

# WESTTOWN TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

Rustin High School Auditorium  
1100 Shiloh Road, Westtown Township  
January 10, 2017 – 6:30 PM

## **Present**

Commissioners – Rodia, Whitig, Adler, Pomerantz, Hatton, Lees and Yaw. Also present was Planning Commission Solicitor Kristin Camp, Township Manager Rob Pingar, Township Planning Director Chris Patriarca and approximately 250 audience members including those mentioned below.

## **Call to Order**

Mr. Pomerantz called the meeting to order at 6:45 and led those present in the Pledge of Allegiance. He then introduced the Planning Commission (PC) and Township staff in attendance at the meeting.

## **Planning Commission introductions**

Mr. Hatton first provided for some “rules of the road,” the PC mandate and a brief synopsis of the previous two PC meetings. Mr. Pomerantz then stated the principal mandate of the PC is to determine the proposed plans compliance with the 2001 Growth Management Plan, the Open Space and Recreation Plan as well as the overall physical development of the Township. He further stated the final decision rests with the BOS and the PC will make recommendations on the application to them through the utilization of all available resources. Mr. Pomerantz further reiterated the meeting is a working one for the PC and for all in attendance to be respectful of this. Mr. Hatton next discussed the overall timeline of the project. He emphasized the mandates of the process as prescribed by the MPC and provided for a brief overview of previous meetings. Next, each PC member made an initial statement for the evening.

Ms. Camp first stated she has been very impressed with how the previous meetings have been conducted as well as the citizen participation to date on the project. Mr. Whitig noted the similarities seen between this and previous applications for the Crebilly property. As such in preparation for the meeting, Mr. Whitig stated he would like to spend the bulk of the time allotted discussing traffic related issues as the sewer related ones seem more straightforward. Ms. Adler also stated he focus was on traffic related issues. She noted the major difference with traffic on this application is that the proposal encompasses the entire tract, and not just a portion as in previous application. Ms. Adler also stated sewer and traffic concerns are less subjective, and looked forward to the future discussion. Mr. Lees stated his major concern is with the need for the connector road and questioned how its exclusion will impact overall traffic circulation. He further stated the Hershey Mill development utilizes a drip irrigation system and looked forward to the discussion to be had on this issue as it relates to the Toll project. Mr. Lees then thanked Mr. Semon for arranging a site visit for the PC to allow for a better understanding of how the development will impact the site as a whole.

Mr. Yaw reiterated the notion that the PC understands the community concerns as they are members of the community as well. Relative to the materials to be covered, Mr. Yaw stated that traffic and sewer issues are straight forward and not subjective by nature. He further encouraged those in attendance to continue to attend future meetings on the project. Mr. Rodia stated it has been his pleasure to serve on the PC, especially when it involves larger projects such as the Toll proposal. He further thanked those in attendance and his colleagues for all of

the work done to date on the project as a whole. Mr. Hatton noted all of the work the PC has put into the Toll project and thanked his colleagues for all of their efforts to date.

Mr. Pomerantz noted how Crebilly is the iconic centerpiece of the Township, and thanked Toll for arranging a tour of the property for the PC. He stated the site visit gave him two distinct observations. First, he stated that he wished that the Township was not in a position to consider this development and wished that the Township had taken more proactive steps to preserve it in the past. His second observation was that the BOS should consider a site visit of the property to have firsthand experience of being physically on the property. Mr. Pomerantz then stated there will be two more PC meetings prior to commencement of the actual BOS hearings. He then stated that he has been impressed with the public participation to date and encouraged all to continue to participate throughout the process. Further he noted the importance of those from Westtown and/or are immediately adjacent to the property to consider requesting party status to the hearings when they start. Mr. Pomerantz then stated how impressed he was with the postcard mailer made by one of the citizen group trying to save the farm.

