

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
Thursday,
September 22, 2005

The West Brandywine Township Planning Commission meeting was called to order at 7:30 p.m.; Bob Schini led the members in the pledge of allegiance. Those members in attendance were; Bob Schini, John Cassels, Kim Hoopes, Chuck Dobson, Anita Ferenz and Steven Jakatt.

Bob Schini asked for acceptance of the minutes for the August 25, 2005 meeting. Steven Jakatt motioned to accept the minutes for the August 25, 2005 meeting and have any revisions to the Planning Commission Secretary within one week. Kim Hoopes seconded the motion with all members in favor.

First item under old business; Schnatz & Rohrer Landscaping Inc. – Preliminary/Final Land Development Plan (00-05-SCHROH) prepared by Berger & Hayes – Industrial Storage Building for Vehicles concerning Landscaping Business. Clock started Thursday May 25, 2000 and continues until Thursday, November 24, 2005. No representative was present. Bob Schini asked for a motion. Steven Jakatt motioned to table the Schnatz & Rohrer Landscaping Inc. – Preliminary/Final Land Development Plan; Kim Hoopes seconded the motion with all members in favor for the exception of Chuck Dobson who abstained.

Balderston Family LTD Partnership/Swinehart Realty Associates LP – Preliminary Subdivision Plan (04-03-CULSWH), prepared by DL Howell Associates, located at Culbertson Run & Swinehart Road. Proposed 115 Single Family Dwellings. Clock started Thursday, February 26, 2004 and continues until Friday, October 21, 2005. No representation was present. The Township had received an extension letter. Bob Schini asked for a motion. Steven Jakatt motioned to table the Balderston Family LTD Partnership/Swinehart Realty Associates LP – Preliminary Subdivision Plan, Kim Hoopes seconded the motion with all members in favor.

James P. Bryant – Final Minor Subdivision Plan (05-04-BRYT), Property location, Pratts Dam Road – Proposed Lot Subdivision. Prepared by Environmental Consultants International Corporation. Clock started Thursday, May 26, 2005 and continues until Saturday, October 22, 2005. Representative present was from ECI who stated they had received Mr. MacCombies review letter dated September 20, 2005. There are a few minor issues that will be taken care of and have no problem complying with the entire review letter. I am asking for a recommendation for approval conditioned on the following; satisfying Mr. MacCombies letter dated September 20, 2005, obtaining the GP's for the driveway crossings, the sanitary sewer planning modules approvals by the Health Department and DEP. Steven Jakatt; Mr. Chairman, we have been in this situation before where there are outstanding comments. I understand the applicant is willing to take care of outstanding issues. I personally don't think its right to pass this plan on to the Supervisors and feel the review letter should be a clean one. I feel all the comments need to be addressed before we pass it on. ECI representative; we will adhere to the Subdivision Land Development Ordinance and Zoning Ordinance. As far as the benchmark, the information is in the drawing but happen to get cut off when it was plotted out. Ronald A. Rambo, Township Manager, item number five, separation of the common drive, item number six, sewage module, number seven we have received, they have notified DEP for stream crossings and item eight, Engineering seal and signed plans still required. The applicant will need to show easements of the plan, with a note that both lots have a right for ingress and egress and common maintenance for shared areas. It then gets recorded as part of the deed whenever the properties are sold this would be added to the plans.

Chuck Dobson; lot number two, the perc data is shown at the top end of the lot, you have a slope arrow showing 10% and most of those holes are in the 15% slopes. Is that a typing error? ECI representative; the slope indication was measured in the field. The Health Department was there at that time. Chuck Dobson, the County Health Department contours and these seem to be running almost perpendicular. They may be forced to adjust some of their perc holes to make it more parallel. After further discuss, Bob Schini asked the Board for a motion. John Cassels motioned approval to the BoS for the final plan for the James P. Bryant – Final Minor Subdivision plan contingent upon satisfying all the housekeeping items in Mr. MacCombie letter dated September 20, 2005, the applicants ability to get general permits required for the minor road crossing, approval from the Health Department for the sewage disposal on site and the escrows be in place, Anita Fernez seconded the motion. All were in favor for the exception of Steven Jakatt you voted nay, and Chuck Dobson who abstained.

