

LOWER MAKEFIELD TOWNSHIP
AD HOC PROPERTY COMMITTEE
MINUTES – SEPTEMBER 14, 2023

The regular meeting of the Ad Hoc Property Committee of the Township of Lower Makefield was held remotely on September 14, 2023. Mr. Steadman called the meeting to order and stated the Committee is working on a strategic Master Plan for the Patterson Farmstead. He stated this meeting is being broadcast only on YouTube and not Facebook because the Township Supervisors are holding a Special Meeting this evening and using the Facebook space for their meeting.

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
Jim Scott, Member

Others: James Majewski, Community Development Director
Candace Ly, Avison-Young
Doug Seiler, Seiler+Drury
Stephen Heinz, HARB Member
Jennifer Nicastro, Neighbor

Absent: Jennifer Stark, Avison-Young
Suzanne Blundi, Supervisor Liaison

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Ms. Sovinee

Mr. Schmid moved, Mr. Mohan seconded and it was unanimously carried to approve the Minutes of August 10, 2023 as written.

OPENING COMMENTS: Mr. Steadman

Preserve farming at Patterson Farm and save the historic buildings is an accurate headline.

Save Patterson Farm or Save Farming at Patterson are inaccurate headlines, and do not reflect the issues that the Township, the property owners, have in front of them. Farming has never been more productive than it is right now in its 340 continuous years of farming. Currently it produces over fourteen different kinds of food products that go into our local markets and stands including cantaloupe, zucchini, tomatoes, and sweet corn as well as field corn and soy beans for livestock. It is an incredibly productive piece of land both in the quality of soil and the quality of farming. In recent years the annual production figures from the approximately 175/180 acres which are actually planted include 60,000 dozen sweet corn, 50,000 pounds of tomatoes, 25,000 pounds of watermelon, 25,000 pounds of cantaloupe, 20,000 bushels of field corn, and 6,000 bushels of soy beans. The productivity of the farm thanks to the farmer who is renting the land has never been greater than it is today. All of that production has occurred without using the outdated farm buildings that are there. Many of those buildings, including the biggest, most important ones which are the Pennsylvania bank barns, were built when the Farm had livestock; and there has not been livestock there for many decades.

The historic buildings that are there are not important to agriculture since the Farm has been very productive without them but they are very important and valuable not for farming but because of the scenic vistas that they create and the setting that they create for the Township. They are important to our community's history and our heritage. While the buildings have not been needed or useful for farming for a very long time, they are important. Part of the challenge is addressing those farm buildings; and the challenge is not keeping the Farm productive, as it has never been more productive. The reason it has been so bountiful is thanks to a very high quality, very skilled tenant, Charlann Farms – Tim Stewart and Sam Stewart – who have done a great job and use modern and responsible agricultural practices, state-of-the art equipment and practices with minimum to no-till leaving a lot of bio-matter on the fields and doing everything right. The reason it is so productive is because of the tremendous financial investment in equipment, facilities, and inputs as they have built a lot of bins, barns, and sheds, etc. on their own farm. It is easy to underestimate what it takes to have productive farmland, and a couple of years ago a tractor-trailer load of fertilizer cost approximately \$7,000; but this past year, one truckload cost \$24,000. Ordering 15 truckloads at \$24,000 a truckload adds up. It has taken a lot of investment and a lot of skill to keep this land as productive as it is, but that is not the problem that this Committee was asked to address.

The number one priority in the Master Plan is to continue farming the land, and the land will stay in farming. The challenges are not about saving the or saving local food production as we have that. The issue is the twelve old farm buildings and three historic homes that involve major dollar investments and trying to determine uses for those buildings. Major capital expenses are necessary to make these buildings usable, and whether they are re-purposed uses or historically-preserved uses, they will take a lot of money. Mr. Steadman stated without intelligent staged investment and intelligent management, the buildings could be lost, and there is no community use other than at the Janney-Brown House where AOY is headquartered. Preserving buildings just for the sake of saving them is a losing proposition and is not a solution. If the community wants these historic buildings saved and wants access to them, which it appears they do based on the input received, particularly at the in-person forum, then they have to be put to productive uses and the site needs to be organized appropriately. Any use that will be considered must be compatible with the top priority of continued productive farming. The use also has to be compatible with the historic nature of the site, and needs to create value which can either be in hard value, dollar-revenue form, that would support the continued maintenance of the building or soft value in the form of a community benefit that creates community value that justifies continued community support whether that is through a charitable organization or Township taxpayer money; and hopefully the uses will support both soft value to the community and hard value that helps pay the bills. This is the challenge that has triggered the Township to set out on this project of creating a Master Plan for the Patterson Farm. Mr. Steadman stated he feels there has been a lot of work and a lot of progress made in that regard.

RESIDENT AMBASSADORS' MEETING DISCUSSION: Mr. Steadman

After the first in-person public forum, a number of residents came forward with real enthusiasm for getting involved; and many of them were from the neighborhoods across Mirror Lake Road which are the closest to Patterson Farm. Resident Ambassadors were organized, and there was a meeting for that community on August 25. Mr. Steadman, Ms. Sovinee, and Mr. Schmid attended that meeting with a lot of people present and there was good dialogue.

From the residents ambassadors a number of ideas were heard around the arts, and there was general support for expanding arts and arts programs at the location which makes sense given the success of AOY and the way a number of people from our community have been introduced to Patterson Farm because of AOY and the arts. There was a lot of support for “makers’ spaces as well as gallery spaces” for the arts. There was a lot of discussion about family-friendly activities/children’s activities as children need exposure to arts, nature, and to farming. There was also support potentially for gift shops and general support for expanding the arts programs which was a strong consensus.

The Satterthwaite House and Farmstead was a topic of a lot of discussion, and to many resident it is viewed as the gateway into LMT. Everyone was interested in retaining that vista and the historic/farming feel to that gateway. The neighbors indicated that they were open to seeing the Satterthwaite House being sold or there being potentially a long-term Lease to a “passionate renovator,” who would have the passion to take on this historic place. That would have to be done with strictly-enforced Deed Restrictions as there was a lot of concern about if it were sold with a couple acres, how it would be controlled; and it would have to be with Deed Restrictions, and the neighbors were open to that. It was suggested that the Township might want to advertise that property for a period of time to see if there are individuals, historically-minded craftsmen, etc. who would be interested in taking on that type of project. There were a lot of questions about the role of the Historical Commission and/or the Historical Architectural Review Board in overseeing that. There was a desire that the Satterthwaite parcel remain, but there was openness that because that particular parcel is separated and has unique challenges because of the expense, it might be suitable for a sale.

Patterson barn ideas included a three-season space for art and shared community space activities. There was a lot of discussion about the Satterthwaite barn, and the neighbors were not in favor of a large venue such as a wedding venue or something that would generate traffic and noise. There was a lot of support for a nature trail possibly with educational signage that would not just be a sidewalk along the road. It was also suggested to install bat boxes to help keep the bug population down. There was a lot of support for a lot of active community and business engagement in the whole project. The idea of having small businesses or non-profit organizations that are suitable to the space was of interest.

