

BUCKINGHAM TOWNSHIP

P.O. Box 413, Buckingham, Pennsylvania 18912
Phone (215) 794-8834 • Fax (215) 794-8837

Website - www.buckinghampa.org



PLANNING COMMISSION

AGENDA

JULY 3, 2019

Call to Order 7:30 p.m.

1. Consideration of approving draft Planning Commission minutes of June 5, 2019.
2. Consideration of recommending Preliminary/Final Approval of the **“Walsh Tract”** Minor Subdivision Plan dated May 30, 2019, Township File SA 2019-01, Tax Map Parcel #06-021-053-001, 5087 Lower Mountain Road, 2 lot subdivision, 5.340 Acres, located in the AG-1 Zoning District, with a 90-day review period expiration date of October 1, 2019.
3. Consideration of recommending Preliminary Approval of the Revised **“Covenant Church – New Parking Lot”** Land Development plan dated Revised June 19, 2019, Township File LD 2019-01, Tax Map Parcel #6-10-007, 4000 Route 202, proposing a new parking lot, plaza space, and associated stormwater facilities, 1.94 Acres to be developed; total parcel size 24.74 acres, located in the R-1 Zoning District, with a 90-day review period expiration date of September 3, 2019.

Buckingham Township Planning Commission
Meeting Minutes

The regular meeting of the Buckingham Township Planning Commission was held July 3, 2019 in the Township Building, 4613 Hughesian Drive, Buckingham, Pennsylvania.

Present:	Andrea Mehling	Chairperson
	Patrick Fowles	Vice Chairperson
	Rebecca Fink	Member
	Erling Salvesen, Jr.	Member
	Dr. Marc Sandberg	Member
	Louis Spadafora	Member
	Glenn Thomson	Member
	Dan Gray	Township Engineer

Not Present: John Ives Bucks County Planning Commission

Mrs. Mehling called the regular meeting to order at 7:30 p.m.

Consideration of approving Draft Planning Commission Minutes of the June 5, 2019 meeting.

Mr. Fowles made a motion, seconded by Dr. Sandberg to approve, as most recently presented, the draft Planning Commission Minutes of the June 5, 2019 Meeting. The motion carried unanimously.

Consideration of recommending Preliminary/Final Approval of the “Walsh Tract” Minor Subdivision Plan dated May 30, 2019, Township File SA 2019-01, Tax Map Parcel #06-021-053-001, 5087 Lower Mountain Road, 2 lot subdivision, 5.340 Acres, located in the AG-1 Zoning District, with a 90-day review period expiration date of October 1, 2019.

Mr. Matthew Fleishman, attorney, and Mr. John Dura, engineer, were present to discuss the project. Mr. Fleishman explained that Mr. Walsh is requesting approval to subdivide his 5.340-acre parcel into 2 lots, keeping the existing house and outbuildings on one lot, and the open field (not being farmed) to be the 2nd lot.

The following items were discussed from within Knight Engineering, Inc’s. July 1, 2019 review letter:

I. Development concerns

1.0 Minor Subdivision Plan Review – July 1, 2019

- 1.1 Neighbor Notification. Mr. Fleishman thought the notification was for adjoining properties, however he has not notified them to date. Mr. Gray clarified the requirement per the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance for both minor and major subdivisions require notification to residents within 1000 feet of the property. Mr. Fleishman said this is a “will comply”.
- 1.2 Completion of required improvements or posting of adequate financial security. Mr. Gray said this item is of utmost concern to the township staff, and the township would prefer not to grant a waiver of this requirement. Mr. Gray said the concern is due to problems created when an applicant puts off making the improvements, sells the property and passes them along to be made

by the unsuspecting new property owner. Mr. Gray said it is important for the applicant to understand that improvements or an escrow will be required.

- 1.4 Widening or reconstructing roadway. Mr. Gray suggested they request a waiver of this requirement as Holicong and Lower Mountain Roads are not ones the township would expect to be widened by a 2-lot subdivision.

