

**PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING**  
**Tuesday, March 1, 2005**  
**(February Meeting)**

The February 24, 2005 meeting was held on Tuesday, March 1, 2005 due to inclement weather.

The West Brandywine Township Planning Commission meeting was called to order at 7:35 p.m., Bob Schini led the members in the pledge of allegiance. Those members in attendance were; Bob Schini, Steven Jakatt, John Cassels, Joseph Boldaz and Anita Ferenz. John Conti took his seat on the Board at 7:38 pm.

Bob Schini asked for acceptance of the minutes for the January 27, 2005 meeting, Steven Jakatt motioned to table the minutes. Joseph Boldaz seconded the motion with all members in favor.

Public Comments: N/A

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 Friday, Tuesday, March 29, 2005. No representative was present. Bob Schini asked for a motion. Steven Jakatt motioned to recommend rejection to the Board of Supervisors for the Schnatz & Rohrer Landscaping Preliminary/Final Land Development Plan (00-05-SCHROH), based on Mr. MacCombies review letter dated February 22, 2001. Under Zoning, Plans do not appear to completely address the requirements of Section 1506, it appears based upon 1506(c) (2a), a twenty foot wide perimeter planting strip is required for the entire perimeter of the tract to act as a effective screen. The total number of plantings required should be calculated from the table in Section 1506D(1). It appears based upon Section 1506E(9) that interior shade trees are required for the parking are (1506 E(9)(s) as well as a ten foot wide landscaped area around the perimeter of the parking area (1506 E(9)(4). Two parking details have been provided on sheet 2 for the parking areas. The applicant should determine the type of surfacing to be used and reflect that on the plans. In addition if the parking area is to be stone as opposed to paved a detail of how the parking spaces are to be delineated by printed lines in accordance with Section 1501.3.4 of the Ordinance should be added to the plans. Under Subdivision and Land Development, Section 502.C.3.g requires sanitary sewer and any proposed connection to be indicated on the drawings and Section 806 prescribes the methods of Sewage Treatment and Disposal. With regards to the provisions of Sections 503.C(2)(g) and 810 the plan indicates the construction of a proposed permanent diversion channel along the Southerly portion of the property which diverts runoff from the South and the East in the vicinity of Manor Road to the Westerly Boundary line of the property adjacent to the lands of the Philadelphia Electric Company. We reiterate our concerns since it appears there is an existing ridge in the middle of the property, which directs runoff in both an Easterly and Westerly direction. John Conti seconded the motion with all members in favor

Brandamore Golf Course - Preliminary/Final Land Development Plan (00-10-BDMGOLF) Golf Course/Club House/Maintenance Building. Prepared by R.K.R. Hess Associates, Inc. Clock started Tuesday November 21, 2000. Letter was received from the applicant granting the Township an open-ended extension of time. No representative was present. Bob Schini asked for a motion. Steven Jakatt motioned to table the plan and Joseph Boldaz seconded the motion with all members in favor.

Hide Away Farms - Preliminary Subdivision & Land Development Plan, (By-Right) (01-02-HAFARMS) Hide Away Farms, property located at Special School Road. Prepared by Nave, Newell & Stampfl, Ltd. – 47 Lots in

West Brandywine Township. Clock started Thursday June 28, 2001 and continues until Tuesday September 25, 2001. Remains open, nothing new to discuss.

City of Coatesville Golf Training Facility – Preliminary Land Development (03-01-CCGTF) – Proposed Municipal Golf Facility – Prepared by Carroll Engineering Corporation. Proposed Municipal Golf Facility, located at Pratts Dam Road. Clock started Thursday, May 22, 2003 and continues until Wednesday, May 10, 2005. No representative was present. Bob Schini asked for a motion. John Cassels motioned to table the plan and Steven Jakatt seconded the motion with all members in favor.

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 March 4, 2005. Bob Schini noted an extension letter was received by the Township. Representative, Craig Poff was still working on the latest review letter from Mr. MacCombie and requested to go to the next submission. . Steven Jakatt motioned to table the Balderston Family LTD Partnership/Swinehart Realty Associates LP – Preliminary Subdivision Plan (04-03- CULSWH) plan, Joseph Boldaz seconded the motion with all members in favor.

