

**PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTES  
April 22, 2004  
AGENDA MINUTES**

The West Brandywine Township Planning Commission meeting was called to order at 7:35 p.m., John Cassels led the members in the pledge of allegiance. Those members in attendance were; Joseph Boldaz, John Cassels, John Conti and Kim Hoopes. John Cassels asked for acceptance of the minutes for the March 25, 2004 meeting, Kim Hoopes motioned to accept the minutes with any corrections to be given to the Secretary within one week, Steven Jakatt 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 Wednesday, June 2, 2004. No representation was present. A letter of extension was received from the applicant. John Cassels asked for a motion. John Conti motioned to table the Schnatz & Rohrer Landscaping Preliminary/Final Land Development Plan (00-05-SCHROH), Steven Jakatt 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 representation was present. John Cassels asked for a motion. Steven Jakatt motioned to table the plan and Kim Hoopes 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.

Costa Homes Inc. – Preliminary Subdivision Plan (02-09-COSTA), prepared by ProTract Engineering, Inc. Property Location; Swinehart Road & Beaver Creek Road, proposed Lots, 26. Clock started Thursday, July 25, 2002 and continues until June 13, 2004. No representative was present. John Cassels asked for a motion. Kim Hoopes motioned to table the plan and John Conti seconded the motion with all members in favor.

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 and Route 340. Clock started Thursday, May 22, 2003 and continues until Tuesday, May 15, 2004. Letter of extension was received from the applicant. No representative was present. John Cassels asked for a motion. Steven Jakatt motioned to table the plan and Kim Hoopes seconded the motion with all members in favor.

Coatesville Area Regional Catholic School – Preliminary 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 February 26, 2004 and continues until Tuesday May 25, 2004. John Cassels asked for a motion. Steven Jakatt motioned recommending rejection of the plan unless an extension of time was received from the applicant. Rejection is based on Mr. MacCombies review letter dated

March 18, 2004 under Zoning, item 5b; the parking lot design does not appear to comply with the specific provisions of Section 200-107E(9)(d)&(f) in regards to the location of islands, permeable surfaces and pedestrian walkways. Kim Hoopes seconded the motion with all members in favor. Josef Obernier offered a suggestion that the name be changed to West Brandywine Catholic or Brandywine Catholic. A resident stated that Coatesville Area Regional Catholic School was a combination of the Catholic Schools in Coatesville. John Snook said they could change the name if the applicant chose to do so.

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 Tuesday May 25, 2004. No representative was present. John Cassels asked for a motion. Steven Jakatt motioned to recommend rejection of the plan unless an extension of time was received from the applicant. Rejection was based on Mr. MacCombies review letter dated April 13, 2004 that stated the plans were found to be both incomplete and deficient towards providing the information required by the Codes for a Preliminary Plan submission. These include major issues such as the absence of a sanitary sewer design, and incomplete storm drainage design, and no water line information. John Conti seconded the motion with all members in favor.

John Cassels, we have heard comments from the public regarding safety issues involving the connection to Raleigh Drive, we understand people on route 322 might try to come into the subdivision where Raleigh Drive is and cut through to the new proposed subdivision to get to their destination. I ask that there be a representative to speak for those present. If there is nothing new to present then we don't have much to talk about other than what the options are. The Planning Board will take a vote tonight and make a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors. The applicant, Greg Poff had previously stated he does not have an issue with the connection either way.

Suzanne Tucker presented a picture collage of children who lived in the neighborhood of the Raleigh Drive subdivision. Suzanne Tucker stated that safety for the children is the number one key issue and that included all children who use Spatola Park. The park is heavily used by children's sports team in the evenings and weekends.

Kim Hoopes, my daughter has a friend that lives on Raleigh Drive and when dropping her off, I have found the street quite busy with children. John Cassels, my son plays baseball at the park, I do understand it is a very busy field.

