

BUCKINGHAM TOWNSHIP

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

Website - www.buckinghampa.org



PLANNING COMMISSION

AGENDA

FEBRUARY 4, 2026

Call to Order 7:30 p.m.

1. Annual Reorganization of Planning Commission:
 - Appoint Chairman
 - Appoint Vice-Chairman
2. Consideration of approving draft Planning Commission minutes of July 2, 2025.
3. Consideration of recommending Preliminary Approval of **"The Estates at Furlong"**, Plan dated "Rev. 1/15/26", Major Subdivision composed of 17 Single Family Residences, Township File SA 2024-02, Tax Map Parcel 6-8-32, located at 3178 York Road on 12.45 acres, in the PBR Zoning District, with an extended review period expiration date of December 31, 2026.

Buckingham Township Planning Commission
Meeting Minutes

The regular meeting of the Buckingham Township Planning Commission was held February 4, 2026, in the Township Building, 4613 Hughesian Drive, Buckingham, Pennsylvania.

Present:	Andrea Mehling	Chairperson
	Mike Jamison	Member
	Frank Ripp, Jr.	Member
	Dr. Marc Sandberg	Member
	Louis Spadafora	Member
	Dan Gray	Township Engineer
	Luke Rosanova	Bucks County Planning Commission
Not Present:	Rebecca Fink	Vice-Chairperson
	Erling Salvesen, Jr.	Member

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

Annual Reorganization of Planning Commission

- **Appoint Chairman**
- **Appoint Vice-Chairman**

Mr. Spadafora made a motion, seconded by Mr. Jamison, to appoint Andrea Mehling as Chairman. The motion carried unanimously.

Mrs. Mehling made a motion, seconded by Mr. Spadafora, to appoint Rebecca Fink as Vice-Chairman. The motion carried unanimously.

Consideration of approving draft Planning Commission minutes of July 2, 2025.

Mrs. Mehling made a motion, seconded by Mr. Ripp, to approve as most recently presented, the draft Planning Commission minutes of July 2, 2025. The motion carried unanimously.

Consideration of recommending Preliminary Approval of “The Estates at Furlong”, Plan dated “Rev. 1/15/26”, Major Subdivision composed of 17 Single Family Residences, Township File SA 2024-02, Tax Map Parcel 6-8-32, located at 3178 York Road on 12.45 acres, in the PBR Zoning District, with an extended review period expiration date of December 31, 2026.

Ms. Carrie Nase-Poust, Esq., Fox Rothschild, LLP, was present along with Vince Fioravanti, President of Fioravanti, Inc., Peter Fernandez, Landscape Architect, Ben Guthrie, Traffic Planner, Brian Lafond, Gola Corporate Real Estate and Chris Munz, Munz Construction and Property Owner.

Ms. Nase-Poust distributed an illustrative rendering of the 17 lot subdivision plan for reference during tonight’s plan review discussion. She said the plan looks pretty much the same as the one discussed in July, however there have been significant improvements made. The basin in the center open space has

been redesigned as an underground basin, per the Planning Commission's request so that the area can be a usable open space feature. She said they had met onsite with Carol Manicone, Landscape Review Consultant, to identify existing trees for a tree inventory, analyzed the condition of the trees, and determined that much of the landscape is not actually woodlands or forest area, so they revised the plans accordingly. Ms. Nase-Poust said they had also met with Dan Gray to discuss the plan revisions.

Ms. Nase-Poust said that many of the items in Knight Engineering's February 3, 2026 review letter are either "will comply" or are requested waivers. She said many of the stormwater and other technical comments will be worked out to the satisfaction of Knight Engineering.

Mrs. Mehling suggested they discuss the waivers that were "not supported" or "deferred" in Knight Engineering's February 3, 2026 review letter.