### **Carroll Engineering/Bill Malin sewer presentation**

Mr. Hatton first introduced the Township sewer engineer Bill Malin of Carroll Engineering. Mr. Malin stated he has evaluated the conditional use application materials, and noted their review is more administrative in nature with a more detailed review to occur as part of a land development application if it reached that point. He further stated the principal focus of his review was to provide the PC with his recommendation what type of sewage disposal for the project makes the most sense for the Township. Mr. Malin first presented a map illustrating the West Goshen Drainage Area served by the West Goshen Plan and the 537 Plan for the area. He noted what Toll proposes is a drip irrigation system which is consistent with the Township 537 Plan. He noted this system was selected by Toll as it is consistent with the current 537 Plan.

Mr. Malin stated he has reviewed the current 537 Plan and noted it was last amended in 2005 and that capacity at the West Goshen plant was being reserved for other areas at that time. Since that time, Mr. Malin noted there have been significant changes and that there is sufficient capacity at the West Goshen plant to handle possible connections from the Toll project. As such, he stated that his recommendation is for the Toll project to be connected to public sewer. Mr. Malin made this recommendation based on that fact that the Township already owns excess, unused capacity at the West Goshen plant that can be capitalized. He stated that a pumping station could be provided on the Crebilly site to convey sewage to the Pleasant Grove pump station. Mr. Malin further noted the Pleasant Grove sewer infrastructure would need to be upgraded, but that as an alternative a new line could be constructed along 926 and Tower Course and enter the existing sewer network at a location with sufficient capacity at this time. A capacity upgrade to the Pleasant Grove pump station would also be required for a sewer connection. Mr. Malin concluded and noted the proposal for Toll is not that much different from what has previously been proposed for the Crebilly site.

Mr. Rodia first asked about the West Goshen system and what will be needed for it to accommodate the additional flows generated from the Crebilly site. Mr. Malin stated the only capital improvement required at this time, based on information provided is the upgrading of the Pleasant Grove pump station. He did note the existing force main along South Concord Road has sufficient capacity for the additional anticipated flows. Mr. Rodia then asked if the additional connections to the sewer would result in additional long-term maintenance of the system from the Township's end. Mr. Malin stated there would arguably be more maintenance costs resulting

from additional infrastructure, but that the additional sewer fees collected should be adequate in offsetting these additional costs.

Mr. Yaw asked if Toll did not utilize the drip irrigation system if they would no longer need the open areas to be reserved for the drip fields. Mr. Malin stated this would be the case, but that he had not specifically looked at this issue. Mr. Yaw then asked if the BOS makes a condition of approval to connect to sewer, would it be his recommendation to upgrade the Pleasant Grove pump station and place new infrastructure along 926 and not upgrade through Pleasant Grove in an effort to mitigate impacts to current residents. Mr. Malin stated the flows from Crebilly would double the existing flows.

Mr. Lees asked if the project is connected to public sewer, are provisions being made for additional connections west of 202. Mr. Malin stated this would be a discussion to be had during the formal land development process, but that at a minimum the system should be stubbed at West Pleasant Grove Road. He further suggested this would be a larger sewer planning study at a future time. Mr. Whitig asked if the excess capacity was purchased with the intention of sewerage the entire township in the past. Mr. Malin stated the excess capacity generally reflects the amount of EDUs necessary to sewer those properties located within the West Goshen drainage area. Mr. Whitig asked if the Crebilly development did connect would there be sufficient capacity to connect existing Township properties if needed at a future date. Mr. Malin stated that if the Crebilly project is connected to public sewer, Westtown will still retain over 200,000 gallons of additional capacity at the West Goshen plant.

Ms. Camp asked if he views any scenario whereby the Crebilly development would be in its own sewer district. Mr. Malin stated he does not see a reason for it to be a separate district of served by public sewer, but could see this as being the case if the drip irrigation system is utilized. He further recommended the Township not accept dedication of a separate plant to serve a drip irrigation system if constructed at Crebilly. Mr. Semon stated in an ideal situation, they would dedicate the system to Westtown, but also stated there are third party entities that operate these types of systems in the event the Township would not accept dedication. Mr. Malin stated in this scenario, he would recommend a separate sewer district for the Crebilly project.

