

BUCKINGHAM TOWNSHIP

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

Website - www.buckinghampa.org



PLANNING COMMISSION
Call to Order 7:30 p.m.

AGENDA

DECEMBER 4, 2024

1. Consideration of approving draft Planning Commission minutes of November 6, 2024.
2. *Item removed from agenda 12/4/24*
Consideration of recommending Final Approval of the **“McKee Development”**, Revised Subdivision Plan dated 8/7/24, Township File SA 2020-01, Tax Map Parcels 6-18-76 and 6-18-79, located along Durham Road / Creek Road / Lower Mountain Road, proposing a Living Community of 41 Units: 12 single family homes, 19 townhomes, 10 twin homes, total parcel size 79.17 acres, located in the AG-1 Zoning District, with an extended review period expiration date of July 1, 2025.
3. Consideration of recommending Preliminary Approval of **“The Estates at Furlong”**, Major Subdivision plan dated 8/8/24, Township File SA 2024-02, Tax Map Parcel 6-8-32, located at 3178 York Road, proposing 17 single family homes on 12.45 acres, located in the PBR Zoning District, with an extended review period expiration date of February 28, 2025.

Buckingham Township Planning Commission
Meeting Minutes

The regular meeting of the Buckingham Township Planning Commission was held December 4, 2024, in the Township Building, 4613 Hughesian Drive, Buckingham, Pennsylvania.

Present:	Andrea Mehling	Chairperson
	Rebecca Fink	Vice-Chairperson
	Frank Ripp, Jr.	Member
	Erling Salvesen, Jr.	Member
	Dr. Marc Sandberg	Member
	Louis Spadafora	Member
	Glenn Thomson	Member
	Dan Gray	Township Engineer
	Luke Rosanova	Bucks County Planning Commission

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

Consideration of approving the draft Planning Commission minutes of the November 6, 2024 meeting.

Mrs. Mehling made a motion, seconded by Mr. Salvesen, to approve the draft Planning Commission minutes of the November 6, 2024 meeting. The motion carried unanimously.

Consideration of recommending Preliminary Approval of “The Estates at Furlong”, Major Subdivision plan dated 8/8/24, Township File SA 2024-02, Tax Map Parcel 6-8-32, located at 3178 York Road, proposing 17 single family homes on 12.45 acres, located in the PBR Zoning District, with an extended review period expiration date of February 28, 2025.

Ms. Carrie Nase-Poust, Esquire of Fox Rothschild LLP, Mr. Vince Fioravanti of Fioravanti Inc., Mr. Ben Guthrie of Traffic Planning and Design, Inc. and Mr. Peter Fernandez of CVDA Landscape Architects were present to discuss the plan for “The Estates at Furlong”.

Ms. Nase-Poust described the plan, saying it is on thirteen acres, in the Planned Business and Residential (PBR) Zoning District which allows higher density such as townhomes, twins, mobile homes, life care center, institutional/life care. Ms. Nase-Poust explained the aerial photo shows the highlighted property and surrounding uses having more intense, higher density townhouses. She said her client elected to propose the development of 17 single family detached homes, which use is not permitted in the PBR District, however the applicant was granted a variance from the Buckingham Township Zoning Hearing Board for the requested use, and was also granted other certain dimensional relief to allow development in accordance with the sketch plan.

Ms. Nase-Poust said the applicant had submitted the major subdivision plan with a layout similar to the Zoning Hearing Board application, with minor adjustments made to address engineering matters. She said they had received reviews from the township consultants and based on those comments they anticipate making several revisions to the plan and will resubmit the plan in the future. She said based on this, they are not looking for a recommendation this evening from the

Planning Commission, but wanted to review the plan prior to making the revisions as there are numerous waivers requested that need to be discussed.