John & Sandra Nunemaker – Preliminary/Final Subdivision Plan (05-05-NMAKER) –Property location; 350 Reeceville Road - Proposed 2 lot subdivision. Prepared by Lake Roeder Hillard & Associates. Clock started Thursday, July 28, 2005 and continues until Wednesday October 26, 2005. Representatives present were Jerry Przystup and John Nunemaker. Jerry Przystup, this is a two-lot subdivision, one lot with an existing house, a new house would be built on the second lot. Mr. MacCombies review letter dated September 21, 2005 has been discussed with Mr. Biloon of Mr. MacCombies office. We feel these are minor items that can be addressed before the BoS meeting. I will answer any question you have concerning this letter. John Cassels, item 3a, have you looked into the discrepancy in elevations? Jerry Przystup, yes we have surveyed the sewer tops and inverts, the information on the as builds are different from what actually exist in the field. David Biloon suggested we take the as built information off the drawing and add a note as to why there is a difference. We feel confident our survey information is correct. We reviewed the drawings to make sure we had the right manholes and then surveyed the field and found them different. There could be a foot or two difference.

Everything else fits in with the topography, an accurate survey and certified to that extent. There is an exiting four-inch lateral there now that would tie into the existing house and the new house would have a six-inch lateral.

The four-inch lateral is an existing; the six-inch lateral is required by the ordinance because of the length from the main to the house. John Cassels, item number four, it looks like you have more design work concerning Stormwater management.

Jerry Przystup, it's minor, we are moving the inlet over closer to the driveway, this was discussed with David Biloon. The inlet basin here, (dwg ref) instead of having the swale come to it, we moved the basin up closer to the driveway. The outlet will go in the southeast corner. Steven Jakatt, I feel these comments are substantial and this plan needs to be cleaned up before I recommend approval. Jerry Przystup, we have been here two months for a two-lot subdivision, the comments are very minor. If we had time we would have had comments back to the engineer. I am not sure of the delay. Steven Jakatt, we have seen in the past where the applicant says one thing and the township engineer says another. I don't feel these issues are minor, and plan to reject the plan unless an extension letter is submitted. Being there was no further discussion on the plan Bob Schini asked for motion. Steven Jakatt, I motion to recommended rejection of the John & Sandra Nunemaker – Preliminary/Final Subdivision Plan (05-05-NMAKER) based on the following comments in Mr. MacCombies review letter dated September 21, 2005. Subdivision & Land Development; Preliminary/Final Requirements, 3a, Datum & Benchmark – It is noted that the plan reflects two sets of elevations. Apparently, there is a discrepancy between the information of the Townships sanitary sewer as-built plans for Reeceville Road and that obtained by the engineer for this project. This matter must be rectified so that all the topography and utility information is consistent, pursuant to section 167-23C(2)(m). Item 4, Stormwater Management – It appears the proposed stone seepage bed has been designed to manage the increase runoff from the construction of the proposed dwelling. However, the design needs to be modified to address the following. 4a; Overflow runoff- It appears that overflows from this system may be directed onto the adjacent property and not to the Southwest property corner where the site currently drains. The engineer needs to clearly demonstrate that present drainage patterns are being maintained and that the development of this lot will not concentrate runoff onto the adjacent property, pursuant to Section 167-61J(3). 4b – Collection of runoff – It does not appear that the swale proposed to divert runoff from the

driveway to inlet two meets the design criteria of Section 167-61M(2)(a). Water Line - Item 6 – The design and installation approval for the extension should be provided from Aqua Pennsylvania pursuant to Section 167-58A. This motion is contingent upon receipt of a letter of extension from the applicant prior to Wednesday October 19, 2005. Kim Hoopes seconded the motion with all in favor with the exception of Chuck Dobson who abstained.