Mr. Hatton asked if it were feasible to run a sewer line all the way to the Rustin pump station. Mr. Malin stated it is feasible, but that it is not a likely scenario as the DEP would be unlikely to approve planning taking capacity from the eastern end of the Township. Mr. Pomerantz asked if he can provide assurances to the public that the drip irrigation system are safe for the public as a whole. Mr. Malin stated the impacts of sewer will be minimal on the environment for either system. Specific to groundwater, he stated either treatment method will not have any impacts as effluent from drip irrigation is clean. Mr. Pomerantz asked if he has previously been involved with other Toll developments. Mr. Malin stated he has been with the most recent being the Toll project in East Bradford. Mr. Pomerantz asked Mr. Malin what the PC should be most concerned with relative to sewers. Mr. Malin stated that high standards for construction and operations are fully utilized in the development and maintenance of the system as a whole. Mr. Pomerantz then asked if he was aware of any sewer issues related to recent Toll developments, and Mr. Malin stated he was not aware of any.

Rob Lewis, the attorney representing Toll, stated that Mr. Malin only focused on connecting to public sewer but their application is only for a drip irrigation system. As such, he asked if he has been able to review the drip irrigation proposal and if it will generally be sufficient to address the sewage needs of the development. Mr. Malin stated he has not fully looked into this option as

not enough detail has been provided to fully investigate. He did state he has no reason to doubt that a drip irrigation system would work, but cannot definitively say it will work based on the information provided.

Tina Ross – 126 Lydia Lane (Thornbury): Dr. Ross noted the EPA has a preference for drip irrigation systems as opposed to traditional sewers resulting from scientific evidence and the impacts of pharmaceuticals in wastewater that goes into streams. She stated the PC should consider the EPA stance on these systems. Dr. Ross then discussed the various soils present on the Crebilly site and how they may be able to handle effluent generated by the project. She further noted the environmental constraints of the site such as watercourses that would limit the areas where drip irrigation fields could be located and noted the land cannot support the total number of homes proposed by Toll if served by a drip irrigation system. Mr. Malin stated all sewage plants are inspected by the EPA and their discharges regulated by the EPA.

Cheryl Ciccone – 131 East Street Road (Westtown): Ms. Chiccone noted that she is serviced by a cesspool and that a creek on their property makes replacement areas impossible. She asked why the Township feels connection to public sewer is the preferable option for the Township instead of the proposed drip irrigation system. Mr. Malin stated the sewer connection is beneficial as sewer fees are paid by the new connections and the increased capital results in a larger pot for on-going maintenance. He further stated that both options are equally good for the proposed Toll development, but that sewer would be the preferred option. Specific to the construction of sewer pipes across a watercourse, Mr. Malin stated very stringent standards and requirements must be met as required by the DEP.

Menno Uithol – 130 Lydia Lane (Thornbury): Mr. Uithol asked about the financial costs of the drip system versus connection to public sewer. He suggested that Toll has done this analysis and selected the drip system and asked Toll if this was the case. Mr. Semon stated Toll has not investigated the costs of connecting to public sewer as the Township 537 Plan only envisions on-lot disposal for the Crebilly Farm. He further stated the drip irrigation system will function essentially as a public sewer for those living in the development, with mechanical cleaning of the effluent occurring before the excess water is disposed of. Mr. Uithol then asked if Toll connected to public sewer who would be responsible for the capital costs associated with the connection and Mr. Semon stated he would expect the Township to require Toll pay for these costs. Mr. Semon stated Toll is open to the prospect to connect to public sewer if it makes sense for them after the proper analysis have been completed.

