

# BUCKINGHAM TOWNSHIP

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

Website - [www.buckinghampa.org](http://www.buckinghampa.org)



**PLANNING COMMISSION**

**AGENDA**

**AUGUST 7, 2019**

**Call to Order 7:30 p.m.**

1. Consideration of approving draft Planning Commission minutes of July 3, 2019.
2. Consideration of recommending Preliminary Approval of the "**Penn's Purchase II**" Revised Major Subdivision Plan dated July 17, 2019, Township File SA 2018-04, Tax Map Parcel #06-016-015, 18 Single Family Detached Dwellings; one existing residential conversion; 2 mixed use buildings to contain retail, 2 restaurants and 18 condominiums. Parcel contains 14.15 Acres, located in the VC-2 Zoning District, with an extended review period expiration date of August 1, 2020.

**Buckingham Township Planning Commission**  
**Meeting Minutes**

The regular meeting of the Buckingham Township Planning Commission was held August 7, 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
	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 July 3, 2019 meeting.**

*Mr. Fowles made a motion, seconded by Mr. Salvesen to approve, as most recently presented, the draft Planning Commission Minutes of the July 3, 2019 Meeting. The motion carried unanimously.*

**Consideration of recommending Preliminary Approval of the “Penn’s Purchase II” Revised Major Subdivision Plan dated July 17, 2019, Township File SA 2018-04, Tax Map Parcel #06-016-015, 18 Single Family Detached Dwellings; one existing residential conversion; 2 mixed use buildings to contain retail, 2 restaurants and 18 condominiums. Parcel contains 14.15 Acres, located in the VC-2 Zoning District, with an extended review period expiration date of August 1, 2020.**

Mr. Edward Murphy, Wisler Pearlstine, LLC, Mr. Greg Glitzer, Gilmore & Associates, and Mr. John McGrath, III of Stonehaven Homes were present to discuss a plan for the proposed re-development of Penn’s Purchase II.

Mr. Murphy explained that due to the large scope of the project, they began by presenting a rough concept sketch to the Board of Supervisors in 2017, the project was then granted several variances by the Zoning Hearing Board, followed by meeting a few more times to discuss the project with the Board of Supervisors. The preliminary plan was then formally submitted to the township, reviewed by township consultants, revised and now is before the Planning Commission for their review.

Mr. Murphy said they had discussed Knight Engineering’s most recent review with Mr. Gray.

Mr. Glitzer explained the project, and began by saying the site is just over 14 acres and is in the VC-2 zoning district. Mr. Glitzer said they took elements of a mixed-use development, by proposing two new buildings along with Route 202; each to contain commercial (shops/restaurant) on the first floor, and condominium flats on the 2 floors above, with 14 condo units in the larger building and 4 condo units in the smaller building. He explained the existing Victorian style house is also part of the project and has 4 existing condo’s/apartments that will be renovated.

Mr. Glitzer said they determined to design a mixed-use village concept after studying the demand for commercial development, and determined less retail was more desirable. Mr. Glitzer said the residential area has 18 lots, each on approximately 10,000 square foot parcels, with the homes set closer to the street and designed with front porches for a neighborly connection, no front entry driveways, and the center units accessing driveways via a center alley.

Mr. Glitzer said the design reduces existing impervious surface by over 3.7 acres.

Mr. Glitzer explained one of the challenges with the site is the 11' vertical fall of grading along the Route 202 road frontage, so they have designed the building using a split-level concept on the interior, with the rear façade adjacent to the parking lot all one level. Mr. Glitzer said they anticipate the rear of the commercial areas to be used as the primary entrances.

Mr. Thomson asked how many people were anticipated with all units, both residential and commercial, occupied at full capacity. Mr. McGrath said he thought the luxury flats above the commercial shops may average 2-3 persons in each unit, and perhaps families of 3-5 in the single dwellings. He said he anticipated the residents to be people down-sizing their property and wanting to be in walking proximity to shops. Mr. Thomson suggested approximately 100 people, and Mr. McGrath thought that was probable.

Mr. Thomson asked about foot traffic anticipated for the commercial area. Mr. Glitzer explained as part of the preliminary traffic assessment they looked at an average number of daily vehicular trips. He said the numbers would be skewed by events held at neighboring Peddler's Village.

Dr. Sandberg asked about parking spots at the current Penn's Purchase that are used for events at Peddler's Village and will no longer be available for that use. Mr. Glitzer said they expect some cross-pollination of people shopping and eating at both venues, but agreed the majority of parking now available will not be there any longer for the overflow. Mr. Glitzer said they had met several times with the Peddler's Village group and they endorsed the proposed use as it would provide synergy to reinvigorate Peddler's Village. He said they did not express hesitancy at losing parking on event days.