New Business; All Souls Cemetery – Final Land Development Plan – (02-14-ASC), Prepared by Bartin & Martin. Proposed cemetery located at Manor & Hibernia Roads. Clock started Tuesday, November 26, 2002 and continues until Tuesday, December 29, 2005. Representative present was Chris Cummings and Tom Shocklin. Chris Cummings; we received a review letter dated September 21, 2005 from Mr. MacCombies office. We will be changing 38 sheets to 39 sheets. In Mr. MacCombies letter is states, “They primarily address procedural and plan maintenance type issues which should be resolved prior to the plans being recorded”. The first item under Conditional Use Decision and Order states, “It does not appear that the applicant has addressed the reuse, upkeep and maintenance requirements of the historic structures pursuant to Item #11. We have a letter that was submitted to the BoS on March 26, 2003, which was accepted prior to a preliminary approval laying out what we plan on doing and how we plan on reusing the buildings. A structural study was done on the springhouse, and was found to be not salvageable. It could be rebuilt, but as a structural resource it would not be of any value at that point. I would hope the Historic Committee would recognize that. John Cassels; John Conti, felt a more reasonable estimate of repair for the springhouse would be on third of the \$450,000 that you previously stated. John Conti felt the springhouse was savable. This Board also sent a letter to the Bos recommending that the structure stay. Chris Cummings, we are not going to raise the springhouse. John Cassels, right now its being demolished by neglect. It is a springhouse, it’s not affected by water coming in but the roof does need repair along with the walls. Chris Cummings; we refer to the \$450,000 and it was basically because it would be difficult to ascertain the level of restoration. John Cassels, John Conti felt it would be a \$30, 000 job. Chris Cummings; There is considerable structural damage to the foundation of the stonewalls and should be taken down and possible be re-used for further restoration. We could to that. John Cassels; the springhouse is the water source for Beaver Creek. The Creek is spring fed, and that is listed in our comp plan as an opportunity for riparian restoration. It’s an important water resource feature. The springhouse is an historic resource, which I would think the Historic Committee would want to protect. There is also a picture of the springhouse in the comp plan. Bob Schini, what did the March letter say concerning the springhouse? Chris Cummings, it would remain on the property but there would be no further use of it. I feel this issue was settled at preliminary land development, in my opinion it’s not a planning issue. We were asked what are plans would be, it was submitted and that’s where it stands. The comment from Mr. MacCombie was he didn’t feel item number 11 on the conditional use order was addressed, but it has been addressed. We will put a note on the record plan. Item number 3, under Subdivision and Land Development – for the most part this is details that need to be added to the plans. Item 3a, talks about labeling the three lots on the plan, this is a much larger tract totaling 285 acres on this side of Culbertson Road. We are developing less than 185 acres of that. There is some labeling of the lots that will be done. There is some question of the gross of the tract areas that will be adjusted or justifying the differences, this might have something to do with the tract that was donated to the Township. This will be done before the plans are recorded. It was also noted we should supply additional perc test, that will be in process tomorrow. Permits from the Chester County Health Department are still outstanding, this was held up due to field plantings.

Bob Schini asked the Board for comments. Kim Hoopes, there still seems to be a question of the springhouse. We think is useable and they think not. Mr. MacCombies letter says the applicant does not address the re-use, upkeep and maintenance of historic structures. Chris Cumming, we have stated that we will maintain the buildings and reuse them for further operation. Until the time we need them they will be maintained and upkeep as farmsteads. The issue was the upkeep of the springhouse; our feeling was that is not something salvageable. We presented that at a public meeting with the BoS, my feeling was at the point that was the end of the resolution of the issue. Chuck Dobson; I would agree with you if the condition accepted out certain structures but it does not. Chris Cummings; it does not require any particular maintenance, it basically says give us your plan. The plan was submitted. Chuck Dobson, so your maintaining that as far as the springhouse in concerned you will comply with the last part of that condition which says continued upkeep and maintenance so as to prevent said structures from falling into any state of disrepair or lack of maintenance. Would you be maintaining the springhouse as is?