Mr. Schmid stated he felt the discussion of the Satterthwaite House being sold or leased to a passionate renovator with strictly-enforced Deed Restrictions was “fascinating,” and that provided a new perspective on how to view the Satterthwaite situation. He stated there were also very strong feelings about the nature trail idea which would not just be sidewalks close to Mirror Lake Road.

Ms. Sovinee agreed with the summary of the meeting which was provided.

Mr. Steadman stated they appreciate the time and effort that the residents put in that evening.

PROJECT UPDATES: Mr. Seiler

Mr. Steadman stated Mr. Seiler and his team have laid out what they have assessed as viable, potential adaptive uses with multiple options for each building. The options being presented tonight are not the recommendation of the Committee at this point, and we are exposing all of the viable options. Mr. Seiler will also present potential site plans that could support the potential uses and adaptive re-uses which would support the increased community aspect, respect for the historical status of these sites, and support continued productive farming. These are potentials and not final recommendations or decisions. Mr. Seiler will present cost estimates of the various potential re-use options so that the Committee can get a sense of the trade-offs between the various options. At this point we are not proposing that the Township spend these amounts; but it will show that if the Township wanted to pursue these uses, they are providing a professional, estimated costs that should be factored into any decisions. Mr. Steadman stated this “bottom-up detail” building-by-building comprise the basis for a Master Plan which will take years to implement. The Master Plan is a guide, and we are trying to envision what the property could be by looking at these potentials building-by-building; but it does not mean that is what every building will be; and it will evolve.

Mr. Seiler stated this is the seventh Ad Hoc meeting, and tonight’s meeting is to present options. He stated when the final report comes out and is presented at the Public Forum which is scheduled for September 26th, he expects to present it with some of the narrative assumptions that are behind this, most of which Mr. Steadman touched on tonight. He stated two that he might add are that the consultants’ opinion after studying the site for as long as they have, is that

the Township should go forward with some form of management entity, perhaps a 501C3 or perhaps something similar to the Ad Hoc group that the Township has now; and they will act as the advisors, stewards, and Real Estate managers so that as options come along that deal with buildings, Budgets are considered, and Grant opportunities come up, that group will make decisions on those items and hopefully come back to this report and use it.

Mr. Seiler stated this began as a Building Master Plan; and his response was he could not talk about buildings unless he understood the site, and their site expert indicated he could not talk about the site and help with buildings unless he understood the market and economic and social context. He stated they came together with the land-use economist, landscaper architect, and himself.

Mr. Seiler stated there are Site Plans which are fairly developed, and they are to set the context in order to talk about the buildings and their uses to help the Township go forward. The Site Plan for the overall site in the upper right and a zoom in on the two farmsteads on the left side was shown. Mr. Seiler stated Bill Collins of Simone Collins prepared the Site Plans and he has an option for Satterthwaite and Patterson, and the architects have their plans. Mr. Seiler stated for the overall site, there are two options for Satterthwaite and Patterson.

Mr. Seiler stated another overriding goal of the narrative is that whatever they are proposing in the Master Plan, his mandate to the team was that it be realistic. He noted that there are Easement problems; and after speaking with the Township and studying the Easement documents, they are proposing that the compost operation essentially stay where it is for the short term, although it is possible that it could be moved some day; and it is possible that it could be in the Agricultural Easement area if it is used on the Farm as there are covenant aspects to that. For now, the proposal is to shorten it, buffer it, and keep it where it is in the short term. With regard to truck traffic to get to it, Mr. Seiler stated they are proposing to open a road to Yardley-Langhorne for farm traffic with a gate so that the farmers from Charlann, or whoever farms it in the future, would come down that road which is the traditional entrance. He showed on the slide where the farmer would come in and how they would travel through the site. This farm road would be separate from pedestrians, cars, and Township trucks for composting. Mr. Seiler stated the Township indicated that they felt it was too far of a trip for their trucks in their two peak months of October and November which involves forty-five trucks a day. He stated we are currently proposing a road that is improved enough for those trucks to come in through a location he

showed on the slide with gates. He also showed an area where people would come in and park and enjoy the property.

Mr. Seiler stated the character of the two farmsteads is an arts/crafts focus for Patterson and an agricultural heritage focus for Satterthwaite. Mr. Seiler stated there was discussion that the Satterthwaite House would be of all of the properties the most easily sold without impacting the concept of arts/agricultural heritage/agriculture; and that house could be sold as far as those operations and would not effect that much other than its ownership. Related to that would be how it would be protected historically, preservation-wise with covenants and the help of HARB. He stated that would need to be determined.

Mr. Seiler showed a slide of Mr. Collins' plan for Patterson, and his premise is that cars would come down the road which would be the current narrow road with pull-offs for the first year, and then it would get widened to a 22' road. Parking was shown. Mr. Seiler stated there would be a one-way loop around; and where it is light gray on the slide that would be gravel/cinders-type paving, and where it is black, it would be blacktop. Mr. Seiler stated Mr. Collins' view is that there would be no cars anywhere in the Village area.

Mr. Seiler stated noted trails being shown. He showed the Agricultural Easement border. He stated they are proposing trails within the non-Easement area that would result in a decent amount of walking paths. He stated you could walk to the ponds, go from one side to the next, and come down to Mirror Lake. He stated they are looking at a crosswalk that crosses and ties into the sidewalk that comes in from the main road. He stated they are recommending continuing the sidewalk down to where there is no sidewalk on either side. Mr. Seiler stated Mr. Collins' hope is that someday they will be able to extend the trails along the field or through the woods. Mr. Seiler stated in the short-term they should be built within the Easement which would let people go from one side to the next and let the neighbors come in and enjoy the landscape.

Mr. Seiler showed another slide from Mr. Collins for Patterson Farm where you come in and there is parking. The location of the well garage, small barn, big barn, and the tool shed were shown. He showed a location where trucks could come in, and the area be improved in front of the corn crib as an event

area for flea markets, pop-up events, etc. Mr. Seiler stated he feels what is shown is a little more parking than what he would like to see there which is why he has drawn alternative plans.

Mr. Seiler showed the architect's plan for Patterson which is similar, and he showed on the slide where you would come in, do a loop, and the area for parking. He stated you would pass through the hedge or as noted by Ms. Sovinee, where cars could come in and do drop-offs at some of the buildings that could be used. Mr. Seiler stated there would be one-way traffic. He noted another area where cars could come up; however, what is shown essentially keeps the idea of a pedestrian village but with a loop through until the Patterson barn is developed and generating use by people. He stated there could be further work done later as the Patterson barn is developed.

Mr. Seiler stated people need to study the Plans and economics individually and come up with opinions to be shared with the Committee and decide on how to revise these for a Final iteration. He stated the number of options to be included in the final report can be discussed.

