LOWER MAKEFIELD TOWNSHIP

AD HOC PROPERTY COMMITTEE

MINUTES – OCTOBER 12, 2023

The regular meeting of the Ad Hoc Property Committee of the Township of Lower Makefield

was held remotely on October 12, 2023. Mr. Steadman called the meeting to order at

7:30 p.m.

Those present:

Ad Hoc Property Committee: Dennis Steadman, Chair (left meeting in progress)

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

Stephen Heinz, HARB Member

Jeff Hirko, HARB Member

Suzanne Blundi, Supervisor Liaison

Absent: Fred Childs, Ad Hoc Property Committee Vice Chair

Jim Scott, Ad Hoc Property Committee Member

Mr. Steadman stated there will be a report by Mr. Camaratta on Case Studies associated

with 501(c)3 management of properties comparable to Patterson Farm. He stated the

Committee will have a discussion of potential recommendations to include Stage One

of the Master Plan. He stated any Master Plan is a long-term vision and document

requiring phases. There are detailed cost estimates from the consultants on various

elements that could be considered in Stage One. The Committee has developed a

worksheet with the consultants to help decide what might be considered in Stage One.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 14, 2023 MEETING: Ms. Sovinee

Mr. Schmid moved, Mr. Camaratta seconded and it was unanimously carried to

approve the Minutes of September 14, 2023 as written.

Mr. Steadman stated all Meeting Minutes are on-line following their official approval.
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OPENING COMMENTS: Mr. Steadman

Mr. Steadman stated Patterson Farm is a beautiful, historical, natural, agricultural

site that is unique in many ways particularly because it is owned by Lower Makefield

Township. He stated there are fewer and fewer farms in the Township, but those

are private farms and it is difficult to protect and prevent development on those

properties. He stated the community and the Township itself are dissatisfied with

the status of Patterson Farm. He stated other than two buildings, the buildings are

closed up because they are unsafe and in unusable condition. There is not public

access to the grounds and the buildings, and the community has indicated that

they are disappointed about the amount of access they have to this Township-

owned property. There is also dissatisfaction with the overall management of this

historical property. He stated these issues have led to the request for a Master Plan.

Mr. Steadman stated the Committee has worked intensely on this project, and

here are clear planning priorities and guiding principles that the Committee has

agreed upon. A top priority is that Patterson Farm must remain in agriculture.

The majority of the land is in an Agricultural Easement. Even without the Ease-

ment, it is important to the community that it stays in agriculture. There is

interest in saving the historical buildings and farm vistas, although there are

some buildings which are more historically-important than others. He stated

without a use the buildings “die and cannot be maintained.” He stated productive

uses/reuses are necessary to be identified, and the uses must generate value to

justify the community investing both time and money. In some cases value means

dollar value/revenue to help support costs of maintenance, and in other cases

value means community value where the community places value in some non-

monetary recreation and enjoyment that helps the community be willing to

support this. Mr. Steadman stated they have not wavered from those planning

priorities and guidelines since the beginning.

Mr. Steadman stated the Patterson Farm produces more food and farm products

today than at any time in its 340 years of continuous agriculture. It is very rich

soil and currently produces over 14 different food products as well as livestock

field corn and soy beans. This is locally-grown produce is sold and consumed

in the greater Lower Makefield community. Mr. Steadman stated the property

has been this successful without using the existing buildings. The buildings are

outdated from an agricultural use standpoint so there needs to be other uses

found for these buildings. The farm is productive because the high-skilled

farmers are using modern, responsible agricultural practices; and they have

made major investments in equipment, facilities, and agricultural inputs.
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He stated we are fortunate to have this kind of agricultural operation in Lower

Makefield. Mr. Steadman stated the Master Plan must support continuous

farming of the property.

Mr. Steadman stated the fifteen historic buildings are what present the challenge;

and they must be repaired, maintained, and carefully managed. The Master Plan

needs to identify productive, community-supported uses for these buildings that

are compatible with farming and with the historical nature of this natural, public

land. Community support includes community access and community use.

Productive use means that it generates revenue to help support maintenance and

generates “soft community value.” Uses must respect the historical character of

the site, the natural setting of the site, and retain the scenic farm vistas which

includes the view coming off the highways. There should also be recreational

access/public use but without huge numbers of cars and people.