Mrs. Mehling asked about some type of delineation between the commercial and the single-family dwelling areas, and Mr. Glitzer said they are considering a pseudo guard house located just past the entrances to the mixed-use area, adding the roadway and island size would also be adjusted so that people would sense a change.

Mrs. Fink thanked Mr. McGrath saying the project is very much better than what is currently on the site. She asked the materials of the buildings. Mr. McGrath said they intend to use a variety of colors of HardiPlank on the homes. He said the product comes in a variety of horizontal, vertical and cedar shake. Mr. McGrath said they would offer a mix of brick and stone exteriors, and provide unique homes by also adding different elevation features. He said they would offer a few different interior floor plans. Mr. McGrath said the residential units may have fake oak beams in the ceilings, shiplap instead of dry wall in certain areas, limited lifetime asphalt roof shingles, and trim around the porches.

Mrs. Mehling said she applauds the alleys and likes the living spaces over the retail areas.

Mrs. Mehling asked Mr. Gray if there were any issues that needed to be discussed or are not a “will comply”? Mr. Gray said most of his items are either “will comply” or will be worked out. He said they may want to talk about the streetscape in the residential area, with recreation and walking trails. Mr. Glitzer said the center area has a spot for a community gathering space and there are bump-out parallel parking spaces along the road with a crosswalk to the pond site. Mr. Glitzer said there could be a decent loop trail to include the pond.

Mrs. Mehling asked about street lighting, and Mr. Glitzer said they proposed small historic-looking features throughout the parking lot and entrance road, with six additional lights proposed within the residential loop road. Mr. Fowles asked how long they would be lit, and Mr. Glitzer said typically they run on a photo sensor, so when they sense sunrise in the morning they would shut off. Ms. Manicone said she prefers a dark sky approach, with only a single light. Mr. Glitzer said the proposed features met the ordinance requirements. Mrs. Fink agreed with the dark sky approach, having only as much lighting as needed for safety purposes. Mrs. Mehling said there needed to be lighting for residents to walk from the restaurant to their homes, adding the idea of the development was to be walkable. Mr. Glitzer said they could consider one light at the intersection of the commercial/single family units, and remove the lights around the back loop.

Mrs. Fink asked if the small lots /buffers were substantial. Mr. Glitzer said they had investigated the site with Ms. Manicone and identified existing vegetation, including many invasive plant and dead Ash trees that will need to be brush hogged out. Mr. Glitzer said they would be requesting a contingency for escrow purposes to provide a “plant pool” of material to go over or under.

Mrs. Fink inquired if there would be a tree buffer or a fence. Ms. Manicone said she had met onsite with the neighbors, Mike and Mary Feeney (present in the audience), and proposed a 5’ in height, vertical-slat black aluminum fence to be placed in front of the buffer areas, with 10-15’ planted buffer behind the fence designated a natural area, not to be mowed, but seeded with attractive materials.

Mr. Mike Feeney, Byecroft Road, thanked Mr. McGrath for being extremely cooperative in responding to his request for a fence along his field. Mr. Feeney commented that he would also prefer less lights.

Mr. Salvesen commented he was very impressed with the mixed use as an alternative to all retail, as many brick and mortar stores are going away.

Mr. Spadafora said he loved everything about the project, but wondered about parking for the residents above the commercial area. Mr. McGrath said there would be parking under the pavilion and around the perimeter of the property under a roof. Mr. Glitzer said there would also be spots specified for “residents only”, with a separate entrance into a lobby area with a mail space, and an elevator. Mr. Fowles asked how many parking spaces were calculated for the residents, and Mr. Glitzer responded “22”, one spot for each residence. Dr. Sandberg asked if there could be parking spots with electric outlets for charging, and Mr. McGrath replied “yes”, they have done that and installed special outlets at other developments.

Dr. Sandberg asked about a crosswalk across Route 202, and Mr. Glitzer replied they had submitted a pre-application to PennDOT for signal timing and functioning for pedestrians. He said the sidewalk handicap ramps were recently updated, and they plan to install a patterned pavement internally, but have no say over PennDOT on a state road.

Mrs. Fink mentioned lot 18 having a long driveway, and suggested a visual barrier between the neighboring lot and the drive. Ms. Manicone said the landscape plan covers the entire length of the driveway in the space between the drive and the retaining wall built for the commercial area, and the neighboring lot will have trees on the corner to provide a buffer and contribute towards privacy.

Mr. Glitzer questioned the landscape plan between the commercial area and residential near lot 18, saying you have the curb, then a timber guiderail so you don't go over the wall, then a hedge, then a fence and then a 15' planting strip at the base of the retaining wall. Mr. Glitzer said the 6' cedar tongue and groove fence atop the retaining wall will block headlights that could go into 2<sup>nd</sup> floor residential properties. Ms. Manicone said the ordinance requires evergreens to block the headlight glare, however considering the fence for this purpose, she thought the hedge may be replaced by more ornamental plantings, with options for edging material to be discussed. Mrs. Fink asked if the residential side of the wall could be softened with plantings, and Mr. Glitzer said they could provide more plantings to Lot 18 to provide screening from the wall.