Mr. Seiler showed a slide of what was discussed with the Township and Mr. Fuller from Public Works with the idea of trucks coming in, going around the barn with gate access so cars do not go into this area. The access would only be during the times that the Township needs to come through. He showed on the slide where he wants to keep all vehicles out which is the viewshed toward the south. The existing gravel area would be kept where the corn crib is located. Mr. Seiler stated on this Plan he is showing that being removed, and he will discuss that further. He stated that area would be kept as a casual/informal place for flea markets, etc.

Mr. Seiler stated reading the preliminary National Registration Nominations that were done and the Eligibility Review that was done as part of the highway work, the tool shed he showed on a slide is the only building on the site that they listed as non-contributing. He stated that building is the most distressed. Mr. Seiler stated the buildings are not in as "terrible shape as you think, but they are right at that edge." He stated the tool shed would take a fair amount of work to bring back for not much use. He stated if it were to be torn down and there was an open pavilion it could screen the compost area.

Mr. Scott stated for a lot of the plans, depending on what the use would be, he imagines that the parking ratios would be significantly higher given some of the concept uses. Mr. Seiler stated he believes that is a valid point. He noted areas on the Plan where there could be doubled-up parking, and on each of the Site Plans they have visualized an overflow area that would be on lawn or graveled areas; and while he feels they should plan for that, he cautioned about bringing in too much blacktop.

Ms. Sovinee asked what is the rationale for a pedestrian village. Mr. Seiler showed on a slide the current situation where cars come in and circle through, and he understands that there are not typically many cars. He stated he does feel that more cars will be coming here, and what has been shown as a pedestrian village is a pleasant space, and it would be nice to keep cars out of it. He stated at one point he had a road, the location of which he showed on the plan since it was desirable to have a place to drop off. He stated Mr. Collins could elaborate on why the pedestrian village would be desirable. Ms. Sovinee stated she agrees that it looks very nice on paper; however, she does not feel it is practical for any tenant using the buildings to have to have parking at one end and then have to "hike in." She stated for AOY it is not just drop-off. She stated there were three classes this morning, and there were approximately thirty cars there. She stated that would already exceed the twenty-eight spaces.

Mr. Seiler stated you can imagine that many cars parking on lawns and over tree roots, and it does take its toll on the landscape. Ms. Sovinee stated people typically exit through Satterthwaite but depending on whether another group is coming in, they can go down Planter's Drive. Mr. Seiler stated to what degree cars are let into the center, he feels is a talking point that can be modified. He stated the idea of letting the public somehow come into Patterson and exit through Satterthwaite as a one-way loop is "a non-starter." Ms. Sovinee stated that is fine, but it still has to work. She stated they would then have to expand Planter's Drive because it is one-car wide at this time. Mr. Seiler stated in Year 1, the buildings would not all be occupied so the traffic would not be too high, and they could consider four pull-offs along the length to save money. He stated he has a budget for what it takes to pave the whole road as a 22' wide road and widen the culvert if that is desired to be done. He stated there could be pull-offs for parking, and you could drop off near each of the buildings. He noted an area where he feels cars could come up if everyone feels that is comfortable as far as the

space; however, it is nice when you have an open lawn area where you walk. He stated that is why drop-offs are important. He stated if you go to the pack house or the barn, you would drop off, unload, and take deliveries, and then leave your car and walk back.

Ms. Sovinee stated that most of their students are over 55, and she does not feel that Mr. Seiler has taken into account the volume of people.

Ms. Sovinee asked if the event space on the Patterson space would be similar to the outdoor event that AOY is doing next weekend with Art on the Farm which is on lawns. She asked Mr. Seiler if he is okay with that. Mr. Seiler stated he is fine with that, but the question is if you want cars in there. Mr. Seiler stated the convenience factor is important, and they need to consider if it is drop-off only, and you park and walk a little bit. Mr. Seiler stated some of the comments that were received at the stakeholder interviews were to have cars park on Mirror Lake Road and walk the whole length of the driveway and keep all cars out. Mr. Seiler stated Mr. Collins' view was to keep cars all around the perimeter but he had more parking. Mr. Seiler stated he feels we should keep the dialogue going with written comments back, and have a focused discussion with Mr. Collins about the whole parking issue.

Mr. Seiler stated parking count comes from Zoning, and we need to know what Zoning should be used. He stated if there is an event space with 150 people for a dinner, you need a lot of parking. He stated one of the models they studied that held events has a lawn that was mowed and they rented a school bus and bused people to take people down to the event. He stated to dedicate a space for 100 cars would change the character dramatically. He stated he is trying to not have it be a suburban office park, although he does understand the convenience dropping off and short-term parking to pick up someone. He stated that is why at some point he had a road through the middle, but "he talked himself out of it." He stated he feels parking at the door at this farmstead is the wrong approach aesthetically.

Mr. Steadman stated if you want to maintain of a historic farmstead, you are not going to have many vehicles parked there. Mr. Seiler stated what he does not like about this option is that it feels a little more suburban. He stated he feels that people from the community will be driving in and parking and using the restroom, reading the trailhead kiosk, and walking on the trail over to the pond. He stated if there is an event, there could be overflow

parking. He stated we do have to be practical, and the ratio being shown is “almost ridiculously small, and it almost needs another lot;” but they need to know how aggressively-programmed the buildings will be given that at the Resident Ambassadors’ meeting, they did not want events here; although that does not mean they get to say what happens.

Mr. Seiler stated the Satterthwaite barn lends itself to interior uses easier, cost-wise and size-wise than does the Patterson barn. He stated it also has an event space yard which is nice.

Mr. Heinz stated he thinks in general if we are talking about better utility of the overall space for the community and maybe vendors and other persons who would want to take advantage of this space, it suggests that there is going to be greater traffic of some kind. He stated he feels that Mr. Seiler is addressing that issue in a certain way that comes from consideration of a lot of effort. He stated he would suggest that each of these things might require an internal Traffic Study when the time comes when the Board of Supervisors is considering the uses of these spaces as to which direction to go. He stated he would suggest forestalling further in-depth discussions and recognize the overview for what it is and comment on the overall idea of whether parking on the periphery makes sense.

Mr. Heinz stated with regard to buffering, in terms of the long-view and considering sunsets, etc. which people like to photograph, if we are going to buffer an operation like the leaf processing, it will be difficult. He stated the sooner the better that it is moved to a different location and does not get in the way of the overall open space of the Farm. Mr. Seiler stated from the consultants’ point of view, they would like to see that operation gone. He stated there is some value to the Township and there is investment in the detention basin and prepping the ground. He stated it has to be paved to do this type of operation, and it is porous paving. He stated it could be restored if the operation were moved although there is some value at least in the short term for the operation being here. He stated it could be that as the uses become identified and more intense, the pressure on moving this operation and the desire to find alternative options may work it out.