Culbertson Realty Associates LP – Culbertson Village Preliminary Subdivision Plan (04-04-CULVILLAGE), prepared by DL Howell Associates, located at Horseshoe Pike & Swinehart Road. Proposed 178 Townhouses. Clock started Thursday February 26, 2004 and continues until Friday, March 4, 2005. No extension letter had been received. Craig Poff discussed the review letter dated January 26, 2005 from Mr. MacCombie. There are some issues in the review letter that don't apply or we are unable to comply with. The first issue being Landscaping, item 5a, it's a provision for perimeter buffering. We believe this is in the direction of the Conditional Use Order,

There are some view sheds from route 322 into the community that were to be preserved. The one being across the pond, and up into this area (dwg was referenced). The plan before you is compliant with the ordinance.

The proposal is to open this area up (dwg was referenced) so there is some semblance of a view of that hillside. Our proposal is that we meet all those objectives by preserving that view shed, and providing reasonable screening of the home sites through the homes that will be built and buffering that. Nothing will be put in front of the pond. Steven Jakatt, it seems you prefer the plan with fewer trees. You would be required to plant those trees on the north side. John Cassels; you mentioned trying to keep the vista open, yet you reduced trees across the entire tract. Craig Poff; just on the view shed part. Generally the perimeter buffering is identical on both, we feel both of these areas should be more open. (dwg referenced) Steven Jakatt, the open field to the north, it's not a wetland, at one time the sewage disposal area was supposed to go within. Not planting these trees would save the vista and also save you money. John Conti asked Craig Poff how many trees do you have to plant by the ordinance. Craig Poff; I can't answer that, we still have other things that are in question as to what is required and what is not. It's hard for me to differentiate between what we started with in the different areas. Your ordinance requires a calculation of a number of street trees based on both sides of the road where applicable. We will be working with the engineer to determine what is applicable. The application of the ordinance on this project, with single-family larger lot, it would not be a question. The problems arise with a multi type family situation. There is not enough room to put street trees within the community. As result you end up with trees that are on top of each other and planting in places not appropriate. Under Landscaping 5 b, c, & d we will comply with. Our landscaping concerns are with Section 200-107(c)(2)(b)(3) and 200-107 (d) (1) (c). On Section 200-107 (d) (1) (c) the table says to calculate a formula of a number of trees times the cartway of both sides where applicable. We need determination of what is applicable. Steven Jakatt, according to the latest plan for three inch caliber deciduous trees applicant would be required four hundred and seventy five, proposed is one hundred and five. Eight-foot high evergreen trees, applicant is required two hundred and thirty eight, proposed is one hundred and eight. Shrub requirement is one thousand eight hundred and ninety nine. Proposed is four hundred and thirteen. John Cassels, are your required numbers based on centerline or your interpretation? Craig Poff; it's more than centerline, but not two times the centerline. John Cassels; so the required numbers are even low. Craig Poff; one

should not dwell on the numbers but on the quality of the plants. Steven Jakatt; the ordinance was written for an open space township. The proposed community you presented might be too dense. Craig Poff; the zoning permits it we are trying to apply the subdivision ordinance.

Steven Jakatt; I am trying to apply the trees to the subdivision. John Conti; a better arrangement of the trees in the open space would work. You have them arranged so they block the view. I am looking at a row of trees, and a row of homes a road and a row of trees along the road, that's all I see. Most of them are on one side of the road. Craig Poff; we have many conflicts with driveways and utilities. I can guarantee you will not find a more tree friendly developer in the state of PA. There have not been too many multi-family communities in West Brandywine. When you have driveways next to driveways, you also have the electric, gas, phone, cable, etc., everything else has to be run through there. In the front of the homes the street tree configuration does not work. You would have roots therefore conflict. John Conti, I don't see a conflict in utilities. Craig Poff; if I go to comment 5 (c) in Mr. MacCombies review letter conflict of utilities is pointed out. There is money to be spent that can be wasted money. We are trying to propose a reasonable landscaping plan that creates value for the community without over kill. Joseph Boldaz; why did you reduce the screening on the bottom plan? Our landscape architect felt this intensity would create long-term maintenance problems. We would be glad to work with any landscape architect of the township. Craig Poff felt the most important place to put screening would along this area. (dwg was referenced) The Cross Creek Development will be buffered. John Cassels; it looks like a detention basin in the front northern corner. Are there any other plans for that field? Craig Poff, there are no plans as yet, it may still be a sewer area but for now, its just housing recreation. Steven Jakatt; it appears on the plan that Bentley Communities wants to cut the number of required trees, how about asking to back off to half of the trees, instead of down to a quarter like Craig Poff wants? In Mr. MacCombies letter it states it cannot support the requested relief at this time. Craig Poff, we are willing to work with the landscape architect of the townships choosing to resolve these issues, I don't think an engineer is qualified to give an opinion on long term viabilities concerning landscaping.