Ms. Mehling asked if the development had a name, and Mr. McGrath said they were considering "Village Crossing".

Ms. Manicone asked if there was only one trash enclosure in the upper parking area for commercial use, and Mr. Glitzer said yes, and it was in the lower area of the larger commercial building's parking lot. Mr. Glitzer said they may locate another near the smaller commercial building but need to have space for a forklift to lift the dumpster.

Ms. Manicone asked about trash collection for the residential units, and Mr. McGrath said each of the 2 commercial/residential buildings would have a trash chute on each floor to an internal compactor, with trash to be collected by a service.

Mr. Fowles said he liked the concept, but questioned the positioning of the single-family dwelling driveways, as in 3 occasions they are very near each other. Mr. Fowles asked if they thought of combining the front of the driveways for lots 17 and 18, and Mr. Glitzer said no, but they could look at that. Mr. Glitzer explained the drive to the right above the pond had a grading transition issue which determined the placement.

Mr. Fowles commented that he would recommend that the homes be designed with as many different materials and styles as possible to break up the swath of similarity. Mr. McGrath agreed and said the homes will be unique to create the "villagy" style of a community.

Mr. Thomson said he was overwhelmed and thinks the plan is fantastic, and asked when the project might begin. Mr. McGrath said they will begin demolition of the existing structures as soon as they receive their NPDES permit, and will time the construction to retain the building currently

housing Villaggio restaurant while the new location is being built, along with installing infrastructure for the homes. Mr. Gray added they still need to work through water and wastewater issues and PennDOT matters, but thought the project may be ready to start early next year.

Mr. Fowles asked Mr. Gray if he had any matters to discuss from the waiver request dated July 18, 2019. Mr. Gray said his only concern regarded item 2.10B in his review letter dated August 5, 2019, “to permit new Site Identification Signs with lighting along Lower York Road entrance drive”. Mr. Gray said they did not have enough information yet on this matter, adding that the location is not such a worry, rather the details of its appearance. Mr. Gray said all other waivers were supported with minor conditions.

Mrs. Mehling asked then if the waiver letter is all “will comply with conditions”? Mr. Murphy replied “yes, conditions that will be worked out with Knight Engineering”.

Mr. Ives commented that in the residential component he likes how the houses are pulled close to the street, and asked if there are any other common village type elements to pull together the residential component. Mr. Glitzer said an earlier streetscape rendering shows the architectural perspective of coming around the curve and seeing the front porches as an important element on the homes. Mr. Ives said that landscaping and fencing are two items that would tie together the village feeling.

Mrs. Fink asked if there were ideas to draw people together in the common area other than benches, and Mr. Glitzer replied that given the size, it would be a more passive area, however the alley will funnel people down that direction with the focus on the pond across the street. Mr. Glitzer said the spillway around the pond was very traversable and accommodating. Ms. Manicone agreed that the area around the pond was very nice and was a great place to watch the birds. Mrs. Fink asked if the common area could be more of a meadow rather than a manicured lawn filled with chemicals. Mr. Glitzer said it should be inviting to allow gathering, and Ms. Manicone said it was too small of an area to convert to meadow. Mr. Feeney said there are grasses such as fescue used on golf courses that only need mowed 3 times a year, and after 5 years weeds do not grow through it. He said the grass doesn’t even need to be fed.

*Mrs. Mehling made a motion, seconded by Mr. Fowles, to recommend Preliminary Approval of the “Penn’s Purchase II” Revised Major Subdivision Plan dated July 17, 2019, Township File SA 2018-04, Tax Map Parcel #06-016-015, 18 Single Family Detached Dwellings; one existing residential conversion; 2 mixed use buildings to contain retail, 2 restaurants and 18 condominiums. Parcel contains 14.15 Acres, located in the VC-2 Zoning District, with an extended review period expiration date of August 1, 2020, with the following conditions:*

- Compliance with the August 5, 2019 Knight Engineering review letter and/or resolved to the township engineer’s satisfaction;*
- Compliance with all matters in the August 2, 2019 Landscape Review Consultant letter and/or resolved to the Landscape Review Consultants’ satisfaction;*
- Support for the waivers requested on July 18, 2019 excepting 9.20.D.2.d regarding Site Identification Signs placement and details, which will be addressed to the township engineers satisfaction.*

*The motion carried unanimously.*

*Mrs. Mehling made a motion, seconded by Mr. Fowles, to adjourn the Planning Commission meeting at 8:50 p.m. The motion carried unanimously.*

Minutes respectfully submitted by Lori Wicen.