

TOWNSHIP OF LOWER MAKEFIELD  
AD HOC PROPERTY COMMITTEE  
MINUTES – JUNE 8, 2023

The regular meeting of the Ad Hoc Property Committee of the Township of Lower Makefield was held remotely on June 8, 2023. Mr. Steadman called the meeting to order at 7:32 p.m.

Those present:

Ad Hoc Property Committee: Dennis Steadman, Chair  
Fred Childs, Vice Chair  
Bette Sovinee, Secretary  
Joe Camaratta, Member  
John Mohan, Member  
Ron Schmid, Member

Others: James Majewski, Community Development Director  
Jennifer Stark, Avison-Young  
Candace Ly, Avison-Young  
Doug Seiler, Seiler+Drury  
Todd Poole, 4ward Planning  
Stephen Heinz, HARB Member  
Jeff Hirko, HARB Member  
Colleen Attara  
Suzanne Blundi, Supervisor Liaison

Absent: Jim Scott, Ad Hoc Property Committee Member

OPENING COMMENT: Mr. Steadman

The Ad Hoc Property Committee is focused on developing a Master Plan for the Patterson Farm site. It is 234 acres of pristine farm/agricultural land containing fifteen old farm buildings and homes. It has been owned by the Township for twenty-five years. Because it was acquired without a real plan other than leasing the land for farming, some of the buildings have gone into disrepair, and we are at a crossroads. If something is not done soon, we could lose some of these historical buildings. Because of their condition, there are major expenses potentially in the millions of dollars to develop the site and get all of the buildings into usable condition. Those expenditures will not be made unless there is a good use for the buildings.

The Committee was put together and charged with the development of a Master Plan for the site which should be looked at holistically to determine what is the best plan for this property in the long run so that proper decisions can be made in the short run as to the priority of spending and uses for the buildings. Major money will not be spent on buildings simply to have them sit idle, and there is a need to find uses. Engagement is needed from the community to do this properly.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Ms. Sovinee

Mr. Mohan moved, Mr. Camaratta seconded and it was unanimously carried to approve the Minutes of May 11, 2023 as written.

#### MASTER PLAN UPDATE

Seiler+Drury Project Update Approach to Study and Assessments Thus Far:  
Mr. Seiler, Mr. Poole

Mr. Seiler stated the team includes Seiler+Drury who are architects/generalists involved with preservation and the environment, Simone Collins, landscape architects/planners, and 4ward Planning, land use/economists.

A slide was shown with regard to the schedule and the tasks that Seiler+Drury was contracted to do. Mr. Seiler stated it was anticipated there would be multiple tasks beginning with evaluation with a focus on history, then developing a program as to re-uses, and recommending putting the program into the buildings with options in discussion with the stakeholders, developing cost estimates, several meetings during this process, and finally submission of a final report. Mr. Seiler stated four public meetings were contemplated with completion of the project in September of this year.

Mr. Seiler stated based on what has been learned about the Township, the Ad Hoc Property Committee, and other people involved in the Township they are recommending to build the presentations and discussions around the Ad Hoc Property Committee meetings which are typically the second Thursday of the month. He stated he is recommending three tranches of effort, the first of which is still data gathering, surveying, analysis, interviews, and reading the history. There was a Kick-Off in March with the Ad Hoc Property

Committee. At the second meeting with the Ad Hoc Property Committee, they shared preliminary results of interviews, started showing some of the efforts they were making on the site analysis, and sharing some of Mr. Poole's early observations. At the last Ad Hoc Property meeting, they went deeper into the economic studies including looking at a number of arts organization and farm heritage destination uses. Mr. Seiler stated tonight is the fourth meeting with the Ad Hoc Property Committee, and he hopes to discuss additional observations with a goal of trying to reach some consensus as to how to respond to some of the observations as well as to discuss preliminary concept plans as to where they are starting to lean. Mr. Seiler stated Mr. Poole will discuss the economic aspects of how the site fits into the world at large.

Mr. Seiler stated all of the buildings have been surveyed and drawn in plan and elevation, and the structural report is almost complete. He stated they are almost ready for the first in-person public forum to be held later this month. He stated while the Ad Hoc Property Committee meetings are public meetings, it is not the same as an opportunity to meet in person with the consultants to discuss their point of focus. He stated for this meeting they are looking to possibly meet at the Community Center; and their team will present where they are, what they have learned, and give the public a chance to talk to them and ask them questions. He stated it is a Q and A session for the public.

Mr. Seiler stated that would be the end of the first tranche, and by that time they will know the buildings, the stakeholders, and will get a sense as to "where the public is coming from."

Mr. Seiler stated they would move into the second tranche which he proposes would begin at the Ad Hoc Property Committee meeting next month to focus entirely on the historicity and the preservation aspects of the buildings. He stated they will at that point understand them, and know their physical limits and their conditions. He stated the preservation consultant, Bob Powers, will be present along with the structural engineer, Charlie Timbie. He stated that would be the time to discuss the pros and cons of different methods of doing a National Register nomination process, confirming that is desired, how to go about it, and how it relates to all of the aspects.