Mr. Steadman stated the Township tasked the volunteer committee to work

with hired professionals – architects, engineers, landscape architects, etc. –

to develop an insightful, executable plan for the site. The Committee was

charged with proposing long-term goals and solutions so that near-term decisions

can be made consistent with the goals and long-term solutions. There has been

a professional, objective analysis done of each building including the conditions,

feasible uses, designs, and cost estimates for repairs. Mr. Steadman stated we

have also had professional, objective market analyses done of best compatible

uses for the site and these types of buildings; and those were found to be arts

in general, arts in agriculture, nature, potential tradesmen such as blacksmiths

and different journeymen who may want to set up a shop in a building, crafts,

education, and recreation.

Mr. Steadman stated we have professional, objective site plans; and compatibility

with farming at this historical site and the envisioned uses can be done with a

modest amount of reorganization of the site to help the flow. The Plan is a multi-

stage, multi-year process. Mr. Steadman stated to begin we need to start with

Stage One priorities, and Stage One is defined as what can be achieved in one to

three years. He stated all other Stages will be dependent on the success and

execution of Stage One.

Mr. Steadman stated the vision that the Committee has developed is that

Patterson Farm is 234 acres of land that stands out from the surrounding high-

ways and suburbs because of its unique and beautiful features. It is like an oasis
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with farm fields, trees, ponds, and wildlife. The Farm is also home to historic

Pennsylvania Quaker farmsteads which are important to our past and to our

community today. People use and appreciate this special place for growing

food, creating art, finding inspiration, and providing education. The land is

incredibly fertile soil that has been farmed for over three hundred years

without interruption. Mr. Steadman stated if we can create that vision in

reality at the site, that is a success for our Township and the community.

Mr. Steadman stated one of the questions which was asked was how to

manage the site. Consistently there have been two strong recommendations

from all of the professionals. One was that Municipal Governments are not

organized or structured to manage such properties; and this is not particular

to Lower Makefield Township, and it is known around the County that this is

not what Municipalities are set up to do, and they are not going to do it well.

A dedicated, focused, non-profit that can raise funds, submit Grant Applica-

tions, use community volunteers, and has a transparent and open relationship

with the landlord can manage such sites and do so today all across the Country.

Mr. Steadman stated that is the primary model for success. Mr. Steadman stated

our Stage One recommendations will include that element, and the Committee

will recommend that the management of this property be turned over to a

responsible non-profit that has a transparent and trusted relationship with the

Township, the property owner.

Mr. Steadman stated Mr. Camaratta has worked hard to research how this

can be done.

LESSONS FROM CASE STUDIES OF 501(c)3 AND DISCUSSION AND MOTION

ON NATIONAL REGISTER SUBMISSION: Mr. Camaratta, Committee Member

and Chair of Lower Makefield Historical Commission

Mr. Camaratta showed a slide presentation on the selected sites he researched

which included the Langhorne Heritage Farm in Langhorne, Pennsylvania,

Dudley Farm in Connecticut, and Thunderbird Lodge in Rose Valley, both of

which were recommended by Mr. Seiler. Mr. Camaratta stated another site

was Sanborn Mills Farm in New Hampshire, which he visited in June; and he

included in the report the e-mail that he had sent to the Committee in June.
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He stated Ms. Donna Doan, Patterson Farm Preservation, recommended that

they look at the Burlington County Agricultural Center which is owned and

managed by the County; and while he reached out to them, they did not

respond back to him. Mr. Camaratta stated Thunderbird Lodge is listed as being

owned by both the Borough and a non-profit. He stated the Lodge came into

the possession of the Borough, but the Borough did not want to manage it; and

they handed that off to a newly-formed non-profit. In the Agreement with the

non-profit, if the non-profit were to fail, then the property would revert back to

the Borough. The non-profit cannot sell it, and they have to use it as prescribed.

Mr. Camaratta stated he feels that we need to better understand the advantages

and disadvantages of the Township owning the property, the Township leasing

the property, and the Township transferring ownership with a reverter clause

to the non-profit. He stated that might impact the ability to access Grants as

there might be certain Grants that are accessible to one form of ownership and

not to others, and it may also impact how work gets done. He stated he had

asked about that at Rose Valley; and because it is owned by a non-profit, they

do not need to go out to Bid for projects, where if it were owned by the Borough,

they would have to go out to Bid if the projects were over $20,000. Mr. Camaratta

stated he is not an expert in this, so we need to get some more information on this

so that we can consider which ownership model would be the best going forward.

Mr. Camaratta stated it should be noted that a number of these sites were in

worse shape than Patterson Farm. He stated when he was at Sanborn, he saw

pictures; and the buildings were in far worse shape than the buildings at

Patterson Farm, and he has included information about this in the report.

Mr. Camaratta stated in many respects because Patterson Farm was owned by

the Township and because the Township did some maintenance primarily keeping

water out of the buildings, they are in not in as bad a starting condition as were

some of these other properties were when they started, although he agrees

that there is a lot of work to be done.