Mr. Vince Fioravanti provided background history, saying the site is zoned PBR and does not allow use B1 single family dwellings, but does allow more high density residential and/or manufacturing/office use. He said they were granted a variance from the Zoning Hearing Board for single family dwellings, and explained they are also limited to 17 Equivalent Dwelling Units (EDU's) for sewer capacity so that is what the plan proposes. He said that in working with the community and meeting with the Arbor Point Homeowners Association, they plan to have open space with walking trails, additional landscape and buffering, a central open space, and added 34 parking spaces with driveways capable of storing 4 vehicles each plus 2 per dwelling on the street in response to concerns of residents in Arbor Point who experience less parking area.

Mr. Fioravanti explained the Old York Road entrance will be restricted to "right in, right out" turns. He said the stormwater will have no impact on the surrounding community, that the site slopes away from Arbor Point in every direction and rainwater will be captured in the middle open space and upper corner leading to Watson's Creek. He said the water and wastewater will be Buckingham Township municipal systems.

Mr. Fioravanti discussed the following waiver requests:

- Request not to survey all features within 500' feet of property. Mr. Gray said they generally support that conditioned on the plan showing the use of features by others and providing an aerial photograph, with the understanding that if additional survey information is required the applicant will submit that information.
- Excessive cut and fill waiver needed as excavations will be deeper than 4 feet. Mr. Fioravanti noted that Knight Engineering requested a cut and fill map which will be provided. He said they understand that if the site is sloped the ordinance wants the development to fit the site, not have excessive cut outs, rather to fit the natural grades.
- Solar access plan. Mr. Fioravanti said they will encourage the builder to use energy conservative building materials and insulation. He said as the surrounding major roadways and buildings are located south and west, it will not work for this site to perfectly align the homes to maximize solar. Mr. Gray said the township would like to see an attempt to make accommodations where possible and would like to see the solar axis dial showing the line and listing of which lots cannot be rotated a few degrees to comply with the requirement. Mr. Fioravanti agreed they can show the ones that are close and request relief from the others.
- Minimum center street line request of 50' rather than 150', and tangent length of 50' rather than 100'. Mr. Fioravanti said this will serve as a traffic calming device, and Mr. Gray agreed.
- Setback line and buffer requirement. Mr. Fioravanti requested a 10' overlap to leave room for decks and patios in the rear yards. Mr. Gray explained the requirement is made to protect the buffer from encroachment from swingsets, etc., and oftentimes a fence is placed between the rear and buffer yard to stop the yard creep. Mrs. Mehling said she likes the fencing surrounding the yards. Mr. Gray said it would be useful with the trail running around the perimeter to differentiate between the trail and backyards. He said that residents

could install their own fencing, however consistent fencing would be nice and that he would like to see a drawing showing the fencing appearance. Mr. Fioravanti agreed that the fencing adds privacy.