- Item 2.14 – Additional parking facilities – five parking spaces initially offered as relief parking. Ms. Nase-Poust explained that the Zoning Hearing Board decision stated that five parking spaces were to be used to accommodate overflow parking for the neighboring Arbor Point community (per their request since they are losing area currently at the stub of East Brighton Street). She said in the plan redesign, they thought the parking spaces may be of more use to their residents to have them near the open space within the community, in front of lots 1 and 2. Ms. Nase-Poust said they would still have the 34 on-street parking spaces as required by the Zoning Hearing Board. Mrs. Mehling thought the five parking spaces were to be meant to accommodate the residents of Arbor Point. Mr. Gray suggested a compromise of placing 2-3 of the parking spaces between the Road A and East Brighton Street intersection so that lots 16 & 17 would have access to them as well as residents of Arbor Point, and then place the remainder of the five spaces in front of lots 1 and 2. Mr. Gray cautioned against blocking fire hydrants, which are sometimes placed where the off-street parking space is located, and suggested a couple of extra parking spaces may be needed.
- SALDO § 9.2.D – The SALDO requires that site improvements be laid out so as to avoid the necessity for excessive cut or fill (greater than four feet of excavation or fill); the Applicant has provided a Cut and Fill Map (Sheet 13 of 83) that indicates fills in excess of six feet and cuts from four to six feet. However, the Cut and Fill Map does not identify the amount of imported/exported soil required to complete the improvements, as has been previously requested.

Ms. Nase-Poust said Mr. Fioravanti ran a calculation of the number of truckloads that may be needed (with variations of houses with or without basements), and concluded that with an estimated construction time period of 60 days, with 2 truckloads per day, there may be 126 trucks. Mr. Fioravanti said they prefer to keep a bit of extra topsoil storage onsite during construction and can always add it to a berm. Mr. Gray agreed that it was good to have some extra topsoil onsite, and emphasized that all construction trucks must enter and exit onto York Road (Route 263).

- SALDO § 9.20.D.2.b – The SALDO requires that buffer areas shall be provided in addition to the required minimum side and rear yards. The Applicant's engineer has provided a ten foot overlap of the rear yard over the required perimeter buffer yard to provide a usable rear yard,

while maintaining the required buffer yard planting requirement and maintaining the proposed open area in the center of the development.

Ms. Manicone confirmed that while she does support the buffer and overlap area, there must be certain protections so that the homeowners are aware, such as signage and limited gates/access, which need to be clearly indicated on the plan. Ms. Nase-Poust confirmed there will be a plan note and homeowner documents will include the restrictions as well as a separate disclosure provided to the homeowner to make it clear who owns the land and what is restricted from use.

Ms. Manicone had concerns regarding the homeowners association monitoring the landscaping and use of areas as it will be residents of the development policing themselves and enforcement can become a problem. She said it must be clearly stated in writing. Mr. Gray suggested the attorneys add an addendum or comment to the disclosure ordinance that the resident will sign off on when purchasing.

Ms. Nase-Poust noted there will be fencing along the perimeter at the rear of the houses indicating the area not to be disturbed, with gates (placement approved by Ms. Manicone), and there will be signage on the fence. Mr. Spadafora asked who is responsible for maintaining the fence? Ms. Nase-Poust replied the homeowner is responsible with the homeowners associations right to step in and fix it if the homeowner fails to do so, and then they charge the homeowner. She reminded everyone that maintenance and landscaping in the area to the rear of the fence, including the walking path and stormwater management basin in the upper right corner is to be maintained by the homeowners association.

Mr. Spadafora confirmed there is not a trail running behind lots 7-11, only in the front? Mrs. Mehling replied that is true as they did not want people to have access to the grade and proximity of the property next door. Ms. Nase-Poust added that each property does have a gate in the fence so they may access the rear of the lot that they own. Mr. Jamison asked if there was concern about lawn clippings and leaves being dumped in the rear of the lots, and Ms. Nase-Poust said the homeowners association will maintain the area. Mr. Gray added the width of the gates will be limited so that large mowers will not fit through them.

Mr. Rosanova asked about lot 7 showing grass pavers on both sides of the gate in the backyard. Ms. Nase-Poust replied that is an underground stormwater area. Mr. Gray said they are still working through details on that lot. Dr. Sandberg asked if the corner stormwater management would be underground? Mr. Fioravanti replied no, in terms of space and slope there was not enough space. Ms. Mehling asked how the stormwater on lot 7 is underground, and Mr. Fioravanti replied that is a different type of basin required for water quality to capture the water and treat it before entering the larger basin. He said all runoff must be treated and filtered, but it will be usable space and look like a regular lawn that kids can play on and lawnmowers can drive over. Dr. Sandberg asked if it could have a patio on it? Mr. Gray said no, there will be an easement on it. Mr. Fioravanti confirmed there cannot be anything placed within 10 feet of the fence on lot 7.