Mr. Seiler stated with regard to the Financial Overview, part of the reason for drawing the Site Plan was to develop site scopes of work to get quantities for different things that need to happen including an assumption for some site

lighting. He stated it could be argued that no site lighting is needed other than one or two lights on the buildings. He stated he has included things like gates, signage, moving the compost, clearing woods, and extending the farm road to Langhorne-Yardley Road. He stated looking at each category, these are placeholder values that have been put in some of which may be low and some of which may be higher. He stated there is a comfortable contingency as well.

Mr. Seiler stated the categories are shared costs, and utilities to Satterthwaite which are easier to bring to than utilities to Patterson. He noted where the utilities come from across the street from Satterthwaite from the neighborhood, and go down Satterthwaite's driveway to feed the buildings. He stated they would follow the road and feed the buildings at Patterson. He stated the costs for water and sewer at Patterson are higher. He stated that cost is picked up at the end of the barn. Shared costs are shown – utilities to Satterthwaite and utilities to Patterson.

Mr. Seiler stated paving and paths are also shown. He stated he has included costs for asphalt driveways and gravel/cinders/fines paths. He stated there is a cost for Satterthwaite paths and paving and Patterson paths and paving, and he noted that the numbers are not small. He stated he also has a cost for each building for utilities including the cost to run laterals to each of the buildings. He stated the costs for the site is approximately \$1 million. He stated to develop the trail system there is a \$55,000 budget; although he feels that is probably a little low since Mr. Collins' plan shows more trails than he has shown, and he likes Mr. Collins' trails better than his own.

Mr. Seiler stated at Patterson there is an assumption that there would be pull-offs along the existing roadbed which might seem impractical; however, for the first couple of years that might be fine. He stated if they want to do a two-way road all the way down to where the hedgerow is, it is \$182,000 but that amount has not been included.

Mr. Seiler stated the next group of numbers is for the buildings on each of the farmsteads. He stated he has broken them into near-term repairs such as painting, repairing windows, fixing roofs, repairing exterior trim, filling groundhog holes, and structural repairs to make the building stable so that it will not deteriorate or get worse; but it is not for an occupiable building. He stated it would be enough so that if a potential tenant were to come along, they would build on what has been shown. Mr. Seiler stated

these numbers are “almost meaningless” because no one is going to choose Option 1 for every building. He stated Option 1 for the well house is a workshop and storage, but Option 3 for the corn crib is a heated/ air-conditioned artists’ work space, workshop, or craftsman’s shop in the center bay. He stated what is valid from this are the near-term costs. He stated the Township or a combination combining with grant money could spend \$780,000 based on the scope that is shown for each building in the near-term repairs.

Mr. Seiler stated he is also showing near-term and long-term options for Satterthwaite. Mr. Camaratta stated near-time repairs go beyond just preservation, and Mr. Seiler agreed. He stated he will be showing examples for each. He stated Satterthwaite is one of the examples he wanted to share with everyone. He stated its near term repairs are fairly pricey. He stated the corn crib is the least because potentially there is not much use for it. Mr. Seiler stated the near-term costs are essentially painting, repairing bad wood, structural repairs, fixing structural cracks, and pointing, etc.

Mr. Seiler stated for Patterson the near-term repairs are in the high \$870,000, and for Satterthwaite you are approaching \$1 million if you did them all. He stated if you do all the site and all the near-terms on both, you are approaching \$2.5 million and above. He stated you do not have to do them all, and that is why he is providing a “laundry list to pick through.” Mr. Seiler stated most likely they would be done over the first few years. He stated there might be a tenant in one of the buildings and you start to do Option A or B in that same time frame.

Mr. Schmid asked if “near term” would be one to three years, and Mr. Seiler agreed although one to two years would be preferable.

Mr. Seiler referred to Mr. Poole’s report, and stated he is taking Mr. Poole’s report which looked at it from the demographics and “bigger world,” and putting it together with his own look at it from the “bricks and mortar/ground up world.” They were working on parallel paths, and they have now been brought together and are being shown using Mr. Pool’s format.

Mr. Seiler stated there were a series of assumptions, and one that Mr. Seiler added was that the up-front, near-term costs are not counted in the Option costs. Mr. Seiler stated he is saying that the landlord is responsible to have

a standing, sound, painted building that has utilities to it; and then each Option builds on that. Mr. Seiler stated there had been a question as to whether the utility costs or site-development was pro-rated; and the answer is no, and he has not brought those big costs pro-rated into these buildings. He stated he wants to be able to say that if someone wants to do Option A, it will cost what is shown; but the site work and stabilization work are different tranches and different efforts.

Mr. Seiler showed a slide of the existing buildings on the Patterson Farmstead. He stated they have done economic studies on all of the buildings and have proposed plans for all of the buildings, but tonight he will just discuss a few of the buildings.

Mr. Seiler noted the Janney-Brown House. He stated Mr. Poole stated there are three options available for that building with the first one being vacate AOY out of it and turn it into a Bed and Breakfast. His premise was that if it were a B & B, it would be a \$1 million investment by that individual who would have to own it to do that. He stated if the Township wants to consider it, they should put it on the market. Mr. Seiler stated a B & B might be interesting for here since there are plenty of other buildings that could be occupied by businesses, artisans, AOY, etc. Selling it would involve no public improvement. Option 2 is that AOY stays in the building and continues to operate it. Some repairs should be done including life safety items like exit signs and emergency lights. He stated as far as return on investment, he had taken that out, but he could put it back in. He stated the formula was so basic that it seemed not usable; but essentially if you take what you earn annually and divide it by the costs that you have to invest to get that, keeping AOY in this building is the best return on investment of all of the buildings. He stated all of the others are less efficient. Option 3 for this building would be that AOY moves out and a business of some sort moves in, with Mr. Poole's example being an architectural or engineering firm, a lawyer, or any business; and while they would pay a higher rent, the Township would have to spend more money. He stated the most efficient of all of the buildings money-wise is that AOY stays in Janney-Brown. He stated selling a parcel such as this or the Satterthwaite House which are the only two being contemplated to be sold would take that cost away.

Mr. Seiler stated in the report there are estimated revenue assumptions for every building. He stated he feels a lot of Mr. Poole's numbers seem low; and he feels as the operating entity, the Township will negotiate each deal

and each building independent. He stated as the property has more identity and “buzz” around it, the Township might be able to get more rents. He stated Mr. Poole has indicated what he believes would be the rents with \$10 for Office and AOY would be a percentage of their annual income.

Mr. Seiler stated each building has what the proposed work is that is represented by these options. He stated these are still being finalized. He showed a slide of the Janney-Brown House. He stated if the Janney-Brown House were to be an office besides life safety items there would be the need for better air conditioning and a handicap bathroom adding that this would be expensive. He stated the way the cost is done is that it shows the cost for the short-term repairs which would be paint the exterior, repair trim, selectively point stone, repair rotten window sills, etc. and generally hooking each building up to utility services that may or not have been run to the site. Mr. Seiler stated if the sewer is not needed at a site, you would not hook up to it. He stated he is also suggesting keeping well water, and he believes that there is well water at Janney-Brown. He stated this would vary based on the building. He stated short-term repairs for Janney-Brown are still \$80,000 although it may be half or two-thirds of that cost.

