

BUCKINGHAM TOWNSHIP

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

Website - www.buckinghampa.org



PLANNING COMMISSION

AGENDA

OCTOBER 11, 2022

(re-scheduled from October 5, 2022)

Call to Order 7:30 p.m.

1. Consideration of approving draft Planning Commission minutes of September 7, 2022.
2. Pre-Submission Sketch Plan:
Review of "3178 York Road", 17-Lots, Single Family Dwellings, TMP 06-008-032, 13.09 acres, in the PBR Zoning District (Planned Business and Residential).

Buckingham Township Planning Commission
Meeting Minutes

The regular meeting of the Buckingham Township Planning Commission was held October 11, 2022 in the Township Building, 4613 Hughesian Drive, Buckingham, Pennsylvania.

Present:	Andrea Mehling	Chairperson
	Rebecca Fink	Member
	Dr. Marc Sandberg	Member
	Louis Spadafora	Member
	Glenn Thomson	Member
	Dan Gray	Township Engineer
	Luke Rosanova	Bucks County Planning Commission
Not Present:	Patrick Fowles	Vice Chairperson
	Erling Salvesen, Jr.	Member

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

Consideration of approving the draft Planning Commission minutes of September 7, 2022.

Mrs. Mehling made a motion, seconded by Mr. Spadafora, to approve, as most recently presented, the draft Planning Commission meeting minutes of September 7, 2022. The motion carried unanimously.

Pre-Submission Sketch Plan: Review of “3178 York Road”, 17-Lots, Single Family Dwellings, TMP 06-008-032, 13.09 acres, in the PBR Zoning District (Planned Business and Residential).

Mr. Edward Murphy, Wisler Pearlstine, LLP and Mr. Vince Fioravanti, Civil Engineer, were present to discuss the sketch plan.

Mr. Murphy explained the property is a 13 acre parcel with frontage on York Road and has direct access to the Arbor Point development. He said the property is zoned PBR (Planned Business and Residential), with limited allowable uses. Mr. Murphy explained the property has been studied by many people over the years with proposed projects, and they were provided with details and testing as to the results of sewage capacity on the parcel.

Mr. Murphy said after meeting with the township consultants, staff and the property owners, everyone agreed that some type of low density residential development accommodating the number of edu’s (equivalent dwelling units) for sewage would be appropriate. He said they submitted this sketch based on that conversation, with 17 single family homes laid out in a “P-loop” configuration on the 13 acre site, with full movement access to the Arbor Point development, and a “right turn only” in and out access to York Road. Mr. Murphy said while this plan does not follow all of the ordinance requirements, it does follow consensus of the comments received during the meeting.

Mr. Fioravanti said they had received Knight Engineering's letter dated October 10, 2022, and were largely in agreement with his comments.

Mr. Murphy said they had identified three variances that will be necessary, and there may be more when the plan is fully engineered:

- 1) The Use itself as it is not contemplated in the PBR district.
- 2) The existing home on the property, which will be demolished, is set back 110'-115' from the right-of-way from York Road, and the closest home on the sketch is equal to or further away, so there may be an acknowledged nonconformity. They will discuss this with the township solicitor.
- 3) The upper right corner section of manmade steep slopes will be encroached upon beyond allowable ordinance limits.

Mr. Murphy said during the meeting with the consultants, they had received guidance on cartway width, sidewalks, etc., and their intention would be to incorporate all of the recommendations into the plan.

Mr. Fioravanti explained the entryway cartway is 32', which is larger than Arbor Points 26', and they are proposing sidewalks and a trail to match Arbor Points. He said they may request a waiver and reduce the tree area of 8' to 4' to work out the connection.

Mr. Murphy pointed out they found there is a tree at the proposed York Road access, and they will relocate the access to save the tree, as well as to provide a better location for site distance.

Mr. Thomson said regarding the access point onto East Brighton into Arbor Point, he had shared the plan with one of his clients who lives on East Brighton, and his client had concerns regarding the traffic pattern. The client explained to Mr. Thomson that East Brighton turns into a one-way street that leads to a right turn onto Rosemont Terrace, and he felt the sketch plan should include the traffic pattern up to Sugar Bottom Road. He also mentioned that there is a lot of traffic near the Sugar Bottom Road entrance when the children are going in and out of school as parents park in that area to pick up their children, and felt these issues should be addressed as part of this plan.

Mr. Gray said they had discussed the water and sewer connection/concept during the staff meeting. Mr. Fioravanti explained the public sewer travels down Rosemont Terrace by gravity to the pump station, and they propose to have a gravity sewer main from the area at the bottom of the plan to the same pump station. He said Mr. Weaver of Castle Valley Consultants had recommended the route for the gravity collection of wastewater in the lower left area, then connection with the easement through Arbor Point to connect to the pump station via a gravity sewer in the road. Mr. Murphy said when they have a better engineered plan, they will approach the homeowner's association of Arbor Point to discuss an easement. Mr. Fioravanti added that they may alternatively discuss a pump station and forcemain into a manhole out in the roadway to the south if they can not acquire the easement from the homeowner's association.