Mr. Camaratta showed a slide entitled, “Key Learnings,” the first being that

with regard to preservation funding, the non-profits he researched indicated

that there are a menu of things that they do in order to preserve the buildings.

He stated they are using memberships, donations, rents, and support from the

Township. He stated volunteers are also important. Mr. Camaratta stated it is

important to have public engagement and involvement in the site because of

the revenue from memberships and donations which can provide matching funds

for Grants. He noted the Keystone Preservation Grants are a 50/50 match; and

if you get $100,000 from the State, you have to raise $100,000 on your own.
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Mr. Camaratta stated it is also important to be able to demonstrate public

interest and engagement. He noted that the Historical Commission applied for a

Preservation Grant to do work at the Slate Hill Cemetery on Yardley-Makefield

Road, but did not get the Grant. He stated one of the issues was that they could

not demonstrate any public participation or engagement with the Cemetery;

and even though people walk through it all the time, there was no way of counting

them. Mr. Camaratta stated the people he talked to stated that when you think

about public engagements you have to think about events and other ways to

demonstrate how many people are engaged since that has a multiplier effect

when you talk to Grant agencies as they want to see public interest.

Mr. Camaratta stated another Key Learning was how these historic farms

leveraged their farmhouse to generate revenue. He stated the non-profits all

had an office at the farmhouse but also had some type of residence in the

farmhouse that generated revenue. He stated these could be people who

just pay a monthly rent; but in two of the examples, they were caretakers

who were not only renting, they were also doing some light maintenance

around the property. He stated at the Langhorne Heritage Farm they have

rooms that they rent out, and cleaning those rooms was part of the caretaker’s

job. Mr. Camaratta stated the properties also had rental of private rooms;

and while we are not looking at massive events with a lot of cars, people were

renting rooms at the farmhouses for birthday parties, anniversary parties,

showers, and in some cases they were being rented for business meetings.

He stated these were good ways to generate revenue. Mr. Camaratta stated

usually the farmhouse was the first focus of preservation so they could have an

office, a residence, and some way to generate revenue through house tours, etc.

Mr. Camaratta stated they then focused on the rest of the buildings in terms

of educational programs and curating exhibits. He stated Langhorne is not

overly big, but Dudley Farm and Sanborn are larger adding that from a scale

perspective, they are representative to the challenges that we face. He stated

if you have a museum, that opens up a new set of Grants. He stated when

they offered programs/workshops sometimes the non-profit would do it,

but often they would bring in artisans who would pay rent, hold a workshop,

and sell what they were making. Mr. Camaratta stated this was another

source of revenue for the non-profit. He stated farmers’ markets, community

gardens, and on-site events encouraged public engagement; and although those

brought in minimal revenue, it was more about getting the public to engage

with the site.
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Mr. Camaratta stated volunteers were the key source of expertise and skills

not only in managing the non-profit but also by doing a lot of the work through

sweat equity. He stated at Dudley Farms, they were given a barn that was not

on the property; and they had to move it, reconstruct it, and get more materials

to reconstruct it. He stated that was all done by volunteers. He stated they had

a person on their Board who worked in construction, and his suppliers provided

the materials needed to build it; and another person on the Board was a teacher

at a local trade school, and he brought the people in to reconstruct the barn.

Mr. Camaratta stated it was repeatedly stressed that while it is important to get

Grants it is equally if not more important to bring in volunteers to help with the

work; otherwise, it becomes as we are seeing, prohibitively expensive or the

buildings will just sit too long. He stated for a non-profit to raise the millions of

dollars needed, it would take too long; and you can shorten that through the

use of volunteers.

Mr. Camaratta stated he found that it was very important how the non-profit

Board members were selected. He stated it was important to have people on

the Board who could contribute through fund-raising. He stated at Rose Valley

there was one person who donated over $20,000 of their own money. He stated

there were also professionals on their Board who would do their accounting for

them and take care of their legal issues. He stated there are also people needed

on the Board who will go out and get resources that are needed to maintain and

preserve the buildings.

Mr. Camaratta stated he asked a lot about what type of expertise was needed,

and it was indicated that where possible, you want to have a staff person who is

experienced in farm/historic site management and/or program development.

Mr. Steadman stated he has a family emergency which requires him to leave the

meeting at this time. He asked that once Mr. Camaratta is finished with his

report that Ms. Stark cover the Discussion of Stage One which includes a spread-

sheet which shows the proposals for Stage One and what each member of the

Committee selected as to what they would support. He asked that Mr. Schmid

take over as Chair. Mr. Steadman left the meeting at this time.