- 1.9 Curbs and 1.10 Sidewalks or bicycle/pedestrian paths. Mr. Fleishman said they will be requesting a waiver for these items. Mr. Gray said he believes the Bucks County Planning Commission recommended sharrow road markings or “share the road” signs for Lower Mountain Road and Holicong Roads in the area of this project, as people do use them for bicycling.

- 1.11 Stormwater Management Facilities – impervious surface calculations. Mr. Fleishman said they will request a waiver of this requirement. Mr. Gray said the applicant will need to determine this calculation, and recommended they make a larger estimate than a smaller one.

- 1.12 Infiltration Rates. Mr. Gray suggested the infiltration areas need clarification. Mr. Fleishman said this is a “will comply”.

- 1.21 Location of well and on-lot wastewater treatment system for both lots 1 and 2. Mr. Fleishman said these items have not yet been designed for lot 2, and they will request a waiver. Mr. Gray said a generic design is required to show there is adequate space to build a house along with the well and on-lot wastewater treatment system. Mr. Fleishman said this is a “will comply”.

- 1.22 Isolation distances for wells. Mr. Gray said the well must be moved back from the property line and the septic may not be within the right-of-way.

II. Individual Plan Sheet Issues

2.0 Sheet 2 of 5 – Existing Features Plan

- 2.6 Existing buildings, driveways, wastewater lines, storm drains, culverts, bridges, public utility easements, etc. within 200 feet of the site shall be show in in the plan set. Mr. Gray said this is a typical request to show existing features. Mr. Fleishman said they will be requesting a waiver of this requirement.

II. Individual Plan Sheet Issues

3.0 Sheet 3 of 14 – Grading, Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan

- 3.5 Location of proposed utility services. Mr. Fleishman said they do not know this information yet without knowing where the house may be placed on lot 2. Mr. Gray said an approximate location would suffice showing access from existing electric/cable lines to the house, making sure utilities are not running through a wetland or other feature not to be disturbed, and no new poles would be required.

- 3.6 Grading associated with proposed infiltration basin small be relocated to be contained within the building envelope. Mr. Dura said they are outside of the building envelope with grading for the basin and will be requesting a waiver. Mr. Gray said he noted the detention/infiltration basin runs right up to the property line between the 2 lots.

II. Individual Plan Sheet Issues

4.0 Sheet 4 of 5 – Construction Details Plan

- 4.1 Construction details for driveway pavement, proposed stormwater management facilities, landscaping, roof drainage systems, etc. Mr. Fleishman said they have not yet designed the house so do not know the driveway details. Mr. Gray said this information will be required at the time of building permit application.

II. Individual Plan Sheet Issues

5.0 Sheet 5 of 5 – Site Analysis and Resource Conservation Plan

- 5.2 Existing Resources Inventory shall be provided for all areas within 200 feet of the Minor Subdivision. Mr. Fleishman said they will be requesting a waiver of this requirement.
- 5.3 Description of proposed wastewater treatment and disposal system. Mr. Fleishman said they had been discussing some types. Mr. Gray said they he is asking if it will be a sand mound or conventional system.
- 5.5 Plan shall identify all historic buildings or resources and methods proposed to preserve those buildings. Mr. Fleishman said there is an old barn in disrepair on the property. Mr. Gray said they may need to go to the Buckingham Township Historic Commission to review if this is a resource to be preserved, or approve for demolition.
- 5.6 through 5.11 Referencing preservation areas, solar resource orientation, renderings of proposed buildings, analysis of resource protection, proposed vegetation cover, analysis of project carbon footprint. Mr. Fleishman said they believe these items are premature based on their request for subdivision. Mr. Gray said the township requires these parameters so that agreements can be drawn up for financial security and notification to the property buyer. Mr. Gray said there are specific township requirements for landscaping the applicant should be aware of.

