

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
Thursday, January 26, 2006

The West Brandywine Township Planning Commission Re-Organizational meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m.; Bob Schini led the members in the pledge of allegiance. Those members in attendance were; John Cassels, John Conti, Anita Fernez, Kim Hoopes, Steven Jakatt & Bob Schini.

Bob Schini asked for nominations for Chairman, Vice Chairperson and Planning Commission Secretary for West Brandywine Township Planning Commission Board for the year 2006.

Anita Fernez nominated Bob Schini for Chairman, Steven Jakatt seconded the nomination, all members were in favor of the nomination. Bob Schini thanked the Board for there support throughout the year and accepted the nomination for 2006.

Steven Jakatt nominated Anita Ferenz for Vice Chairperson; Kim Hoopes seconded the nomination with all members in favor. Anita Ferenz accepted the nomination.

Steven Jakatt nominated Joann C. Ranck for Planning Commission Secretary; Kim Hoopes seconded the motion with all members in favor. Joann C. Ranck accepted the nomination.

Bob Schini asked for a motion to close the re-organizational meeting. Kim Hoopes motioned to adjourn the meeting at 7:06 pm, Steven Jakatt seconded the motion with all members in favor.

Joann C. Ranck
Planning Commission Secretary

The West Brandywine Township Planning Commission meeting was then called to order at 7:08 p.m., Bob Schini led the members in the pledge of allegiance. Those members in attendance were; John Cassels, John Conti, Anita Fernez, Kim Hoopes, Steven Jakatt & Bob Schini. Chuck Dobson took his seat on the Board at 7:24 pm.

Bob Schini asked for acceptance of the minutes for the December 22, 2005 meeting. Steven Jakatt motioned to accept the minutes for the December 22, 2005 meeting and have any revisions to the Planning Commission Secretary within one week. John Conti seconded the motion with all members in favor.

Public Comments; Ross Unruh, Gary Green & Chris Saclo to present a petition of the YMCA to amend the Zoning to provide a parking requirement for Community Recreation Facility. Ross Unruh; Gary Green is the CEO of the YMCA's of Brandywine Valley, and Chris Saclo is in charge of the local YMCA on Hurley Road. (parking analysis handouts were given to the Board) The petition before the Board is limited to the standard for parking requirements. The West Brandywine Township ordinance does not address this type of facility. In the near future the Brandywine YMCA will be coming in with a land development plan to add parking and sometime thereafter will come in for an expansion of the building.

Representative Gary Green; the YMCA is in the process of working on growth and expansion for all our branches. At this time we have five operating units. We started our process in East Goshen on how we would be able to present credible information on what we feel are realistic parking needs for our organization. A study was done 12 months ago that involved the Brandywine, Kennett and Southern Chester County YMCAs'. We used this study to present to East Goshen Township. Our staff did manual counts of all three YMCA's parking lots for a two week period, Monday thru Friday, at 6, 7 and 9 am in the morning and 4, 5, 6 and 7 pm in the evening. These are typically high usage periods. The first quarter of the year is typically our highest volume indoor use. This gave realistic base points as far as our traffic was concerned. Cards were scanned to keep track of the traffic in the building. Quarter one had the highest usage. If we open up early in the morning it starts to pick up at 6 am, we have a peak around 8:20 am to 9:00 am, in the middle of the day it curves back down and picks up again in the evening. This correlates to our parking peaks. The outdoor pool usage is highest between 12 and 4:00 o'clock in the afternoon. This is the slow time during the day. We are able to accommodate the peak of an outdoor pool during the summer time, with the usage of the rest of the facility during the morning and evening. In West Chester we are doing a 80,000 sq. foot building, we calculated a reasonable number to give us a cushion in terms of our membership which we determined would be 320 cars for an 80,000 sq. foot building. Beyond that we identified parking for staff that would be an equivalent of twenty cars between the part and full time staff that would be coming and going throughout the day. Three hundred and forty cars would be the numbers we would be using. That number seemed to be reasonable with West Goshen Township. In terms of YMCA membership; projected in West Chester is 14 to 15 thousand by the time that building fills to capacity. In Kennett Sq. we are running 12,000 members with a parking capacity of somewhat less than that. We feel we will have excess capacity through any of the growth curves we hit. We proposed a variance to the people in Narvon Township for a future YMCA. They granted us a variance on that so we will be building the same size parking lot for the building in Narvon. We would like to ask West Brandywine to allow us to use that same pattern as we go forward being our particular usage is not laid out as a specific ordinance. It would not be in our best interest to propose something that we know would not work.