Mr. Seiler showed the fit-out for AOY using Janney-Brown which would be some life safety issues, a few repairs, an office, bathroom, air-conditioning, and keeping the boiler.

Mr. Seiler stated they have done this for each building with economic and capital assumptions, proposed plans, and a cost estimate that relates to that plan.

Mr. Seiler showed a slide for the packing house. He stated at the Public Forum there were comments about just having farming as well as comments that there should be more arts. Mr. Seiler stated the consultants feel that AOY has a track record and they are successful. He stated Ms. Attara is there and also has a track record. He stated they have both given the place some identity, and Mr. Poole proved that the demographics show that people like destinations like this.

He stated Option 1 for the packing house is an occupant that would not be part of an Arts Village concept. He stated it could be used by the farmer as there are two buildings on the site that potentially lend themselves to the farmer, and one of them is the packing house. Mr. Seiler stated the farmer would come in from his road from the south with a new overhead door. He stated

it could also be used by a landscaper for storage or someone who wants to store classic cars. He stated that option would be less rent, but less cost as well.

Mr. Seiler stated Option 2 would be use by an artisan such as a carpenter, furniture maker, or someone else in the arts; but it would be a tenant, not necessarily AOY, that fits the theme of an Artisan Village. He stated costs for this would be a little bit higher as it would include a bathroom but not as much as what they have shown as Option 3. Option 2 would bring in a little more rent, but would also involve a little more cost. Mr. Seiler stated Option 3 would build on an idea that was discussed with AOY although it would not have to be AOY.

He stated what he envisions with the stewardship program is that you will have multiple businesses/multiple tenants, and possibly multiple non-profits that are compatible with each other in an Arts Village and an Agricultural Heritage Village as the themes. Mr. Seiler stated for Revenue assumptions, Mr. Poole is only at \$5 a square foot which Mr. Seiler feels is low, but Mr. Poole did not want to increase it. Mr. Seiler stated the Township should get what they can get. He showed what they are proposing for improvements under Option 3. He stated the building is not in good shape, and he noted that every header over every window and door is cracked. He stated he has included structural repairs under near-time and listed the costs. He stated he has \$82,000 just for stabilization of this building although it could be less. He stated they would not have to replace the windows, but they are in bad shape. He stated he is proposing that most of the windows on the site be repaired; but for this building, he has recommended that they be replaced as they are just mid-Century windows.

Mr. Seiler showed a slide of the tenant garage which is a 1910/1920 building. He stated he would like each Farmstead to be a trailhead of sorts so that some users who come to the site could park and use the trail. He stated generally you need a bathroom. He stated for some of the buildings he is not proposing bathrooms, and you can have a use on a campus if you have a bathroom within 500'. He stated this building would lend itself to be a bathroom. He stated Option A is a summertime bathroom or it could be a twelve-month a year bathroom separated by gender.

Mr. Camaratta asked Mr. Seiler if he found that there were more urgent needs that if they were not addressed could compromise the building with water getting in, etc. Mr. Seiler stated while he does not have a list yet, what

he is envisioning is that when he gets to the Chapter on the existing buildings he felt in a narrative he would comment on individual buildings as to what needs to be done soon. He stated he believes that the equipment barn has some foundation issues. He stated not every building has a structural repair, but the equipment barn has a structural repair item in the near term. He stated the only structural repair he saw for the packing house, which could be deferred for another five years, were the cracks at the window heads. He stated he was going to do this in narrative form and then have a line item that is under structural repairs.

Mr. Seiler stated he feels this is a roadmap for the future. He stated someone could indicate that they want to use the well garage, and they would come to the management/stewardship group which is managing the property, and it would have to be studied in detail probably with an architect or builders and discuss what needs to be done in the building. He stated each building will have to be studied as you do it each time. He stated his report cannot do that, but what he is trying to do is identify what is in his narrative, put a placeholder in the estimate, and feed that back to the overall budget so that the Township can plan.

Mr. Steadman stated in that Chapter those repairs that are important structurally need to be called out as urgent or necessary first steps as opposed to optional first steps. Mr. Seiler stated the Committee is a very-engaged group, and the near-term repairs need to be vetted, and he feels it needs a sub-set whether he breaks it into two parts or colors them or puts an asterisk. He stated these are his professional recommendations for year-one costs and fixing the structural items are absolutely year-one as is painting and repairing. He stated how he develops that could be discussed at a working group whether he does near-term in two phases like emergency or first-tranche shell development. He stated he feels this is needed, and it is something that he can do.

Mr. Heinz stated he feels it should be considered “where you would get the most bang for your buck,” where if something is done now on a building, it will save ten times that amount later on. Mr. Seiler stated he believes that can be done. He stated the corn crib roof repair should absolutely be done in year one. He stated he also feels all of the buildings should be painted which means that some structural repairs should be done. He stated they could be painted without repairing the windows as you basically want to protect the

buildings from the elements. He stated structural repairs should positively be done. He stated it might be half the costs that are shown. He stated he will look into this further.

Mr. Seiler stated he would like to show two buildings on the Satterthwaite Farmstead. He stated they have all been costed although they are not fully final in terms of cost, but they are close enough to start getting feedback. Mr. Seiler stated Mr. Poole has three sale options which have no public cost, but that is assuming they are sold without any investment. Mr. Seiler stated he feels the Township might do the short-term costs as the Township might get more money, but that would depend on the negotiation.

The option for the veterinarian concept was shown, and this would be the full five acres, and all of the barn buildings. Mr. Seiler stated he feels this is the most impractical option although it is appealing as there is still a person who is interested in it. He stated it would take the barns off the table from an Ag/Heritage point of view and the public use of those buildings so it does have a big impact on the public usability and the experience of the site.

Mr. Seiler stated he had previously discussed taking that five acres and putting it along Mirror Lake, but there is the Easement problem. He stated that has been included in the report, but there is not much analysis of it. Mr. Seiler stated another option is for a B & B which could be a nice feature for the site helping each of the two Villages to succeed as far as the businesses that go in there, and the broader community could benefit from it. He stated he believes it would be a nice place to stay. Mr. Seiler stated Mr. Poole feels it would be a \$1 million investment by that person, and they would need to own it.

Mr. Seiler stated another Option came out of the neighbors' discussion that it could be sold to a property owner for a house, and they could divide off an acre along the front. It would have the trails and the ability to have a pull-off with a little garage and driveway. Mr. Seiler stated there would need to be Covenants in the Deed, and perhaps the HARB District could be expanded into this area, and there could be some additional protections. He stated that would be a Fee-Simple Sale, but that has not been analyzed financially that much.

