

BUCKINGHAM TOWNSHIP

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

Website - www.buckinghampa.org



PLANNING COMMISSION

AGENDA

JULY 2, 2025

Call to Order 7:30 p.m.

1. Consideration of approving draft Planning Commission minutes of March 5, 2025.
2. Consideration of recommending Preliminary Approval of **“The Estates at Furlong”**, 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 July 31, 2025.

Buckingham Township Planning Commission
Meeting Minutes

The regular meeting of the Buckingham Township Planning Commission was held July 2, 2025, in the Township Building, 4613 Hughesian Drive, Buckingham, Pennsylvania.

Present:	Andrea Mehling	Chairperson
	Frank Ripp, Jr.	Member
	Erling Salvesen, 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

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

Consideration of approving draft Planning Commission minutes of March 5, 2025.

Mrs. Mehling made a motion, seconded by Mr. Salvesen, to approve as most recently presented, the draft Planning Commission minutes of March 5, 2025. The motion carried unanimously.

Consideration of recommending Preliminary Approval of “The Estates at Furlong”, 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 July 31, 2025.

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 and Chris Munz, Property Owner.

Ms. Nase-Poust summarized that the current plan proposes 17 single family homes, they had submitted preliminary plans and received reviews in the fall of 2024, discussed waivers for feedback and direction, redesigned the plan in response to the reviews and waiver discussions, and submitted revised plans. She explained they had received Knight Engineering’s review in June, met with the township engineer and have resolved most of the items, with most design items being “will comply”, and no major outstanding issues. She said this evening they would like to discuss certain waiver requests, and intend to revise the plans again for resubmission to the township.

Mr. Fioravanti reviewed the current plan and identified revisions that have been made since the first submission:

- The roadway was revised per the township engineers comments to provide parking and pedestrian bump-outs. The parking is now offset and wider in the center, with raised pedestrian crossings for traffic safety.
- The sanitary sewer system previously had a pump station in the lower right of the plan, and a central gravitation system pumping to Arbor Point. That system has been replaced with a low pressure system and no pump station.

- Additional soil testing was conducted around each proposed dwelling location for each basement and in the center for the stormwater basin, by digging test pits. Changes were required as the bedrock was shallower than they had thought. This caused the basin to increase in size, which led to another waiver for cut and fill, and a slope of 3:1 request.
- They met with the Arbor Point Homeowners Association and agreed to make traffic calming improvements in Arbor Point by adding stop signs and other additional traffic controls.
- They met with PennDOT and received direction to proceed in designing the entrance as right in, right out turns only.
- Along with the overlap in landscape they discussed the reverse frontage lots, with a 75' buffer setback and 150' setback for the principal dwelling.
- They have layout plans to distribute showing the proposed additional 1000 square feet of impervious surface area being added to each lot to accommodate reasonable development in each yard, which will be designed into the stormwater system.

Ms. Nase-Poust said they will review the traffic comments and distributed a handout showing the proposed improvements to be made within the adjacent Arbor Point development.

- Mr. Guthrie, Traffic Planning & Design, explained that PennDOT has required a “right in, right out” access at the intersection of York Road, so they had submitted an updated traffic study and conceptual design plans to PennDOT and received good feedback. He said the township engineer requested a “right in and right out” restriction along with installing a median along York Road, and they are agreeable to that suggestion and will revise and resubmit the plan to PennDOT.
- Mr. Guthrie explained that the residents in Arbor Point had expressed concern regarding cut through traffic and speeding within their development, so they had met with the Homeowners Association representative to walk East and West Brighton Street which resulted in them recommending the installation of a township standard speed hump near the entrance from Sugar Bottom Road. He said at the community center the development had been designed with raised intersections, but they were observed to be ineffective, so they have proposed “all-way” stop signs to address pedestrian safety at those 4 intersections (West Brighton Street at Dorchester Street and Rosemont Terrace, and East Brighton Street at Dorchester Street and Rosemont Terrace). Mr. Spadafora asked if these improvements need to be approved by PennDOT, and Mr. Gray replied “no” as they are township roads. Mr. Gray explained that typically the township doesn't prefer 4-way stops, but they make sense at these locations. He said the township is also proposing as a separate project adding an additional speed hump on Rosemont Terrace leading into the adjacent Heritage Center development to address their speeding concerns.