Comments from the public, Josef Obernier, 152 Baker Road, will there be a homeowners association and if so will the association be responsible for the replacement of trees in the development should they die? Craig Poff, there will be a homeowners association who will be responsible for the maintenance of the landscaping material but not for replacement.

Josef Obernier, are these trees considered part of the landscape and if the trees die does the homeowners association replace them? Ross Unruh stated it depended upon the circumstances. Josef Obernier, if the homeowners association is responsible to maintain the development would it not be their responsibility to replace the trees? Ross Unruh stated the developer has responsibility for up to eighteen months. Josef Obernier; if there is buffering around the development and the buffer dies after ten years, who is responsible for replacement? Ross Unruh, if the homeowner association wants to replace the trees they could. Josef Obernier; is there a requirement to replace the trees? Ross Unruh, normally there is not.

Josef Obernier; those people that are driving from the church heading eastbound, their view is toward the southeast and they will see this development and what your proposing is no trees or screening or if there are trees or screening at some point in time that could become a sewage recipient area. Craig Poff; we do not own any of this, (dwg referenced) that bufferage is much of this entire area from 322. Josef Obernier those people that drive eastwardly on 322 will be seeing the proposed facility. Can I presume that between the two representations the number of units and the location of those units are identical? Craig Poff, that's correct. Josef Obernier, when I look at the pictorial that's presented on the floor, I notice at the pond area and following that dark green, I noticed as you get to the southern south easterly, that's a light green and on the other diagram it looks like you were having something there. Craig Poff, that would be a couple hundred new trees. Josef Obernier, and you don't want to do that. Craig Poff, that's correct. There is no reason for it; you're not getting any use whatsoever. Craig Poff; one could go into the forest and plant trees but why. Ross Unruh, I think the purpose of the ordinance is to have reasonable landscaping to enhance the physical appearance. This requires some judgment on what is reasonable landscaping to accomplish the goal, which is to make the proposed development look good. I see

townships come up with onerous landscaping replacement requirements and there is no place to put them. The townships feel if they cut back they are giving the developer some kind of economical break. The purpose is not to create a fund for the township but to make the development look nice on a long-term basis. John Conti; maybe we should get a landscape architect, but who would pay for the architect that would be reviewing your plan? I disagree when you say why put trees there, it's more than just a visual thing. Craig Poff; our company has won more awards for tree preservation. John Conti, because it's so dense more the reason it should have trees. Craig Poff; we want to do a tasteful job screening, more is not always better. We would welcome the opportunity of the Townships choosing to work with that landscaping architect. Craig Poff, in reference to parking, we are providing parking overflow areas throughout the communities. There will be one and two car garages with ample length driveway to allow one or two cars in the driveway. Concern was that a car would encroach into the street right of way. There is overflow within the right of way now; we spoke with Mr. MacCombie's office about this issue. We don't believe the interpretation of the ordinance precludes the plan in front of the board. If determined it does not apply, we could do the following. We would push the homes four feet away from the road, creating longer driveways and more impervious surface, we would ask for a waiver for the right of way width, reducing fifty down to thirty three. It does not change anything on the plan other than moving lines on paper. Steven Jakatt, you have built many of these subdivisions, is there a significant number of the larger vehicles that would cause the blocking of the sidewalk. And if blocked, is there enough overflow parking to take up for those cars. Craig Poff; I used to live in a Bentley Home Community and never had a problem. I have a picture of one of our communities that show the driveway, sidewalk configuration. The footprint on these plans is exactly the same footprint. John Cassels; there is a township ordinance concerning parking on the street. Are you allowed to park in the right-of-way? Craig Poff, there is no ordinance that says you may not park in the right-of-way.