Mr. Seiler stated the real Options are 4, 5, and 6. He stated in all of these it is the “full envelope, and there is no reason to take down any of the envelope, and the building is basically sound.” He stated the inside should be cleaned up and the structural issues fixed on the third floor and the basement. He stated the real money on Option 4 is spent on the first-floor only for event space/ retreats, and it could be leased on a per-event basis. He stated Mr. Poole’s Option 4 assumes the Preservation non-profit would pay a modest net Lease of \$500 per month, would pay all utilities, and do minor repairs. He stated it would still take a decent amount of money to be put into it which might not be public money, and it could be that the group that is renting it would have to put the money into it.

Mr. Seiler stated Option 5 is that it could be used as an office by a lawyer, architect, or engineer; and they would rent the whole building and he would assume they would primarily use the first and second floors. This would bring in more significant rent, and it would cost more since bathrooms would be needed and bringing in HVAC. Mr. Seiler stated Option 6 is a hybrid option that came out of conversations at the Public Forum that it could be a split-use building where a portion of the first floor would be leased to an Ag/Heritage non-profit for office and educational displays, and the balance of the house would be leased as a three-bedroom residence.

A Plan is available as to how that might work. Mr. Seiler stated each would have their own separate entrance, and that would be a little less money, but it is two sources of income and would be a stable use. He showed where the non-profit would come in off of the porch, and there would be a workroom, room for displays, meeting space, and a restroom. He showed where the Residential would come in at the front and at another location and potentially there could be a shared lobby. He stated the stairs would be for the Residential use. He showed the location of the living space, kitchen and three bedrooms upstairs and two bathrooms. Mr. Seiler stated Mr. Poole estimated that the rent would be \$1,800 a month for this Residential space. Mr. Seiler noted the upstairs area for the first-floor tenant which would include an office and a small powder room. He stated they have to study the stairs up from the kitchen which they feel are hidden in a wall. He stated the third floor and basement are still placeholders.

Mr. Seiler showed the costs for the near-term, adding more repairs including carpentry repairs are needed. He stated costs for painting have been shown.

Mr. Seiler stated he did not cost out Options 1, 2, and 3 because they are assuming sales.

Mr. Seiler stated he neglected to say that for both barns he is separating upper and lower into their own separate uses, and he feels that the lower level could be used and nothing be done upstairs, or the upper level could be used and nothing be done downstairs on both barns.

Mr. Seiler showed a slide with regard to the Satterthwaite barn. He stated Option 1 is that it would be sold to the large animal vet. He noted Option 2. He stated there are two-parts on the first level, and the back portion would most likely be used by the Township for storage, and the front porch could be for demonstrations with the doors opening up to the event yard. He stated Option 3 is a more-refined version, which he has called "pop-up space," where events could happen both inside and outside or inside only. He showed the Plan with the revenue and capital assumptions. Mr. Seiler stated there are natural divisions because of the slope of the grade. He stated the doors would open up. He stated there are utility rooms and trail use from the outside, pop-up space, and storage for tents, tables, chairs, catering space, and concrete floors.

He stated for the Ag-use, Option 2, it would be a gravel floor; and for the pop-up, Option 3, it would be a concrete floor. He stated the barn could serve that yard, and it is an easy way to have a big impact on the public coming into the site and being able to stand in it and enjoy it.

Mr. Seiler stated for the upper barn, Option 1 is that it would be part of the Fee-Simple sale. Option 2 would be a minimal intervention, although it would still cost a fair amount of money. He stated this would be bathrooms, catering area; and while it would be ventilated, it would still not be heated and cooled and would be summertime use only. He stated there could be a deck that overlooks the event yard. Mr. Seiler stated it could be mothballed and not much happen to it, and there is a low headroom situation.

Mr. Seiler showed a slide of a portion of the barn which he feels is a very desirable space. He stated he would not want to insulate it or change its character because the boards are new as the Township did a renovation in

2008. He stated there is line item for repairing the floor to make sure there are no holes or places where someone could trip. He stated they would need to spend money to be able to get people up the ramp in the back.

Option 3 was shown which includes bathrooms. Mr. Seiler stated Mr. Poole's Option 2 has bathrooms outside using port-a-potties. He stated this space could be three-seasons with bathrooms and catering storage. He stated an extra stairs would be needed because of distance for occupancy and the need for more than one exit. A slide on costs was shown.

Mr. Seiler stated he is looking for buy-in on the philosophy as to how he is structuring the report, and hopes the Committee feels it is a useful format.

Mr. Mohan stated this is a lot of data, and he feels it is a useful format especially where the numbers are broken down which we need to see.

Mr. Heinz stated when we are looking for places to hold public meetings the rooms we have available in the Township are pretty small, and what Mr. Seiler showed in his slide on the Satterthwaite barn would double the size of most of the Township rooms.

Mr. Seiler stated he has the square footages in the data charts. He stated he feels that the Satterthwaite barn is more-easily convertible to a people space than is the Patterson barn; however, the Committee may feel that the Patterson barn is a better location and is more central to the site, and might support the Arts Village idea better. Mr. Seiler stated he did price assembly uses with bathrooms and services for both barns, and Patterson needs more work and it bigger so the cost is bigger.

Mr. Steadman stated a lot of data has been provided, and we need to look at how that feeds into a vision for the overall property and what it could become. He stated we need to create a vision that will hold up and be supported by the community and the Township, as the property owner, and how to begin down that path. He stated we need to consider the near-term, stage 1 priorities. He stated it might be stabilization of some buildings or some "easy wins" that can generate more public enthusiasm and public access. Mr. Steadman stated Mr. Seiler is building the data that is helping create the vision.

Mr. Seiler stated he feels we should consider what will be discussed at the Public Forum. He stated he has heard that agriculture is the primary purpose since he first became involved. He stated while he believes that is true, he also feels the site should have a public use that is not just for the arts people, not just for the agricultural/heritage people, and not just for the farmer, but for people who just want to take part in birdwatching, walk the trails, and enjoy nature and passive recreation. He stated that is what would happen in the central area. He stated currently he is showing a lot of farming going on, but there could be community gardens, and more development of pond-related, birdwatching features. He stated there are trails, and this would be a pleasant place to come to. He stated this is why he wants trailheads and trail access.

Mr. Steadman stated it can be a pleasant place, and following the stream that starts with the large spring between the two farmsteads that creates that pond and ultimately Buck Creek can be a beautiful area; and a pine bark-mulched managed trail could be a resource. He stated around the ponds it could be organized to be both natural and accessible. He stated currently it is purely natural and harder to access, but they would not have to ruin the nature of it to invite the public in. He stated where it is outside the Easement, we have a lot more latitude to do that than in the Easement. Mr. Seiler stated he is visualizing that you have no latitude outside of the Easement until you "lobby and make it;" but even the trails within the Easement there is a decent length of trails, and you can still go from farmstead to farmstead. He stated people can also drive in or walk in and enjoy this space.