Mr. Seiler stated the schedule of eight Ad Hoc meetings starting in March is based on ending in October. He stated he already asked the Committee to extend the first tranche one month because the gathering of data was a little

more intense with the interviews, etc. than was anticipated so they about one month behind where they expected to be. He asked once we understand the historicity, the buildings, and where we want to go, and the fact that we will have Mr. Poole's report, is it necessary to have a special focus night to talk only about uses being considered by the Committee versus their recommendations. He stated that could be blended into the next meeting which would be the sixth meeting with the Ad Hoc Committee in August which is when he expects the team will start having options given the buildings, capacity, size, conditions, and uses that might start to make sense and the reasons why. He stated the question is whether to have a "more abstract use" night and then get into the physically-planned options for the Committee to review. He stated once options have been vetted through the Committee, he would then want to go to the public at an in-person public forum and vet the uses through them.

Mr. Seiler stated we need to consider the timing of this. He stated it is early June, and at "Ad Hoc six" options would be discussed. He asked the Committee to think about what they feel about a late August/early September second public forum meeting.

Mr. Seiler stated the third tranche is that they would take the feedback from the in-person public forum and all the discussions that have been held it with the Ad Hoc Property Committee, and choose an "A Scheme which may be an A Scheme with a couple B-Primes." He stated those would be developed and reviewed with the Ad Hoc Property Committee, and revise as necessary. He stated "Ad Hoc eight" would be in October with a final draft to the Board of Supervisors and the third, in-person public forum at the Board of Supervisors meeting in late October/early November.

Mr. Mohan stated while people could be away on vacation in August, he feels that we should keep moving on this.

Ms. Blundi stated they are cutting it very close with a meeting the end of October/early November to not having a successful Budget conversation. She stated traditionally the first draft of the Budget is developed the end of October/very beginning of November. She stated the first Budget draft also has to be public for a certain number of days in order for the final draft of the Budget to be approved.

Mr. Seiler stated the October Ad Hoc Property Committee meeting would be October 12. He stated he does not feel they could tighten the schedule any more. He stated he feels that the uses could be put in with the options.

Mr. Childs stated he understood that the proposal was three public meetings and then the presentation to the Board of Supervisors. Mr. Seiler stated that previously there were four public meetings scheduled, but Mr. Collins had felt that typically three public meeting were sufficient for a Master Plan. The final public meeting would be at the Board of Supervisors meeting.

Mr. Seiler stated he is recommending taking one of the public meetings out because it would be difficult to schedule another one around the Ad Hoc Property Committee meetings. He stated when they first considered having four public meetings, he did not realize how public of a process it is in Lower Makefield which is "extraordinary."

Mr. Steadman stated while this is correct, they are expecting the in-person, public forums to hopefully attract more people than the monthly meetings do. He agreed August is a difficult time, but they need to take the Budget into consideration so we cannot afford to take August off and push things back further. He stated he is in support of the general timeline proposed

Mr. Heinz suggested that the two meetings in the third tranche be two weeks apart and have two Ad Hoc Property Committee meetings in one month which might get the information out to the people who need it. Mr. Seiler noted the different meetings where different information would be presented, and after a certain point, they would be presenting the same information but with more-refined detail.

Mr. Schmid stated he feels the strategy of our need for transparency and getting a lot of input would be served by the logic that Mr. Seiler is presenting, but he would like time to think about the dates.

Mr. Seiler stated he would like the Committee to advise him what they want him to do; however, tonight he is specifically looking to get a date for the first in-person public forum.

Mr. Steadman stated he feels that mid-October is the deadline getting the final information to the Board of Supervisors. He stated a determination will have to be made if the Committee needs to add meetings in between some of the sessions.

Mr. Seiler stated the guiding principles from the Ad Hoc Committee are: That the Patterson Farm should remain largely agricultural, the Township (with community support) should do its best to preserve the buildings, and without a purpose, these buildings will not be viable or sustainable. Mr. Seiler stated he added two more, one of which is: Any proposals for the re-use or preservation of these buildings should be based on a holistic analysis and best planning practices. He stated that is why the team is working with the Township; and they are looking at site, economics, history, ecology, the buildings themselves, and “agency” which refers to the concept of who operates them and who is responsible for repairs, etc. He stated they feel that this is a critical issue that decisions should be based on. He stated the last thing he is adding is that their charge is not to just say “everything is great and all their ideas are perfect” but that they should present what they believe to be true.

Mr. Heinz asked that with regard to the last item, he asked that the “truth” be supported by other examples, documentation, and information as to why they believe these things to be true. Mr. Seiler stated he agrees 100%. He stated he has been happy to have had the chance to meet with Mr. Heinz on the site. He added that what everyone will learn is that they will base their recommendations on talking to everyone, gathering the facts, and considering their desires.

