

BUCKINGHAM TOWNSHIP

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

Website - www.buckinghampa.org



PLANNING COMMISSION

AGENDA

MAY 1, 2024

Call to Order 7:30 p.m.

1. Consideration of approving draft Planning Commission minutes of March 6, 2024.
2. Consideration of recommending Preliminary/Final Approval of the "McIntyre Project", Minor Subdivision plan dated November 20, 2023, Township File SA 2024-01, 2 Lots, 3.0 Acres to be conveyed from TMP 6-17-30 to TMP 6-17-29, located in the AG-1 Zoning District, with a 90-day review period expiration date of July 2, 2024.
3. Consideration of recommending Preliminary Approval of the "Proposed Warehouse – Digirolamo Tract", Land Development & Lot Line Change Plan dated Rev. April 9, 2024, Township File LD 2023-04, Tax Map Parcels #06-004-016 and 06-004-017-001, 58.15 Acres, located in the PI-2 Zoning District, with an extended review period expiration date of August 1, 2024.

Buckingham Township Planning Commission
Meeting Minutes

The regular meeting of the Buckingham Township Planning Commission was held May 1, 2024, in the Township Building, 4613 Hughesian Drive, Buckingham, Pennsylvania.

Present:	Andrea Mehling	Chairperson
	Rebecca Fink	Vice-Chairperson
	Frank Ripp, Jr.	Member
	Dr. Marc Sandberg	Member
	Louis Spadafora	Member
	Glenn Thomson	Member
	Dan Gray	Township Engineer
	Luke Rosanova	Bucks County Planning Commission
Not Present:	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 the March 6, 2024 meeting.

Mr. Spadafora made a motion, seconded by Mr. Thomson, to approve the draft Planning Commission minutes of the March 6, 2024 meeting. The motion carried unanimously.

Consideration of recommending Preliminary/Final Approval of the “McIntyre Project”, Minor Subdivision plan dated November 20, 2023, Township File SA 2024-01, 2 Lots, 3.0 Acres to be conveyed from TMP 6-17-30 to TMP 6-17-29, located in the AG-1 Zoning District, with a 90-day review period expiration date of July 2, 2024.

Mr. John Genovesi and Mr. Cody Spadaccino of Tri-State Engineers & Land Surveyors, Inc. were present, along with property owners Kathy McIntyre and Fred Dunn, to discuss the proposed subdivision plan.

Mr. Genovesi explained that the applicant, Steve McIntyre, proposes to transfer three acres of land in a lot line change between 3152 and 3182 Lower Mountain Road. He explained that the current property line runs vertically from Lower Mountain Road to the back of the properties, and the applicants propose to transfer a 3 acre rectangular piece near Lower Mountain Road from the Dunn’s to the McIntyres and use the area as pasture for steer. He said there would be clearing of dead trees and underbrush to turn the area into a pasture, but no other improvements would be necessary.

Mr. Genovesi said that all items in the April 29, 2024 Knight Engineering, Inc. and April 12, 2024 Landscape Review Consultant’s letter are “will comply”, and that Mr. Spadacino will meet with the Landscape Review Consultant to develop a plan showing trees to be saved or removed. Ms.

Manicone said that she had met with Mr. Spadaccino onsite and some of the trees are already tagged. She said there are a number of dead ash trees laying on the ground or on the verge of falling, and they will be cleared out. Ms. Manicone said there is one very large oak tree near the road front and other large cedar trees. She added this will make a wonderful pasture, and she recommended that since some of the trees are elevated, the owner could provide attractive fencing.

Mr. Gray explained the Dunn's property (3182 Lower Mountain Road) is under Act 319 and receives a preferred tax assessment, so this project will be multi-year transition as they may only transfer up to 2 acres per year or would be subject to paying roll-back taxes. Mr. Gray said the county is aware of this proposal and has authorized this process.

Mr. Rosanova said the plan for lot 1 shows a single family dwelling, Use B1, and asked what is the principle use? Mr. Genovesi said the principal use will continue to be Use B1, Residential.