The Brandywine branch parking lot was laid out years ago for a facility that has grown over the years. The excess parking is in the back by the ball field and does not relate well to our customers. In the master plan we are working on now, we would like to get our parking situation resolved first. There is still the need to address entrance issues and traffic pattern flow issues. Parking would be more beneficial toward the front of the building making it more convenient and accommodating for future growth. The YMCA is aware they would have to agree on a particular amount on a sq. footage basis and would have to stick with that. We feel this request would give us more than enough excess to handle the crowds as we go forward with an excess capacity for those special occasions.

Steven Jakatt; I can see the YMCA needing parking now and again down the road. Have you looked at vertical parking? Gary Green; no, we know it can be done; it's just an expensive alternative.

Parkesburg is a possible location for a future YMCA expansion. A commitment has been made to have a YMCA within 10 miles of anyone that lives in our service area. That should take some pressure off the Brandywine site. John Cassels; you're petitioning for us to recommend to the Board of Supervisors that we agree with this amendment to the existing zoning? Is it because the use is not identified in the ordinance? Gary Green; correct there are no guidelines to go by. Ross Unruh; the building was built in 1981 and I don't know what standards they may have used. Chris Saclo; part of the challenge is not the design flaw but more the seasonality of the building.

At this time we only have 232 spots, there are also a couple dozen cars on the grass for convenience sake. We don't necessarily need more space but we need it in the right place. John Cassels; currently there is no use for this type of facility, and your suggesting a minimum of 250 spots, what about the next facility that comes into the Township, can you give me another example. Gary Green; we are relatively unique because of the variety of uses we have. John Cassels; your talking about buildings sq. feet and you all ready recognize there are other fields that could be put into the equation. Ross Unruh; they will be designing to the standard. John Cassels; is this level too high and would it become burdensome for future applicants? Gary Green; if you grant the variance, it would be a case-by-case decision, if you change your ordinance that would be different and that is what we are asking of the Township. Ross Unruh; we are asking that you change the ordinance; it would be better to have uniform standards. Gary Green; would it help if you just made it to accommodate YMCA's? Steven Jakatt; I would be more in favor of a variance for this particular case instead of changing the whole zoning ordinance. John Cassels; the categories in that ordinance don't fit anything; If you look at that table this is the highest requirement for parking for this type of use. (ref handout) Gary Green; we arrived at this because it corresponded to the figures of what they asked for in East Goshen.

John Conti; the two weeks in February when the cars were counted are by far the most popular two weeks of the year. I would think you could cut the amount of cars in half, even on the average months. They picked the most used two weeks. There is parking in the rear of the building that is not being used. If it's in ordinance form then its law and you don't have to go for variances every time someone comes in that doesn't cover there specific needs.

Chuck Dobson, when you define recreational facilities does that exclude a Golds Gym, or other types of private users that want to come in. If Golds Gym comes in and they have 2,000 sq feet, that would require eight parking spaces, which would probably not be enough. That is what we are concerned with. The ordinance could expand the definition of Community Recreational Facility, I don't know if you can separate that out from a private enterprise like Golds Gym or another user. Ross Unruh; we could try to define this in terms of the specifications and the number of parking spaces. Thought can be given to how we can tie down Community Recreational Facility to site specific. Chuck Dobson; being non-profit might be part of the definition process that helps to key the YMCA in and someone else out. Ross Unruh; I will look at some other ordinances to see how they address this particular issue. Steven Jakatt; massaging or playing with a potential ordinance so it does not unduly burden someone else, why not just a variance? Massaging the ordinance could take weeks. Kim Hoopes; I would rather see a variance instead of amending an ordinance just for one facility. Chuck Dobson; the YMCA would have to prove hardship if they went before the Zoning Hearing Board. Ross Unruh; our problem is we don't have a standard. Is there a consensus that 250 spaces and the spaces for the employees be an appropriate standard? Bob Schini is there consensus of the Board that 250 sq ft for every parking space plus parking for employees is a reasonable stand? This may not work for the next person that may fit the same definition. Kim Hoopes; that is why I would rather they go for a variance. Ross Unruh; I will try to narrow the definition down and try to eliminate your concerns. Steven Jakatt, he is still designing it to the Brandywine YMCA, I would like to see this done the right way being a variance. Ross Unruh; we would like to have a standard going forward. We want to do the parking, which will deal with future expansions as well as current needs. We are just trying to come up with a standard primarily to deal with this facility. It seems to me there is more concern about having a type definition than a standard. I will go look at other ordinances in other places for information.

Bob Schini, would the Board feel comfortable recommending to the BoS, to amend the ordinance. Kim Hoopes; I am not agreeing to amend the ordinance. Steven Jakatt, I agree with Kim, the 1 per 250 sounds all right, but I am not agreeing to amend the ordinance. Ross Unruh, there are two people reluctant to the zoning change which I feel

is the better way to go for both sides, the other is type and definition. I will try to alleviate some of the apprehension in that regard. I would like to wait until the next meeting until I come up with a definition, talk it over with Ron and have something back to you next meeting. Ron Rambo; you could come up with an Indoor Community Recreational Facility and Outdoor Community Recreational Facility. Since Ross is doing this now, you can split the two, come up with two definitions with two different parking standards.