Mr. Seiler stated he believes that prior efforts to solve the “Patterson Farm puzzle,” failed because the wrong or too narrow of an approach was taken. He stated early on an engineer went into great detail with the Satterthwaite House; and while that may have been needed because repairs were done right after that, he does not feel the problem will be solved by only looking at one or two aspects, and it has to be solved by looking at them all.

Mr. Seiler stated the Township took possession of the property in the 1990’s; and while not everyone may necessarily agree, considerable improvements have been made including roofs, emergency repairs, and the houses that are occupied have been maintained and had services put into them. He stated there have also been many studies prepared, but none of them were as broad as what is being worked on now.

Mr. Seiler stated there is now an urgency to act which was not the case five to fifteen years ago. He stated the buildings need attention but a plan is needed before committing more public money to the preservation. He stated everyone is present because Patterson Farm is a remarkable place and he commends

everyone for going through this process. Mr. Seiler stated it is important to reach a consensus-based outcome where all of the stakeholders generally agree with where we will be going. He stated this is essential for success, as you cannot have outliers who did not feel they were engaged “sniping” at what we come up with. He stated what is being done includes a multi-faceted analysis with planning, economics, history, structure, and governance. He stated this is a challenging task.

A slide was shown of the Matterport file for the Satterthwaite Farmstead which is an example of the 3D survey they did of all of the buildings. He showed a slide of the Patterson Farmstead as well as a slide of the data tables which include square footage and circuit dates. A slide was shown of the first floor of the Janney House, and each house has been drawn to this detail.

Mr. Seiler stated their structural engineer, Charlie Timbie, has written his draft report which will be finished shortly. Mr. Seiler stated all of the documents will soon be available, and he will work with Mr. Majewski on how these will be made available to the public. Mr. Seiler stated Mr. Timbie’s work sets the basis for structural capacity, and what repairs need to be done to meet certain uses; and that would be the foundation for what the costs would be.

Mr. Seiler stated the next phase is taking the principles and early observations and start to speculate a bit. He stated he is looking at the property as having four primary use areas including the farm operations and the art focus, which is building on AOY’s success at the Janney House and the way they use the ground, but also from Mr. Poole’s analysis which he will be discussing. The third is the farm heritage focus generally considering that around the Satterthwaite buildings. He stated this use as well as the art use could be on either side or they could co-mingle between those uses between them. He stated the fourth use area relates to the Satterthwaite House as well. He stated it is a little different as it is a little separated from its outbuildings, it is on a road that makes it distinct, and it is also different because of its size and the type of building that it is.

Mr. Seiler stated he believes that every building should be looked at individually. He stated he was a HARB member for twenty years and has been involved with historic buildings for many years; and he feels that every building is a different size, different character, different capacity, and can serve different functions and needs. He stated each building should be looked at individually in terms of use, preservation standard, and philosophy. He stated any building could be occupied

by an individual, an organization, a business, or a combination. He noted the Satterthwaite Farmstead buildings and stated you could have a craftsman in the well garage and a 501C3 operating out of the barn. He stated there could be someone else using the corn crib, and they could all be part of this focus area. He stated this came from looking at prototypes; and he particularly noted the Edison Ford Winter Estate in Fort Myers, Florida, which Mr. Timbie worked on. Mr. Seiler stated Mr. Timbie had advised that at that location, each building has an identity and looks different. One has a florist, one a blacksmith, and one a gift shop; and some of them are operated by an individual and some by the 501C3. He stated the point is that for success, the buildings should be used, or you could just mothball them if they are just needed for “visual, poetic impact in the landscape,” or decided what else to do with them if there is not a use.

Mr. Seiler stated there are three classes of buildings. He stated there are the two large houses plus the caretaker’s house which are the Residential angle, there are two large barns which could have different uses for assembly for large capacity which could three or four-season buildings, and there are the various other accessory buildings.

Mr. Seiler noted a document which will be put on-line which discusses the characteristics of houses versus farm buildings.

Mr. Steadman asked Mr. Seiler to speak to the nature/environmental/passive recreational type of potential uses which could be on the property. He asked if that would overlap all four of the uses. Mr. Seiler stated while there are four use areas, the site also has features which cross areas such as the stream. He stated a trail could be another example, as well as the road circulation, and the forest. Mr. Seiler stated he feels trails are a very important use for this site, and in the Final Plan there will be some suggestions on that. He stated they need to research the Easement more thoroughly as it may not allow a perimeter trail or we may need to swap Easement land to achieve that. He stated he feels that to be successful every building would have things going on, the whole place would be a destination, individual buildings would be a destination, and they would all enhance the Edgewood Village community and trails in general. He stated the idea is to make this the “dream that everything thought about” when the Township bought it, but did not quite know how to do it. He stated trails and passive recreation would very much be a part of this. He stated in order to do this we need to consider where would there be parking, where would the trailhead be for people who want to use the trail, etc.