Mr. Keith Redding, East Brighton Street, commented that the speed hump would be most effective placed further down W. Brighton Street from the entrance of Sugar Bottom Road as that is a very long stretch. Mr. Gray explained that the parking along the street limits the speed hump location.

Mr. John Telepchak, S. Whittmore Street, requested a speed hump on West Brighton Street between S. Whittmore Street and Sugarbottom Road, as traffic also speeds in that area. Mr. Gray said their concern had been more people entering than exiting Arbor Point, however if that direction is also a concern the developer has now been made aware.

Mr. Guthrie explained they tried to pick the highest impact locations for the proposed Arbor Point improvements, and added they expect a minimal number of cars from the new development to exit through Arbor Point.

Ms. Nase-Poust next requested to discuss certain waiver requests addressed in the Knight Engineering July 1, 2025 review letter.

- SALDO § 9.2.D and SALDO § 9.23K.1.b – 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 SALDO requires the maximum slope 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.

Ms. Nase-Poust said these waivers are requested only for a few locations in the site, as most of the site complies with the ordinance requirement. She said they did try to design the site to minimize cuts and fill, however there are areas along the basins that exceed the 4 feet limit.

Mr. Fioravanti explained they prepared a cut and fill map after meeting with Mr. Gray, to specify areas exceeding 4'. He said the site had been designed to meet existing slopes by using natural topography. He said there are landscaped berms around the perimeter, surrounding the basins. Mr. Fioravanti said the upper right corner basin shows cutting more than 4' to store water in the basin.

Mr. Fioravanti said the center basin concerns ½ of the open space in the center, and they did not want to increase the size of the basin so are requesting a waiver of the cut and fill calculation to 3:1. He said the center basin will be landscaped appropriately for the open space area, and leaves ½ acre of landscaped trails. Mr. Fioravanti explained that both basins will be maintained by the Homeowners Association, with detailed maintenance and guidelines noted on the plan, and will be planted with mixes that do not require frequent mowing. He explained that they propose a 20' elevation between the front of the road the upper right basin, and the fill in the middle basin slope is about 3% from left to right, with a shallow basin, maybe a 4' cut with the basin/berm 10' higher than the nearby road, and 35' from the road. He said residents in the homes across the street from the basin will see landscaping and the side of the basin, with a useable center common area beyond.

Mr. Fioravanti explained the upper right basin will be completely fenced.

Ms. Nase-Poust added that the basins were sized to accommodate additional impervious for future improvements homeowners may want to install on their lots, by calculating an extra 1000 square feet for each home, times 17 homes.

Mrs. Mehling said they shouldn't refer to the middle area as open space as the basin now takes up half of the area. She asked if some of the water could be directed underground, adding that she is concerned about kids climbing up the side of the basin and falling into the water. Mr. Fioravanti said it would only hold water during a rain event, and then would drain. Ms. Nase-Poust said it will look like a grassy landscaped area with plants to deter people from being in there. Mr. Fernandez noted it would be a bird habitat. Ms. Nase-Poust added that at the back right basin, they could put another fence around the top of the berm in addition to the buffer fence at the bottom.

Mr. Gray asked in regard to the neighboring properties looking at a 10' high 3:1 berm, does it make more sense to have less of a berm and more of a depression, or have underground storage? He said Fenton's Corner has village greens and a large underground stormwater system. Mr. Gray said the 3 lots along the northern edge would be more profitable looking at open space rather than at a mound of dirt, as they will be premium lots overlooking the open space. He added that the basins got larger due to the additional impervious and asked if some on lot stormwater could be added to account for the additional. Mr. Gray said if they could reduce the berm height they wouldn't need the waiver and could make it work with less depth.

Mr. Fioravanti agreed to meet with Mr. Gray on this matter, and said he would investigate the options of putting some of the basin underground. He said sometimes it can be a combination and would lower the height. Mr. Gray suggested that maybe the systems could be tiered underneath the paths to provide a nice looking open area.