At this time Bob Schini asked the Board for a motion. Chuck Dobson, I motion that we accept the parking density of one space for two hundred fifty square foot plus one space for every two full time employee and the applicant expand upon the definition, and recommend the BoS consider the zoning change as presented by Ross Unruh upon agreement of a satisfactory definition for the use at hand. John Conti seconded the motion Steven Jakatt was against the motion and was against the zoning change, if we recommend something to the BoS it has to be a whole document, it has to be a definition plus the way its defined. I am not against the needed parking space, just the method. Kim Hoopes & John Cassels were in agreement with Steven Jakatt. Ross Unruh, we will come back next month, we would rather not have the motion at this time. Chuck Dobson and John Conti withdrew their motion on the advice of the applicant. Ross Unruh thanked the Board for there time and stated they would come up with a definition for next months meeting.

First item under old business; Schnatz & Rohrer Landscaping Inc. – Preliminary/Final Land Development Plan (00-05-SCHROH) prepared by Lake Roeder Hillard & Associates – Industrial Storage Building for Vehicles concerning Landscaping Business. Clock started Thursday May 25, 2000 and continues until Thursday, March 30, 2006. No representatives were present. Bob Schini asked for a motion. Kim Hoopes motioned to table the Schnatz & Rohrer Landscaping Inc. – Preliminary/Final Land Development Plan; Steven Jakatt seconded the motion with all members in favor.

Glen Loch Subdivision. – Minor Subdivision Plan (05-06-LODGE) – Applicant; Cannon Lodge Bldg - Location, Hurley & Baker Road. Hurley Road Subdivision. Proposed three-lot subdivision. Prepared by Edward A. Korab PE. Clock started October 27, 2005 and continues until Wednesday, March 1, 2006.

Representative present was Edward A. Korab who stated he was requesting a three lot subdivision and two building lots off of Barker and one main lot that will be left there for the time being with the existing historic structure on it.

The owners have agreed to rehab the historic structure in accordance to the recommendations of the historic committee. All three lots have been perc'd and information has been given to Chester County Health Department. We are waiting for a response from the CC Health Department so these systems can be designed. In the last two months I have had meetings with Mr. MacCombie to go over some issues.

With respect to the two lots on Baker Road, we are going to be submitting separate grading plans for each one of those once the septic is designed and they know the style of the house.

For the remaining lots when we pick up the wetland area and the steep slopes we are left with 8.8 acres for future development. The house will be on its own lot when the rest of the parcel is subdivided. With this submission we are requesting three waivers. A waiver from Section 167-9(a)(5), to allow us to go on to a future subdivision of what we are calling lot number one. Once we know how all of its going to fall into place, then we will proceed. A waiver from 167-63 natural features protection plan, with the development of these two lots, they are fairly open, and this house will remain. That is something we will be facing with the major subdivision. A waiver for 167-65 a conservation of woodlands, hedgerows and specimen vegetation. These are open in this area, nothing will be bothered here (dwg ref) when we get to the major subdivision we will then address those various issues. I don't know what my soils are in some of these areas so probing is required. A lot of this layout is going to hinge on how we go ahead and start the engineering on the rest of this piece, then I can come up with a better concept, one that does not require any variances or changes.

Jamie MacCombie would like this road (dwg ref) to come in at more of a right angle to that point, we know we should be in this area with the road access due to good visibility up and down. This plan is just a concept. I am here to get a recommendation from the Planning Commission Board for the subdivision of three lots. Mr. MacCombies letter states that all the issues relative to the subdivision are taken care of. There are some comments relative to the concept sketch. We are hoping to move forward with subdivision approval. Kim Hoopes; Mr. MacCombies letter states concern about the steepness of the proposed cul-de-sac and how much excavation needing to be done. I did suggest last time having the right-of-way coming in off of Baker Road. Ed Korab; we tried that; if we had to go the minimum right-of-way what we could put in there would be fifty feet. Doing that would take away two lots. Mr. MacCombie suggested that we not do that but try to work out a right-of-way in this area. (dwg ref) We have some grades that are greater than ten percent; I don't know how that driveway is going to work yet. There is still a lot of work to be completed on the rest of this site. Kim Hoopes; from what I see you are going to come back and say I can't get a road in there so I want to have all these driveways coming down Hurley Road. Ed Korab; the owners don't want to do that. I may need a waiver from your land development ordinance if I can get a roadway at thirteen percent and not ten percent. Ed Korab; thirteen percent is steep, although retaining walls would make it work. Kim Hoopes; that sounds more costly then bringing in the road off of Barker. Why not extend the lots to the west a little so you make up the difference in your square footage? I feel the construction of the road would be less costly. Ed Korab; the option was discussed with Mr. MacCombie and he did not particular care for that. Mr. MacCombie also suggested that we deed restrict this one lot (dwg ref) so that whoever builds on it cannot have access onto Hurley Road, only a driveway onto Baker Road. Kim Hoopes; I agree with that. Are you proposing a single drive coming out there for those two lots?