- No stormwater management and drainage structures may be located within the required buffer area. Mr. Fioravanti explained there are 8' trails indicated in the 10' wide grass paver path area required to maintain the basin at the top corner, and berm and embankment in the upper right corner. Mr. Gray suggested they could combine the trail and access path by making it 10' in that area. Mr. Gray said this would also work with the access to the existing pump station, making it wide enough to get a pick up truck through. Mr. Gray suggested the Landscape Review Consultant could work with Carter van Dyke Associates to keep the buffer but allow the pathway to meander through the buffer. Where the basin berm encroaches into the buffer yard, Mr. Gray suggested placing the landscaping from the buffer yard into the basin as part of the stormwater management on the landscaping plan. Mr. Fioravanti agreed.
- Not to require stormwater system onsite to be designed for maximum impervious permissible, however requesting to add an additional 1,000 square feet to handle additional stormwater. Mr. Gray said that would be fine as long as the lots are deed restricted, which is typical where there is a homeowners association. Mr. Gray said they need to be sure that the stormwater system be designed to provide control for whatever can ultimately be constructed on each lot, that future homeowners should not be required to install individual on-lot controls, and to provide sufficient plan information to alert future homeowners of this restriction. Mr. Fioravanti agreed to look at this.
- Ordinance requirement of 4:1 slopes on berms 8' high or more. Mr. Fioravanti explained they are requesting 3:1 slopes in the upper right corner of the plan, because if they do 4:1 it encroaches into the buffer. He suggested they could pull the basin forward or could install a retaining wall. Mr. Gray said a retaining wall would require another waiver and did not recommend it. Ms. Manicone suggested that since the basin is already in the buffer, it could slope further into the buffer and become more of the landscaping while retaining the 4:1 ordinance requirement. Mr. Gray agreed they could grade it out and plant it with trees at the bottom and shrubs along the top. Mr. Fioravanti agreed.
- Request for the basin access trail to be 10' instead of 15' wide. Mr. Gray supported this request as long as it is clear and not crowded with trees as the area will need to be used to maintain the stormwater facilities.
- Mr. Fioravanti questioned the buffer requirements, overlap area, and space to allow decks and patios outside of the building area for the three lots located along York Road as there appears to be a contradiction between the Zoning and Subdivision/Land Development Ordinances. Mr. Gray recommended that legal counsel may be required to clarify and/or a return to the Zoning Hearing Board. Mr. Gray said that the Zoning Hearing Board granted setback from the arterial road from 200' to 100', and there is a landscaping berm being provided. He said a clear demarcation line will be needed for the building lots such as a fence marking the buffer. Mr. Gray said the clear demarcation must be shown on the record plans so that the lot owners understand the restriction and that the Homeowners Association can enforce the restriction as part of the bylaws.
- Lots should be laid out substantially at right angles or radial curves, typically 90 degrees from the road centerline. Mr. Fioravanti explained the lot on the upper right just below the basin is at 80 degrees and a waiver is needed due to the curve at the corner so that the lots

don't look irregular. Mrs. Mehling suggested if they eliminate the first house on the right off York Road they may be able to fix this issue. Mr. Fioravanti said they did move that house up further, but maybe they could eliminate it. Mr. Gray did not object to the layout as proposed relative to this requirement.

Mrs. Mehling clarified the Old York Road entrance would be only right-in/right-out turns? Mr. Guthrie said that is correct, adding that they had looked at a full access in the traffic study, but feedback received from PennDOT and the township engineer shows the right-in/right-out is better and they will revise the traffic study accordingly. Mrs. Mehling agreed that to make a left turn out from the location would not be easy. Mr. Thomson questioned the traffic pattern if coming down York Road south, how would they enter the community? Mr. Gray said they could enter Arbor Point at Brighton Street, and Mr. Guthrie explained to exit left they would take Rosemont Terrace to Heritage Center Drive to the signalized light at Route 263 to make a left turn.

Mr. Gray explained when Arbor Point and Heritage Center were developed, this parcel was planned to be part of that larger concept, hence the stub street in Arbor Point. He said prior plans showed Rosemont Terrace running to York Road which access was eliminated due to site distance concerns at an unsignalized intersection. Mr. Gray said if the York Road entrance was full access then people living in Arbor Point might cut through this new development instead of going to Sugar Bottom Road or Heritage Center Drive.

Mr. Toby Profetto, Rosemont Terrace, said he headed up a petition amongst the residents due to ongoing safety issues with speeding traffic on Rosemont Terrace. He said he is very concerned about adding this amount of homes with 2-3 cars per home, and delivery vehicles cutting through Arbor Point and Heritage Center. He feels there are trying to squeeze houses onto a property which will cause drainage and traffic issues. Mr. Gray asked if there was a community perspective on the traffic issue and asked if they would rather have full access onto York Road? Mr. Keith Redding, Brighton Street, said he would prefer full access.

Mr. Glenn Thomson said the Planning Commission needs to plan from the traffic issues. He said he is a contractor and while working in a neighbors home he asked for feedback, and traffic was the primary issue. He said allowing 6 parking spaces per house times 17 lots was also an issue, but he understands the emotion and daily experience for these people.

Mr. Profetto said he works for Toll Brothers and they paid lot premiums along East Brighton Street because they were told there would be no building behind their lots. Mr. Gray said at that time the owner did not want to sell to Toll Brothers, however the stub street was on the original plan for Arbor Point. Mr. Gray said the intent is always to allow the interconnection of communities. Mr. Gray said his concern with full access to York Road would be more vehicles using East Brighton Street and coming through this development as a main throughfare to York Road.