Ken Hemphill – 39 Mill Race Place (Concord): Mr. Hemphill noted that sewer plans are meant to eliminate human waste, but not chemicals and pharmaceuticals. He stated his concern with the drip irrigation system with these types of chemicals and compounds leaching into the groundwater and Radley Run. In order to protect this watershed, he stated that Toll should be required to connect to public sewer and that this connection should be required without any bonus densities. He then stated his belief the BOS is mandated by the Pennsylvania Constitution to address environmental issues, especially those resulting from effluent.

Anny Centerwaith – 951 Garrett Mill Road (Willistown): She stated she is a member of the Quarry Swim Club and asked if the drip irrigation system will be built on a serpentine vein which may impact the overall rates of infiltration.

Mr. Pomerantz noted in the conditional use application that Toll made for conditional use that they stated sewage treatment is an either/or option for on-site versus public sewer connection.

Nick Bonkoski – 822 Serpentine Drive (Westtown): Mr. Bonkoski asked if Toll does utilize the drip irrigation system if there will be an option to connect to public water through a possible extension of the existing water line.

Scott Kirkland – 6 Sloan Road (Pocopson): Mr. Kirkland stated he lives in Riverside at Chadds Ford which is also a Toll community. He requested the PC come view their community to see the aftermath of what Toll has left for the residents to handle. He stated Toll left them with a big mess resulting in a court-ordered settlement. Specific issues included the removal of all topsoil, on-going issues with both their stormwater facilities and drip irrigation system, a failed retaining wall and poor construction of the actual homes. Mr. Semon stated he would not comment on this situation at this time.

James Hammerman – 1020 East Street Road (Thornbury): Mr. Hammerman objected to the argument that just because there is capacity at the sewage plant that it should be utilized.

### **Kimley-Horn/Al Federico traffic presentation**

Mr. Pomerantz started the discussion with the Township Traffic Engineer Al Federico of Kimley-Horn by conducting an informal poll of those in attendance who have been in traffic at the 202/926 intersection. Noting that everybody in attendance has had this experience he stated the PC is well aware of the many traffic-related issues facing the community and they can be assured the PC will handle them as best as they can within the constructs of the law.

Ms. Camp then provided a legal overview for what can and cannot be required of an applicant relevant to traffic as part of a conditional use application. She noted the use proposed by Toll is allowed by conditional use as part of the current zoning. Specific to traffic related issues the applicant must demonstrate that the additional traffic generated by the project is reasonably mitigated. Ms. Camp stated the analysis completed by Mr. Federico is meant to provide guidance to the PC on reasonable conditions that may be warranted to mitigate the overall impacts of the development on surrounding traffic. She further stated a complicating factor for the Township in this process is with two of the adjoining roads (202 and 926) being PennDOT roads which the Township has no jurisdiction over. Ms. Camp did state coordination has already occurred between the Township and PennDOT on these issues. She further stated the high bar that must be crossed by the BOS in order to deny a conditional use application as a result of traffic related issues. This is the case as the use has already been determined to be appropriate for the district where proposed. Specific to the MPC, Ms. Camp stated it provides for the foundation for what the Township can and cannot regulate as it relates to land use.

Mr. Federico stated he has been the Traffic Engineering consultant for both of the previous proposals for the Crebilly property and has extensive knowledge of the existing conditions and of the property as a whole. He further stated he will be providing for conditions for the PC to consider as part of their recommendation to the BOS. Mr. Federico his presentation included an introduction to traffic engineering, his findings after review of the Toll study and conclude with his recommendations for the PC. He stated the basic elements of a traffic analysis are safe and efficient movement of traffic, and providing for overall health safety and welfare of the public relevant to traffic. Mr. Federico stated the applicant must demonstrate they have successfully mitigated adverse impacts on the road infrastructure resulting from their project. Mr. Federico stated his review was for only “Option A” inclusive of 317 units and was also inclusive of alternative transportation modes.