Mr. Camaratta stated Mr. Seiler had separated Satterthwaite from its farm buildings but he did not separate the Patterson farmhouse from its farm buildings, and he asked why that was done. Mr. Seiler stated some of it was geography. He stated he believes the perception was that the Satterthwaite Farmstead with the house and the outbuildings had to be together; however, he realized that none of them really have to be together. He stated with regard to the Janney House, he believes it is so integrated with the Patterson Farmstead and the way it creates a community green, that it is more of an identified space than Satterthwaite. He stated Mr. Collins noted that Satterthwaite has the viewshed which is the view from Satterthwaite across to Patterson which is more in your mind than the view from Patterson back which he believes is because of how it sits on the land. Mr. Seiler stated Satterthwaite is physically more separate and it sits by the road which is a unique characteristic. He stated with regard to the Janney House it is integral to the Patterson cluster.

Mr. Schmid asked Mr. Seiler if this is a vision for the four use areas, are there any best practices from other sites as to how long it takes to realize the vision with the art focus and the farm heritage focus. Mr. Seiler stated Mr. Poole can speak to this.

Mr. Poole stated part of the answer is the economics of how this works, and part of what he will be looking at in the second phase of his assignment which ownership and management options since that will determine how quickly this comes together. He stated he does not feel it “will happen overnight, and it will need tweaks along the way.” Mr. Poole stated some of the case studies that will be part of the market study include locations in the region that have developed synergy with arts, heritage, and complimentary activities that evolved over time. He stated whatever is ultimately proposed, he feels we should consider five-year increments.

Mr. Seiler stated he believes that some portions could move faster than others. He stated with regard to the farm heritage aspect, he had asked the stakeholders if there is a farm-related collection. He noted the Trolley Museum in Scranton which he worked on which came about because there was a collection looking for a home. Mr. Seiler stated in Lower Makefield, they were hired to look at buildings; and their team indicated that in order to understand the buildings, you need to understand the land, the community, and the economics.

Mr. Heinz stated there are two large collections of farm implements, one of which is across the street at the farm that is currently being evaluated for development, and the other is in Doylestown in the Mercer Museum that they do not have displayed because it is too big. Mr. Seiler stated curators have told him that you can start with any collection and you just improve it.

Mr. Seiler stated he feels that there have been several successes at Patterson Farm including that the land has been preserved, the Easement has been created, the agricultural operation is ongoing, many people are engaged in this process, AOY is using the Janney House and grounds very well, and the buildings have been kept standing with some repairs made. He stated there have also been some failures in that it has not been determined how to go forward because they have not had the tools put before them. He stated the purpose of what they are doing is to holistically look at as much as they can and talk to as many people as they can and work together to create a vision of how to go forward.

Mr. Seiler stated it will not be easy to find appropriate, compatible uses. He stated frameworks should be set up so that if someone comes in with a proposal for a use, there are Covenants, Easements, and Zoning in place.

Mr. Seiler stated he feels a non-consensus driven framework or a less than rigorous plan will fail. He stated rigorous means looking at everything, and he feels we are all trying to do that together. He stated he feels for these buildings if we do not find a use for these buildings or have a use identified so that the Township can justify mothballing the buildings, it will be the same as demolishing the buildings. He stated at some point the buildings become attractive nuisances, and most Governments feel obligated to tear them down.

Mr. Seiler stated at least three things are required and probably more. He stated the first is to look at the buildings in detail and understand them, and they are close to that point. He stated we need to study their relationship to the landscape which is currently being done. He stated the third is to consider the relationship between future uses dealing with the economic realities of the region which is what Mr. Poole is doing.

Mr. Seiler showed a slide of the four Zones – the agricultural/active farming, arts focus, farm heritage, and the idea that the Satterthwaite House could be considered alone with a little bit of land or a more land; but the concept is to allow for the consideration that something else can happen at Satterthwaite.

Mr. Seiler stated if the arts community is such a destination, they could share workshops back and forth with tractors and heritage implements available to be seen. He stated he is suggesting "flexible with boundaries."

Mr. Seiler stated he feels the industrial operation, the composting/gravel pit, out of the area he showed on a slide and to come off of Stony Hill Road. He stated he knows the road was removed and the Easement erased, but perhaps it could be negotiated back. He noted the location where he would propose that the composting area be located instead of its current location. He stated they have studied the use of the farmer, and he asked if the farmer could take the upper level of the Patterson barn and use the packing house and a shed he showed on the slide for some of his equipment/operations. Mr. Seiler stated there has been much discussion with the consulting team and some members of the Committee, and it is felt that since this is a farming operation, if equipment was needed to be parked in a barn, they feel it should be at the location he showed on the slide.

