

# WESTTOWN TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

Stetson Middle School Auditorium  
1039 Wilmington Pike, Westtown Township  
November 16, 2016 – 6:30PM

## **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, Township Code Enforcement Officer Travis DeCaro, and approximately 300 audience members including those mentioned below.

## **Call to Order**

Mr. Pomerantz called the meeting to order at 6:40 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 presentation**

Mr. Pomerantz and Mr. Hatton made a presentation that provided for both a history of proposed development at the Crebilly property as well as an overview of the conditional use (CU) process as a whole. Mr. Hatton first went through the overall expectations for the meeting. Mr. Pomerantz stated the mandate of the PC for this process is to provide recommendations and potential conditions of approval based on the comprehensive plan, open space plan and overall physical development of the Township. Mr. Hatton followed by providing an overview of the PC in general and their mandates relevant to zoning, land use and ordinance revisions.

Mr. Pomerantz next described the CU process. He spoke of its basis in the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code (MPC) and local ordinances. He stated the first step is a completeness review by the Township followed by a full review by the consultant team. The PC reviews the plan through the prism of the comprehensive plan and flexible development ordinance. Mr. Pomerantz stated the role of the PC is to make recommendations and for the BOS to make the final decisions on the CU application. Mr. Hatton then stated the BOS will then hear from the consultant team as well as consider the PC recommendation as part of their CU deliberations. Upon completion of the hearings, the BOS must then consider approval unless the proposed development will have more negative impacts than a similar type development would produce. Within 45 days of close of the hearings, the BOS must make a ruling unless granted an extension by the applicant.

Mr. Pomerantz then stated a CU is a use that is allowed and may be approved after BOS hearings close on the application. He then stated the proposal by Toll does not require a zoning change, but rather is an existing CU that an application may be made by any property owner who meets the criteria set forth in the ordinance for a flexible development. Mr. Hatton then stated that in addition to the standard CU application, Toll is also making application for bonus densities with the burden of demonstrating the additional units are not resulting in additional negative impact the responsibility of the applicant to demonstrate. In order to qualify for bonus density, Toll must demonstrate they are providing for substantial, additional public improvements in excess of what their development requires.

Mr. Pomerantz then described the process as a whole. Mr. Pomerantz stated the applicant has granted an extension for the BOS to start their hearings through February 6, 2017. This allows

for the PC to hold up to four meetings on the Toll application to make their final recommendation. He then spoke about “party status” as it relates to the CU portion of the hearing and the rights this status guarantees. Mr. Hatton noted all of the hearings are recorded by a court recorder and that the application must be in general accordance with the comprehensive plan. If approved, the subdivision and land development process will subsequently commence.

Next, an overview of previous applications for the property were discussed. Mr. Hatton first spoke of the “standstill agreement” which comprised of a land development plan that was submitted to the Township and granted an indefinite extension to act upon, but where no action was ever formally taken. After this proposal, the continuing care retirement center CU was approved by the BOS in 2007 but was never executed as a result of the great recession. The most recent proposal for the property was for an apartment complex, but was withdrawn by the applicant in 2015. Mr. Pomerantz then provided for a brief overview of the Toll project from the perspective of the PC. There were several questions about materials related to the project and accessibility to them and Mr. Patriarca stated they will be placed on the Township website as they become available throughout the process.

Specific to the timeline for the PC to review the application Ms. Camp provided for a brief overview. She stated the reason for the more expedited timeline as compared to the Bozzuto application was as a result of the applicant not requesting a text amendment, but rather made an application within the framework of the existing zoning ordinance. The requesting of the text amendment with Bozzuto resulted in there not being a timeclock as opposed to the Toll application which is subject to MPC timeframes as the use is presently allowed by CU. This was followed by a brief discussion of the standstill agreement. Mr. Snook noted the standstill agreement does not impact the Toll application as it does not seek consideration of it as part of their application. Ms. Camp then explained the role of the BOS as it relates to the CU process. She stated the BOS acts as a judge and jury on the information presented as part of the hearings at a future date.

Ms. Camp then explained the actual application filed by Toll for CU consideration. She stated the flexible development by CU allows for greater densities in exchange of open space preservation. She further stated the applicant may also request additional bonus densities in exchange for significant public improvements beyond what is required for their project by ordinance.

#### **Initial PC member statement and thoughts**

Mr. Whitig stated he evaluated the application with a focus on concerns made by the public as part of previous applications made for the property. Those concerns which he stated the applicant should address as part of the PC review include: loss of open space, traffic congestion, sewer infrastructure, school population, the battlefield and watersheds. Ms. Adler stated the traffic concern has been a major issue in all of the previous applications for the Crebilly property and that careful attention will be focused on this issue. Mr. Lees stated that he does not have specific comments at this time other than to listen to what Toll will be presenting as well as the public comments.