Jim Mitchell of 19 Gloucester Drive thanked the Board for allowing them to speak concerning the connection. The Board noted they have been over to Raleigh Drive to look specifically at the proposed connection. Jim Mitchell, while reviewing the traffic impact study, the proposed development as stated in the report propose one un-signalized access road along Culbertson Road and one un-signalized local access road along Swinehart Road. There is no mention of the proposed Raleigh Drive cut through. I don't understand why the Raleigh cut through is not discussed & pictured within the traffic impact report. Raleigh Drive is not shown on the diagrams or maps within the report. How are you prepared to vote when the traffic impact study does not discuss the issue. I spoke with Brandywine Regional Police Chief Mark Kocis, he requested to see a traffic impact report that would show him what would happen to our neighborhood as a result of the proposed cut through, there is nothing I can show him. This is the third time I am asking who is responsible for traffic calming measures should the cut through become an eventuality. The round trip drive is seven tenths of a mile without the cut through. One of the things the traffic impact study does discuss is that there are delays that exist at the signalization light at Little Washington at peak hours in the morning and afternoon. Trying to go out the back door to avoid 322 isn't going to work according to the traffic impact study. We don't need a back door. Clearview Drive, has a severe "S" curve in the middle of their neighborhood. Whoever built that development took into consideration traffic calming measures. You are not going to be able to go into our neighborhood and put in a severe "S" curve, it would be impossible. There are two important goals I would like the Board to consider. One is to satisfy the requirement of the Conditional Use Study and also preserve the quality of life in our neighborhood by voting for something other than a clear cut through.

Frank Montgomery of 12 Raleigh Drive thanked the Board for listening to their concerns, and thanked neighbors for coming out to the meetings. Frank Montgomery; pictures of the streets and roads we are talking about were taken. As you can see traffic is parked on the street from the baseball park. The community has approximately seventy homes. It's a quiet peaceful neighborhood; we all purchased our homes because of the privacy and the beauty of the neighborhood as well as convenience to main road arteries. Most of our concerns with this cut through are the safety of our community as well as those from other communities that use the park. Pictures show Raleigh Drive as a straight road from 322 and one short one and one very long one that you can see is a straight run that leads up to the entranceway to the proposed cut through. The shorter one is directly from my driveway, which is the entrance on the other side of the street that goes into the ballpark. Throughout our entire community Gloucester as well as Raleigh will become a potential speedway. The neighborhood has no sidewalks and no streetlights. The only curbs are in the West Brandywine area. Our children are forced to use the roads for multiple reasons. Walking to the school bus, playing, riding bikes, and walking. Downingtown school district allowed my eight-year-old daughters bus stop to be moved because they felt it to be unsafe to walk from our house down to 322. Adults ride their bikes in the neighborhood, they walk their children as well as pushing strollers. Our children will not be able to use the streets. In East Brandywine on street parking is allowed, with no curbs or sidewalks, cars parking in the streets, how are all these additional cars going to come through there safely. Residents of East Brandywine versus West Brandywine are already burdened with the heavy traffic on weeknights and Saturdays because of the ballpark. Between five and six o'clock the onslaught of cars start coming into the park. When you add another hundred and ten homes the traffic will be crazy. Safety in general for all that use Spatola Park and all the neighbors is our concern. In the last three days I almost saw three kids get hit by a car and that's with traffic as is. There was a young child playing with a ball in the middle of his driveway. The child lost the ball and followed the ball through the street into my yard. I saw a group of boys playing in a driveway close to the street, a car was coming out of the park and the boy fell from his bike in front of the car. This was at Spatola Park, but these are the kind of things we are seeing already. With one hundred and ten new proposed homes our calculations come to four hundred extra cars traveling on our roads. Our concerns are with the ones that do not live in either community, the ones that find the cut through. Their main interest is getting from point "A" to point "B" the fastest possible way. We are being told the whole concept is being done for safety and based on a Conditional Use Study done in 1978. The neighborhood is not the same as it was in 1978. There were thirty-six homes based on the original study opposed to seventy and the ballpark was not as busy as it is today. The 2003 study did not take the residents into consideration at all. The proposed community will have two separated entrances and exists, Culbertson and Swinehart. We ask that you not compromise the safety of an already existing community, for the safety of another that has not been built while you rely on the traffic impact report that was done before most of the homes in the neighborhood were built. Most people are not looking for homes on through streets; they are looking for homes that are quiet, tucked away, a safe place to raise children. We strongly request you take the safety and concerns of the entire community into consideration when voting.

John Cassel, the traffic impact study was done the beginning of 2003 and presented in May. This was reflecting the original plan submitted. The plan changed during the Conditional Use Process based on input from planners, our planning consultants and the Chester County Planning Commission that suggested that it should include the cut through. West Brandywine Township is in the process of doing an ACT 209 traffic study in which this applicant has said that he will comply and submit his thousand dollars per trip generation that his proposed developments will generate. That money will go toward improvements to problems that will be generated by those proposed developments. We can not look at an intersection that goes into another township that is not part of the study. It does look in the future and looks at adjacent townships and development that are known to be happening in the near future. It does not address that intersection, 322 and your development. I can not answer the questions concerning calming measures. The township is doing a study. It is up to the applicant and I don't think any applicant is going to go back into your subdivision and retrofit curb and straight roads and things of that nature. I recommend you go back to your Township, (East Brandywine Township) and request that no parking be allowed on the road, regardless of the cut through or not. Little kids running out between parked cars would then be in traffic. West Brandywine does not allow parking on any of these streets. We do not have sidewalks. Our roadways are clear.