Mr. Profetto also said that parcel is not zoned for these homes. Mr. Gray said they went to the Zoning Hearing Board and were granted relief for single family dwellings as opposed to higher density which is allowed by zoning. Mr. Gray said that the 17 units is set by the capacity of the site to provide septic systems, noting that the township's sewer system does not currently have capacity for more than 17 houses. Mr. Gray said that prior applicants had proposed 42-44

townhomes. Mr. Profetto said the amount of houses and the cut through and setbacks will put the houses closer to Rosemont Terrace. Mr. Gray said no, the Zoning Ordinance regulates setbacks and the primary building location within the lot, and the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance regulates road locations among other items. Mr. Gray said the zoning relief included a 150' setback from York Road, and there is a 50' perimeter buffer along Arbor Point. Mr. Profetto said that a barking dog could be closer to their houses, and Mr. Gray said that's possible, but these regulations are zoning regulations that cannot be waived by the Board of Supervisors, while Subdivision and Land Development requirements can be waived by the Board of Supervisors. Mr. Gray said the Planning Commission does not vote on the waivers requested, however they make recommendations to the Board of Supervisors who vote on them.

Ms. Debbie Kenderdine, East Dorchester Street, said she was present at the zoning meeting. She said that 17 homes are far better than condensed housing or another permitted use, and felt the attorney and developer are keeping in the spirit of the community. She said there are concerns about the open access at East Brighton Street and requested that it be an emergency access with sidewalk access.

Mr. Michael Cohen, East Brighton Street, said he is not a traffic engineer but in his opinion full access is far superior as traffic looks for the path of least resistance to enter a neighborhood. He said anyone coming from the south would be forced to turn on Sugar Bottom Road and then East Brighton Street, so full access would ease the traffic on East Brighton Street. He said those heading north on York Road, going onto Rosemont Terrace through Heritage Center is rather circuitous, and full access would be far easier in and out to neighborhoods.

Ms. Nase-Poust said initially they thought full access would be better, but they are tied to what PennDOT will or will not allow. She said PennDOT is not supportive of full access due to the Left Out movement, which is why they have agreed to revert back to the right in / right out option. Mr. Guthrie said they conducted traffic counts at the intersection and Heritage Center Drive existing signal in morning peak hour 8am-9am was the heaviest hour, with 220 vehicles entering/exiting (110 entering / 110 exiting). He said this development adds 3 left turns in that timeframe, an approximately 1% increase. Mr. Guthrie said PennDOT provided no leeway and said that left turns must be prohibited. Mr. Guthrie explained when they project trip generation they look at the National Institute of Traffic Engineers data, which is collected in the morning and evening peak hours, by number of houses and number of trips. They projected four vehicles entering and 11 exiting for 17 homes in the morning, with 30% travelling to the north, and only 3 lefts out. Mr. Cohen said so only 10-15 cars leaving the neighborhood from 8-9am? Mr. Guthrie said some before and some afterwards, maybe 25-30 leaving at different times, and some people work from home.

Mr. Keith Redding, East Brighton Street said the community has tried to have traffic calming devices / speed bumps installed, but they need 70% of all of Arbor Point, and people who don't live on East/West Brighton Streets don't care. Mr. Redding said the people who live on East Brighton Street know that cars fly down there and excess traffic would be very detrimental.

Mr. Vince Fioravanti explained they do have traffic calming in the proposed development, and plan to add raised pedestrian crossings at the intersection and junctions, with manicured islands in

front of the parking rows. Mr. Gray suggested that if they are only allowed the right in / right out access, they should perform further study of the East/West Brighton Streets intersections.

Mr. Profetto asked why couldn't they install a traffic signal on York Road? Mr. Gray said there are two traffic lights in close proximity and other means of access, and not enough traffic to warrant adding a signal.

Ms. Janet Laken, Rosemont Terrace said that she stopped someone from speeding on Rosemont Terrace who almost hit a little boy who fell off his bicycle.