Mr. Camaratta stated the Pennsylvania Historic and Museum Commission

(PHMC) has experience with this, and they have a number of sites which are

administered/managed by volunteers. He stated they had good advice
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which was included in the report as to how to select a non-profit that is likely

to be successful in preserving the grounds. He stated the PHMC also sent him

a number of Contracts which could be reviewed by the Committee.

Mr. Heinz asked if people were aware that Lower Makefield Township has

some experience with the tenant/worker relationship at the Five Mile Woods

although at this point he is not sure who is renting the residence. He stated

it was previously the ranger, Rick Mellon, who provided service not only at

Five Mile Woods, but for the rest of the Township. He stated at that time,

which was probably twenty years ago, Mr. Mellon lived there with his family.

Mr. Heinz stated there are probably records as to how that was handled.

Mr. Camaratta stated he understands that the residence at the Five Mile

Woods is still being rented, and we could look at the Legal Agreement.

Mr. Camaratta stated he looked at financials for the last three years at the

other sites he researched, and he encouraged the Committee to review that

in the report. He stated while they are not making a significant amount of

money, they are able to bring in the resources that are needed to preserve

the buildings. He stated Rose Valley actually received $300,000 in State

Grants, and they did not use volunteers as much but hired workers.

He stated much of their work was dealing with slate roofs, stucco, and

masonry which is different than dealing with wood structures; and that

required more skills.

Mr. Camaratta stated part of what was in the Master Plan from Seiler+Drury

was to look at National Register submission for Patterson Farm. He stated

the first thing that needs to be done is a Determination of Eligibility. He stated

in 1998 it was determined that it was eligible; however, that needs to be

updated every five years. He stated he had discussed that with the PA SHPO,

and they want to see some recent photographs which we have as well as a

historical significance statement which we also have. He stated he would

like to update the Determination of Eligibility to make it current; and he would

also like to explore with SHPO what are possible ways of bringing the Farm onto

the National Register. He stated he has listed three ways – those being that the

farmstead be listed separately, Patterson Farm could be put in as its own Historic

District, or as was discussed previously, we could expand the Edgewood Village

Historic District, which would probably be the easiest to do. He stated he wants

to understand a little more if there are benefits or drawbacks to each of these

approaches.
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Mr. Camaratta stated he has discussed this with Mr. Kratzer. Mr. Camaratta

asked for a Motion from the Ad Hoc Committee that he should approach the

Board of Supervisors in order to approve going forward with these steps.

Mr. Mohan moved and Ms. Sovinee seconded to approve Mr. Camaratta

approaching the Board of Supervisors about going forward with these steps.

Ms. Sovinee asked if this will involve appropriations or will it be done by

the Historical Commission or other volunteers; and Mr. Camaratta stated it

will be done by the Historical Commission. He stated they will then come

back with a strategy of what is the right option to get the Farm onto the

National Register and what is the gap between the information we have

and the information we need.

Motion carried unanimously.

DISCUSSION OF STAGE ONE: Full Committee

Mr. Schmid stated Mr. Steadman indicated in his e-mail sent out today that

the spreadsheet being shown includes all the revisions and votes of six of the

seven members, but that it is not the final Stage One recommendation. At a

later date, the Committee will reconvene after discussion tonight, to come up

with final recommendations to take to the Board of Supervisors.

Ms. Stark stated what the Committee has done with the help of the professional

team is list 36 tasks/scopes of work, divided them up by parcel and building, and

then rated them with whether or not they should be something that gets

attempted to be done in the first phase of work which is being called Year One

through Year Three. Ms. Stark stated there is an estimated cost for each line item

as well, and that takes into consideration some of the thought process that the

Committee went through when they were evaluating what is absolutely necessary

to be done versus what could be pushed off a little bit while we looked for Grant

money to fund that piece.

Ms. Stark noted Item #1 is that LMT turns over property management to

a non-profit group, and that is where the information that Mr. Camaratta has

been gathering comes into play. Ms. Stark stated currently the estimated cost

is $10,000; and in the comment section it shows that this would be for legal

costs, and this is a placeholder.
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Ms. Stark stated the second item was update or revise the Zoning classification

of the site. She stated there is a placeholder for that of $5,000. She stated we

only had one person on the Committee think that was something we should do

in the first phase, but we can re-visit that to consider why this may be important

at this juncture.

Ms. Stark stated the third item was a new farmer’s driveway access, and this

includes design and construction with an estimate of $80,000 to do that.