- SALDO § 9.20.D.2.d – The SALDO requires that no structure, driveway, storage of materials or equipment, Stormwater/Best Management Practice facility or parking areas shall be

permitted in the buffer area, except that a driveway may cross the required buffer area in order to connect the street with a parking area of driveway lying outside the buffer area. The Applicant's engineer is requesting that the Township permit the proposed basin embankment to be located within the required 50-foot perimeter buffer yard along Arbor Point and within the 75-foot perimeter buffer yard along the Wallace property (TMP 06-008-031).

Ms. Manicone confirmed that there is a lot of landscaping going into the buffer, with trees up to 6" caliber. She said she will confirm with Mr. Fernandez to be sure they avoid areas where they cannot plant and adjust the landscaping accordingly.

- SALDO § 9.23.K.1.b – The SALDO requires the maximum slopes of any stormwater management facility or best management practice facility earthen embankment be four horizontal to one vertical feet if the elevation difference between the outlet structure invert and the top of berm exceeds eight feet. Whenever possible, the side slopes and basin shape shall conform to the natural topography. The Applicant's engineer has requested that three horizontal to one vertical feet slopes be allowed to reduce disturbance and allow for the preservation of more internal common area.

Ms. Nase-Poust explained the floor of the basin is over 20' in the drop, however from the bottom of the basin to top berm is 8', with 14' difference from the road to the basin. She said the basin will be owned by lot 7, but maintained by the homeowners association by a professional landscape company. She said the basin is also fenced in to restrict access. Ms. Nase-Poust said there is a fence along the rear of lots 1-6, down the side of lot 6, along the bottom of the basin lot and then up again on the side of lot 7.

Mr. Spadafora commented there is a gate shown on lot 7 and wondered if they should be concerned about kids going back there to sled. Ms. Nase-Poust replied that plantings will be in that area making it not easy for sledding, and that technically the area will be owned by lot 7.

Mr. Gray added there is access for stormwater management through the back of lots 5 and 6. He also noted that the top of berm to invert of basin is actually 10', which would then require the 4:1 slopes required by the SALDO, but he did agree that there will be enough landscaping to discourage use as a sledding or play area. Ms. Nase-Poust said the basin makes sense in that corner due to natural drainage, however they cannot provide the 4:1 as it would require a complete redesign of the lots.

Mr. Ripp asked if they could continue the fence on the upper side of lot 7 to the landscaped area as it would visually deter people. Ms. Nase-Poust replied yes, the black wrought iron fence could continue as requested.

- SALDO § 9.23.K.2.a.i – The SALDO requires a minimum depth of 36 inches be provided between the intended bottom of the BMP facility and the top of the limiting zone for infiltration best management practice facilities intended to receive runoff from impervious surfaces associated with residential land use. The Applicant's engineer has indicated that a minimum depth of 24 inches is proposed and is consistent with the state requirements.

Mr. Gray noted that prior discussions with the soil consultant confirmed that there would not be any impact to the groundwater and is asking the Applicant to provide a formalized letter and attach it to the revised stormwater report. Ms. Nase-Poust indicated that the requested certification letter would be provided.

- SALDO § 9.23.H.3 – The SALDO requires controls be provided to ensure that the “during construction” peak discharge rate and discharge volume is controlled to not exceed those peak discharges and volumes before development. The Applicant’s engineer has indicated that the during construction time period is a temporary period of time, that the Plans have been designed to meet all DEP required protection standards, and that volume control during this temporary period of time is not warranted.

Mr. Fioravanti said they did design for peak flow during construction (peak attenuation) and requested a partial waiver for volume. He said the design is shown as a separate section in the stormwater management report (page 38, and on plan sheet 19). Mr. Gray said he supports the volume component and will confirm the stormwater management information, adding that this is only supported during construction.

