

East Bradford Township Planning Commission Meeting Minutes August 23, 2016

The August meeting of the East Bradford Township Planning Commission (PC) was held on August 23, 2016 in the East Bradford Township Building, 666 Copeland School Road, West Chester, County of Chester, PA 19380-1822.

Commission members present:

Anthony (Tony) Biacchi, EdD, Chair
Robert Korbonits, Vice Chair
Kathryn Deaville
Don Lynn, Esquire
Wes Thomas, PhD
Bill Trittle, P.E.

Commission members absent:

[Vacant]

Staff/Professionals present:

Mandie Cantlin, Planning Administrator/Secretary/Assistant Manager
Mark Lucas, P.E., Township Engineer

Staff/Professionals absent:

Michael P. Lynch, Township Manager
Brenden Beaumont, Zoning Officer
Planning Commission Solicitor
Thomas Oeste, Esquire, PC Special Council

Others in attendance: six guests, including applicants

CALL TO ORDER: The meeting was called to order at 7:40 p.m. by Chair Biacchi.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None

MINUTES: Dr. Thomas made a motion to approve the minutes from July 26, 2016, as presented. Mr. Lynn seconded the motion. There was no discussion and the motion passed unanimously.

OLD BUSINESS:

1. SD 629 Nastase – The applicant, Orazio Nastase was represented by Ken and Nicole Addis and Jim Fritch, P.E., Register Associates. Review comments have been submitted by:
 - Mark Lucas, P.E., Township Engineer dated August 15, 2016
 - Brenden Beaumont, Zoning Officer dated August 15, 2016
 - Thomas Comitta Associates, Planner dated August 17, 2016
 - Environmental Advisory Council dated August 22, 2016
 - Trails Committee dated May 5, 2014
 - Fire Company dated March 16, 2015
 - Chester County Planning Commission dated May 7, 2014

Dr. Addis indicated that she and her husband are not interested in the trail easements suggested by the Trails Committee. (The Trails Committee (TC) noted that the Official Map depicts proposed east-west trails along the Miner Street frontage and in close proximity to the rear property line (on Windon open space). The TC recommended the Supervisors request trail easements along the front and rear of the property, as well as a side easement to connect the front to the back.) Although the PC was in agreement that the TC's recommendation was disproportionate to the project, they recommended that the applicant consider whether they had a preference among the easements recommended.

Instead of paying the fee in lieu of recreation, Dr. Addis asked the Township to consider the negotiation/agreement they worked out with the neighboring property owner with regards to access. The PC did not take a position of the fee, but rather suggested the applicant discuss the matter with the Supervisors.

There was discussion about the sight distance. The applicant reported that they met with PennDOT and would be able to provide adequate sight distance (to PennDOT's standards) with some vegetation removal. Because the Township's sight distance requirements are more stringent, the applicant will still need relief from the Township standards. The applicant will clarify with PennDOT whether the HOP will cover all three driveways (two relating to this application and one for the neighboring property). The applicant confirmed that the posts/fence at the entrance will come down at the conclusion of the subdivision.

After some discussion, the PC agreed that the applicant should submit the landscaping plan for review/approval before making a recommendation to the Supervisors. Mr. Korbonits did recommend that the Supervisors grant the modifications requested by the applicant:

- Relief from sections 95-17.J (4), 95-28.B, 95-32.A, and 95-32.K to allow for a shared driveway on the basis that constructing a separate driveway would require more disturbance, more tree removal, more stormwater management, retaining walls, and would have reduced sight distance.
- Relief from section 95-32.A to allow the sight distance at the intersection of the existing driveway to not be maintained as specified in Section 95-22.

Ms. Deaville seconded the motion. There was no further discussion and the motion passed unanimously.

NEW BUSINESS: None

MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS:

1. Comprehensive Plan – The Supervisors adopted the Comprehensive Plan on August 9, 2016.
2. PC Vacancy – Prior to the meeting, the Commission interviewed several candidates for the vacancy. They will interview several more next month.
3. Trainings and workshops – Nothing discussed.
4. Application Updates –
 - a. SD 625 CCAA – Staff is working on the trail and the applicant secured a dimensional variance in July.
 - b. SD 632 Tigie – The next Tigie conditional use hearing is scheduled for September 13. There was some discussion about procedure.
 - c. WCU Campus Development Plan –The applicant appeared before the Supervisors in August. If/when a proposal for additional development on south campus is submitted, West Goshen will be notified.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

NEXT MEETING: The next meeting of the Planning Commission is scheduled for September 27, 2016 at 7:30 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT / CONTINUANCE: At approximately 9:15 pm the Commission unanimously agreed to adjourn the meeting.

Mandie Cantlin
Planning Commission Secretary

CURRENT TIME CLOCKS

Application	Clock Expiration	Next Extension to be Considered
SD 632 Tigie	September 13, 2016	Next hearing
SD 629 Nastase	December 7, 2016	PC October / BOS November
SD 625 CCAA	N/A	N/A (Final approved; recording due)