Mr. Spadafora questioned if steer are currently using the property, and Mrs. McIntyre responded no, but after they acquire the property they will install a fence, and have a maximum of 6 head of steer. Mr. Spadafora asked if there were neighbors who may have concerns, and Mrs. McIntyre said there were no issues.

Mr. Ripp asked about the phases of the project, and Mr. Gray explained there is a total of 3 acres being transferred between parcels, with just under 2 acres adjacent to the McIntyre property to be transferred first, and then the remaining section.

Mr. Gray said technically this is a lot line change but is being processed as a preliminary plan. He said it would be up to the attorneys if the final plan needs to be reviewed by the Planning Commission, or if it would be considered for approval by the Board of Supervisors as a preliminary/final plan.

Mr. Rick Buchholz, 1865 Lower Mountain Road, asked if a flag lot was being created. Mr. Gray said no, there are no new lots being created; the plan is a 2-phase lot line change, with the lot line being moved twice. He clarified there are no new parcels or lane lots being created, only a land swap.

Mrs. Fink made a motion, seconded by Mr. Thomson, to recommend Preliminary Approval of the "McIntyre Project", Minor Subdivision plan dated November 20, 2023, Township File SA 2024-01, 2 Lots, 3.0 Acres to be conveyed from TMP 6-17-30 to TMP 6-17-29, located in the AG-1 Zoning District, conditioned upon:

- compliance with the April 29, 2024 Knight Engineering Inc. review letter;*
- compliance with the April 12, 2024 Landscape Review Consultants review letter;*
- compliance with the April 30, 2024 Bucks County Planning Commission review letter.*

The motion carried unanimously.

Consideration of recommending Preliminary Approval of the "Proposed Warehouse – Digirolamo Tract", Land Development & Lot Line Change Plan dated Rev. April 9, 2024, Township File LD 2023-04, Tax Map Parcels #06-004-016 and 06-004-017-001, 58.15 Acres,

located in the PI-2 Zoning District, with an extended review period expiration date of August 1, 2024.

Edward Murphy, Esq., of Wisler Pearlstine, LLP, Mr. Greg Glitzer and Ms. Sharon Dotts of Gilmore & Associates, and Mr. Greg Rogerson, J.G. Petrucci Company, were present to discuss the proposed plan.

Mrs. Mehling explained to the large audience that the applicants' team will make a presentation, consultant reviews will be discussed, and then the audience may make their comments and ask their questions.

Mr. Murphy said they were before the Planning Commission on February 7th to make the initial presentation for development of the proposed industrial warehouse on the Digirolamo Tract, and since then they revised and resubmitted plans to address consultant review letters. Mr. Murphy said they had no issue with any of the review comments received. Mr. Murphy said the plan itself has not changed in terms of size of the building and access points.

Mr. Murphy said during the February Planning Commission meeting they had reviewed all of the requested waivers, and only had two waivers to be discussed this evening. One regarding technical engineering and another regarding a potential conflict between the Landscape Review Committee and Knight Engineering's treatment of a buffer yard. He said they will comply but wanted to highlight them for discussion.

Mr. Glitzer asked to discuss the Knight Engineering comment, "The Plan has not been revised to provide sufficient buffer plantings between the proposed Warehouse Use on TMP #06-04-016 and the parcel (Parcel A) being transferred to TMP #06-004-012-001 as part of the Lot Line Change Plan proposal. Furthermore, the plans do not provide sufficient plan notes or confirmation from the Bucks County Airport Authority that the existing vegetation on Parcel A will not be cleared and can be counted toward meeting the minimum buffer requirements. As it is expected that the Airport Authority will clear the existing vegetation within the "Clear Zone Easement" (if not all vegetation on Parcel A), the plan shall be revised to provide the required Buffer Plantings in this area."

Mr. Gray replied that he is requesting the applicant to get clarification from the Bucks County Airport Authority as to their ultimate plans for the area, whether it will get cleared or not. He said if it will not be clear cut, the area could offset the landscaping buffer requirements, however if they do clear cut then the 50' buffer will be recommended. Mr. Glitzer said that is fine, and the item is a "will comply".