- SALDO § 9.4.A.2, SALDO § 9.4.A.3 and 9.4.A.4.a, and SALDO § 9.4.A.4.b Solar orientation waiver requests – Mr. Fernandez said they prepared a solar orientation plan, however due to the loop road they cannot provide the solar orientation exactly per ordinance. Ms. Manicone said due to the restricted area on the site, she agreed that they cannot orient all of the houses to township requirements, adding there is a lot of landscaping proposed that will provide shade and she is pleased with the design. Mr. Gray said his comment was only regarding the pixelation on the plan sheet in the last submittal, adding that he also is very pleased with the landscaping.
- SALDO § 9.16.A.2.C – The SALDO requires that driveways to single family lots shall not be located less than sixty feet from the intersection of the curb line extended for each road for corner lots and shall be measured along the curb or edge of road. The Applicant’s Engineer has requested that the driveways to lots 1 (50’), 9 (30’), 10 (0’) and 16 (30’) are proposed to be closer to the proposed street intersections than the required sixty feet, noting that the driveways for lots 10 and 15 are located within the intersection. The Applicant’s Engineer has stated that the proposed traffic calming measures and raised pedestrian crossings provide an appropriate level of safety for the site, while also noting that the layout is consistent with the layout presented to the Zoning Hearing Board.

Ms. Nase-Poust clarified that only lots 10 and 15 do not comply, all of the others do. She explained for lot 10 it would be difficult to change the orientation and driveway due to the lot layout and driveway location. She said there is a stop bar at the street with a raised intersection.

Ms. Nase-Poust said for lot 15 they could possibly flip the driveway to the other side, but then would be concerned about backing onto a raised intersection and would need to narrow it down, and that the stormwater inlet there may also need to be addressed. Mr. Fioravanti said they feel both options are safe but that only lot 15 has the option to flip the driveway. Mr. Spadafora asked what happens if they flip lot 15 driveway and a car is in the on street parking?

Mr. Fioravanti said the street is wide enough for 2 cars and on-street parking. Mrs. Mehling thought it may look strange for only one house to have the driveway on the opposite side than the others, adding she is more concerned about lot 10.

Mr. Ben Guthrie, Traffic Planning and Design, Inc., confirmed that these are low speed low volume residential streets with stop signs and raised intersections to slow cars to almost a stop. He said everyone is moving slowly and there should not be any high speed conflicts. Mr. Fioravanti added the site distance is also good.

Mrs. Mehling asked if they could turn around on the driveway? Mr. Gray suggested a 5' hook so people can back in and turn around on lots 10 and 15. Mr. Fioravanti said it would need to come in front of the house, or if going towards the side it would be closer than 5' from the property line, but they would look at that option. Mr. Gray suggested that in front of lot 15, they could make the raised pedestrian crossing more square and pull the handicapped ramp over to tighten up the intersection. He also noted they may need an easement or waiver to allow the driveway to cross the easement in the front corner of lot 15.

Mr. Gray noted if the driveway on lot 15 was flipped, there would be a condition of having a 3-way stop and to adjust the handicapped and pedestrian crossings to allow the driveway to get onto the road without hitting the apron, adding he would like to see a 5 foot area to permit the car to turn around.

Dr. Sandberg asked if the garages were covered, because if you flipped the garage on lot 15 oncoming lights in the intersection would shine into the house.

It was agreed by all to keep the driveways as designed, add the 3 way stop to each intersection and a 5' bump out for a "K" turn in the driveways.

Ms. Nase-Poust said there were multiple pages of technical matters in Knight Engineering's review letter and they agree to meet with Mr. Gray and provide documentation, with most items being "will comply".

Mr. Gray wanted to confirm that no double stack units would be used in the stormwater management system as they have been a problem and great expense to developers and contractors. Mr. Fioravanti confirmed there will be no double stacked tanks, adding they have individual tank details for each MRC. Mr. Spadafora asked how long the tanks last, and Mr. Fioravanti replied that they are plastic, do not decay or rust, and generally have a life expectancy of at least 25 years. He said they also use them underneath parking lots. Mr. Fioravanti explained they are basically milk crates strapped together, wrapped in stone, with built in end panels where pipes can connect. He said they are all connected hydraulically, and store more water than beds of stone. Mr. Fioravanti said that circular concrete pipes are no longer used.