Ms. Stark stated the next section refers to the Patterson Farmstead, and it

goes through every individual building. She stated these are items that pertain

to immediate work to halt water infiltration; adding that if we can halt water

infiltration, we can hold the building steady while we do some more serious

planning and discuss putting more dollars into a structure.

She noted Item #12 which is to paint all of the Patterson Farmstead buildings

with an estimate of $185,000, adding that may be high. She stated the reason

a lot of people picked this item was because it has an immediate impact to the

care of the site, and anyone driving by would immediately see that something

has been done.

Ms. Stark noted Item #20 which is tree clean-up. She stated this would be initial

landscaping, tree trimming, and clean-up; and this would make the site look

better. She stated there is discussion as to who would do that, and it could be

$10,000 to a vendor or it could be partially completed by in-house labor so that

out-of-pocket costs could be reduced. She stated once it is determined what

the Committee agrees should be the first phase, we need to consider how we

will approach these items as far as costs and labor.

Ms. Stark noted Item #22 which would be long-range which is to connect

water and sewer to the Janney and Caretaker’s cottage from the Patterson

central location. She stated this has a predecessor which is run water and

sewer from Satterthwaite to central Patterson, which is Item #21. She stated

the Committee needs to consider not only what we are going to do, but also

in what order.

Ms. Stark stated while a number of items were chosen by a number of the

Committee members, there were some outliers, and she feels it would be

good to have dialogue. Mr. Schmid stated if an item got four to six votes, he
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feels that there is a lot of consensus; and it would be good to have dialogue

about the outliers where there were only one, two, or three votes; and

Ms. Stark agreed. Mr. Camaratta stated it would be interesting to understand

what the Committee members’ objectives were for making their selections.

He stated his objective was to get public engagement with the site, water

abatements at the buildings, and clean up anything that would prohibit

volunteers from working such as asbestos, lead, etc.; and he picked things

that would be consistent with that. He stated he would like to hear what

others had as objectives when they were making their selections.

Mr. Mohan stated he did not get his comments into Mr. Steadman in time;

however, when he went through the list, he considered what would be the

best use of money at this juncture. He stated he did not chose Zoning

because we do not know what we would be re-Zoning it to; and until there

is agreement on that, he does not feel $5,000 should be spent on that.

He stated he was looking at how useful each item was to keep the process

moving in the short term so that we can get a better Plan for Phase 2 and

spend the money in an appropriate manner.

Mr. Schmid stated he felt that the major priority was to set up the 501(c)3 and

get that up and running since a lot of the responsibility for the future of the

Plan will reside with them. He stated he tried to choose items that would keep

the buildings up in a minimal way with minimal expenditure for the first one

to three years, fixing the holes, painting, etc. He stated he felt that ultimately

the 501(c)3 would be responsible for evaluating the overall Plan and then

getting input as well as seeking Grants, Contracts, money from the community,

and other ways to help fund the longer-term projects.

Ms. Sovinee stated she wanted to make sure that the buildings were shored up

by dealing with the foundations, groundhog holes, etc. She stated she does

agree that we need to get a 501(c)3 in there. Ms. Sovinee asked if we are not

making recommendations tonight, and Mr. Schmid stated Mr. Steadman’s

e-mail indicated that we were not going to come up with final recommendations

or take a vote this evening as a Committee. He stated after tonight’s discussion,

we would finalize the recommendations before going to the Board of Supervisors.

Ms. Sovinee asked if that means that we will not be making recommendations to

the Board of Supervisors until November, and Mr. Schmid stated he believes

that it will go before the Board of Supervisors on November 1. He assumes that

the Committee will meet as soon as possible after tonight’s meeting to finalize

the recommendations taking into account the discussion taking place tonight.
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Ms. Stark noted the votes column where items that received one or two votes

can be seen. Ms. Stark stated the re-Zoning item has already been discussed.

She noted Item #8 – Design and Construct Pedestrian crossway at Mirror Lake

Road – which only got one vote. Mr. Camaratta stated he voted for that so

that there would be public access since we would be putting trails, etc. on the

property, and people need to be able to get safely across the road in order to

use them. He stated he saw this as part of public engagement. Mr. Mohan

stated until the trails are built, he does not feel that the crosswalk should be

built. He stated when the trails are built, they can do the crosswalk at the

same time. Mr. Camaratta stated Item #6 is the money for the trails.

Ms. Sovinee noted that is money just for the design of the trails.

Ms. Stark noted Item #10 with regard to the National Registry as its own

District. Ms. Stark stated she believes the items related to the National

Registry should be held off until the discussion is held with the Board of

Supervisors. Mr. Camaratta stated he feels the discussion with the PA

SHPO is going to be very important since if they say the information we

have is sufficient, we could proceed with the Submission.