Ross Unruh, typically overflow parking in a townhouse developments is in the right-of-way. John Cassels will you be seeking relief? Craig Poff, no, we will seek an interpretation. We will not be providing a dedicated mail pick. There was some additional easement for construction across the front of the Whitley property. There is a question concerning the sewer line crossing 322, that's part of the overall sewer plan.

There was a comment that unit 136 is too close to the existing six foot diameter pipe that runs in the field by the Whitley property. We have re-located this townhome (plan reference) to this building. You will see this on the final plans. Sidewalks are not required in the community although we are providing sidewalks on one side. We are also providing a concrete sidewalk and an asphalt driveway. There is a request we provide a concrete apron. Due to cost, maintenance and construction related issues we will do it as proposed.

John Cassels, in the engineers' review it states pursuant to 167-39E require sidewalks to be installed on both sides of the street. Craig Poff, what he is referring to is in the section of code about street construction and then refers you to the appendix which show exhibits that show free profiles, typical width sidewalks, without sidewalks. It shows you single-family development; these are details to be used as typical when applicable. Ross Unruh, there is no language in the subdivision ordinance that you must have sidewalks anywhere, let alone on both sides of the street. We have provided the length of construction on the pond reconstruction. Comment in Mr. MacCombie's review letter request that we provide a plan for the white spot (dwg referenced), that is a later phase and this information will be submitted at a later time. Those are the items in Mr. MacCombie's letter that we aren't able to comply with 100%. John Cassels, the stormwater basin being eleven feet deep and its proximity to Unit 108, and 113. Craig Poff, basin two has been sized to be one and three quarter feet shallower, the orifice has been increased 3 1/2 inches to avoid clogging and a rack will be added. The proposed details have been added to the plan. It's a least 20 feet from the rear units of 109 through 114 on the new revised plan. Craig Poff, the only two issues that have substance are the landscaping and parking. The parking I feel can be easily resolved. We would encourage the township to engage a landscaping consultant and we will work with them to revise the plan. I talked to Mr. Rambo, and Mr. MacCombie last week and again today over any outstanding items, the only issues raised was the parking issues. Ross Unruh, we are asking for a recommendation to the BoS's for preliminary plan approval subject to the outstanding issues on Mr. MacCombie's review letter with the exception of the parking requirements and working with the landscaping architect. Steven Jakatt, you want a recommendation before we see if there are any waivers required. Craig Poff, waivers have been listed on the plan from day one. Landscaping

is an interpretation issue. John Cassels, you have requested relief from landscaping on the number of plantings and Mr. MacCombie's review letter is at least a thirteen-page review letter.

Ross Unruh, we will comply with all the issues on the review letter with the exception of the parking, and the landscaping. And we recommend that you get the benefit of the consultant so that whatever is recommended to the BoS's have the benefit of that expertise.

Craig Poff gave the letter of extension to the Board and asked that Mr. MacCombie expedite the review process and requested the township engage a landscape consultant at Bentley's expense to review the landscape plan. Bob Schini asked for a motion. Joseph Boldaz motioned to table the Culbertson Realty Associates LP – Culbertson Village Preliminary Subdivision Plan (04-04-CULVILLAGE), to recommend the letter of extension to the BoS's, a clean engineer letter, and urge the township engineer to expedite the next review prior to next month's planning commission meeting and request that the township manager obtain a landscaping architect to review the applicant's most recent submitted plan. John Conti seconded the plan, with all members in favor.

Craig Poff, concerning the Special Study, ACT 537 I would like to discuss this at next month's planning commission meeting.

St. Peter's Church – Preliminary Subdivision & Land Development Plan (04-06-PTCHURCH)– Proposed Catholic Church – Prepared by Nave Newell, Inc., located at Beaver Creek Road & Route 82. Clock started Thursday, March 25, 2004 and continues until Monday, March 4, 2005. Representative present was Greg Newell, who stated they have worked through the issues with Mr. MacCombie.