Mr. Seiler showed on the slide a proposed loop trail, adding there could be remote parking with a trailhead and a link to Edgewood Village as well as other streets. He stated it could possibly be used as a way to eliminate needing to put a sidewalk on the side of Mirror Lake Road he showed on the slide which would be tight. Mr. Seiler stated there could be a discussion with Bucks County Conservation about giving land back. He noted a hatched area which would take back a portion of the land that is currently under Easement and put it back in the hands of the Township which would be more useful to the Township than to the farmer. He noted an area which would be more useful to the farmer than the Township. He stated it would then leave about six acres of land for trail encroachment into the farming operations.

Mr. Steadman stated he likes getting the industrial/leaf mulching operation out of the center of all of the activities. He stated the area where the greenhouse was is not farmable now since it has been compacted down, adding Mr. Stewart has indicated it could take thirty to forty years before he would be able to plant anything there. Mr. Steadman stated the farming that is going on is going on beyond the Easement, and what has been defined by Mr. Seiler as potential land that would become part of the Agricultural Easement makes sense.

Mr. Seiler noted a dotted line on the slide which is the farmer's path, and he stated you want to keep farming equipment and operations from crossing the destination centers. Blue dots shown on the slide are gates which would be for emergency vehicles and could be connected if necessary. He stated they are visualizing that the Janney House Zone could be larger depending on "what kind of takers come along." He noted the existing entrance for the Janney House as well as another entrance on the other side of the stone wall in front of Satterthwaite. He noted areas where there is close parking and remote parking when there is an event. Mr. Seiler noted where the one entrance stops and it does not cross the viewshed. He stated if there were to be an event at the lower level of the Satterthwaite barn which would open up to a tent for a festival or craft show, parking for that would be on the back side.

Mr. Heinz stated he feels this is a great beginning point with a lot of evaluation and thought process that has already gone into it.

Mr. Mohan asked about the trail loop, and asked how close that would get to the actual active farming from a safety perspective. Mr. Seiler stated it would be next to the edge. He stated at the next meeting he will bring a picture of the Norristown Farm Park which he lives next to. He stated when you walk on those trails, which are paved and wide enough for Park vehicles to drive on, there is 8' of mown grass and then you have the soy or corn crop. He stated when you walk on those trails you can watch the corn grow all summer. He stated with a grass buffer and "common sense," he has rarely come across people going into the fields. He stated someone from the Township could speak to someone from Montgomery Parks about their experience as they have been doing this since the 1970's. He stated it is over 600 acres of farmed land.

Mr. Poole stated 4ward Planning are land use economists and they perform economic and Real Estate analysis for public and private sector clients. He stated they do a lot in the realm of re-development and also have a practice area that focuses on the economics of open space, revenue generation, and doing projects like this one where they are working in a collaborative effort with landscape architects, architects, and engineers. He stated they have done a lot of work locally, regionally, and throughout the eastern and western U.S. He showed a slide of the project team which he is leading, who are all very experienced. He stated he has been in the field for thirty years, twelve of it in the public sector and the rest as a consultant.

Mr. Poole stated their charge on this team was to identify the market potential including examining it from both a local and regional perspective. He stated they look at socio-economics, demographics, consumer expenditures, etc. He stated until you understand the market, it is difficult to look at adaptive re-uses or propose a program that will work. He stated they are going to consider market-viable adaptive re-uses. He stated a lot of ideas have been discussed over the years, and they heard some of them during the interviews and discussions with local individuals; however, whatever adaptive re-uses are selected they need to be market-viable. He stated that does not mean that they are financially or economically-feasible, and it just means that there is a market for that use. He stated the step that would come in the second phase would be to identify among the market-viable uses how financially-feasible they are, or how they could make them so if they are not, through a variety of means.

Mr. Poole stated they are looking at identifying revenue-generating potential whether that is privately-generated revenue such as a separate, third-party, private entity coming in and purchasing property and operating it consistent with the goals of objectives of the Township or whether third-party funding such as public funding or philanthropic funding is necessary to underwrite the operations and capital expenses.

Mr. Poole stated after they have identified economic and revenue opportunities, the final thing they will be doing is identifying ownership and management options for these adaptive re-uses. He stated they are very much aware that the Township is not interested in continuing to manage the properties on the farmstead, and that will be considered when they are evaluating ownership/management options.

Mr. Poole stated they utilize a lot of public and third-party data that they have used over the years which could be U. S. Census data or information that is available on the Web for competitive supply which is other farmsteads that might have arts organizations, programming, or heritage centers. He stated they also use private third-party data for the socio-economics trend analysis that they performed. He stated they subscribe to an on-line application called Esri which is one of the leading purveyors of socio-economic data Nationally. Mr. Poole stated they also reviewed background information provided by the Township which helps guide them in the proper direction. He stated they have been interviewing industry professionals including people who are running heritage organizations or arts facilities that are similar or overseeing programming that might have application on the farmsteads. He stated they also met

with people who are currently using the farmsteads including those associated with AOY, the current farmers, and Ms. Attara which they feel is very important to help guide their study.