Ms. Stark stated Items #14 and #15 both had a single vote each. She stated

Ms. Sovinee was in favor of basic structural repairs to the equipment garage.

Ms. Sovinee stated she was in favor of this because of the damage from the

groundhogs. Item #13 only got three votes. Ms. Sovinee stated that also

related to the groundhog holes. Ms. Sovinee stated there was a note that it

was sound enough to postpone, and she asked if that was the recommenda-

tion from the consultants; and Ms. Stark agreed. Ms. Stark stated she feels

they need to parse out groundhog hole repair versus if there is structural

work that cannot wait three years. Ms. Sovinee stated it had been noted

that the north end of the foundation was of concern as well as gutters and

downspouts which means water is getting in. She stated there are also

broken boards on that building that need to be dealt with. She stated it

may not need full structural repairs, but she feels something should be done.

Ms. Stark stated they should discuss with Mr. Seiler what is the bare minimum

needed to achieve our goals, and could we reduce the cost by taking some of

the scope away.

Mr. Schmid stated he feels we need to look at the outliers and get people’s

reactions and then go back to Mr. Seiler with this so that we can refine it

before the Committee meets again to come up with final recommendations.
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Mr. Camaratta noted Item #14 – the lower shed roof, which he feels is a water

abatement issue. He stated Mr. Seiler may say it is not, and it is just the shingles;

but usually when roofs start to fail, water begins to get in; and that is why he

selected it. Ms. Stark stated that is a good question that should be brought up

with Mr. Seiler.

Ms. Stark noted Item #22 which Ms. Sovinee was in favor of, and Ms. Stark asked

if she knew that would require Item #21 to be done as well. Ms. Sovinee stated

she did not notice that so she understands now that those buildings will not be

ready for water hook-ups until later so that could be taken out.

Ms. Stark stated Item #28 also had a low vote count. She stated it was all

Satterthwaite excluding the corn crib – paint and minimum necessary carpentry

before painting. Mr. Camaratta stated as was noted earlier painting helps a lot

to preserve the buildings as well as it makes it look nicer. He stated Mr. Steadman

had stated that it shows that care is being taken and it shows progress. Ms. Sovinee

stated the previous three items, #25, #26, and #27 add up to $115,000, and she

does not know if that is a redundancy. Mr. Mohan stated he believes one is just

the Satterthwaite House, and the rest are the Satterthwaite properties.

Mr. Camaratta stated he feels that Items #26 and #27 are higher priorities since

once you resolve those issues, you can have volunteers do painting, especially

the ones that are one or two stories although probably not the houses or the

barns as they are tall. He stated that would be a way to offset some of the costs;

but if volunteers are coming in, we cannot have asbestos and biological waste, etc.

Mr. Hirko stated he feels they would also have to do #29 along with #26 and #27,

and others agreed.

Ms. Sovinee stated she would like to see the corn crib demolished on the

Satterthwaite side. She stated if there are going to be volunteers on the property

it should be made safe, and she would not someone to get injured looking in

there. Mr. Mohan stated they might be able to reduce the cost by finding some-

one would take it down and keep the wood as a reclaimed wood item.

Mr. Hirko stated if it would help, if the Township would clean up the residual

waste from that building, he would take it down. Mr. Hirko was thanked for

offering to do this.
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Mr. Schmid stated we go from a low for Stage One of $500,000 which were

Mr. Steadman’s recommendations to a high of about $763,000 which were

Mr. Camaratta’s recommendations. He stated we need to refine this, vote

on it, and take it to the Board of Supervisors. Mr. Camaratta stated there

may be some “packaging” that may not be optimal for us; and if we go back

to Mr. Seiler and advise him that our main concern is that water is kept out

of the budlings and that clean-up is done so that volunteers could come on,

we might get a different packaging on some of these things that were printed

out.

Mr. Mohan stated since they are broken out and packaged with Satterthwaite

as one and Patterson as the other, we could bundle the painting for a painter

to paint everything, and that may come in at a lower price.

Mr. Hirko stated Mr. Sam Stewart, the farmer, knows a painter that travels up

and down the coast and paints farms and barns; and he gave a “tremendous”

price for the Patterson side of the Farm, but the Township turned it down.

Ms. Blundi stated this has been discussed a number of times; and the difficulty,

which has been pointed out again this evening, is that when the Township owns

the building, there are certain requirements that are in place. She stated the

Township as a public entity has certain requirements that a private landowner

would not have.