Chris Cummings; the letter states in view of the fact that the springhouse serves a lack of practical service, its difficult for the Archdioceses to justify the significant expense with the restoration. Accordingly the archdiocese has no plans for the maintenance or restoration of the structure. The archdiocese is held responsible for the reuse of the stone from the springhouse and incorporating the stone into the new cemetery office that is planned for construction. Kim Hoopes; that's the headwaters for Beaver Creek and I think it has some significance. John Cassels, but the springhouse does not do much for Beaver Creek. The purpose of the springhouse is water supply for the farm. It's more of an historic structure, rather than a water source. Chuck Dobson; is there a similar cost to adapt to reuse the stone from the springhouse and refurbishing the springhouse? Chris Cummings I don't think its going to cost \$250, 000 to incorporate the stone into the building. Ron Rambo, if you read the intent of the decision, the order gives approval for 185 acres to be utilized for the cemetery. Until such time they get to develop the remaining part. You can take a letter to the BoS that would work on not allowing the structure to deteriorate while its being used as a farmstead at such point they incorporate the existing building into the cemetery. After further discussion Bob Schini asked for a motion. Kim Hoopes made a motion to recommend approval of the All Souls Cemetery – Final Land Development Plan – (02-14-ASC), to the BoS with the following conditions, clean letter from Mr. MacCombie, establishment of escrows, Steven Jakatt seconded the motion with all members in favor with the exception of Chuck Dobson who abstained.

Ross Unruh discussed the YMCA proposed project along with the director of the YMCA and Ty Lienneweber, Ross Unruh, the YMCA is here to discuss there immediate plans to expand there parking area, and in the future to expand the building. Chris, director of the YMCA; the facility has been in West Brandywine Township for approximately twenty-five years, since that time we have grown with the community. In January of 2004, we had approximately 8400 members, the start of this year had jumped to 9700 members and currently in August we had 12,000 members. The membership has grown over 42% in the last twenty-one months, 23% overall. We have contacted other municipalities within our service area and have listing the information on housing starts that ended up totaling 12, 000 units. We anticipate the area growth to affect us tremendously. We would like to be prepared for this growth. With the use of our property, parking is not where the people want to use it. The east lot is usually full, and rather than people going to the west lot which is behind the facility back by the fields, they park on the grass in front of the pool area. In the summer you see the reverse. When the pool is open and the fields are busy, this lot is filled, (plan was referenced) people parking on the grass and then the grass in front of the pool area. Our intention right now is to expand the parking to accommodate future parking and also design and expand it to meet our future facility growth as well. Currently there are 219 parking spaces. We are part of a YMCA association with five branches. The benchmark used internally exceeds all the township requirements; we are going on the assumption of one parking space for every two hundred square feet. Under our current size that is about 265 parking spots. We are already undersized in parking at 219. What you see in red off the front of the building is our intension to expand the building to meet future needs. (dwg ref) We are not looking for approvals right now, but wanted the Board aware of our intentions.

Our goal is approximately one year from now to go out on Capital Fund raising Campaign to raise the money to expand the building. Its listed on the plan but its actually two phases. One phase is approximately eight thousand sq foot addition; the other phase is an eight thousand square foot addition with a two thousand foot lobby in the middle. A year from now we will raise funds for phase I and the lobby, it will be a total of about ten thousand sq foot addition. That would bring the facility up to about sixty-four thousand sq feet. The parking needs based on the calculations we are using is about 320 spots. What we are looking to do now, is increase the parking to 350 spots, so it would meet the plans that we have in the near future. If by chance we received a large amount of money, and allowing us to go on with the second phase that would bring up the facility up to seventy-three thousand sq feet. Under our calculations would be approximately 365 spots. We are at 350 once the engineering starts. We have the ability to continue that parking design across the front if it's needed. That would bring us up to 400 spaces. We don't anticipate that we would ever need 400 spots. The concept consists of blowing the front of the building forward but in addition we are adding parking across the front. We have a large number of special need members and will be turning the entire first row into handicap parking. We will bump out the 15-minute parking that we currently have in the front.