Ms. Nase-Poust said the last item to discuss is traffic improvements, as they have made a submission to PennDOT and also wanted to address traffic concerns within Arbor Point. Mr. Guthrie explained they need a Highway Occupancy Permit for the Route 263 entrance/exit, they will add a concrete median in the center of Route 263 as a barrier and that PennDOT had agreed on the right in, right out turn

movement. Mrs. Mehling asked if the barrier would block the neighboring driveway, and Mr. Gray said no, that is outside of the barrier. Mr. Guthrie said there is a right turn deceleration land and wide curve for slowing down traffic.

Mr. Guthrie said they had made a field visit to Arbor Point to study traffic calming devices, and their initial thought had been to raise the crosswalks near the Sugar Bottom Road intersections, however they didn't meet PennDOT standards as they were too close to the intersections. He proposed placing them further down East Brighton. Mr. Guthrie said there would be 4-way stops near the community center at West Brighton, East Brighton and Dorchester Street intersections. He thought with the new stop signs an additional speed hump may not be needed.

Mr. Keith Redding, East Brighton Street, reported that Arbor Point has many fast drivers, and there should be traffic calming devices installed on West Brighton between East Dorchester and South Whittmore Streets, and on East Brighton just before the turn onto South Whittmore Street. Mr. Gray confirmed that was the plan. Mr. Guthrie said there also is a proposed speed hump at East Brighton Street just before the on street parking.

Ms. Jodi Reilly, East Brighton Street asked if there would be a stop sign at Rosemont Terrace and East Brighton Street and Mr. Gray replied yes, there would be a 3-way stop, and there would also be traffic calming in the new development. He said the idea is to discourage cut through and to slow down traffic, adding that the township typically stays away from all way stops, but are supporting them here. Ms. Reilly asked if construction trucks would come through Arbor Point, and Mr. Gray replied no, that the new entrance would be barricaded to keep all trucks internal with entry/exit only from York Road. He said as houses are built the road into Arbor Point would be opened when the first occupancy permit was issued, but all major construction should be finished by then.

Mr. Keith Redding, East Brighton Street, asked if they are proposing a 4-way stop at East Brighton and East Dorchester, and Mr. Gray replied yes. Mr. Redding said that may create a problem for overflow street parking where he lives and they may not be able to get out of the curb cutout where they park. Mr. Guthrie said they only expect 1-2 cars to be backed up there. Mr. Redding said an hour before and after school and rush hour it will be more. Mrs. Mehling asked if school buses come through Arbor Point, and Mr. Gray confirmed that they do as they are dedicated roads. He said Central Bucks School District will look at bus movements when all is dedicated in the new development.

Mr. Rosanova had a question on the trail system, saying in previous plans the trail south of lot 11 by the entrance ended as a stub, however with this plan the trail curves down and ends near Route 263. Mr. Fernandez said that Mr. Gray had suggested the curve due to a grading issue. Mr. Fioravanti said the trail could also be extended in the future if it went to the street. Mr. Rosanova said in the regional trail system there is a trail planned across the street, but on this side there is a creek and no issue of the adjacent property being developed. He thought it made more sense as a stub rather than have it right against 263 as it doesn't serve a purpose for the resident on lot 11. Mr. Gray said it could be deferred to a future date and could be a waiver, adding he believes lot 11 will own the property. Mr. Rosanova said if they are deferring the trail, does it make sense to remove the fence and place it closer to the house on lot 11? Ms. Nase-Poust said they still need the fence to protect and stop intrusion in the landscaped buffer. She said if there is to be a sidewalk in the future, it needs to be clearly identified on this plan as that is a homeowners lot, not open space. Ms. Nase-Poust confirmed that lot 11 owns to the right-of-

way on Route 263 and is a one acre sized lot. Mr. Spadafora said then that people would be on their property? Mrs. Nase-Poust confirmed that all of the trails are on private property, so yes. Mr. Gray recommended the plan shows the path as a dashed line for future connection if necessary in the ultimate ROW of York Road, and remove the upper sidewalk on lot 11. Mr. Guthrie confirmed they will add that to the plans submitted to PennDOT.