III. Technical Review Issues

1.0 General Issues – July 1, 2019

- 1.1 Recreation Fee. Mr. Fleishman said they submitted this fee and it was returned to them. Mr. Gray said this is usually a requirement when the development agreement is approved.
- 1.2 Site Photographs Report shall be provided in electronic format. Mr. Fleishman said this was done. Mr. Gray said they were not on the CD provided with the plan submission.
- 1.3 Cut and Fill calculations. Mr. Fleishman said this is a “will comply”.
- 1.4 Reviews/approvals required from various agencies/departments/consultants. Mr. Dura said they had not submitted a plan to the Bucks County Conservation District at this time – they were waiting until they apply for a building permit. Mr. Gray said all of the permits must be provided in the Permit Approval Booklet the applicant is required to submit when considered for approval of the subdivision plan. Mr. Gray said they could request a waiver for the BCCD permit timing. Mr. Dura said with regards to approvals from the Bucks County Department of Health and Castle Valley Consultants, they had submitted planning module applications which are under review. Mr. Gray said those reviews should be included in the Permit Approval Booklet.

III. Technical Review Issues

3.0 Wetland Report – July 1, 2019 - Cursory Comments

- 3.1 Wetlands Report requirements. Mr. Dura said these are “will comply”.

The Landscape Review Consultant’s June 25, 2019 review letter had several comments. Mr. Fleishman and Mr. Dura requested clarification on the buffer planting requirements. Ms. Manicone said that buffer plantings are required around the entire perimeter of the properties, and if there is existing quality vegetation it may be counted towards the buffer area. She suggested an informal clustering of street trees along the road, while maintaining existing trees and supplementing them. Mr. Gray suggested that Mr. Dura should meet with Ms. Manicone at the site, in order to inspect and understand field conditions before preparing paper plans.

The Bucks County Planning Commission's June 25, 2019 review letter had several comments, and Mr. Dura said they are all "will comply".

The Zoning Officer's June 27, 2019 review letter had a comment regarding the need for a site perimeter buffer to be shown on the plan, as building setbacks are measured from the perimeter buffer setback.

Mr. Gray said it is important to notify the neighbors before this plan is reviewed again by the Planning Commission. He also asked Mr. Dura to meet with him to prepare the waiver request letter. Mr. Thomson requested more detail on the historic building, and Mrs. Mehling added if the building could be saved, that would be good.

Mr. Dura said they would work on the outstanding issues and submit revised plans for review.

No Action was taken on this application.

Consideration of recommending Preliminary Approval of the Revised "Covenant Church – New Parking Lot" Land Development plan dated Revised June 19, 2019, Township File LD 2019-01, Tax Map Parcel #6-10-007, 4000 Route 202, proposing a new parking lot, plaza space, and associated stormwater facilities, 1.94 Acres to be developed; total parcel size 24.74 acres, located in the R-1 Zoning District, with a 90-day review period expiration date of September 3, 2019.

Mr. Joe Lanzetta, Applicant, Mr. Glenn Harris, Design Engineer with Renew Land Development Solutions and Ms. Kim Freimuth, Fox Rothschild, LLP, were present to discuss the revised plan for "Covenant Church – New Parking Lot".

Mr. Harris provided a recap, saying when this project was last before the planning commission, there were concerns regarding an intrusion into the 75' setback and the possible effect of construction upon the double row of evergreen trees. He said since that date, they had a field meeting with township staff and marked out the 75' back and front yards, which resulted in redesigning the parking lot pulling it back from the setback. Mr. Harris said they have a sketch plan to discuss tonight, prior to submitting the revised engineered plans.

Mr. Harris showed an exhibit of the plan as approved by the Zoning Hearing Board in 2016, explaining the parking lot was configured differently than the current plan due to a change in the wetlands since that time. Mr. Harris said the 2016 Zoning Hearing Board decision also had approved the 2nd parking area onsite and the building addition which is currently under construction.

Mr. Harris then displayed the current revised sketch plan which addressed items of concern by the planning commission during the previous meeting, showing setbacks in compliance of the required front yard setbacks, landscaping in front of the parking lot, sidewalks into the building and center area and raised pedestrian walkways in the original parking lot.

