

Milford Township
Planning Commission Meeting Minutes of May 27, 2026
7:00 P.M.

Attendance: Planning Commission Members Present: Fran Murray, Chair; Edwin Bolton, Vice Chair; and Susan Edwards, Secretary. Member Adam Klein was absent.

Staff Present: Jeffrey Vey, Township Manager; Devan Ambron, Assistant Manager/Secretary/Treasurer; Todd Baldwin, Pennoni; and Matthew Walters, Bucks County Planning Commission.

Call to Order: Mr. Murray called the May 27, 2026 meeting to order at 7:00 pm.

Minutes: The meeting minutes of April 29, 2026 were accepted and approved as presented.

Plan Acceptance:

MVP 663 I, LLC, Milford Village Section 1 Retail, Final Plan, Route 663, TMP No. 23-010-175-001. Proposed Retail Use consisting of two buildings (6,000 square feet and 37,200 square feet) located in the Arterial Mixed Use Overlay District. The Milford Village Section 1 Retail Final Plan was accepted for review.

Subdivision/Land Development:

U.S. Cold Storage, Waiver of Land Development, 4000 AM Drive, TMP No. 23-002-147-001. Mr. William Benner, of Obermayer Rebmann Maxwell & Hippel LLP, was present on behalf of the applicant. Mr. Benner explained that the application consists of a request for a waiver of land development to permit the construction of a 1,260-square-foot addition to the existing 249,057-square-foot warehouse, along with the removal of portions of existing pavement and the construction of additional asphalt vehicle parking and concrete trailer parking areas. Mr. Benner noted that the applicant previously appeared before the Zoning Hearing Board in September 2025 and was granted variances for impervious surface coverage and wetland disturbance. He further stated that the applicant had received the Bucks County Planning Commission review letter dated May 21, 2026, as well as the Pennoni review letter dated May 14, 2026. Mr. Benner introduced Mr. Jeff Funk, U.S. Cold Storage Manager; Mr. Charlie Kulp; and Mr. Adam Citrullo of Bohler Engineering. Mr. Benner stated that, following discussions between Mr. Citrullo and Mr. Baldwin, only two review comments required further discussion. The first, contained in the Bucks County Planning Commission review letter, concerns the submission of a Sewage Facilities Planning Module Application Mailer to determine whether an Act 537 Planning Module is required. The second concerns the requirement for a Traffic Impact Study for any land development expected to generate more than 100 daily trips. Mr. Benner indicated that the applicant would comply with all remaining review comments. Mr. Citrullo provided an overview of the proposal. He explained that the project includes the removal of portions of existing pavement and the construction of additional asphalt employee parking spaces and concrete trailer parking spaces. The proposed improvements will result in a net increase of 12 employee parking spaces and 17 trailer parking spaces. A new driveway is proposed from AM Drive, a private roadway, along the eastern property line. The project also includes relocation of the secondary access drive and construction of a drive aisle extending around the rear of the building. Mr. Citrullo stated that these improvements will enhance site operations by separating automobile and trailer traffic and eliminating the existing access point on the east side of the building. The primary site access will remain unchanged. In addition to the parking improvements, a 1,260-square-foot building addition and associated stormwater management facilities are proposed. Mr. Citrullo reiterated that the Zoning Hearing Board granted variances to permit 75% impervious surface coverage where 60% is permitted and to allow disturbance of a wetland area for the construction of additional tractor-trailer and employee parking spaces. The applicant is now requesting a waiver of land development. Mr. Citrullo advised that the applicant is currently pursuing a Chapter 105 Permit and has participated in a pre-application meeting with both the Bucks County Conservation District and the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection. At this point, Mr. Murray requested that Mr. Baldwin review the consultant comments. Mr. Benner reiterated that the only items requiring discussion were the Bucks County Planning Commission comments regarding the Sewage Facilities Planning Module and the Traffic Impact Study. He stated that no increase in employees, sewage generation, or water usage is proposed and, therefore, the applicant does not believe an Act 537 Planning Module is necessary. Regarding the Pennoni review letter, Mr. Benner stated that all comments would be addressed and complied with. Mr. Benner further noted that the applicant is prepared to provide additional traffic information but questioned the necessity of a full Traffic Impact Study given the limited scope of the