Mr. Federico first discussed access to the site. He indicated the proposed access points are off

West Pleasant Grove Road (WPG), 926 and 202. Specific to access he stated engineers look at the functional classification of roads when evaluating access points. He then provided for an overview of the classifications from local roads to expressways and stated WPG is a local distributor road, 926 is a minor arterial and that 202 is a major arterial road in the area of Crebilly. From an access perspective based on classification, the WPG access are the most appropriate based on its functional classification and are proposed at reasonable locations. Specific to New Street, as a minor collector it is appropriate also to have access to it. The 926 access has more limited functionality as a result of significant stacking issues and its proposed location as to not create a four-way intersection. The 202 access would generally be limited based on Township zoning, and in his opinion the functionality of this access may be limited based on the existing traffic condition. Specific to the WPG access, Mr. Federico stated consideration should be given for traffic calming such as roundabouts to enhance public safety and reduce impacts associated with cut thru traffic.

Mr. Federico next discussed the overall circulation proposed for the site. He noted some of the proposed tight turns within the road network and sight distance issues but stated these types of issues would be handled as part of a land development application.

He next discussed the issue of the connector road. Mr. Federico stated the concept for the connector road is from the 2001 comprehensive plan and is envisioned to allow for residents to the west of 202 to have an additional access to northbound 202. He then provided for some additional context as to why the road is proposed. Mr. Federico stated the 2001 PennDOT plan for this section of 202 envisioned grade separation and limited access with the closure of WPG. As such, the connector road would provide for the access lost resulting from the PennDOT project at that time. He further stated the connector road has been included in previous applications for the Crebilly site and indicated the norther leg of the connector road will be constructed as part of a separate land development application.

Mr. Federico then discussed the overall changes in PennDOT improvements for this section of 202 since 2001. He stated the grade separation and interchange plan has been essentially abandoned with the only improvement proposed at this time to improve the signalization at the 202/926 intersection. He further stated the previous uses proposed for the Crebilly site were more intense and the completion of a connector road consistent with the proposed developments. The Toll proposal is for a residential subdivision and completion of a boulevard-style connector road may not be as appropriate as it were for previous proposals. Further, this type of road may be considered inappropriate as it could serve more of the broader community as opposed to those living within the development.

Mr. Federico next discussed the potential with aligning the 926 access with Bridlewood and somewhat "smoothing" the circuitous route through the development to provide for a local north-south connection that is generally unattractive to cut-thru traffic. He also discussed the elimination of the 202 access to also limit the impacts of cut through traffic.

Mr. Federico next discussed trails and noted the comprehensive plan envisions a perimeter trail around the totality of the Crebilly tract. He further noted the potential for pedestrian connections to the school complex and to Dunvegan Road.

Next Mr. Federico spoke directly to the submitted TIS, and stated only the Township and not PennDOT has reviewed it to date. Mr. Pomerantz asked why the TIS was not concurrently submitted to PennDOT. Mr. Federico stated this would be speculative from his end, but that Toll

sees the municipal review process as taking longer than that of PennDOT. He further stated Toll may want to work with the Township in the development of traffic mitigation techniques so that they have full buy-in on what is submitted to PennDOT. He then discussed an alternative improvements plan PennDOT may require if Toll is unable to mitigate impacts. Mr. Federico stated a TIS is to quantify traffic impacts from a proposed development and how they impact the existing road network and what needs to be done to address these impacts. He then discussed the Trip Generation Manual and stated Toll had indicated their development will result in an additional 2,700 daily vehicle trips, and noted this is 60 percent more than what was envisioned for the Bozzuto proposal.

Mr. Federico next stated per the Toll TIS, their engineer has concluded that the majority of new traffic will impact 202, with a portion utilizing 926 and a small amount utilizing New Street. He further stated the study did not evaluate the New Street/WPG intersection, and that it should be as part of a future resubmission as presently it illustrates zero vehicles. Mr. Federico further stated he did not totally agree with the proposed distribution of traffic given the overall geometry of the site. He then reiterated that the majority of traffic resulting from the development will traverse the 202/926 intersection, especially if motorists will be traveling northbound on 202.