Ed Korab; no I am proposing separate driveways for each lot. My client did not want to see a common driveway. Ron Rambo; were you presented with a sketch plan that I prepared for the site from your client? Your client and I discussed this sketch plan for two hours, we changed the configuration of the two lots you were proposing, we put the fifty-foot right-of-way back into the entire track off of Baker Road, it would give temporary easement through, giving time for the road to be built. That came up with over eight lots, with proper road frontage, and proper setbacks. Ed Korab; I was never told or shown the sketch plan. Chuck Dobson; why did you feel you would lose those two lots by putting in a road. Ed Korab; we needed a fifty-foot right-of-way. If I use a fifty-foot right-of-way I can't count that in my area for frontages. Ron Rambo; you could have put the fifty-foot right-of-way where the common driveway was proposed and still come up with the minimum frontage required for those two lots. You would have given a temporary easement through that right-of-way to those two new lots to utilize until such time the public street was built. Once the public street was built they would then enter onto that public street. Ed Korab; Information was never given to me. My client has asked me to move forward with this setup and worry about the rest down the line. It's important for them to get started. Kim Hoopes; we need to worry about what's down the line, and that would be the placement of that road to access the rest of those lots. Ron Rambo; on the January 8, 2006 plan what was showing as far as driveways? Ed Korab; the plan shows two different driveways, two lots. The only thing different from the plan you are looking at to the plan James MacCombie referenced based on the meeting we had, is the numbers in the chart for area and bulk being revised. Ron Rambo; your client Ron Scott has the sketch I drew. Ed Korab; Ron Scott told me he sat down with you and had some thoughts on it, but to proceed with the plan. Ron Rambo; I will be at James MacCombies office tomorrow, I suggest you get the sketch plan from Ron Scott and meet me at James MacCombies office. Ed Korab; is the consensus of the Board that you would rather see this access way based on a sketch that was given to Ron Rambo? Ron Rambo; it would be based more on a better means of access and less intrusion into the steep slopes.

Bob Schini asked for a motion. Steven Jakatt motioned to table the Glen Loch Minor Subdivision Plan, Chuck Dobson seconded the motion with all members in favor. (extension letter was received by the Township)

Culbertson Realty Associates LP – Culbertson Village Final Subdivision Plan (04-04-CULVILLAGE), prepared by DL Howell Associates, located at Horseshoe Pike & Swinehart Road. Proposed 178 Townhouses. Clock started Tuesday, November 22, 2005 and continues until Sunday, February 19, 2006. There were no representatives present. Ross Unruh submitted a letter of extension, and stated there was nothing to discuss at this

time. Bob Schini asked for a motion. John Conti motioned to table the Culbertson Realty Associates LP – Culbertson Village Final Subdivision Plan; Kim Hoopes seconded the motion with all members in favor.

New Business - Balderston Family LTD Partnership/Swinehart Realty Associates LP –Final Swinehart Subdivision Plan (04-03-CULSWH), prepared by DL Howell Associates, located at Culbertson Run & Swinehart Road. Proposed 115 Single Family Dwellings. Clock started Thursday, December 22, 2005 and continues until Tuesday, March 21, 2006. There were no representatives present. Bob Schini asked for a motion. Kim Hoopes motioned to table the Culbertson Realty Associates LP – Culbertson Village Final Subdivision Plan; Steven Jakatt seconded the motion with all members in favor.

Sketch Plan; Chester Point development Corporation, proposed a two lot subdivision on Gabel Road. Representatives present were Dean Meyor and Philip Zelkind. Ron Rambo; the surveyor that surveyed the road for you this past week needs to fix the hole correctly on the newly paved road. The surveyors were digging spikes trying to find them and damaged the road. Dean Meyor; I will inform them to correct the situation. We don't seem to have any problems with the ordinances concerning the sketch plan before you. The site totals 4.2 acres. Site is located on the east side of Gabel Road. We have rights on the property along with the gentleman that owns the property. The owner will take one lot and we will take the other. We will be back to the Board with a Preliminary/Final submission. The Board was favorable to the plan and did not see any major issues.

Bob Schini; the letter from John Vilcheck, will be discussed at next months meeting.

Meeting reminders were read.

Bob Schini asked for a motion to close the meeting. Steven Jakatt motioned to adjourn at 9:27 pm, John Conti seconded the motion with all members in favor

Joann C. Ranck
Planning Commission Secretary

Plann/MinDec05