project and the fact that no additional employees are proposed. Mr. Murray asked why additional parking was needed if there would be no increase in staffing. Mr. Funk explained that the additional employee parking is needed due to overlap between work shifts. He stated that when the second shift arrives, members of the first shift are often still on-site, resulting in a shortage of approximately 10 to 12 parking spaces. Mr. Baldwin stated that his primary concern was related to the potential increases in water and sewer demand. Since the proposed building addition will not increase demand for either utility, he indicated that he supports the waiver request, provided the applicant complies with the review comments. Mrs. Ambron asked about the intended use of the building addition. Mr. Funk explained that the warehouse was constructed in 2002 and currently contains men's and women's locker rooms. The women's locker room contains only one restroom and limited locker space. The addition will provide expanded women's locker room facilities as well as an enlarged employee break room. Mr. Citrullo stated that the parking improvements are intended solely to support existing operations. He indicated that the applicant could provide a traffic generation letter in lieu of a full Traffic Impact Study. Mr. Funk explained that the additional trailer parking is needed due to increased trailer activity at the facility. He noted that trucks frequently arrive as much as ten hours early and currently park along AM Drive, creating operational and traffic concerns. Employees regularly have to direct drivers away from the roadway. The proposed trailer spaces will allow those vehicles to park on-site, reducing congestion and improving site circulation. Mr. Baldwin agreed that the proposed improvements would help keep traffic on-site and stated that supplemental traffic information should adequately address the Traffic Impact Study comment. Mr. Citrullo advised that a revised waiver review letter had been submitted requesting additional waivers. The first is a waiver from SALDO Section 512.K.1, which requires stormwater basin embankment slopes to be no steeper than 4:1. The proposed basin slopes are 3:1, which are permitted under SALDO Sections 511.D.1 and 511.D.2. The second is a partial waiver from SALDO Section 512.K.8, which requires outlet pipes to be reinforced concrete pipe (RCP). The applicant proposes to use HDPE pipe, which is an accepted industry standard for underground storm sewer conveyance systems. Watertight joints will be provided as required. Regarding utility comments, Mr. Citrullo reiterated that no increase in water or sewer usage is proposed. It was also noted that a recommendation letter from the Quakertown Area Planning Committee (QAPC) had not yet been received. Mr. Walters stated that the plan had been reviewed by the QAPC and that a recommendation letter would be issued during the week. He further stated that the QAPC would have no comments on the application. Mr. Murray noted that the Township had received a letter from the Fire Marshal dated May 26, 2026, along with photographs showing trailers obstructing roadway and drive access areas. Mr. Bolton asked whether signage was present in the area where the parking issues occur. Mr. Funk stated that signage is currently installed and noted that Link Logistics owns the roadway, subject to an easement. He added that additional signage would be installed in the coming weeks. Mr. Murray referenced the Fire Marshal's comments regarding required fire apparatus access widths. Mr. Citrullo responded that the proposed fire access route would remain unobstructed and would provide a 24-foot-wide access drive leading into a truck court approximately 70 to 75 feet wide. Mr. Bolton asked for confirmation that both access points were not being eliminated. Mr. Citrullo confirmed that only one access point would be removed. Mr. Funk added that the proposed configuration would improve emergency access. He explained that the existing fire access route is a stone surface that has never been utilized and that the revised layout would separate the access points by the full length of the building, thereby eliminating the current conflict area. Mr. Baldwin stated that he had spoken with Fire Marshal Chris Kletzing and noted that the review comments requested a truck-turning template. He indicated that this matter could be addressed through the plan review process. He also noted that fire hydrants are located at the southern corners of the site, including the southeast and southwest corners, and stated that no fire safety conflicts were anticipated. Mr. Murray noted that the Fire Marshal's letter referenced a proposed fire department access gate and requested information regarding the gate type and method of operation. Mr. Funk stated that a gate with card-access control is proposed and that a gate currently exists on-site. Fire Marshal Kletzing possesses a key to the existing gate. Mr. Funk explained that the gate is generally closed only on Saturday evenings and when the facility is not in operation. He also stated that a Knox Box will be installed to provide emergency access. There was no further discussion.