Mr. Glitzer said they had submitted a revised waiver request list and have withdrawn a previous request for the plan to be reviewed as a preliminary/final plan. He said due to some potential offsite improvements to be designed and other items that are yet to be determined (such as the end user), they agree to go through the 2-stage process and submit a final plan as a separate submission.

Mr. Glitzer said the other waiver to be discussed was their request for a waiver from SALDO § 9.2.D – Requiring subdivision and land developments to avoid the necessity for excessive cut or fill. Mr. Glitzer explained the waiver is being requested due to the existing topography of the site, that there is a need for cut and fill for areas throughout the site to appropriately accommodate the building pad, operational needs and stormwater management. He said the proposed grading design seeks to minimize excessive cut and fill to the greatest extent possible, limiting the area of disturbance, preserving existing drainage patterns, and promoting opportunities for conservation easements on the site. Mr. Glitzer said they will have materials from underground stormwater chambers and will have extra topsoil that can be used to form amended soil in the rain gardens and other areas. He explained they are trying to keep the building area low to limit visibility. Mr. Glitzer confirmed that all earthwork will remain on site.

Mr. Gray explained that the cut and fill specifications not to exceed 4' were implemented to ensure similar footprints were maintained, rather than allowing a developer to installing retaining walls in order to squeeze more houses in. He said the residential development was the genesis of the specification, however he said it does run afoul with any large building as it is difficult to balance a very flat pad and the requirement has been waived previously by the Board of Supervisors.

Mrs. Mehling requested updated information on traffic flow and road improvements as that was a matter of discussion during the previous meeting. Mr. Glitzer said most of the related improvements are related to Stony Lane, starting at the driveway intersection with a raised median to ensure exiting traffic has a right turn only.

Mr. Glitzer explained they continue to request a waiver for improvements to Cold Spring Creamery Road and propose in lieu of those improvements they will commit to improving Stony Lane to a 24' width with 2 foot shoulders from the driveway entrance to Landisville Road.

Mr. Glitzer said the traffic impact study includes a schematic for the intersection of Old Easton and Landisville Roads, adding striping to channelize turning movements and reduce drifting and merging.

Mrs. Mehling requested a walking path installation all the way along Stony Lane from Cold Spring Creamery Road to Landisville Road. Mr. Gray reported the township does not own the right of way on the all of the properties along Stony Lane, except for some of the parcels owned by the Bucks County Airport Authority, and can only require the walking path from Cold Spring Creamery Road to the end of Lot 2 of the original Boyce Tract when that is ultimately developed. Mrs. Mehling said that she would recommend that the Planning Commission would recommend that the walking path be provided along Stony Lane.

Mr. Thomson asked if overnight truck parking is planned onsite. Mr. Glitzer said the applicant had committed to no overnight truck parking. Mr. Thomson asked if there would be overnight operations (24 hours) and Mr. Glitzer said "no".

Mrs. Fink thanked the engineers for designing a plan with 50% of the land conserved rather than covering the site with improvements and by containing the building to the back of the site. She appreciated the light industrial use being proposed versus many of the other planned industrial uses

that would be allowed under zoning. Mrs. Mehling agreed that the warehouse is better than some of the other things that could be there, and stated there were copies available of the proposed uses for the audience. Mrs. Fink read all of the allowed uses to the audience. Mrs. Fink stated that in the process of planning, Pennsylvania requires that the township has zones for housing, industrial and other uses, and this area is zoning industrial as was planned a long time ago. She said when people moved into the area near this site, they knew it was zoned industrial, which usually requires tractor trailers. Mrs. Fink said she is very happy this is not a much bigger industrial development.

Mrs. Mehling asked the audience for their comments, and requested they not be repetitive.

Mr. Bateman set up a large monitor and displayed a presentation titled “Preserve Buckingham – Stop The Warehouse”. The following speakers discussed the various topics included in the presentation.

Ms. Victoria Bresnahan, Landisville Road, Buckingham Township.