Mr. Harris noted by raising the pedestrian walkways in the original parking lot, the single trees planted there would need to be removed, however they added a 1:1 replacement in the lower left corner of the parcel. Mr. Gray clarified he had not meant to imply they had to replace the existing sidewalks, rather that he would prefer that the lower lot have raised walkways. Ms. Freimuth clarified then that they can leave the upper parking area the way it is, and Mr. Gray confirmed that to be correct.

Mr. Harris said the previous submission had 98 parking spaces, the revised sketch has 88, and they added landscaping to the entrance from Route 202.

Mr. Fowles stated this sketch is tremendously improved over the first plan, but he remains conflicted about the need for the parking lot at this time. He said that he was present to observe the parking lot activity recently on a Sunday morning, and counted over 150 empty parking spots during the first and second services, and that the majority of cars from the first service left before the second service, and in between services the lot was approximately 1/3 full. Mr. Lanzetta said that summer has the lowest church attendance, however in the fall and winter, there are people double-parking everywhere and they had a shuttle service from Hyde Park for an additional 30-90 cars. Mr. Lanzetta said there is a seasonal trend in the attendance. Mr. Gray suggested if there are only a few events a year that require additional parking, perhaps continuing to shuttle is a practical solution. Mr. Lanzetta said it was not practical, adding they have to rent vans and get drivers for the service.

Mr. Lanzetta said they had a study conducted by Church Planning LLC which confirmed their need for additional parking in relationship to the growth of the church through demographics. Ms. Freimuth said they would provide results of that study to the Planning Commission.

Mrs. Mehling said the Planning Commission's dilemma is seeing the need for more parking spaces. Mrs. Fink said she is skeptical that the parking need is there. She suggested perhaps a drop off area of 10 spaces for convenience may be an option, and if the need is proven for more spaces, she suggested they look to add to the other existing parking lots.

Ms. Freimuth said the parking lot is proposed in the only location that is available on the site, and also in a place that will not adversely impact neighbors. She said the Zoning Hearing Board approved it in the proposed location largely due to the fact of not impacting neighbors.

Mr. Bob Clemente, Mechanicsville Road, said he and his wife would be vehemently opposed to any parking being added towards their property which is adjacent to the church. Ms. Manicone explained that all parking area must be buffered with landscape. Mr. Clemente said the church is already working with him to plant more trees to help buffer the addition, but he does not want more parking towards his property. Mr. Clemente said he supports the proposed location for the new parking lot.

Mr. Spadafora asked if they build the additional spaces, and say three years from now they continue to grow, then what. Mr. Lanzetta said the site will be maxed out at 27% impervious with the new parking area. He said the next step would be satellites, perhaps purchasing an abandoned shopping center and renovating it with livestream services.

Mrs. Fink said she was on the Planning Commission during review of the original plan during the year 2002, and at that time the church was asked if they planned to grow, and they said no. She reminded

the applicant that they are the Planning Commission, who labor over the plans and apply the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance and listen to neighbors. Mrs. Fink said they have already outgrown the site, and the Planning Commission is not here to help them develop a parking lot that will be full only a few days a year.

Mr. Gray suggested the church considers installing only a portion of the parking area and reserving the remainder for the future, which would also save them some expense, as they did with the upper parking area. Mr. Harris said they could install the stormwater features and put a dash line on the plan showing the area to install at a future date. Mr. Lanzetta agreed to consider this.

Mr. Gray suggested that the space near the trash enclosure and access drive may have space that could be tightened up, or add a curbed island to break up the paved area and soften it with vegetation. Mr. Harris said they would evaluate the geometries to see what works for trash and fire truck access.

Mr. Gray reminded the applicant they need to provide an affidavit that they notified the neighbors of this plan. Ms. Freimuth said they would supply that.

Ms. Freimuth said they would be providing the township with a request for an extension of the review period, and then would be returning to the Planning Commission in the future.

No Action was taken on this application.

Mr. Fowles made a motion, seconded by Mrs. Mehling, to adjourn the Planning Commission meeting at 9:20 p.m. The motion carried unanimously.

Minutes respectfully submitted by Lori Wicen.