had been addressed. Both Mr. Glitzer and Mr. Gray responded that they were addressed and provided an explanation.

Mr. Glitzer noted that DelVal had generated a report to show no evidence of wetlands. Mr. Gray added that all proposed work was outside of all areas previously identified as wetlands anyway. Mr. Glitzer noted that with the change in orientation they had extended buffer plantings.

Ms. Tihansky made a motion, seconded by Mr. Fowles to recommend approval of SA 2008-02 "Soroka Tract", Pineville Road/Durham Road, TMP# 6-23-55-1, 10.37 Acres, AG-1 Zoning, Revised Preliminary/Final Plan of a 2 Lot Subdivision (plan dated Rev. 7/2/08). The motion carried unanimously.

3. Public Comment

Mr. Wayne Marquez, Buckingham Forest resident, asked when the roads would be paved in Buckingham Forest, expressed concern about their condition and asked the Planning Commission for guidance on how to proceed to get the roads paved as quickly as possible. Mr. Gray reviewed the process for dedication, explained that the developer determines the schedule for road paving and explained that there were several issues (including a water supply issue) that the developer would prefer to address prior to paving the road. Ms. Mehling recommended that if Mr. Marquez really wanted to bring attention to the matter he should attend the Supervisor's meeting and make public comment.

Ms. Sutphin made a motion, seconded by Mr. Fowles to adjourn the meeting at 8:37p.m. The motion carried unanimously.

Minutes respectfully submitted by Suzanne Safran