Ms. Bresnahan discussed Environmental Concerns:

- As planned, the Petrucci warehouse introduces extreme environmental hardships to our community
- 90 tractor trailer trips per day = a dangerous increase of carcinogenic fumes
- Truck “dwell time” means that our community will be exposed to fumes 24/7
- Increase in noise pollution will also have negative health implications

Ms. Bresnahan said that Buckingham Township’s noise ordinance taps out at 75 decibels and 72 decibels overnight, adding that in her opinion this measurement only benefits developers. Ms. Bresnahan stated that record levels of carcinogenic fumes would be produced by the 90 tractor trailer trips per day, and that the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection would be involved.

Ms. Jennifer Pothoff, Church School Road, Buckingham Township.

Ms. Pothoff discussed Safety Concerns:

- Over-night Truck Accommodations
- Unfamiliar truck drivers on unfamiliar roads can be extremely dangerous
- Possible hazardous materials being transported in front of people’s homes
- Our rural roads are too small and not suitable for and can not support the proposed traffic safely

Ms. Pothoff said regarding the safety of our roads, there are 90 tractor trailer trips per day according to J.G. Petrucci, there are accommodations for trucks to stay overnight, and for 300 employees to enter off of Burnt House Hill Road. She said the risks include drivers not knowing the narrow and windy roads, distracted driving by employees and truckers that could cause head on collisions, and hazardous materials as a potential concern because the end use is unknown. Ms. Pothoff encouraged the planning commission to listen as there is strong opposition to building a warehouse like this in our community. She said it should be built on an existing highway. She demanded the Planning Commission to listen to her concerns and to stop this warehouse.

Mr. Jeff Glauber, Twinbrook Circle, Buckingham Township.

Mr. Glauber discussed Plan Concerns:

Mr. Glauber said there are many key reasons why the warehouse should never have been allowed to get to this point. He believes that “Use G3 Wholesale, Storage, Warehouse” is an incorrect representation of the project zoning classification and that it should be “Use G6 Truck Terminal”. He explained that under use G6 short term warehousing may be permitted. Mr. Glauber said that warehouses have changed and are often used for turnaround focused on quick distribution, using cross docks for speed efficiency as opposed to long term storage. He referenced a video prepared by Hy-Tek Intralogistics highlighting the functioning of a Cross Dock type warehouse and how it is different from Warehouse Storage. Mr. Glauber said that distribution is clearly the primary purpose of this warehouse as it is designed with 30 cross dock truck bays and ninety 18-wheeler trips per day.

Mr. Glauber referenced a report prepared by Mr. Dan Cook out of Minnesota delineating the design and function of a cross dock warehouse and confirmed that this proposed structure will be used as a “cross-dock” with the main function being distribution. Mr. Glauber said again, Buckingham zoning regulations make this a G6 use.

Mr. Glauber referenced a Jones Lang Lasalle (JLL) 2021 research report defining truck terminals, which he believes nearly exactly matches what Petrucci has proposed.

Mr. Glauber said this submission is classified incorrectly, as Use G6 Truck Terminal must be located in an industrial park with immediate access to an arterial highway. He said Use G6 is not permitted within 1000’ of any private or public drinking water systems or wells, of which there are both currently.

Mr. Glauber said they ask the Planning Commission to recommend against this plan based on the clear misclassification of zoning.

Mr. Mike Bateman, Tall Oak Court, Buckingham Township.

Mr. Bateman concluded the presentation by thanking the community to help reach where they are at, and stated the following:

- 19 waivers from SALDO are requested, including waivers to bypass rules for road improvements and excessive cuts and fills. Mr. Bateman said there is no reason to make this warehouse easier to build by granting these waivers.
- Massive environmental and safety concerns for residents
- The Developer has misled us and misrepresented this project and the land is not zoned for the intended use of this truck terminal
- Presentation and documents left behind for all parties. Mr. Bateman said this presentation has been emailed to township officials, is available on their website, and has been shared with the press.

Mr. Bateman said he knows that their concerns do not apply to this Planning Commission, but recommended that the Buckingham Township Board of Supervisors denies the plan

based on the clear fact that it does not comply with the Buckingham Township Zoning Ordinance.