Mr. Poole stated they reviewed third-party research reports which will be seen when they provide their final market study, and they have some case study reports some from existing research and some primary research that they have conducted and developed. He stated the case studies will offer insights into what can be done on these farmsteads.

Mr. Poole stated one of the first things they like to do is start with study areas from which to pull data, examining competitive inventory which are other sites which might compete with the Patterson Farm site. He showed a slide with Lower Makefield in the center of the map, and they identified a fifteen-minute primary market area (PMA) which is a drive time. He stated the software that they use allows them to identify driving times for market analysis. He stated they have also shown a thirty-minute SMA, which is a secondary market area. He stated for a larger comparison, they have also shown a sixty-minute secondary market area which would suggest potential customers/visitors who would come from a far distance, but would come less often than someone within the thirty minute or the fifteen minute primary market area. Mr. Poole stated these areas are the geographies from which they have pulled socio-economic data; and in most respects, they have also identified competitive inventory.

Mr. Poole showed a slide of tourism regions that they have pulled according to PA Visit Bucks County, and you can see where Lower Makefield sits within this. He stated they have also brought over their 15 minute PMA, 30 minute SMA and the greater tourism region which has been included on the map which includes much of the Delaware Valley Region and over the River to Mercer County. This shows where the prospective visitors/customers would come from.

Mr. Poole stated there are millions of visitors annually coming into the Bucks/Mercer area. He stated visitors to these two Counties according to the Tourism Economics 2021 Report spend a relatively equal amount with \$872 million in 2021 spent in Mercer County and \$842 million spent in Bucks County on tourism-related goods and services. Mr. Pool stated notwithstanding the Pandemic, these spending patterns are predicted to grow which is favorable for the farmsteads.

Mr. Poole stated according to research data, visitors in this region are drawn to galleries, historic sites, restaurants, and festivals. He stated both the household incomes and the educational attainment levels are strongly correlated with the proclivity to visit galleries, historic sites, and restaurants, etc. He stated Lower Makefield Township is relatively affluent, as is the region as well; and that all bodes favorably for the types of uses and activities that have been expressed for the farm site. He stated this includes a farm heritage center, the arts program that is already established there, and other things that are currently being examined which still required additional evaluation.

Mr. Poole stated you want to be able to target Baby Boomers, Gen Xers, and Millennials. He stated as you move away from Lower Makefield, the age decreases, and Lower Makefield represents the larger share of Baby Boomers those born between 1946 and 1964. He stated within the fifteen-minute drivetime, that is where there are a lot more Gen Xers; and as you get further out, closer to Philadelphia is where you get to Millennials. He stated the primary and secondary market areas are capturing a nice cross section of the older generation and younger generation which means the programming and the offerings at the farmsteads will need to keep in mind that there is this particular consumer audience available. He stated we need to discuss how to balance that or if we want to target a particular generation.

Mr. Poole stated high-discretionary household spending goes hand-in-hand with high-household incomes. He showed a slide for Lower Makefield that is based on consumer expenditure surveys produced by the Census Bureau, and they are able to identify spending on recreation, lodging, and food and beverage while traveling. He stated there are relatively high expenditure levels locally, and they drop off a little as you move away from Lower Makefield which is to be expected as the population gets younger with lower household incomes. Mr. Poole stated the household incomes as well as the discretionary spending in the primary and secondary market areas are relatively high relative to the Nation and probably to other nearby States.

Mr. Poole stated they have also identified, which is consistent with the income and the educational-attainment levels, that a large swath of the adult population participates in outdoor activities/nature-related activities which includes hiking, birding, running, and cycling; and they are also interested in culture going to museums, visiting heritage farm sites, and participating in arts activities. He stated all of this is very favorable for the Patterson farmstead.

Mr. Poole stated in the analysis, one of the first things that they wanted to do was to eliminate what they felt were unlikely market-viable uses which are not likely to be sustained over a period of time, two to five years, because these would not be enough visitation for it, enough consumer expenditure for it, or that the facilities available to house these operations are inappropriate for the space offered.

Mr. Poole stated restaurant use was cited as an opportunity; and if it were to go anywhere, it would probably have to be in the Satterthwaite House. He stated the issue with the Satterthwaite House is that it would require a lot of capital expenditure to make it into a restaurant. He stated even if they kept the footprint and put in \$800,000 to \$1 million which is probably what it would cost, the square footage is quite limiting based on the needs of a restaurant. He stated it would probably only be able to sit at best twenty to thirty people, and it would need to be very high end to be able to make money. He stated they would probably have to bump out the back to make room for a modern restaurant kitchen, and it is not felt that the cost to do something like this would not be of interest to most entrepreneurs or restaurateurs.