John Conti, I appreciated and am impressed with how respectful the group is in presenting their case. I do sympathize with you all and I am in total support for whatever you want to do. I feel your case was presented well.

Kim Hoopes, I am in favor of gating for emergency vehicles only. I think the access should be there.

John Cassels, I think we can put up a gate just for emergency vehicles. If a child gets hit at the ballpark the quickest way to the hospital would be through the new development. There are safety issues both ways.

Joseph Boldaz, I live on a cul-de-sac and enjoy living on the cul-de-sac. I can see one day that being open to gain access to route 322. I have been down Raleigh Drive at 7:30 in the morning and 5:00 and 6:00 o'clock in the afternoon, I know it's a nightmare getting on & off of 322 and I can see it being a raceway through there. Initially I supported putting in a gate for the cut through, I don't think I can now support that knowing the amount of children out there, along with the amount of activities going on. I think you have presented your case well. As far as getting an injured child to a hospital I don't think seven tenths of a mile will make that much difference. If you put in a gate chances are the gate will be left open, it could get broken. Kids will be messing with the gate and the next thing you know there is no gate there anymore. Will the Township come out to fix that gate, I have a tendency to say no. So now you have an access through there. Next thing you know someone will be hurt. I stand behind these people and say thanks for bringing this to my attention, I fully support you. I don't think it's worth stirring up that much trouble.

Steven Jakatt, I have sat here and listened to your presentations and you have many excellent points. I have also been in favor of a back door to a community. I am still in favor of a back door to a community. I also live on a cul-de-sac, and if a cut through where to happen there it would be traumatic. I also respect where our planners and the people who guide us through the process have to tell us. They look at the big picture, like I am trying to do now. I grew up on a cut through street, that had three times the traffic that 322 has. All we had to play on was the street. We learned to play in traffic. Our parents were good people like you that taught us to watch out for traffic. The street was our playground and we survived. We learned not to run between parked cars. I know that if this goes through you will do the right thing. My vote is for a full cut through street at Raleigh Drive. I thank you all for coming out and being so courteous.

John Cassels, you mentioned there are curbs in West Brandywine portion and on that cul-de-sac there are curbs. Steven Jakatt replied yes there are. So the applicant would have to cut that curb to put the road in. How far from the cul-de-sac is the ball field. Response was two tenths of a mile. John Cassels, what if we asked the applicant to keep the lane in between the two lots to connect to that cul-de-sac but not do any improvements to the cul-de-sac, leave the curb the way it is, but put down grass pavers. A resident from the end of the new development could at least get to the ball field and park there and have that access way available so people could walk through or get access to the ball field. I think in an emergency an ambulance should be able to get through there. The pavers will allow them to get through there, but the emergency vehicle would have to jump the curb.

Kim Hoopes I would not be opposed to the grass pavers going through, I think there should be a curb cut.

After further discussion by the Planning Board John Cassels asked for a final vote on the Raleigh Drive connection. Steven Jakatt voted for a fully paved street connection with unlimited access. John Cassels and Kim Hoopes voted for a green connection providing emergency access only. Joseph Boldaz & John Conti voted for a green connection provided for pedestrians and bicycle access only. Recommendations will be formally submitted to the Supervisor at the next Board of Supervisors monthly meeting.

Joseph Obernier, if anyone would like to speak on a topic at the Board of Supervisors meeting, if you do not call in advance there is time at the end of the meeting where you can get up to talk. You have a group with designated spokespeople. I suggest you call in advance and ask that those people be put on the agenda and that would happen at the beginning of the meeting. When the BOS specifically request the Planning Board take a vote on a

specific issue, we ask who voted what way and for what reason. (Josef Obernier asked the Planning Board to state their occupation at this time). The Board of Supervisors appoints the Planning Board which has had almost no turn over. This board represents something different in aspects of planning. We did that on purpose. We have never asked anyone to step down, even when they disagree that's ok. In the BOS's meeting the vote will be read out loud and will be asked for their reasons. No one has made any decisions, this happens at the end and the BOS's will be making that decision. The traffic calming measures in West Brandywine is the responsibility of the West Brandywine Police Department. East Brandywine is the responsibility of Brandywine Regional Police Department. However this turns out and you have issues, come back and meet with the BOS's. You could also talk to the police chief.