Following the presentation, Mr. Gray asked Ms. Bresnahan for confirmation of the facts regarding her statement about record levels of carcinogenic fumes being produced, and Ms. Bresnahan said she did not have it in writing, rather it was a conversation that has not yet reached the Department of Environmental Protection.

Mr. Gray questioned Ms. Potthoff about her statement that there would be over 300 cars per day, and Ms. Potthoff said the traffic study said there would be parking for 300 employees. Mr. Gray explained the difference between the required parking amount in the zoning ordinance and the expected traffic levels, saying that many of the spots are held in reserve. Mr. Glitzer confirmed that 167 parking spaces are actually proposed. Mr. Gray said that the plans show 300 spaces because the zoning ordinance requires it. Ms. Potthoff said he was correct, the 300 cars were based on the plan, not the traffic study. Mr. Gray verified that the traffic study has the traffic count based on the proposal of building 167 spaces and says a total of 93 in and 93 out per day, not 300. Ms. Potthoff said they still disagree, and that the community cannot handle that much traffic.

Mr. Gray clarified that in accordance with the PennDOT Motor Vehicle Code, pedestrians along state and local road shall yield the right-of-way to motor vehicles, except when the road is provided with a crosswalk or bike lane, noting that is walking along busy roadways is unsafe.

Mr. Gray asked if Mr. Glauber's assertion that this is a G6 Terminal was simply because of the cross dock? Mr. Glauber said it is due to the transfer of freight, less amount of storage than traditional warehouses and the number of truck bays. Mr. Gray asked if the design was set in stone for cross bays, and Mr. Glitzer replied "no". Mr. Gray asked if they will continue to consider it a "truck terminal" no matter how they revise the layout, and Mr. Glauber said it is based on storage, and deferred the matter to the group's attorney, Peter Nelson, Esq.

Mr. Nelson said as far as the cross dock, if that is not proposed then they need to submit a new plan and start from scratch. He said there are court cases that say making promises to comply with the ordinance once built does not show compliance.

Mr. Gray clarified that the Planning Commission makes a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors, who will issue an approval or denial and will note reasons why denied or conditions of what is needed to be provided. He said that many details are finalized between approval of the preliminary and final plans, which is why he does not support reviewing this plan as a preliminary/final.

Ms. Elaine Pasqua, John Dyer Way, Plumstead Township.

Ms. Pasqua had concerns about water runoff and drainage issues, saying that environmental concerns know no boundaries. She said that she had read the post-construction stormwater report, and shared her concerns with a neighbor who works for the State of New Jersey in the environmental department, and a person who works with the Bucks County Health Department. She said that they too, are concerned about the amount of impervious surface and runoff into her neighborhood.

Ms. Pasqua said that there has been a lot of climate change since the 2010 stormwater management ordinance was adopted. She said there is runoff from Landisville Road, topsoil is being washed away, and swales are washing away the 30 year old bridges. Ms. Pasqua said they have 70 wells and 92 kids in her neighborhood and is concerned about toxic effects. She said that current rainfall situations need to be studied. Ms. Pasqua said they have been affected by arborvitae that caught on fire by the Biotechnology Center 10 years ago and due to the fire retardant used they now have PFAS in their water.

Ms. Pasqua said she was going on the record with her concerns that if the quality of their water changes the builder will pay for corrections.

Ms. Pasqua said last Friday a garbage truck spewed oil all down the roads and had concerns tractor trailers could do the same.

Ms. Adalaide Skoutelas, Arbor Lane, Buckingham Township.

Ms. Skoutelas asked Mr. Gray if they were PennDOT roads when he was discussing not having right-of-way. Mr. Gray said the motor vehicle code says unless the shoulder is marked with a white line, pedestrians should yield to motor vehicles. He said the motor vehicle code applies to all roads, and that the township could have standards above it. Mr. Gray said that pedestrians must stay in the bike lane or walkway, and noted that additional right-of-way would be required from private properties if sidewalks and walkways were required outside of the development boundary.