We have taken the opportunity to expand the rear parking lot. That is our intent on this project. Ty Lienneweber, I have not done any preliminary design to see what the size of the basin should be. We have to meet the NPDES requirements for infiltration so that would be incorporated into part of the buildings. We are looking to expand the basin in this direction but we are also looking at coming down into this area. (dwg ref) At this time we are not looking at removing any trees. We are proposing another under ground system over here (dwg ref) that's if it's needed we would do some storage in here. Knowing how Mr. MacCombie reviews the plans, we would propose a level area that would have a wetland planting type of plants that would filter the impurities before it gets into your natural stormwater storage. It will be forebay without holding the water back it will just be a flat area so the water slows down tremendously and has a chance to filter through the plantings. Under the NPDES requirements is water quality infiltration, which is the preferred method. We will do water infiltration that is required as much as we can knowing that we are not going to create a problem down the road.

YMCA representative, lighting that we have in front of the building to the west side is angle lighting. That is something we would like to correct and continue the proper down lighting that we have on our east parking lot. We will be able to fix the lighting inconsistencies on the YMCA campus. Ross Unruh, for our formal submission we would like to do a Preliminary/Final submission being it's only for a parking lot. Ty Lienneweber we will be doing all the storm water management for the entire project, we want to get the entire infrastructure in now. After further discussion Bob Schini thank the representatives for their presentation. Ron Rambo, I have had some discussion with the YMCA, and I am also on their Board, I brought to their attention the need to have Hurley Road widen to accommodate both turning lane "A" east bound into it as well as the deceleration point going west and if that is approved we go the "Y" and the Township and approach the School District for additional twenty-five foot right away on the school property to shift Hurley Road over that comes out to Reeceville Road approach, ninety degree intersection at some point in the future. We have the School district committed for land. It would be twenty-five foot along all their frontage and additional twenty-five foot right of way on the existing right of way along all Hurley Road and all Reeceville Road. After future discussion the board thanked the representatives for their presentation.

John Snook The Final draft for the Comprehensive Plan has been completed for some time. By law a public presentation of the comprehensive plan before the Planning Board is required prior to the BoS being able to consider adoption of the plan. Implementation strategies were developed based on the successful regulatory programs and land development review practices that the Township has embraced over the past several years, starting with the adoption of the OSRERP. The implementation approaches respond to the community planning goals and objectives identified in Chapter Two. Strategies respond to on going changes in real estate market conditions and focused on the perspective of the Township's role.

The horizon for this Comprehensive Plan is twenty years out, and will be subjected to further review and revision or update within a ten year time period. They include immediate action items, ranging from initiation of specific programs to resolution of policy issues and revision to local regulatory provisions. These are intended to be undertaken or initiated within the first two years after adoption of the Plan. Further strategies are articulated as short-term action items for initiation within the next two to five years. Other strategies represent standing policy or on-going programs, some are already underway and others recommended for initiation herein. They are intended to continue throughout the life of this plan until subsequent update. Recommended strategies also include suggested items for further or follow up study prior to implementation with the follow up also to be initiated in two to five year time frame. Recommended Immediate Action Items- Initiate Transportation Capital Improvements Plan. Assign Parks and Recreation Board or appoint a Trails Committee with the responsibility to oversee planning and implementation of the Community Trails system. Apply for grant funds to enable the development of a detailed Community Trails Plan based on the Concept Map. Initiate Township Open Space Program – appoint a standing Open Space Committee with representation of the Township, landowner and community interest. Upon recommendation of the Open Space committee, confirm or revise the basic mapped focus for open space protection priorities, particularly those to which Township open space funds may be applied. Specific priorities for acquisition of conservation interest should be assigned on a parcel by parcel basis, based on continuity of open