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 Tuesday May 25, 2004. No representative was present. John Cassels asked for a motion. Kim Hoopes motioned to reject the plan unless an extension is received from the applicant. Rejection is based on Mr. MacCombies review letter dated April 12, 2003 under Subdivision & Land Development, number 16g; No easements for sanitary, storm sewer or water lines are indicated – C(3)(b). The pipe storage basin between lots 124 and 125 needs to be accounted for in an easement. John Conti seconded the motion with all members in favor.

Tremoglie, Gregory & Amy, Glenmoore Veterinary Hospital - Preliminary Final Land Development Plan- (04-05-TREM), prepared by Commonwealth Engineers, Inc, located at 3 Andover Road. Proposed expansion to the existing Glenmoore Veterinary Hospital with an expansion of the existing parking lot. Clock started Thursday, March 25, 2004 and continues until Wednesday June 23, 2004. No representative was present. John Cassels asked for a motion. Steven Jakatt motioned to table the plan and Joseph Boldaz seconded the motion with all members in favor.

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 March 25, 2004 and continues until Wednesday June 23, 2004. No representative was present. John Cassels asked for a motion. Joseph Boldaz motioned to table the plan and John Conti seconded the motion with all members in favor.

Public Comment; John Snook, I am here at the request of Ronald A. Rambo, Township Manager, concerning the Ridings of Hibernia. I am trying to get their attorney to clearly state the concerning options. At the BOS's meeting questions were not clearly answered by the attorney for Ridings of Hibernia. (Memo was handed out to the Planning Board dated April 22, 2004). John Snook, I have addressed this to the Planning Board, the BOS's and the Township solicitor and manager. I did not focus on alternative approaches; I don't think that's right. Steven Jakatt was quoted at the meeting that he did not like the plan. There are a lot of issues with the plan. The key issue at this point focuses on issues in front of the board which is a request to extend after the fact the right of a dead plan. The plan was approved long ago and under the law. The applicant has requested the Township consider extending that plan. The applicant has made some offers to offset or mitigate impact of the plan, which relates to the fact the plan does not comply with current zoning. Normally there is often submitted new plans under the current ordinance. The new plan that has been submitted is not the old plan it is a revision to the old plan. There is nothing in the municipality planning code providing for the extension and revision for a prior approved plan. John Good said, in my conversation with him I don't know how you change it after its already been approved. The question is what are the benefits to the township for extending the old plan versus the new plan. Revisions to the original approved plan does not comply with current zoning ordinance in relationship to density, open space, process and natural resources. The non-compliance efforts are not severe, but they are in non-compliance. The proposed plan has ninety-two lots, the current ordinance allows eighty-three. The proposed plan show fifty-two acres of total open space, but only fifty-one acres actually comply with our exclusions from measurement of minimum required open space under current zoning. They would have to submit a new plan through the conditional use procedure. The concern is if we go back to the drawing board and submit a new plan

according to current ordinances, they might say the offerings are off the table. We need to consider if the offerings are comparison with what they are asking. My suggestion looking at all this is at least they modify the request and consider open or holding open the consideration of the extension, and simultaneously submitting a new plan under current ordinance. Address the issues in a timely manner within saying a drop dead date after which the offers go away. The Township has total desecration according to John Good to say yes or no to the extension. The proposed plan leaves significant open space in public view from Hibernia Road but offers a deadly line up of new homes adjacent to neighbors of the southern portion of the tract. It bulldozes right over to natural drainage swales, it feeds the wetlands that are in the core. It does not respect our current riparian buffer regulations. The engineer is concerned with the setback from riparian areas and drainage swales. If they were to do a new plan, mostly reduce the lot size they could open the plan up with open space in compliance with the open space provisions. I would not recommend the Township point blank give them an extension of the old plan, they have everything to gain. Steven Jakatt, Ron has told me that Jim MacCombie did this plan and under the current ordinance they could get ninety- eight units. John Snook replied yes, I have spoken with Mr. MacCombies office and they did not have current information from the applicant. They failed to consider the multiplier in the R2 district of .9 they assumed it was 1.0 , that was amended by ordinance adopted by the BOS's last year and is in effect.

John Cassels asked for comments from the Planning Board concerning Ridings of Hibernia to be given to him before May 5, 2004 so these can be complied and a report given to the BOS's on May 6, 2004.

Meeting reminders were read; the next Planning Commission Meeting is scheduled for Thursday, May 28, 2004.

John Cassels requested a motion to adjourn. Steven Jakatt motioned to adjourn at 9:35 p.m., John Conti seconded the motion with all members in favor.

Joann C. Ranck  
Planning Commission Secretary