Mr. Bolton made a **MOTION** to recommend the issuance of a letter to the Board of Supervisors in favor of approval of the requested Waiver of Land Development for U.S. Cold Storage, 4000 AM Drive, TMP No. 23-002-147-001 with the condition the applicant comply with the Pennoni review letter dated May 14, 2026. The Planning Commission supports the waivers requested in a letter dated May 27, 2026. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Edwards and passed unanimously.

Other Business:

Bracalente Property Investments, LLC, Preliminary Plan, 20 West Creamery Road, Trumbauersville, TMP No. 45-002-015, 45-002-11, 23-021-013. Mrs. Estelle Eberhardt of Horizon Engineering was present on behalf of the

applicant to present the proposed subdivision. The application involves three parcels: TMP Nos. 45-002-015 and 45-002-011, located in Trumbauersville Borough within the Suburban Residential Low Zoning District, and TMP No. 23-021-013, located in Milford Township. The proposal would reconfigure the three existing parcels into four lots. The majority of the project is located within Trumbauersville Borough. A minor lot line adjustment and conveyance between TMP Nos. 45-002-015 and 23-021-013 is proposed in Milford Township, resulting in a vacant parcel of approximately 17.93 acres. Mrs. Eberhardt explained that Bracalente currently operates an industrial use under previously granted variances and has access to both West Creamery Road and Main Street. At the request of Trumbauersville Borough, the residential uses are being subdivided from the industrial operation. The residential properties are currently served by public water and sewer. Mrs. Eberhardt stated that all comments found in the Trumbauersville Borough and Bucks County Planning Commission review letters are will comply. No construction is proposed as part of the subdivision, and several waivers, including public improvements, will be requested. She also noted that a variance will be required for Parcel F due to existing setback encroachments associated with a building that was part of a previous lot consolidation. Mr. Murray confirmed that the applicant had received the Bucks County Planning Commission review letter. Mrs. Eberhardt responded they have and that all comments are considered "will comply." She further noted that no improvements are proposed within Milford Township other than the lot line adjustment and access to West Creamery Road. Mr. Bolton asked about existing access arrangements. Mrs. Eberhardt stated that the current access point would be eliminated and replaced with fencing. Discussion followed regarding future access and the implications of combining parcels that cross municipal boundaries. Mrs. Eberhardt explained that any future land development application would require review and approval by both municipalities. Mr. Bolton expressed concern that the proposed lot configuration could complicate future development and emphasized that a landlocked parcel cannot be created. He also noted that if the larger parcels are combined, the primary access would be through Milford Township. Mr. Murray expressed concern regarding emergency access, particularly if access were limited to a single point. Mrs. Eberhardt stated that the parcels are currently vacant and that issues relating to access, circulation, and emergency services would be addressed during any future land development review. She noted that sufficient frontage exists to potentially accommodate a loop road and that access from Trumbauersville Borough is proposed to be removed. Mr. Bolton stated that he believes a secondary emergency access easement should be maintained, preferably to Main Street, to provide adequate emergency access. He also suggested that an easement could potentially be obtained through the Fire Company property. Mrs. Eberhardt agreed to consider the recommendation. Mr. Baldwin raised questions regarding the legal implications of consolidating parcels that cross municipal boundaries, including taxation and municipal boundary considerations. He noted that municipal boundaries are typically monumented and that boundary adjustments often require ordinance action. Mr. Bolton agreed and stated that, given the size of the parcel, it is unlikely either municipality would wish to relinquish taxing authority. Mr. Bolton further noted that previous discussions regarding access to Main Street generated significant opposition from residents. He stated that while subdivision issues could be addressed, he would not support a future land development proposal without a secondary emergency access easement. He also expressed concern regarding the ability of West Creamery Road to accommodate future traffic demands. Mrs. Edwards agreed with the concerns regarding access. Mrs. Eberhardt reiterated that traffic, access, and emergency service issues would be addressed during any future land development process and noted that West Creamery Road is a PennDOT roadway subject to PennDOT regulations and permitting requirements. Following discussion, Mr. Bolton recommended that the determination of Milford Township's level of involvement in the subdivision process be deferred to the Milford Township Board of Supervisors and Township Solicitor. All Planning Commission members were in agreement. There was no further discussion.

Adjournment: With there being no further business Mrs. Edwards made a MOTION to adjourn the May 27, 2026 Planning Commission meeting 7:51 p.m. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bolton and passed unanimously.