Mr. Gray said they have added the 1000 square feet impervious surface for each lot as an ideal but suggested individual on lot controls that are more controlled than infiltration, as controls are put in as the lot is built and does not require township enforcement, and the cost of the underground storage would be at the homeowners expense if they wanted to use the 1000 additional footage.

Ms. Nase-Poust clarified for the back basin, does the Planning Commission support the 3:1 if they fence the basin entirely. Mr. Gray said they could design the fence at the spillway to freeboard underneath and encircle the basin, including the slope.

Mr. Gray suggested the applicant amends the waiver request to cover only the back basin (basin 1B). Mrs. Mehling said the Planning Commission members agree that in the center, the stormwater should be mitigated underground or onto other properties.

Ms. Manicone asked how the upper right basin would be accessed for maintenance, and Mr. Gray proposed a rear access gate in a regular size for mower access. Ms. Manicone said that makes sense visually, and may involve some relocation of the trail. She said she and Mr. Fernandez could study the landscaping and make adjustments.

- Ms. Manicone noted that the trail on the plan loops through the rear yard of lot 5, and Mr. Gray said they would like it split down the middle of the lots along the property line. Ms. Manicone suggested the fence be in a similar aluminum to the rear of the properties, but only 3' to define the path between the houses rather than the 5' at all other locations on the property.
- Mr. Ripp questioned if there is space on the lots for an additional 1000 square feet of impervious surface. Mr. Fioravanti noted that some lots are larger than others, and the 1000' could be used as needed on various lots. Mr. Gray said the agreement will be written so each lot is the same, explaining that the intent is to make the impervious clear in the plan and on the disclosure statement, so that homeowners do not come to the township declaring a hardship on their specific lot. He said the building envelope and buildable area is marked on the plan to keep the development from sprawling.

- 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. Mr. Gray said that Mr. Fernandez has worked with the Landscape Review Committee to agree on the buffer plantings and location of the gates. Ms. Manicone said she approved of the fencing to provide a clear and definite boundary for the buffer overlap area, and having the language on the record plan and disclosure notices for each lot. She said there is a lot of landscaping on this project that she and Mr. Fernandez are working on.
- SALDO § 9.3.D – The SALDO requires that side lot lines be substantially at right angles (i.e., not less than 60 degrees or more than 120 degrees) or radial to street lines. The applicant’s engineer has requested a partial waiver to allow the shared Lot Line between Lot 6 and Lot 7 to be less than the required 60 degrees and more than 120 degrees such that Lot 7 can include the extents of the proposed stormwater management facility (Basin 1B). Ms. Nase-Poust stated that the facility (Basin 1B) will be maintained by the Homeowners Association, not the owner.
- 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 said she and Mr. Fernandez can make the basin into something quite attractive for the site and supports the waiver request. Mr. Gray advised they should put the tree roots as far away from the berm as possible.
- SALDO § 9.23.K.1.o – The SALDO requires cleared 15-foot-wide accesses to stormwater facilities for maintenance and operation. It was agreed this waiver request shall be withdrawn and the applicant agrees to provide the 15-foot-wide access as required.
- 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. Mr. Gray recommended tabling this request in order for the engineers to meet and discuss as the soil data needs to be worked through.
- B.T.S.O. § 307.C.1.a – The referenced Buckingham Township Stormwater Management Ordinance requirement is also within the SALDO (SALDO § 9.23.H.3) and 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. Mr. Gray supported the partial waiver noting the applicant has agreed to comply with the peak rate volume component 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 explained they cannot meet the solar requirements on this site. Ms. Manicone said she understood given the lot restrictions and sizes. She said the landscaping

is extensive and they will use larger trees which will contribute to a solar effect on the property, therefore she supports granting these waiver requests. Mr. Gray noted that the township has been provided with a plan layout that the Zoning Hearing Board supported, that did not provide for solar orientation requirements.