Church layout, parking, and sewer have stayed in the same location. We have been coordinating with the school. The planning modules have been set to DEP. Phase one will be the church itself, phase two will be the parish hall and parking, phase three will be the rectory. Primary reason for phasing is funding. The parish hall and parking, we didn't include that parking area. Landscaping, behind the rectory is an area of a farm that the farmer does not actively farm. The parish hall and parking, we did not include that parking area, the congregation size does not come close to warranty that many parking spaces.

We don't have to pave until we actually do all the designs and have all the approvals, we would also do our site grading. We have not decided how to set up escrow, but will be resolved at final approval. Landscaping, we spoke last time concerning planes within the riparian buffer. Behind the rectory is an area where the farmer is no longer farming. There is a pond, stream delineating the wetlands. We will be planting some trees in that riparian buffer. It's not Brandywine Creek, but there may be some merit to helping restore some of the natural appearance.

In the ordinance concerning common property lines there is to be a twenty-foot landscape buffer around our buildings. We have asked the BoS's, where the uses are the same kind, do you still provide that buffer. The school asked the BoS's and they agreed that they do not have to provide buffering to us, and we are asking for the same thing back. It's not a variance or waiver it's the BoS's evaluation of the landscaping. The next issue is buffering around our parcels, the ordinance gives the school the leeway to say it's already heavily landscaped these no need for you to have ours buffered.

Around this out parcel (dwg referenced) we have added landscaping along the western side of the property. We will provide some supplemental in areas where there isn't sufficient buffering. We will be talking to the BoS's concerning the landscaping issues. Mr. MacCombie's review letter talks about paving and a few technical management issues that can be resolved. The letter of March 1, 2005 will be submitted to the township manager.

The ordinance does not say I have to get a waiver, it says the BoS's have the option at their discretion to not require this. In submitting the March 1, 2005 letter, I am following in the footsteps of the school that submitted a letter with similar issues. Bob Schini,; there is a common ground between the church and the school and there is buffering around the out parts where your saying there is already significant buffering.

Greg Newell, this is a heavily landscaped area. If you tried to look in you could not see these buildings. Steven Jakatt, its my understating that Mr. Newell is going to work out the rough edges with Mr. MacCombie and we will be receiving a revised review letter. Greg Newell, we are going to re-submit plans, I believe that anything on here does not change any of the layout, land planning, bearing distances, things of that nature.

Greg Newell, the treatment plant has been designed to accommodate both the school and church. The township has approved the planning module and sent it to DEP who is doing their review. MacCombies office is not concerned whether the beds have enough capacity he believes that is all accurate. The concern is whether the school or the church will maintain the treatment plant, as the school opens before the church is there any equipment that is not turned on then, that should be turned on later.

The school has already submitted the planning modules. I have committed to get together with Jeff Miller who is doing the entire sewer design. If I can get formal approval I can sit down with the school and discuss cross easement details, and access to the sewer. Steven Jakatt; are there any portions of Mr. MacCombies February 22<sup>nd</sup> letter you don't agree with or don't comply with? Greg Newell, there are no issues I won't be able to resolve.

Infiltration, we have done some testing and it's our proposal to sump the bottom of the basin. I know that it infiltrates and the water would just sink into the ground. Mr. MacCombie wants us to dig a hole fill it with stone and let the water go into the stone. My point is why put stone in the ground if the ground itself infiltrates. We have some issues as to how we deal with things related to the basins that we will work out. Bob Schini isn't basin two a problem. You have three drainage basins. Greg Newell; you have two "A", two and one. Bob Schini; Evans Mill stated there was a problem with infiltration in basin two. Greg Newell, that is the low point on the site. The low points on the site are not the best locations for infiltration due to sediment run off. We were able to do infiltration in other locations to overcome that. To get back to Steven Jakatts question, yes I can address the engineer's comments. Steven Jakatt, I would feel more comfortable with a final review letter from Mr. MacCombie. Bob Schini asked for a motion. John Conti motioned recommendation to the BoS's to approve the letter from Nave Newell dated March 1, 2005 for relief of landscaping, Steven Jakatt seconded the motion, all members were in favor. Steven Jakatt, on the plan itself I would recommend that we table and wait for a clean review letter from Mr. MacCombie. Anita Ferenz, John Cassels, John Conti, Joseph Boldaz and Bob Schini motioned to recommend preliminary approval to the BoS's with all members in favor for the exception of Steven Jakatt.