He then discussed the current PennDOT concept to improve the overall efficacy of the 202/926 intersection with additional turn lanes and revised signal timing. Mr. Federico stated the Toll study assumes this improvement will occur prior to their build out and thus included it in their analysis. As such he suggested that Toll include in their analysis the situation whereby they would be responsible for its construction and not PennDOT in the event the project gets delayed further.

Mr. Federico then discussed his findings. He stated the TIS was generally consistent with both Township and PennDOT requirements, with several technical difficulties to be addressed prior to the formal hearings. He further stated their analysis show less traffic on 202 now as opposed to 2012 and that this will need to be evaluated further. He further noted the TIS included traffic from the proposed ArborView commercial development but not the traffic generated by the road itself, and suggested a right turn lane from 202 onto WPG may be required by PennDOT. Qualitatively speaking, Mr. Federico suggested more analysis may be necessary to evaluate impacts on nearby "minor" roads such as Dunvegan.

He then offered a series of recommendations for the PC to consider as part of a recommendation to the BOS, and acknowledged there may be some conflict with previous consultants suggested. Mr. Federico suggested:

- Something more than stop signs be considered for the WPG intersections
- A road be realigned to more closely follow the alignment of the connector road in the vicinity of Westminster Presbyterian Church
- A general addressing of the existing condition of WPG as impacted by Toll
- A potential access to South New Street
- Consideration of lining up the proposed 926 intersection with Bridlewood in order to have a signalized intersection
- Consideration of removal of the 202 access
- Consideration of pedestrian access at the 202/926 intersection
- Define what is actually occurring at the 202/926 intersection and how the development may require more mitigation than what has been proposed
- Consideration of turn lanes at the principal accesses to the development

- Consideration of a turn lane at the 202/WPG intersection, but acknowledged without the northern leg of the connector road completed, this facility may not be warranted
- Consideration of review of surrounding “minor” roads and potential mitigation techniques as needed

Mr. Pomerantz first noted of a meeting held with Thornbury at their request to discuss how the Toll development may impact their township, with a specific focus on alignment of the Bridlewood intersection. Mr. Rodia asked for Mr. Federico to provide some pros and cons for the construction of some type of connector road. He stated he views the road as an advantage as it provides local access as to avoid 202 as a “community connector concept.” Mr. Rodia followed by asked about the 2001 PennDOT proposal, and Mr. Federico stated at that time they were only evaluating limited access treatment for 202. He further stated in previous applications, the connector road was offered by applicants in order to mitigate their overall traffic impacts. They then discussed the omission of the New Street/WPG intersection from their analysis and suggested it should be evaluated further. Specific to the geometry of WPG at this time, Mr. Federico stated a concern with its further deterioration associated with construction traffic.

Mr. Yaw noted the burden on the applicant is to demonstrate they will not significantly add to an existing traffic issue. He asked Mr. Federico of his long-time experience in traffic engineering in Chester County as well as knowledge of previous applications for the Crebilly property and then asked in his opinion has the applicant met their burden of proof in mitigating traffic impacts. He stated that to date Toll has not achieved this based on outstanding technical deficiencies, sight distance deficiencies and an alternate plan for 202/926 in the event the PennDOT project does not occur. Mr. Yaw then asked if there are additional considerations he feels Toll should consider as part of the development and Mr. Federico stated what he outlined as being the most significant issues in his opinion. Mr. Yaw then asked if Toll determines to only “cherry-pick” some of his recommendations, would it be cause for the application not being in compliance with traffic requirements. Mr. Federico stated this could be the case depending on the elements selected and whether or not they are also generally compliant with the zoning ordinance and comprehensive plan. Mr. Yaw asked for his thoughts on a connector road “light” that continues north to the Stetson jughandle, and Mr. Federico stated that the plan has been approved by the Township but that additional PennDOT approvals may be required.