Mr. Steadman suggested that the Committee try to organize a working group to begin to digest this more completely. Mr. Steadman asked Mr. Seiler how close the document is to completion for all fifteen buildings. Mr. Seiler stated it is not close enough to go to the Supervisors, but he feels it could be shared with the Ad Hoc Property Committee. He stated he would like the Committee to study it and provide him feedback on each building. He stated he feels that early next week he would have them available. Mr. Steadman stated as soon as they are available the full Committee should have them to review.

Mr. Steadman asked that Mr. Seiler provide he and Mr. Childs with the documents, and they will see that they get properly distributed. He stated Mr. Majewski can help with that as well, and Mr. Majewski agreed.

SECOND IN-PERSON PUBLIC FORUM: Mr. Steadman/Full Committee

Mr. Steadman stated he knows that there is a draft Press Release that the Community Outreach Sub-Committee and Mr. Majewski and his team are working on that we hope to get out soon to publicize the second in-person Public Forum which will be held on September 26 at 6:30 p.m. at the Township Building. Mr. Steadman stated they encourage residents to attend as this is important information to hear about, and it is an opportunity for the public to give feedback and impress the Board of Supervisors that this is important to the community.

Mr. Steadman stated Public Comment will begin shortly, and those interested should begin to dial in now.

ACTION ITEMS, FOLLOW-UP ASSIGNMENTS & FUTURE MEETING SCHEDULE:

Mr. Steadman/Ms. Sovinee

1. Mr. Seiler will provide the documents organized and send to Mr. Steadman, Mr. Childs, and Mr. Majewski so that it is properly accessible to the Committee

Mr. Childs stated the expectation is that we are still looking to be on the Agenda for the Board of Supervisors at their October 18 meeting.

Mr. Steadman stated that is the intended goal, but he would like to see where we are after September 26. He stated we have spent a lot of time, resources, and energy to develop a quality Master Plan that should provide a roadmap/guide for years to come. He stated two to three years from now, it will not be remembered if that was delivered in October or November; and it needs to be a quality plan. He stated he does not want to compromise the quality of the plan for an arbitrary date. He stated if there is a trade-off between timing and quality, his vote would be to get it right.

Mr. Childs stated the criticality is that Budget decisions are being made momentarily by the Board of Supervisors; and if we expect them to include something for the coming year, it is key that they are aware of that. He stated while Acting Chair Blundi was not able to attend tonight because of a Board conflict, we need to make clear that if we want to be on the Agenda, she needs time to make sure that happens. Mr. Steadman stated he agrees, and we do want to be on the October 18 Agenda.

Mr. Seiler stated he is aiming for that, but he agrees with Mr. Steadman. He added that he has been working on the “bricks and mortar, the cost, and the hard data” that answers the question what is in the first tranche and what is critical to be in next year’s Budget. He stated the Public Forum will be held with a working group meeting right after that to discuss what was indicated at the Public Forum. He stated while it might not be the final report that has the final correctly-worded narrative for everything, the numbers, scopes, and basic ideas would perhaps be enough information for the Supervisors to discuss at their October 18 meeting. He stated if it needs to be final by then, that is the timeline that he is on; and his goal is to be 100% done by then. Mr. Childs stated that is good to know since this was not an open-ended Contract, and we are already past the time that was expected for this delivery. Mr. Seiler stated in his defense, this turned out to be a big task. Mr. Childs stated Mr. Seiler had the opportunity to understand what the project was, and Mr. Seiler agreed. Mr. Seiler stated he is still aiming for October 18.

Mr. Camaratta asked if it is possible to get the anticipated first-year costs; and Mr. Seiler stated he is hearing that what is needed is to take the near-term and break out a year-one cost. He stated they need to consider what is the most critical that will give the most return. Mr. Seiler stated he would like feedback from the Committee on the trail and utility work because from the “building point-of-view, you do not have to spend a dime on that from his perspective,” but you might want to provide guidance from a community-benefit point-of-view.

Mr. Steadman stated there may be some elements that are more urgent and front-loaded than others; and if it is important for the farmer to have a dedicated farm access to Yardley-Langhorne Road, that might be very important to help move that farm traffic out of certain areas even before all of the other elements are in place; and we will have to discuss things like that in addition to some urgencies on buildings and near-term priorities.

Mr. Seiler suggested that Mr. Steadman and Mr. Seiler coordinate an e-mail poll among the Ad Hoc Committee members as to what some of those priorities are. He stated that would help him with the priorities.

Mr. Camaratta asked what the final deliverable will look like beyond what was shown this evening. He asked what additional work the Committee needs to do before the October 18 meeting once Mr. Seiler provides the information.

Mr. Steadman stated we have a lot of building blocks, but we need to articulate the vision more clearly and look at what the “Grand Plan” could be; and then show what are the steps to get there, and what are the recommended first steps. Mr. Steadman stated depending upon the success or failure of the first steps that will impact what are the second steps.

Mr. Camaratta stated there has been some discussion of governance, and he feels that needs to more detailed and part of the plan. Mr. Seiler stated he was visualizing that he and Mr. Poole would make a general comment that there should be a 501C3 that has a mission to steward the land going forward, negotiate Leases, raise money, and do repairs. He stated much beyond that, they do not see that they would be structuring that in their report. He stated he feels the next focus group should consider what the community has to do. He stated there is also a Zoning component, the expanded HARB concept, and the Application for National Register status. He stated he would have a Chapter stating that, but not much more than what he has indicated tonight. He stated he does not know how the Township will want to structure the non-profit although he can provide a model of one. Mr. Seiler stated Mr. Poole feels that there should be a non-profit, and he agrees. Mr. Steadman stated he believes that there is increasing agreement about that. He stated he knows that the Township staff is thinking that way as well because the Township Government is not set up to manage a property like this. He stated a proper non-profit organization that works cooperatively with the landlord, the Township, is what is needed.

Mr. Camaratta stated he feels that we need to identify who is accountable for implementation or he is concerned that we will have a nice plan that sits on the shelf for years. He stated he feels that we should have an idea of not just what to do but how to do it.

Mr. Seiler stated he feels that the Rose Valley Museum in Delaware County is a perfect example of what the Township should try to do. He stated it is a Township-owned property managed by a 501C3 that seeks Grants, negotiates with the tenants, hires contractors for repairs, and makes decisions. He stated a non-profit entity is their primary tenant plus they have a caretaker in the building. He stated he feels that they must have By-Laws, and someone could contact them and discuss it. He stated he does not feel it is that unusual to set it up in this way. Mr. Seiler stated the name of the entity is the Rose Valley Centennial Foundation, and they manage building the called Thunderbird Lodge that has the Rose Valley Museum in it as the tenant. Mr. Camaratta agreed to follow up on that.

Mr. Steadman stated he had a discussion today with Mr. Kratzer about what would be involved to set up a 501C3 and what some models might be.