Ridings of Hibernia – Final Subdivision – (04-09-RIDHIBA) – Prepared by Vollmer Associates LLP - Proposed 92 lots, located at the intersection north of Lafayette and Hibernia Road. Clock started Thursday, October 28, 2004 and continues until March 26, 2005. Representative present was Jenny Strelzik, there was a lot located here (dwg referenced) the planning commission felt there was too much of an intrusion upon the wetlands. This lot has been relocated to this area. (dwg reference) Since our last meeting we have had two production meetings with township staff including Mr. MacCombie. We are here to ask for final approval based on the comments of Mr. MacCombies letter dated February 23, 2005. A lot of the comments from Mr. MacCombie are addressed in our February 24, 2005 letter concerning waivers and modification.

Representative, item number five on Mr. MacCombies review letter, we met with his office to discuss the location of a pump station. The recommendation was that everything associated with the pump station be put inside the building. The building is within the sixty-foot front yard setback. The plans currently show fifty feet. This is something that will be added to the Conditional Use and discussed. It was agreed with Mr. MacCombie and Ronald Rambo, that the pump station and the treatment plant be separate. The grading of the basin, it was recommended by the BoS's we ask for a waiver from this section. (dwg referenced) There is an issue with the cul-de-sac being 1000 feet, our interpretation of the ordinance is from the centerline. MacCombies interpretation is from the intersection to the back of the dividing line.

Steven Jakatt, this subdivision was resurrected and pushed forward time and again. I'm looking at modifications of waivers, additional waivers, because you can't make it work. There are sixteen pages concerning Mr. MacCombies review letter and you want approval of a final plan?

Representative, we are not looking to ask for approval without meeting the letter and then walk away. We understand there are things in the letter that need to be ironed out. Its technical issues, it does not affect the planning or the locations of the lots. We need a waiver on the cul-de-sac for the additional seventy feet.

Steven Jakatt; your letter concerning waivers, on the first page your asking for modifications to existing waivers. Representative, these are modifications being handled through the Conditional Use Hearing. Steven Jakatt; you were given waivers in Conditional Use, and you are requesting additional waivers to those? Representative; the only one added to that is number five. Steven Jakatt; on page two you than have additional waiver request. Representative; your ordinance requires a two way modified base on the roads. We did not do a complete topographic of the plan. We have verified some of the contours

John Cassels, the plan is based on field survey performed by Vollimer Assoc. in September through November of 2003. Topography was based on aerial topography dated 1987. Your also not showing topo off site within 100 feet. Representative, we are just shy of 100 feet, it would be 75 feet. John Cassels is the 75 feet off the old plan or the new information? Representative, the old plan. John Cassels, you have stated you will not provide traffic impact study for single-family developments for eighty or more units when served by multi accesses.

We will utilize the interim fee. John Cassels, how do you determine the calculations for the number of trips. We have looked at the number of units, two cars, two trips. It would be four trips per house.

The waiver from standard one to infiltrate 52% of the volume required. Steven Jakatt; aren't you supposed to infiltrate 100%. Representative, this site will only yield 52%. (Plans were referenced as to where the beds where being placed). We tested all of those sites, between every other lot to determine infiltration.

John Cassels; the ordinance states that if you cannot infiltrate you are supposed to go on to the next standard. Representative; if you infiltrate 50% then you can discharge. The discharge would be put into the wetlands. John Cassels; that flow would get into the creek and then cross Hibernia Road, and find its way down to Brandywine Creek. Steven Jakatt; if the soils don't infiltrate maybe the subdivision should not be built. Maybe the number of houses should be reduced along with the proposed roads. How much of this wetland mitigation, how will that compensate for the additional run off, since your not infiltrating per our ordinance or you don't want to infiltrate per our ordinance how is the mitigation going to compensate for that? Will it take additional contaminates out of the water? Representative, that's the idea of the wetland at the infill ducts. The sediment from the road and the wetlands is used as a filter. That area is fairly flat. Types of plants have been specified for that area.

Representative; we have not provided a landscape plan for the lots. Most homeowners prefer to do their own landscaping. We are providing the buffering for the basins, for the perimeter, street trees. What you see on the details, if it's around the wetlands it will go in. If there are not wetlands on that lot than it's at the desecration of the homeowner whether he wants this landscaping plan of something else.