Mr. Schmid stated Ms. Stark will take this back to Mr. Seiler, and it will be

re-visited in the near future when Mr. Steadman weighs in as to the next

meeting so that we can resolve all of this and come up with final recom-

mendations as a Committee to give to the Board of Supervisors.

OTHER BUSINESS

Mr. Schmid noted that the Public Comment period will be coming up shortly.

Mr. Majewski stated the survey is still open. He stated while he had set a closing

date on it, he extended it today so that comments can still be made at the Town-

ship Website on the Patterson Farm page. He stated documents and photos can

also be attached on the On-Line Permitting and Citizens’ Request Portal on the

Township Website, and they can be shared with the members of the Ad Hoc

Committee.
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Mr. Heinz asked if having a 501(c)3 organization be either totally responsible or

accept ownership in some way, is there a process that has been included with

the information that Mr. Camaratta received about how the public can continue

to stay involved and be part of the process with a bi-annual report or something

like that, or public meetings once a year to review the process similar to the kind

of access that turned out so well in the process that we have had so far.

Mr. Camaratta stated there are Covenants that we could put in that would

require review before any modifications over a certain dollar amount or design

changes were made. He stated HARB or someone else would be able to do

that. He also stated the PHMC indicated that in one of their Agreements,

they have a yearly review and inspection of the site. He stated there are

Design Guidelines that they are supposed to follow, and PHMC does an

inspection to make sure they are following those Design Guidelines.

Mr. Heinz stated he would like to see if there is some way as we are going

through the process of establishing the organization that is going to take over

that there would be some kind of public input/public review that would not

just be the Supervisors indicating they have satisfied the requirements.

Mr. Heinz stated it would then make it obvious that we are continuing to

accept review from the public about how well we are doing as a public entity.

He stated the Ad Hoc Committee has done that to some extent; and by

having the public reviews/public meetings about the process, we have

encouraged that kind of participation, and he is trying to make sure that

we do not lose that level of participation.

Mr. Camaratta stated in general when it came to public engagement, most

of the discussion was around the programmatic aspects of how many people

came to events, attended workshops, house tours, etc. He stated he feels

what Mr. Heinz is asking for is different with regard to public feedback; and

he did not ask that question although he is sure that could be built in.

Mr. Camaratta stated he feels it is worthwhile for us to investigate different

ownership models. He stated these would include, the Township owns the

buildings, the Township leases the buildings, or the Township gives the

buildings to a non-profit with Covenants and a Reverter Clause to make sure

that they are being used as intended. He stated he does not have the expertise

to determine that, and he asked if there was someone who could help him

consider that and come back with a recommendation as to what would be the
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appropriate ownership model. He stated they need to consider the advantages

and disadvantages of these different ownership models. He noted what

Ms. Blundi just discussed with regard to the requirements put on a Township

when they own a building.

Mr. Heinz stated he feels Mr. Majewski would be able to put together a summary

of that kind of information or they should ask Mr. Kratzer to see what he has to

say about this. Ms. Blundi stated she believes that Mr. Camaratta was asking if

any of the volunteers would be able to work with him to put together the pros

and cons of the different models at a high level. Mr. Camaratta stated Mr. Scott

might have a background in that, or they might need to talk to a Land Use lawyer.

Ms. Stark stated she would like to know what the legal differences are for pro-

curements and management. Ms. Blundi suggested that they follow up with

Mr. Scott following the meeting.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Ms. Lora Tarantino, 185 Durham Road, Newtown, asked about the corn crib.

She stated she recalls that previously Mr. Camaratta had suggested keeping

that as an asset/structure on the farm from a historical perspective; but she is

now hearing people talking about dismantling it, and she asked if that is a

definite. She stated she understands that it is not a useful structure, but

historically it is a “marker for the history.”

Mr. Schmid stated the process that they are following tonight is for the

Committee and others to discuss the various options and how each of the

Committee members have weighed in on expenditures; but we were not

making final decisions this evening. Ms. Tarantino stated while she understands

that, the information was revealed about removing it. Ms. Blundi stated no

decisions have been made tonight.

Ms. Donna Doan, 2814 Langhorne-Yardley Road, Langhorne, stated she does

not know if all of the Committee members are aware that Patterson Farm

Preservation submitted a Lease for the Satterthwaite House through their

attorney this week so that is an option that is on the table. She stated they

are very interested to get into the property and work on the restoration.