Mr. Lees asked if the proposed road network will be offered for dedication to the Township. Mr. Federico stated he does not recall this being addressed in the Toll application and he was not prepared to offer a formal recommendation on this issue at this time after expressing pros and cons for it. Ms. Adler asked if he is recommending improvements for the WPG/New Street intersection, and Mr. Federico stated he is only requesting it be studied further at this time. Specific to New Street, he stated the 926 signal will be retimed to allow for better circulation and further suggested that additional turn lanes may be required. Mr. Whitig asked if he would be supportive of the “Plan A alternate” relative to the reduction in setbacks and further asked him to evaluate it from a traffic standpoint and provide comments back if warranted.

Ms. Camp asked what specific “minor” roads would he like to see considered and he stated those in the neighborhood to the north and south of the proposed development along Dunvegan and Bridlewood. She followed by asking at what time PennDOT should be involved in the review process and Mr. Federico stated this should occur at the earliest possible time as to avoid conflicts between locally approved plans and what would be allowed by PennDOT standards as part of a concurrent review. Mr. Hatton asked if the Westtown Inn was relocated, would it positively impact the PennDOT project and Mr. Federico stated this would likely change how

PennDOT proceeds with their 202/926 improvement. He further stated the reason for the PennDOT delay was a result of the Westtown Inn being eligible for inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places.

Mr. Pomerantz asked for Mr. Federico to speculate as to whether or not Toll anticipated his identification of deficiencies in their TIS and if this was the case, why would they follow that approach. Mr. Federico stated he did not know why they would possibly follow this approach, but further stated that it is rare to have a TIS perfect on an initial submission. Mr. Pomerantz followed by asking if a TIS is ever evaluated at the completion of a project to see if what was projected actually materialized. Mr. Federico stated that one way this issue can be handled is through the requirement for a “post-development study” to investigate this issue and possibly offer suggestions for improvements based on real-time data. He further stated if this is required, a fixed cost should be determined as an applicant will not agree to a “blank check” for improvements.

Mr. Lewis, the attorney representing Toll first asked about the PennDOT process and about the meeting held with various representatives and stakeholders without Toll being present. Mr. Federico stated the meeting with Thornbury was at their request and was their meeting, not Westtown’s. Mr. Lewis then reiterated the TIS is an iterative process and introduced their traffic engineer Nicole Kline with McMahan Associates to provide a brief rebuttal to Mr. Federico’s presentation. Ms. Kline spoke first of their generalized approach with the Township as well as the scoping meeting with PennDOT. She further stated Toll does not want to submit to PennDOT without Township input first. Specific to some of Mr. Federico’s concerns, Ms. Kline stated they were representative of his review letter and that they will continue to work with him in addressing them.

Ellen Steele – 1055 East Niels Lane (Westtown): Ms. Steele stated for residents living west of 202 have very few northbound options and asked if both WCU and the borough have been involved discussing how the additional traffic from the Toll project may impact traffic north on New Street. Mr. Federico stated this issue has not been addressed by the applicant to his knowledge.

Allison Corcoran – 1007 Dunvegan Road (Westtown): Ms. Corcoran stated she had reached out to Dr. Scanlon with the WCASD on this project. She then asked if consideration has been given to the Skiles/202 intersection. Mr. Federico this consideration has been given as part of the Fair Share project, but not as part of the Toll project.

Amy Murnane – 1046 West Niels Lane (Westtown): Ms. Murnane expressed her concern with the increased traffic at the Skiles/202 intersection as well as with the lack of 202 northbound options for residents west of 202. She further asked safety considerations are being made relevant to the proposed road network. Mr. Federico stated that safety concerns are evaluated as part of the TIS process.

Cheryl Ciccone – 131 East Street Road (Westtown): Ms. Chiccone stated that safety is her top concern and that this is already an issue along 926 with poor sight distance and cited her experiences getting her mail. She further stated she cannot imagine pedestrians crossing from the development across 202. Additionally, she stated the 202 shopping centers are difficult to access and cited existing stacking issues along 926. She finally questioned how the increased traffic resulting from the Toll development will negatively impact property values. She further suggested that Toll should minimize impervious areas, only allow single-family homes and not

permit access onto either 202 or 926.