Mrs. Mehling said that the Planning Commission hears the residents' concerns, specifically regarding traffic and environmental issues. She said the Planning Commission has reservations about this plan as far as traffic and pollution, however they also understand that the plan meets all of the requirements for a warehouse and meets requirements of the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance. She said in that respect, the Planning Commission is prepared to make a partial recommendation for the warehouse with serious misgivings about the traffic and pollution it may cause.

Mr. Gray clarified the Planning Commission is reviewing a G3 use as requested by the applicant, and is sure all of the attorneys will discuss the concern first heard this evening of the G6 use. He said this is the preliminary plan, and the process will begin again with the final plan.

Mrs. Fink said this is a good use of the land in regard to what it could be. She said she understands that the applicant will address the traffic issues that we see with improvements on Stony Lane and channelization on Old Easton, and that they will address the cut and fill requirements, and that she commends their engineering and thanks them.

Mr. Thomson said that the Planning Commission hears the community and must follow the process. He said there are zoning questions, however that are not a responsibility of the planning

commission. Mr. Thomson said meeting the compliance issues is the minimum requirement and he expects that to happen.

Dr. Sandberg said as Americans we have the right to build what we need to within the context of the law, so if this project follows the law and they have the right to build, then by law they have no reason to stop the project. He said that is what he is here to find out, adding that he is confused about the G6 and G3 uses as brought up during this meeting. He said if all is correct, then they have a right to build, if not, then they have to stop them.

Mr. Spadafora said he agreed that the Planning Commission is a part of a process. He said that based on what he has heard, he personally is concerned about the traffic, more so than the environment. He said there are places where warehouses work extremely well, and he is not against the warehouse. Mr. Spadafora said as the plan is tonight, he is not against it but cannot recommend it, and he explained that is to send a message to the residents that he is listening. Mr. Spadafora said ultimately the Board of Supervisors will vote, and don't have to follow the Planning Commissions input, but will certainly internalize it. Mr. Spadafora said we need further conversation and education, and thanked Mr. Gray for answering their technical questions. Mr. Spadafora said he believed they should continue conversations and try to reach a point where the plan is mutually acceptable and is a productive development for Buckingham Township.

Mr. Ripp said that he and his wife are lifetime Buckingham Township residents, and he has attended many meetings of the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors and sees both sides. Mr. Ripp said we are all volunteers and residents, and we listen. He said the warehouse is not perfect, but they are trying to work with the owner and developer as they have rights, too. Mr. Ripp said he hears the concerns.

Mrs. Mehling said it is time to pass this project along to somebody who can actually make a decision, or they could be here every month otherwise.

Mrs. Mehling made a motion, seconded by Mrs. Fink, to recommend Preliminary approval of the "Proposed Warehouse – Digirolamo Tract", Land Development & Lot Line Change Plan dated Rev. April 9, 2024, Township File LD 2023-04, Tax Map Parcels #06-004-016 and 06-004-017-001, 58.15 Acres, located in the PI-2 Zoning District, with an extended review period expiration date of August 1, 2024, with the following conditions:

- *The developer shall widen and improve Stony Lane to 24' with 2 foot shoulders;*
- *The developer shall make improvements to Old Easton and Landisville Road as depicted in the traffic study and coordinate such changes with Plumstead Township;*
- *The developer shall verify all existing traffic movements along Stony Lane, Landisville Road and Old Easton Road (if existing traffic is to go that way), and make all recommended improvements;*
- *The developer confirms commitment to no 24 hour operation;*
- *The conflicting use G3 vs G6 debate will be resolved to the township solicitor's satisfaction with the applicants' attorney and the residents group attorney (if they wish to enter into the discussions);*
- *The applicant shall comply with all township consultant review letters;*
- *The applicant shall comply with the two waivers discussed during this meeting – the cut and fill and the Landscape Review Consultant buffer matter are both "will comply";*

- *The site shall be balanced cuts and fills;*
- *Official renderings from adjacent streets will be provided to the Board of Supervisors;*
- *The applicant shall install a sidewalk along Stony Lane along the front of the Boyce Tract and Airport parcel as involved in this project, and beyond up to Landisville Road with the proviso that the township would be required to acquire the rights-of-way;*
- *Approval is subject to all health and safety requirements of the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection and the Bucks County Department of Health, including review by the township water and wastewater consultant.*

Dr. Sandberg said he had not seen a conclusion from the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection, and Mr. Gray said that an NPDES permit would be needed before development (related to earth disturbance). Mr. Gray stated that other studies are also required for environmental issues, and his review letter states that the applicant must provide all of the appropriate reviews. He said they must provide/comply with state requirements regarding air pollution and any type of emission, as there are no township regulations. Mr. Gray said the townships noise ordinance is for more of a sustained nature, adding there are enforcement provisions for smells and other items that would be more of a reactive response.