Mr. Poole stated another use that was discussed for the Satterthwaite House was a Residential use unrelated to the farming activities such that the Residential use would not be associated with a worker or the farmer living in the house. He stated they were made aware through information and reports provided to them that a few years ago there was a professional who was an expert in historic houses for purposes of a Residential use who examined the Satterthwaite House, and he has reflected the findings of that report. He stated it was indicated that the location would be undesirable because of its proximity to Mirror Lake Road/ Route 332, it is directly under the flight path related to the Trenton-Mercer Airport, and the magnitude of the investment that would need to go into the house to make it habitable would not be worth it given what could be spent somewhere else on a historic structure in a better location. He stated while this use was ruled out, someone could come in indicating that they were willing to pay whatever it takes for the house, although the likelihood of that happening is not high.

Mr. Poole stated for similar reasons a Bed and Breakfast would probably not be marketable as that would involve the same issues with it as a residence. He stated Bed and Breakfast entrepreneurs are usually operating on a relatively



tight budget, and they too would have the issues with the money needed for Satterthwaite as well as the space available which would be limiting on the revenue opportunity side.

Mr. Poole stated they also found Commercial Office Use to be non-market viable. He stated he does a lot of analysis in this area. He stated the Office market is quite soft at this time; and even before the Pandemic, it was soft in many areas principally because of remote work and technology. He stated when a Commercial business, particularly a small business, is looking to locate office space, they want to be in a location that offers walkability to amenities such as cafes, restaurants, personal services, and sometimes even transportation; and none of those things are available at this site. He stated that would be a major strike against the Satterthwaite House becoming a Commercial Office space. He stated like the other uses identified above, the cost of renovations would be far too great particularly for someone who would lease space. He stated landlords will only do so much on a building or office space, and the fit-out cost is typically borne by the lessee. He stated it is unlikely that a potential tenant would invest that kind of money in a property that it did not own.

Mr. Poole stated they are still involved in examining the potential market-viable uses. He stated they want to make sure that the uses that they are identifying are also compatible with and complimentary to existing activities and the character of the site. He stated it is a farmstead, there is history to the site, and there is an existing arts organization that is doing quite well and could do even better. He stated the list he is showing tonight is reflective of that and includes an Agricultural Heritage Center/Museum, a distillery, an event space, and in-residence arts workshops and programs. He stated they are still evaluating all of these uses, and the market report will show the information and data that they have gathered.

Mr. Poole stated while it is not on this list he has heard that there was interest some years ago from an equine center possibly taking space at the Satterthwaite Farmstead. He stated while they need to evaluate that more, he feels that is a possible use that would be complimentary to the existing site.

Mr. Poole stated they need to finalize the market report which will be shared with the Committee shortly and then will probably be made publicly available. He stated the findings will be discussed with the Ad Hoc

Committee; and then based on what has been identified as market-viable uses, they will discuss with the Ad Hoc Committee which ones they would like to see examined further for financial viability. He stated he will look into the type of revenue they can generate through private sector transactions as well as what public or third-party funding might be required based on the nature of the activity or particular use. He stated finally they will identify ownership and management models based on the uses that are both market-receptive and financially-viable. He stated they will keep in the mind that the Township would very much like to not be in the business of managing buildings and overseeing maintenance and managing something that is not public-sector related.

Mr. Childs stated Mr. Poole had mentioned four options which were non-marketable specifically for the Satterthwaite House. He asked if those would also apply to the other buildings on both farmsteads or have they not looked at those at this point. Mr. Poole stated the reason that they focused on the Satterthwaite House as it related to those uses is because the Janney House is successfully occupied by an arts organization. He stated they also know that one of the other buildings is occupied by an artist. He stated they are looking at one of the barn buildings and one of the other outbuildings as opportunities to further expand on the arts programming and keeping it clustered on "that campus." He stated they did not consider those other buildings. He stated the uses identified – the residence, the Bed & Breakfast, the office, and the restaurant would not work in those structures other than in the Janney House.

Mr. Seiler stated while a restaurant could work in a portion of one of the barns, he feels the issue is proximity to the road, visibility, signage, and ease of getting in and out. Mr. Poole stated it would also have to be highly specialized. He noted a restaurant in New England which operates a pizza restaurant out of a barn, and people come from all over to go there.

Mr. Heinz asked Mr. Poole to do a quick expense/benefit analysis that would show the overall potential cost of renovation and what could be achieved with the usage so that it would show why they are saying it is not viable. Mr. Heinz stated he feels this could be quickly done for the non-viable uses because they could get cost analysis of renovations versus what the possible income might be. Mr. Heinz asked that he also consider the value of the use in terms of public access and "public achievement," and "Township roles for a specialized space that might not be otherwise fulfilled in the Township." He stated it would be a "quasi or maybe a totally public use for a portion of

the site.” He also stated with regard to the restaurant, he feels they could consider a small bistro/café/snack bar which might be included and utilized by those at the arts programs which would be similar to what happens at sports fields.