Mr. Gray said in the illustrative rendering provided today, the number of locations where fences are required to cross stormwater easements should be a waiver from 9.6.A.4 allowing to selectively cross easements for fencing as necessary to maintain fences that keep people from encroaching. He said an example is the rear of lot 15 drainage swale that runs between lots 15 and 14. He said they should specify what lots have the encroachment.

Mr. Gray confirmed there is no need for a waiver request for lot 15 as the driveway will stay as is.

Ms. Nase-Poust said they appreciate tonight's discussion, they have direction and want to continue to move forward. She requested the Planning Commission consider recommending preliminary approval subject to certain conditions, and they will re-submit plans to address all comments discussed and in Knight Engineering's review letter.

Mr. Spadafora made a motion, seconded by Mr. Ripp, to recommend Preliminary Approval of "The Estates at Furlong", Plan dated "Rev. 1/15/26", Major Subdivision composed of 17 Single Family Residences, Township File SA 2024-02, Tax Map Parcel 6-8-32, located at 3178 York Road on 12.45 acres, in the PBR Zoning District, with an extended review period expiration date of December 31, 2026, subject to:

1. *Compliance with all the comments in the February 3, 2026 Knight Engineering, Inc. review letter, including:*
 - *There will be 34 on-street parking spaces as required by the Zoning Hearing Board, with 2-3 parking spaces between the Road A and East Brighton Street intersection and the remainder of the five spaces in front of lots 1 and 2.*
 - *SALDO § 9.2.D waiver is supported following discussion during this meeting.*
 - *All construction trucks shall enter and exit the site via Route 263.*
 - *SALDO § 9.20.D.2.b waiver is supported following discussion during this meeting.*
 - *The homeowner's disclosure document shall include clear instruction regarding restrictions on their property beyond the fence indicating the buffer area, and maintenance of the fence.*
 - *SALDO § 9.20.D.2.d waiver is supported following discussion during this meeting.*
 - *The fencing along lot 7 shall be continued to the landscaped buffer area.*
 - *SALDO § 9.23.K.2.a.i waiver is supported following discussion during this meeting. A formalized letter shall be attached to the revised stormwater report confirming that the stormwater management system will have no adverse impact on the groundwater.*
 - *SALDO § 9.23.H.3 partial waiver is supported following discussion during this meeting, noting that the development need only to provide peak rate control during construction.*
 - *SALDO § 9.4.A.2, SALDO § 9.4.A.3 and 9.4.A.4.a, and SALDO § 9.4.A.4.b waiver is supported following discussion during this meeting, with the correction to the pixelized plan sheet.*

- *SALDO § 9.16.A.2.C waiver is supported following discussion during this meeting conditioned upon the installation of 3-way stops at the intersections in front of lots 10 and 15, and a 5' bump out for a "K" turn be added to the driveways if possible.*
- *A waiver request of SALDO § 9.6.A.4 shall be added to allow selectively cross easements for fencing as necessary to maintain fences that keep people from encroaching. The lots shall be specified.*
- *Additional conditions to include:*

There shall be no use of double-stacked tanks in the stormwater management system.

The entrance/exit on Route 263 shall be right-in, right-out only, with a concrete barrier placed in the center of Route 263.

Traffic calming within Arbor Point shall be as follows: 4 way stops will be installed near the community center at West Brighton, East Brighton and Dorchester Street intersections, traffic calming device(s) shall be installed on West Brighton and East Brighton, and 3 way stop will be installed at Rosemont Terrace and East Brighton Street and at Rosemont Terrace and West Brighton Street. Traffic calming devices shall also be installed within "The Estates at Furlong" as shown on the plans.

The trail south of lot 11 shall be placed within the ultimate right of way of York Road and noted as a possible future path and marked with a dotted line.

2. *Compliance with all the comments in the January 23, 2026 Landscape Review Consultant letter.*
3. *Compliance with all the comments in the July 1, 2025 Bucks County Planning Commission review letter.*

The motion carried unanimously.

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

Minutes respectfully submitted by Lori Wicen.

Minutes approved by Planning Commission on February 4, 2026.