Mr. Seiler stated the first tranche of money most likely would be Township money. He stated with the Rose Valley example, the Township gives that group \$25,000 a year toward their Operating Budget, and they use that and leverage Grants. Mr. Seiler stated they have gotten three Keystone Preservation Grants from the PHMC for that building and one Planning Grant. He stated once it is shown that there is “good work happening, it self-feeds.”

Ms. Sovinee asked if the Public Meeting will be a forum so that they can clarify it for the Press Release. She asked what will be the format. Mr. Steadman stated we have been calling it a Public Forum. He stated they will work with Mr. Seiler on the format and how to set up the room.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Ms. Donna Doan, 2814 Langhorne-Yardley Road, Langhorne stated a lot of information has been given tonight, and “most of it is very good.” She stated that if Mr. Camaratta is doing research, he should look at Langhorne Open Space, Incorporated (LOSI). She stated Langhorne Borough owns their heritage farm, and LOSI is in charge of the management of the property, and they rent out the farmhouse to a tenant. She stated it is Residential upstairs and it is meeting space downstairs. She stated they are a long-term organization, and she believes that they have been organized over thirty years. She stated they have expanded to become a Land Trust so they not only preserve that Farm in the center of the Borough, but also some natural areas and a graveyard.

Ms. Doan thanked Mr. Seiler for breaking out the information to the group so that it is easy to digest although it is a lot of information. She stated she would love to see Patterson Farm get the recognition that it needs and the upkeep that it needs and take its place as the sister property of Pennsbury Manor, Bolton Mansion, and Three Arches which are the Quaker Trail of History properties founded at about the same time. She stated that should be noted in the plan going forward.

Ms. Doan stated she believes that the long-range and most cost-effective “thing” is to support the agriculture. She stated one of the things she does not like to see on Patterson Farm is additional paving and additional parking areas because

there is always a “slippery slope.” She stated while they might want 30 parking spaces now, next year they will want an additional 50. She stated there is a “wonderful” 1700 farmhouse that is on the Makefield Highlands Golf Course. She stated it has parking up to the door, is vacant now, and it needs a purpose. She stated there is plenty of parking for the Golf Course; and if there is need for a shuttle, there are golf carts on site. She stated it already has wide driveways, bar service for anyone who wants to have a party with alcohol, and it is a larger house than the Patterson House. She stated it also has a large venue for exhibits and events, and it has a large tent. She asked if the Artists of Yardley would consider taking that over as an Annex to the Janney-Brown House, that might cut down on the amount of change, construction, and disruption that we have at Patterson Farm.

Ms. Doan stated someone mentioned the bats, and there are bats there. She stated hopefully they can remain undisturbed in the building that they are in.

Ms. Doan stated Patterson Farm Preservation has a great interest in Satterthwaite. She stated she would caution the Committee about considering the sale of Satterthwaite because that led to litigation before and tied it up for a couple of years, and she hopes that they will not take that step. Ms. Doan stated Patterson Farm Preservation would love to get into Satterthwaite and foster some of the programs that Mr. Seiler has mentioned about birdwatching and nature. She stated we should let “Patterson Farm shine for what it is and not what we can build on top of it.” She stated we have the Agricultural Security area there for a reason which is to protect those natural resources. She stated we should do the most minimal things that we can do so that people can still enjoy the farm but still grow food there and not infringe on what the farmers are doing.

Ms. Doan advised Mr. Steadman that she does not think that he understands the impact that a lot of this construction will have on the farmers, and she disagrees with some of the points that he made at the beginning of the meeting that “farming is assured.” She stated it is not assured if we do not have a plan that specifies how the viability of farming can continue. She stated that needs to be a component of the Plan; and for that, she would like to see the Committee call in representatives from the agricultural community including the Farm Bureau or other such organizations like the County Extension to get their input. She stated it seems that we have been pointing this toward making this an art community, but we have not heard from the other side from agricultural

art community, but we have not heard from the other side from agricultural people who are in agriculture now and could better represent agriculture in the community. She stated she mentioned this before and Supervisor Blundi stated “we did not want to promote anyone’s business;” but she is not asking that they promote the business of specifically Charlann Farm, but the importance of agriculture to remain in our now Suburban community since Patterson Farm “has been hedged in by the suburbs,” and it becomes more and more important as a food source to keep local farming viable.

Ms. Doan stated she looks forward to further discussions. She stated she feels that the Zoning issues also have to be addressed. She asked that they protect the Agriculture Security “by all means,” and that should be a priority. She stated she talked to the Farmland Preservation Board in Doylestown, and they said this should be a priority with our Supervisors, and she hopes that will be in the recommendation.

Mr. Steadman stated agriculture being a priority will be in the recommendations. He stated because of the preserved nature of the Easement area, it has to stay in agriculture; and that Easement is sufficiently strict that even consideration of potentially constructing a pole barn building that the farmers could use and wants on that site is not allowed in that restricted area. He stated there are a lot of limitations, and Charlann has been very effective in managing their production without the old buildings.

Ms. Nicastro stated she is one of the resident ambassadors, and she lives in the neighborhood across the street from Satterthwaite. She stated she and her neighbors had asked if there are any plans to do a Traffic Study of Mirror Lake Road. She stated they are “huge fans” of putting in crosswalks to connect the sidewalks around the Township, but Mirror Lake Road is really dangerous and cars are driving very fast and visibility is limited. She stated they are concerned that with all of the construction on the By-Pass, the sale of Torbert and development there, we are only going to add more traffic to the area. She stated they would like to see a Traffic Study done of Mirror Lake Road which is probably more of a Townships issue versus a Patterson Farm issue, although she feels it is all interconnected. She stated the road has been very dangerous for a couple of years.

Mr. Steadman stated he appreciates Ms. Nicastro raising that issue, although it is outside of the purview of the Ad Hoc Property Committee. He asked if Mr. Majewski could comment on this on behalf of the Township. Mr. Majewski

stated at this time he does not believe a Traffic Study is necessary; but as we move forward once we have identified uses that may impact that, a Traffic Study may be warranted at that time. He stated we have looked at the speeds along Mirror Lake Road and have data on that, and that would be helpful in pursuing this further.

Mr. Steadman stated we need to keep this in mind as we talk about Patterson Farm and public access. He stated the public has been demanding greater access to the Farm as it has been largely off limits except for AOY; and with greater access, there will be greater access of cars and foot traffic to the site. He stated he is confident that in the early stages, there will not be any large venues there. He thanked Ms. Nicastro for taking the leadership role for the resident ambassadors.

Mr. Steadman stated the next monthly Zoom meeting of the Ad Hoc Property Committee is October 12 at 7:30 p.m. which will be after the in-person Public Forum.

There being no further business, Mr. Mohan moved, Mr. Schmid seconded and it was unanimously carried to adjourn the meeting at 9:40 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Bette Sovinee, Secretary