Mr. Tom Conte, East Brighton Street, said this seems like a nice well planned out community, but the issue is traffic on East Brighton Street. He said he has a 4-1/2 year old special needs child and every day he asks people to slow down. He felt that adding 17 houses won't matter much, but outsiders will cut through the roads.

Mr. Mark Digaetano, East Brighton Street, said he also thought the development seems well planned, and could be worse than 17 houses, but the traffic scares him as he has two grandchildren who live there. Mr. Digaetano said he questions more traffic on Sugar Bottom Road with the elementary school right there and asked if that would be affected.

Ms. Rebecca Fink said it seems to her if there was full access that more people would come from the townhomes to exit/enter onto York Road in that way. Mr. Guthrie agreed, adding that there are pros and cons to both, but the right in / right out minimizes the impact.

Dr. Marc Sandberg asked if there was any consideration of the north part of the community directly accessing Arbor Point and the south side accessing York Road via Heritage Center. Mr. Gray said no, as there is another parcel in between, and then Heritage Center open space and a stream.

Ms. Nase-Poust said she understands and hears the concerns regarding traffic, and wants to continue to work with the community. She said they will look at the intersections within Arbor Point and see how they could contribute towards or install traffic calming devices on East Brighton Street.

Ms. Kenderdine said an existing issue are the one-way very narrow roads in Arbor Point.

Mr. Redding asked if they intend to tie into their pump station, and Mr. Fioravanti said no, they are proposing their own pump station. Mr. Redding asked if two retention ponds will be enough because the land is low, and Mr. Fioravanti said they believe so. Mr. Redding asked if there was a plan to prohibit the critters, such as mice and squirrels, from going to Rosemont / Heritage areas when a bulldozer is brought onto the property. Mr. Fernandez responded they will be providing buffer areas with landscaping.

Dr. Marc Sandberg asked if they had considered designating two U-Turns on York Road, one at Heritage Center Drive and one at Sugar Bottom Road, with a left on green arrow signal? Mr.

Guthrie said that would be unconventional and may create other safety concerns to other areas, but they could talk offline about it and appreciated the brainstorming.

Mr. Luke Rosanova asked where the onsite traffic calming measures would be. Mr. Fioravanti showed the plan and pointed out the raised/striped pedestrian crosswalks at every intersection. Mr. Rosanova asked about in between the units just north of Road A where the trail connection starts, and Mr. Fioravanti said there would be one there.

Mr. Rosanova said the extension of East Brighton Street is a wide road compared to the roads in Arbor Point, and has stripes on the pavement, and asked if there could be cutouts for parking added there to slow traffic. Mr. Fioravanti said yes, those would be added. Mr. Gray confirmed there would be narrow crosswalks with a raised crosswalk at the transition point.

Mr. Rosanova asked if the Homeowners Association would specify per lot who is responsible to maintain basins and trails that are on the individual lots. Mr. Gray said there usually is an open space management plan, and an operation and maintenance plan, with everything clarified. He said the record plan also usually notes who is responsible for what.

Mr. Redding asked how large the homes would be. Mr. Fioravanti replied approximately 2050 square feet footprint with a 2nd floor and basement. Mr. Redding asked the price, and Mr. Fioravanti said they did not have that yet. Mr. Gray noted the zoning for the building lots were based on the lots at Buckingham Forest, if he wanted to compare.

Mr. Rosanova noted that the Bucks County Planning Commission did not receive this plan for review, and requested either the current or revised plan be submitted through the portal.

Mr. Gray asked if there was a single contact for the Arbor Point community who the township could contact when this project is scheduled as the developer is not required to notify past the initial submission. Ms. Kenderdine said she would provide the property manager's information.

No action was taken.

Mrs. Mehling made a motion, seconded by Mr. Spadafora, to adjourn the Planning Commission meeting at 9:27 p.m. The motion carried unanimously.

Minutes respectfully submitted by Lori Wicen.

Minutes approved by Planning Commission on February 5, 2025.