She stated she cannot read the prices being shown on the screen, and she

hopes that information will be posted on the Township Website. She stated
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it seems that some astronomical sums are being considered, and she feels a

501(c)3 could come in and there would be tax dollar savings on this whole

project that the taxpayers would appreciate. She stated we have a lot of

mentors, and she knows that Mr. Camaratta did a lot of work with his research

which was excellent; but she has also been talking to Bolton Mansion which

Ms. Stark is aware of. Ms. Doan stated that house was on fire and has been

brought back and looking beautiful. She also noted Craven Hall, the William

Tennent House, and the Moland House which are testaments as to what can

be done by a 501(c)3.

Ms. Doan stated she hopes the Committee will consider Patterson Farm

Preservation, and she does not understand why there is no discussion about

them as it always seems like they want a new 501(c)3. She stated Patterson

Farm Preservation has been here since 2015, and they are ready to partner

with the Township to get this done and make Patterson have a sustainable

future that includes agriculture. Ms. Doan stated it is not just the farming of

the land that is important, it is also the buildings. She stated she disagrees

with Mr. Steadman when he says there is no agricultural use for the buildings

since there is. She stated she would like to see the promotion of agriculture

in our community as there has never been outreach from the Township to

the Secretary of Agricultural or any of the agricultural leaders in the community

that could bring in programs such as the Master Gardeners, 4-H, Grange, or the

Bucks County Farm Bureau. She stated we could also tie in with the Pennsylvania

Farm Show the theme of which is Connecting People to the Land. She stated we

could have the Pennsylvania Secretary of Agriculture, Russell Redding, come in

and do a personal appearance on the Farm to raise the profile of the Farm.

She stated this would bring in “some of the high dollar donors,” and give

Patterson Farm the recognition that it needs throughout the Commonwealth.

She stated we could bring in the Quakers from the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting,

and make them aware that Satterthwaite is being restored. She stated we should

also work on the grounds with Bucks Beautiful and the Martha Washington Garden

Club. She stated we could also work with the Moravian Tile Works. She stated

donations would come in if the public was aware that we are supporting agriculture.

She stated we need to support farming as we are probably going to lose a couple

more farms, and we know for sure that we are losing Torbert Farm. She stated any

other farm in the Township that is not under preservation could be imminently

gone. She stated it is likely that the Ruth Wright Farm and the Patterson Farm will

be the largest remaining parcels in the Township, and we do not want to “dismiss

that and say that these buildings have no agricultural purpose because they do.”
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Mr. Schmid stated that in all of the meetings that he has attended with the Ad

Hoc Property Committee, the Committee has supported the notion of advancing

agriculture in the community, and Ms. Doan has advanced a lot of good ideas.

Mr. Schmid stated he does not know that any of the Committee members were

aware of the fact that Ms. Doan had submitted a Lease on the Satterthwaite

House. Ms. Blundi stated they sent in a Lease requesting that they be allowed to

Lease the building. Ms. Doan stated she does not have the e-mail addresses

of the members of the Committee but they can e-mail her at admin@patterson

farmpreservation.org, and she can send them a copy of the Lease. She stated

their attorney modeled it on the Lease that was provided to AOY so there is

a similarity there. She stated they are open to discussion and look forward to

that. Mr. Schmid stated he knows that Ms. Doan has communicated with

Mr. Steadman on various occasions, and he asked Ms. Doan to send it to

Mr. Steadman this evening so that the Committee can look at it. Ms. Doan

stated she did send it to Mr. Steadman the other day.

Mr. Camaratta stated in terms of the study that he did, it was not always

starting a new 501(c)3, and sometimes it was selecting a 501(c)3, especially

when it came to the way the PHMC thought about their properties. He stated

in the report he included some selection criteria for what would make a good

candidate whether it was a new one coming in or an existing one. He stated

we should spell out what the selection criteria is and then go through a process

of looking at existing ones or people who want to start one.

FOLLOW-UP ASSIGNMENTS & FUTURE SCHEDULING: Ms. Sovinee

1. Mr. Camaratta – Go to the Board of Supervisors with the

recommendation to update the National Historic Registry

Application

2. All – Review Mr. Camaratta’s report in terms of considerations

for an existing or new 501(c)3 and research comparison of

ownership models

3. Ms. Stark – E-mail already sent to Mr. Seiler to clarify some

pricing in terms of groundhogs and water
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4. Ms. Doan – Already sent proposed Lease for Satterthwaite

House by Patterson Farm Preservation to Mr. Steadman

so the Committee can review it

Mr. Schmid stated we will wait for Mr. Steadman to schedule the next meeting

which he assumes will occur quickly so that final recommendations can be

discussed.

There being no further business, Mr. Camaratta moved, Ms. Sovinee seconded

and it was unanimously carried to adjourn the meeting at 9:00 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Bette Sovinee, Secretary
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