Mr. Poole stated he does this kind of modeling and analysis for a variety of clients and such a concession business that Mr. Heinz has suggested would “die a quick death,” and there would not be enough support even for the programming that is there for such a use. He stated they would have a difficult time finding an entrepreneur to take that on for that reason. He stated there would not be enough consistent, daily traffic to make that work. He stated what there could be would be food trucks on event days. He stated when there are big events, there could be food trucks as they do not have to rely on foot traffic at a single place, and they go to where the activity is. He stated that is an economically-viable operation whereas if there is a stationary food vendor there, that would be difficult.

Mr. Steadman stated when we are looking at a viable use, that is separate from a financially-profitable use. He stated there could be a community use that the community or non-profits would support. He stated with this property the goal is to find a mix of those so that there are some financially-feasible operations that help pay for the maintenance, but there is also community good as it is a beautiful spot. Mr. Poole stated the beauty of their team is that they are working in concert together for that – the preservation of the open space and the public activities along with the fact that there is a need to generate revenue in order to support some of the activities. He stated some activities will also help subsidize others, and he will go into more detail once he gets to that portion of the study.

Mr. Steadman asked Mr. Seiler and Mr. Poole if their slides from tonight will be sent to Mr. Majewski so that they can be posted on the Patterson Farm Website so everyone can access them. Mr. Majewski stated he has them, and they will be posted. Mr. Steadman asked everyone to review them and come back with questions and comments.

#### Community Outreach & Engagement: Mr. Schmid

Mr. Schmid stated the Sub-Committee meets prior to the Ad Hoc Property Committee meeting. He stated there are yard signs and banners up, and

he thanked Ms. Sovinee and Ms. Tierney for their work on this. He stated they will continue to put up more signs in public places including at Patterson Farm. He stated this is to get the community involved in what we are doing and send them to the LMT Website to learn more about what is going on.

Mr. Schmid stated this Saturday we will have a booth at Memorial Park from 10:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. He stated this is a collaboration between AOY and Park & Recreation to bring Art to the Parks. There will be twenty vendors, music, and food trucks, and we will have a booth there talking to residents of Lower Makefield and tell them about what we are doing to try to get them more interested in this. Mr. Steadman will staff the booth from 10:00 a.m. until 1:00 p.m. and Mr. Schmid will staff the booth from 1:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m., but they would also like one other person during both of those times. He asked if anyone can join them to please let him know.

Mr. Schmid stated we have done some outreach to local businesses including McCaffrey's who will give us two days, and he will be talking to Mr. Steadman and Mr. Seiler and his team as to when would be the best time to have a booth at McCaffrey's whether it would be at the second tranche or the third tranche that Mr. Seiler discussed earlier. He stated we need to consider the best time to be at McCaffrey's educating LMT residents about options.

Mr. Schmid stated the Sub-Committee is talking to the Township about creating a "buzz" around the public meetings and perhaps contracting with an agency to help us raise awareness for the three public meetings that we have been talking about. He stated for tonight we need to decide on a date for the first public forum. Mr. Steadman stated Ms. Tierney has advised via e-mail two dates that the Community Center is available are June 26 and June 27. Mr. Seiler stated June 26 would be his team's preferred date.

Mr. Steadman stated they are envisioning having stations and expertise at each station where they could talk about the historical status of the buildings, the land use, and engineering. Mr. Steadman stated this would be a good opportunity to collect community input and to share what we have learned and the thinking thus far to get reactions. He stated with the yard signs and banners, and Mr. Schmid's activities, we want to make people aware of the issues and of the development of the Master Plan.

Mr. Steadman stated there was discussion on what time the public forum should be held, and after discussion it was decided it should be from 7:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m. Mr. Steadman, Ms. Sovinee, Mr. Schmid, and Mr. Childs, and Mr. Mohan indicated that they would be available to attend.

Ms. Sovinee stated this will be a drop-in session, and Mr. Steadman agreed it will be an open house. Mr. Seiler stated his team will be available.

Mr. Steadman moved, Mr. Schmid seconded and it was unanimously carried that the first, in-person public forum be on June 26 from 7:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m. in the Community Center,

#### PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no one from the public wishing to speak at this time.

Mr. Majewski stated those who were unable to watch the meeting this evening can see a re-run of the meeting on YouTube.

#### ACTION ITEMS, ASSIGNMENTS & FUTURE MEETING SCHEDULE: Ms. Sovinee

1. Mr. Majewski will post the presentations from this evening on the Township Website
2. Mr. Schmid is looking for help with the booth on Saturday and those who can help should contact him
3. The public meeting date has been set for June 26 from 7:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m. at the Community Center
4. There will be an October 12 deadline as discussed this evening because of the Budget issue

June 8, 2023

Ad Hoc Property Committee

There being no further business, Ms. Sovinee moved, Mr. Childs seconded and it was unanimously carried to adjourn the meeting at 9:20 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Bette Sovinee, Secretary