- SALDO § 9.16.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. Ms. Nase-Poust said that lots 15 and 10 are not technically corner lots, so this requirement does not apply. She said that the driveway on lot 15 could be flipped, but on lot 10 relocating the driveway would not make a difference even if moved to the other side. Mr. Gray suggested that once the designs are laid out for the raised pedestrian crosswalks at the intersections, those driveways should be pushed to the furthest point from the intersection as they do not want people backing out onto the street at intersections. Mr. Fioravanti agreed they would make it as safe as possible, and would look into raising the intersections. Mr. Rosanova requested a crosswalk at the entrance to East Brighton, and Mr. Gray agreed that needs to be added to the plan if it is not already there. Mr. Salvesen suggested an offshoot of the driveway at lots 10 and 15 so people could turn around to go forward onto the road as backing into an intersection could be a hazard. Mr. Fioravanti said that would be difficult with the 150' setback as they cannot pull the house back into the lot. Mr. Gray agreed in these compact developments there isn't an ability to add another 10x10 pavement into the front lot .
- SALDO § 9.16.E.5 – The SALDO limits the width of the curb cut at the street line to no more than fourteen feet. Mr. Gray said this plan proposes to double the curb cut to accommodate 2 cars so they are not blocked, but could have a single curb cut flaring out to the 2 car garage which would reduce impervious and the visual of all the pavement. Mr. Fioravanti said he understood 10-14 feet is the ordinance requirement, and they are proposing 22'. Mrs. Mehling asked if they would be 2-3 car garages, and Mr. Fioravanti replied "just 2". Mr. Spadafora said it makes it easier to get cars off the street if you have guests to have a wider cut, but it looks pretty ugly. Ms. Nase-Poust confirmed then that the driveway could still be double wide, just at the entrance it would neck down to a single width. Mr. Fioravanti agreed that the driveway entrance would be reduced from 22' to 14' at the roadway, which will eliminate the waiver request.
- SALDO § 9.3.1 – The SALDO requires that any lot that takes access to an internal street, that the structure on the lot be setback a minimum of 200 feet from a public road existing at the time of the subdivision application. Ms. Nase-Poust said this is a conflict between the Zoning and Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, and she does not believe a waiver is required as they received a variance for the reverse 175 setback. Mr. Gray agreed and recommended that the waiver should be granted.
- SALDO § 9.5A – Mr. Fioravanti said this waiver was requested but was not included in Knight Engineering's review. He explained a partial waiver was requested to not require the full determination of the elevation of the seasonal high-water table and/or groundwater elevation for each dwelling unit by on-site testing to be completed prior to the Preliminary Plan Submission. Mr. Fioravanti explained they did soil testing at each dwelling site and didn't find

groundwater, but they may have been a foot above the basement and couldn't prove it. He said they discussed adding "basements will not be permitted on lots 1-6 and 12-16 unless core development and water is at least 2 feet below the slab elevation".

Mr. Fioravanti clarified that the testing will be completed at construction, and if the homeowner wants a basement on those lots, they will need to have it drilled and tested. Mr. Gray agreed that the plan should be clear that no basements are permitted on those lots unless the homeowner agrees to provide additional testing for water. Mr. Gray said a waiver is not needed for this item since the applicant is not asking to put the basement below the water table.

In summary, Mrs. Mehling stated the Planning Commission is adamant about Basin A and Mr. Fioravanti agreed they will look at options to get some or most of it underground and see what that involves.

Mr. Rosanova said the "right in, right out" turn on York Road seems lacking in deterring a left turn into the development. Mr. Guthrie said their initial PennDOT submission was minimal, and they will prepare a plan with a median on the next revision. Mr. Gray said if they cannot add the median, then they will discuss extending islands or some other resolution as a small pork chop is insufficient. Mr. Gray noted they need to be sure the neighbor can still access their property as they are not involved in this application.

Ms. Nase-Poust thanked the Planning Commission and consultants for their time and consideration, and confirmed they will schedule a meeting with Mr. Gray to discuss the basin.

Mr. Spadafora made a motion, seconded by Mrs. Mehling to adjourn the Planning Commission meeting at 9:10 p.m. The motion carried unanimously.

Minutes respectfully submitted by Lori Wicen.

Minutes approved by Planning Commission on February 4, 2026.