space and presence of significant natural and or cultural resources including: Class I and II woodlands, forested interior habitat, agricultural properties, identified scenic landscapes and lands within the designated Highlands area and within biodiversity corridors established in Chester County's Linking Landscapes. Priorities should also reflect known or anticipated opportunities based on landowner intentions, current statutory requirements for either easement acquisition or resale of purchased land with using Township open space funds and potential use of other than Township funds. Initiate Community and Landowner Education Program – designate Township or other parties responsible to educate the community and individual landowners using tools such as the Township Newsletter, focused community or landowner meetings and support of activities that promote the following; Information to owners of priority open space parcels including the results of proactively applied “Focused Regulatory Analyses” and the services of a professional land conservation organization as appropriate, regarding the options available for conserving otherwise developable lands and resources, while still achieving financial benefits, whether through use of limited development approaches, TDR, sale or donation of conservation interest or other means. Reforestation of opens riparian buffers as well as protection and maintenance of existing forested riparian buffers. Use of remaining small areas of undeveloped prime agricultural soils community supported agricultural operations. Architectural design of highly visible structures consistent with scenic and historic resource protection objectives and water conservation. Initiate Development and Subsequent Adoption of Ordinance revisions. Establishment of a TDR program Elimination of bonus density applicable to general provision of excess open space under the OSDO, possibly modified or replaced to provide more specific incentives for protection of Class I and ii woodlands, forested interior habitat and other high value open space resources. Effective mandate of use of the OSDO within the Future Land Use Plans Open Space designation. Extension of by-right use of the OSDO. Required compliance the “Four Step” design process at the time of Conditional Use application wherever a land development is involved. Extension of riparian buffer requirements and woodland disturbance limitations in riparian corridors and wetland margins. Specific stipulation at the discretion of the Township to require riparian reforestation where appropriate. Allowance of agri-tourism as a means to help the Townships remaining farms stay in operation. Initiate Request to Chester County to amend the “Livable Landscapes” map. The Township should submit a letter of request to Chester County to amend the Livable Landscapes” map to incorporate “Rural Center” landscape designations generally encompassing the “Rural-Suburban Mixed-Use” overlay designations indicated on the Future Land Use Plan. Recommended Short-Term Action Items – Explore post office consolidation. Continue discussions with the municipalities abutting WBT regarding potential opportunities for further cooperative police protection. Consider establishment of an optional means for land development applicants to partially fulfill Site Analysis submission requirements through initial digital submission of surveyed out bounds of property upon which the Township GIS consultant of a fee basis will overlay comprehensive resource information compiled for the Plan for subsequent use by applicant in demonstrating compliance with “Four Step” design process. Develop detailed Community Trails Plan. Consider further revision to land use regulatory ordinances. Recommend standing Policy and Ongoing Action. Continued effective administration and enforcement of existing regulations, Implement Township Open Space Program, Implementing Trials Program. Support the ongoing regional effort to designate Indian Run as an exceptional value stream. Promote use of appropriate Best Management Practices. Suggested Follow-Up Planning Activities – monitor potential development opportunities under applicable zoning regulations periodically in order to continue to meet fair share and MPC mandated requirements to provide for a literal diversity of housing types. Monitor and document traffic and roadway conditions in order to exhibit the need for improvements to PennDOT and other that provide funding for improvements not funded by impact fees. Monitor and consider formal study and documentation of the effects of new development on current and future levels of service provision and expansion. Continue analysis and consideration of the options for future fire protection services. Pursue a more formal and detailed inventory historic resources than has been included in this Plan or may be developed under current efforts. Consider further study of hydric soils mapping within the Township to determine an ensure appropriate levels of protection for soils where land development is proposed particularly where existing mapping sources may be insufficiently accurate. Consider a technical appraisal of wetland resources to provide a Township wide assessment of their extent biodiversity and water resource management functions and relative sensitivity to development impacts, to help inform future decisions regarding stormwater management, wastewater discharge, open space management, landscape restoration and potential future regulatory amendment. Explore means to utilize gray water irrigation for golf courses and similar uses. Consider study of the potential for wastewater for wastewater irrigation approaches,

which retain agricultural fields and community gardens in open space without unduly limiting their productive use as well as design approaches such as discharge to artificial wetlands, which may mitigate potentially negative impacts of stream discharges of wastewater.

Meeting reminders were read at this time.

Bob Schini, asked for a motion to close the meeting. Steven Jakatt motioned to adjourn at 10:06 p.m. Kim Hoopes seconded the motion with all members in favor

Joann C. Ranck

Planning Commission Secretary

MinSept05