Myron Grubaugh – 1024 Dunvegan Road (Westtown): Mr. Grubaugh asked first for an explanation on the routing for the connector road and where or not it will be one-way. He further stated the traffic study should be done inclusive to peak school traffic at the Stetson jughandle. Mr. Federico stated the concept for the connector road does provide for two-way traffic and will generally meander across the eastern side of the Crebilly tract. Specific to the times traffic counts were taken, Mr. Federico stated they did account for school traffic in their timing and generally discussed the Township and PennDOT requirements for traffic counts.

Vickie Greer – 209 Crop Court (Thornbury): Ms. Greer stated the Toll proposal does not include the connector road that is favored by PennDOT. She then asked if additional studies be requested identifying impacts to Bridlewood in Thornbury. Mr. Federico stated that PennDOT gave a strong commitment to have Toll evaluate Bridlewood as part of their study.

Doug Anderson – 606 Jacqueline Drive (Westtown): Mr. Anderson asked about WPG traffic and noted a left turn from there to northbound 202 is prohibited. As such, he noted there is a strong likelihood that Toll traffic may utilize Jacqueline Drive to reach the jughandle to travel northbound on 202. Mr. Federico reiterated his request of Toll to investigate the WPG/New intersection.

John Strock – (Thornbury): He made a statement that the proposed traffic patterns will impact future residents as well. He expressed a concern with the connector road and Bridlewood being something akin to State Farm Drive in Concord.

Chas Crognale – 609 John Anthony Drive (Westtown): Mr. Crognale told his story of losing his younger brother in a significant traffic accident. He spoke of his concerns with additional traffic on Dunvegan and Bridlewood noting these are existing neighborhoods where kids play in the streets. He stated he estimates a minimum of 634 cars will be associated with the development and questioned if the existing infrastructure can handle the additional capacity. Specific to safety, he asked if the total number of children has been determined that live in these existing neighborhoods. Ms. Camp stated she has never seen this type of analysis required as part of a TIS.

Gale Fitzpatrick – 667 Heritage Drive (Birmingham): Ms. Fitzpatrick asked if anticipated traffic from the Tigie development is included in the analysis. Mr. Federico stated he is aware of this development and that he is recommending Toll evaluate this traffic as part of their TIS. She further requested New Street south of 926 be included as part of the Toll analysis. She further expressed a safety concern with illegal traffic movements along eastbound 926 making the turn onto northbound 202.

Ann Helion – 1164 Lake Drive (Westtown): Ms. Helion stated her concern is with safety and as a former educator expressed her concern that bussing will not be provided from the WCASD for the Toll development due to its close proximity to the Stetson/Starkweather campus. She expressed her concern with students walking to school next to a busy road. Ms. Helion next discussed the stacking issues along 926 during the peak hours and the difficulty in making turning movements. She finally asked if any analysis has been done on the 926/New signal.

Jack Simpson – 1111 Meetinghouse Road (Birmingham): Mr. Simpson noted that many of his neighbors have given their land to land conservancies. He thanked the PC and Toll for their

expertise and then asked Toll about the Jewelers Row issues in Philadelphia.

Pete Dufault – 110 Forelock Court (Thornbury): Mr. Dufault noted he was president of the Brandywine HOA. He stated they are against the alignment with Bridlewood due to the increased traffic that would ensue and stated this is a safety issue. He further stated the full connection with Stetson creates a full bypass of the 202/926 intersection.

Sue Sagullo – 707 Jacqueline Drive (Westtown): Ms. Sagullo commented on safety aspects of the project. Specifically she expressed a concern with the new residents accessing 202 from Jacqueline Drive and how the increased traffic may impact students waiting at bus stops in the morning and afternoon. As such, she requested that Jacqueline Drive be included in their analysis.

### **Adjournment**

10:20 pm (RP/RH)

Respectfully submitted,

Chris Patriarca  
Planning Commission Secretary