Mr. Spadafora asked how to assure the residents there will not be more run off created by this development. Mr. Gray said the applicant must reduce the rate and volume of runoff according to a county wide study, adding that they have calculated up to a 100 year storm event and are doing more than is required.

Mr. Ripp explained that this plan is still very early in the process. He explained while many may be upset tonight, concerns such as Hazmat, zoning, and approval of a building permit all follow many checks and balances that are required before anybody occupies the building.

Ms. Corinna Blair, John Dyer Way, Plumstead Township.

Ms. Blair asked when was the traffic study done and why wasn't her neighborhood of 72 homes, mostly with 3+ cars, not included. She felt another traffic study should be required. Mr. Gray said the traffic study was done in March of 2023 and September of 2023. He said traffic studies require specific places that need to be analyzed, and routes to major roads. He said smaller intersections without a direct route out of a development into the neighborhood are not included as there is no expectation of additional traffic within them. Mr. Gray said the township is still reviewing the traffic study to determine its compliance, adding that it includes amendments to include the traffic study and analysis following the Wawa improvements, the future Fred Beans Hyundai and has actual data counts taken from Research Way. Ms. Blair said that every intersection impacted along the surrounding roads should be included.

Ms. Alison Foster, Braddock Court, Buckingham Township.

Ms. Foster asked Mr. Glitzer what he meant by "offsite improvements". Mr. Glitzer clarified he was referring to portions of Stony Lane beyond the site, and said they commit to making improvements along their own property.

Ms. Foster said it is a real shame that people in the hallway could not participate in this meeting. She said there was a request made to hold this meeting in a larger venue which was denied, and that this is important to all of us and all should have a voice and the ability to hear this. She asked how should they encourage moving this meeting to a larger venue? Mr. Gray said that is a decision made by the Board of Supervisor's and the Township Manager, not this commission who are volunteers and do not hold positions within the township building. Mr. Gray said Ms. Foster could make the request to the Supervisors and/or Township Manager for consideration.

Mr. Peter Nelson, Esquire, said the Planning Commission's job is to provide advise and a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors. He said they have stated there is a lot of information to be reviewed, and does not understand why they are saying they will pass this along. Mr. Nelson said he thinks the plan should be tabled, that there is no reason why the township solicitor cannot address the G3 or G6 use prior to them making a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors. Mr. Nelson said he does not understand why the Planning Commission needs to rush a judgement when this is a massive issue before not only this township, but neighboring townships. Mrs. Mehling replied that they are not rushing anything, as they have twice reviewed the plan presented to them, the applicant is in compliance with the township consultants review letters, and the zoning information is not something the Planning Commission deals with.

Mr. Gray stated the township is reviewing an application for G3 Warehouse Use, not G6. He said down the road, if they come in with a building permit which is completely contrary to this application, the township zoning officer and staff would reject it for a use not allowed. Mr. Gray said if this use was indeed G6, then the plan would need to be refiled, but currently the G3 plan is being motioned for a recommendation of preliminary plan approval.

Mrs. Mehling called the vote: Mrs. Mehling, Mrs. Fink, Mr. Salvesen, Dr. Sandberg, Mr. Thomson and Mr. Ripp voted "aye. Mr. Spadafora voted "nay". The motion carried.

Dr. Sandberg made a motion, seconded by Mr. Spadafora, to adjourn the Planning Commission meeting at 9:50 p.m. The motion carried unanimously.

Minutes respectfully submitted by Lori Wicen.

Minutes approved by Planning Commission on November 6, 2024.