Bob Schini asked the Board for a motion, Steven Jakatt motioned to recommend rejection of the waiver for Section 200-83B, to allow the pump station to be located in the front yard setback, which is waiver 5 on page two, I recommend acceptance of waivers 1, 2, 3 and 4 on page three, which are to prepare the signage plan to be drawn to a scale of one inch to hundred feet, to prepare final plans of plan sheets 38x42 inches, to show topographic contours located less than 100 feet off the track, and use topographic data from more than two years old, and to use water resource information from data more than two years old I recommend acceptance of providing fee in lieu of community playground. I would recommend rejection of not providing a traffic impact study, rejection of the waiver from standard to infiltrate 52% of the volume requirement for the two-year storm. I recommend rejection to allow disturbance within the riparian buffer for base and grading on lot 78. If these are still on floor

concerning the Conditional Use Hearing then I recommend rejection of all six-waiver request. First two motions failed for lack of a second. John Conti motioned to recommend acceptance of request 1 through 6 on page two and 1 through 4 and 6 through 8 on page three and rejection of request 5 on page three and the coming waiver request for cul-de-sac greater than 1000' in length, John Cassels seconded the motion with all members in favor for the exception of Steven Jakatt. Jen Strelzik submitted a letter to the Board granting an extension of time. Steven Jakatt motioned to table the plan, Joseph Boldaz seconded the motion with all members in favor.

Coatesville Area Regional Catholic School – Final Subdivision & Land Development (04-02-CARS)– Proposed Coatesville Catholic Regional Elementary School – Prepared by EB Walsh & Associates Inc., located at Beaver Creek Road & Route 82. Clock started Tuesday, December 21, 2004 and continues until Sunday, March 20, 2005. No representative was present. Bob Schini asked for a recommendation, Steven Jakatt recommended tabling the Coatesville Area Regional Catholic School – Final Subdivision & Land Development, Joseph Boldaz seconded the motion with all members in favor.

Steven B. Janiec – Final Minor Subdivision Plan (05-01-JANBLD) Three-lot subdivision, located at 1639 Horseshoe Pike. Prepared by EB Walsh & Associates. Clock started Thursday, January 27, 2005 and continues until Tuesday, April 26, 2005. Representative present was Steven Janiec, who stated he had no problems with the comments in Mr. MacCombies review letter dated February 1, 2005 and will be addressing these comments. Steven Jakatt motioned to table the plan, Joseph Boldaz seconded the motion with all members in favor.

First under new business, Steven B. Janiec – Land Development Plan (05-02-JANICBARN) The Barn at Plank Farm, located at 1639 Horseshoe Pike. Prepared by EB Walsh & Associates. Clock started Tuesday, March 1, 2005 and continues until Sunday, May 29, 2005. Representative present, Steven Janiec; this plan is going through conditional use, there is no change from the original plan. We are following the conditional use order, the only difference is that we have a new antique dealer coming in, its not the same dealer presented at the conditional use hearing. The new antique dealer is more of a co-op; he will be renting out space. He is not going to have the secondary business that was presented at conditional use. We have changed our landscaping plans that went through conditional use. We have followed the same themes of not buffering in certain areas not presented in the conditional use.

There is wooded area in the back and in the conditional use we felt we did have to buffer anymore from the back. In our conditional use they were allowing buffering along here (dwg referenced) in the housing development and we still propose that. We have a new plan that made more sense for our development. Parking has shifted a little from the original plan. He wanted a gravel driveway to go in front, incase someone wanted to move a piece of furniture. Building sizes have not changed; there will be a farm porch roof in the front. The lighting plan is the same. Our parking is more than other antique co-ops. There will be twenty-nine parking spaces. Our storm water supplies another fifteen space. The building will be open six days a week. The upstairs of the barn will be used for semi storage. Bob Schini asked for a motion, John Cassels motioned to table the plan; Steven Jakatt seconded the motion with all members in favor.

Bob Schini requested a motion to adjourn. John Cassels motioned to adjourn at 12:02 p.m., Steven Jakatt seconded the motion with all members in favor.

Joann C. Ranck  
Planning Commission Secretary