Mrs. Mehling asked if they would need to cross the neighboring property to access the pump station, and Mr. Gray said no.

Mr. Fioravanti said the water could be provided via a connection to the public system, adding that they discussed an additional well auxiliary as a back-up that could be tied in if necessary.

Mr. Gray asked if the homes would be solar oriented, and Mr. Fioravanti said yes.

Mr. Gray asked the Planning Commission if they were comfortable with the plan for single family homes, the size of the home/lots, and the density. He said an alternative could be 17 townhomes or units and an apartment. Mr. Gray said the developer has acknowledged they could go another direction, but wants it to be palatable to the township. Mr. Murphy said that during the meeting with the consultants and property owners everyone agreed the single-family homes would be preferable.

Mrs. Mehling asked why there was one house placed all alone on the left side of the entrance, and Mr. Fioravanti said the house is 100' from York Road, and has a normal feel to it as a typical development entrance with 2 houses across from each other. He said an alternative would be to relocate the 3 homes near the entrance to the open space in the center, but he felt the acre open space in the center with a walking trail around was a nicer plan. He said there is a walking trail planned throughout the entire buffer area along with landscaping, and the walking trail will tie into the sidewalks in Arbor Point. He said they would extend the trail along York Road to the edges of the neighboring properties.

Mr. Gray noted if the entrance is moved due to the tree, the house on the left may be moved up further. He said a benefit with the house located in its current direction is that people wouldn't be seeing a rear yard upon entrance to the development, but he noted that if the house was switched in direction to face the middle area, they could buffer the back. Mr. Gray noted the units on the right will need to be figured out as they present a nonconformity issue.

Mr. Murphy asked for clarification on any issues of a right-in and right-out entrance onto York Road. Mr. Gray said the residents of Arbor Point may not want that as it will produce more traffic through their development. Mr. Thomson had concerns regarding the access onto York Road. Mr. Gray said that PennDOT requires a raised median in the middle of the road to prohibit left turns at these areas, and noted there is a 4' flush median there now, that may need to be built up with a mountable curb. Mr. Murphy said they would likely install a longer taper along the frontage where you pull over to enter as opposed to something abrupt, and Mrs. Mehling said the roadway shoulder is currently wide in that area. Mr. Gray said they would be required to follow PennDOT's requirements.

Mr. Fioravanti said they would request a waiver from the rear yard setback so that the 75' buffer against the neighboring property could coexist with a 40' rear yard. He suggested the area could be restricted. Ms. Manicone, Landscape Review Consultant, said that type of thing has typically presented a problem for the township, as no matter how you mark the area people will do whatever they want, and it ends up being the responsibility of the homeowner's association to monitor their own residents. Mr. Gray said the reason for the requirement is to provide a defined rear yard not encumbered by buffer planting and would not support the waiver. Mr. Gray noted that Buckingham Township's buffer requirements are denser than shown on the sketch plan.

Mr. Gray asked the planning commission members that as far as density, layout and open space if they are in favor of the plan or would rather see a similarly designed townhome complex. Mrs. Fink replied in terms of the surrounding area, this plan made sense, but added she was not sure about this particular layout. Mrs. Fink was also concerned about the buffer request as it would be very difficult to enforce. Mr. Fioravanti said they would have no problem providing 75' and 50' with the single-family dwelling dimensions, but would prefer not to go 35' from the edge of the buffer to the building placement. Mr. Gray suggested as they develop the area with bulk requirements they may find a usable backyard area including both the building setback and buffer area.

Mr. Gray asked the planning commission's preference on the York Road access, and they all agreed the right-in / right-out was preferable.

Mrs. Mehling asked if they could relocate the first house near the entrance so it isn't hanging out there all alone. Mr. Fioravanti replied they would see if they could orient it to face the corner of the P-Loop as a typical corner lot.

Mr. Spadafora said that he liked the walking trail, and asked who would maintain it. Mr. Fioravanti replied the homeowner's association would be responsible for its maintenance, and added that the roads would be dedicated to the township. Mr. Gray noted that Arbor Point roads were dedicated to the township and the township would most likely accept these roadways, also.

Mr. Rosanova confirmed that the trail will meet the trail on the neighboring Wallace property, and Mr. Fioravanti said yes.

Mr. Gray suggested they could work out parking situations as they go through the land development process, with maybe some 32' and some 26' at transition of the intersection. Mr. Fioravanti said they sometimes locate visitor parking stalls in the middle area. Mr. Gray agreed they could work through a nicely designed road network during the development process.

Mr. Murphy thanked the Planning Commission for their comments and feedback.

Mrs. Mehling made a motion, seconded by Mr. Spadafora, to adjourn the Planning Commission meeting at 8:11 p.m. The motion carried unanimously.

Minutes respectfully submitted by Lori Wicen.

Minutes approved by Planning Commission on December 7, 2022.