Mr. Yaw stated he has thought of and considered many of the issues of concern and encouraged the public to “stay the course” and attend future meetings on this project. Mr. Rodia thanked the audience for their attendance and provided his background and his personal interest in the application and thoughts on the Crebilly development. Mr. Hatton then stated his

two initial thoughts were that the public would provide comments to assist in their decision making while recognizing the PC is composed by resident volunteers and respecting that fact. He then stated he hopes the applicant listens to and works with the Township to find a reasonable solution that works for all parties.

Mr. Pomerantz stated his frustrations with the development of the Crebilly property as a whole and Township interactions the property over the past 25 years. He then spoke of his concerns with the standstill agreement and the PC process involved with their Bozzuto approval and the 33 conditions developed for it. He then stated to his knowledge there have not been any substantive conversations with land conservancies on possible preservation of the property. He then spoke of his hope for the planning process to result in a reasonable end, as well as a greater focus on future land preservation within Westtown.

### **Toll Brothers presentation**

Gregg Adelman, counsel representing Toll, provided for a general overview of their proposal and how they developed their initial plan. He stated there is a balancing act between property rights and how to implement a successful project addressing concerns of all parties involved. Mr. Adelman stated their application was voluminous in scope, but that the intent of their discussion would not get into detail as the Township consultant team has not been able to complete their reviews and provide comments for Tolls team to respond.

Mr. Adelman first provided an overview of the existing conditions of the site. He stated the 322 acres will be subject to a conservation design and require analysis from the Township planning consultant for consistency with this requirement. He then spoke of the differing conservation areas required by the ordinance and spoke of the careful consideration that must be given to environmentally sensitive areas such as wetlands and steep slopes. He stated that when Toll developed their initial plan, it was designed to stay away from as many of these sensitive areas as possible. He further stated there are approximately 24 acres that are considered to be environmentally sensitive and have been excluded from the developable area.

Mr. Adelman stated that Toll has developed a base plan that illustrates 319 total residential units and does not request any additional density bonuses. He stated this plan does not require any discretionary bonuses in order to complete. The plan includes 200 single-family homes and 117 carriage homes with 197 acres, or 60 percent of the property, remaining intact as open space. The open space is predominately concentrated along the perimeter in an effort to best preserve existing views. Mr. Adelman further illustrated the layout was chosen in an effort to stay away from environmentally sensitive areas.

Speaking about access to the property, Mr. Adelman stated the development will include access points off 202, 926 and West Pleasant Grove Road. There is no proposed access off South New Street. He then stated the community is proposed to be served by a community on-site system as the Township's 537 Plan does not envision sewer connections for this area. He then discussed the areas whereby the disposal of effluent is proposed by way of a drip irrigation system. Mr. Adelman stated the preference for Toll is to connect to public sewer, but that they are prepared to utilize this on-site system if necessary. If the project connects to the sewer, Toll recognizes it could result in additional sewer upgrades to the current system to accommodate their project. Mr. Adelman emphasized the final decision on whether or not a connection to the sewer system will occur is at the discretion of the BOS.

Mr. Adelman next discussed the typical lots and units envisioned for the project. For the base,

no-waiver plan, he stated the carriage homes are proposed with widths of thirty feet in blocks of four. He further noted the building separation is sixty-feet between blocks as required by the ordinance. He further argued the intent of the sixty foot separation is for larger multi-family buildings and not carriage homes. For the base, one-waiver plan Mr. Adelman noted the separation of the carriage home blocks was reduced from sixty to thirty feet and as a result of this, the number of homes per block was reduced from four to three. He further noted how the one-waiver plan results in an increase of open space and moving of units further away from the 202 frontage.

Mr. Adelman stated Toll is prepared to move forward with either of the base plans, but that they are also open to additional units afforded through a density bonus plan. He stated the density bonuses are highly discretionary, and may only be granted only after the applicant demonstrates they have provided substantial public improvements in excess of what is mandated by the existing ordinances. Mr. Adelman stated Toll calculated the maximum density possible is 397 total units and in their density bonus plan they envision 150 single-family units and 243 carriage homes. This plan still provides 194 acres of open space and preserves environmental features and pushes development to the interior of the site. Mr. Adelman stated the density plan will continue to evolve as needed with bonuses based on substantial public improvements.

The PC then asked several initial question on the project. Mr. Whitig first asked about the regrading of the site and where it will predominantly occur. Jeff Madden, Toll's engineer stated the proposed grading will roughly occur at the center of the site with the open spaces preserved with very limited disturbance. Mr. Whitig next asked for them to describe how the project will appear from West Pleasant Grove Road. Mr. Madden stated there will be landscaping and berming along West Pleasant Grove Road to provide screening for both the new and existing residents. Mr. Whitig then asked what the overall landscaping of the project will entail, and Mr. Semon stated landscaping will be developed as part of the subsequent land development process that follows conditional use. Mr. Whitig asked about recreational amenities proposed for the project as envisioned by the comprehensive plan and what Toll is proposing relevant to this. Mr. Semon stated Toll is proposing to repurpose an existing stable and barn for community space for the residents, provision of trails and areas of open space. He further stated that Toll will discuss with the Township the possibility of Township open and recreational space associated with the project.

Ms. Adler asked what are the proposed building heights as well as renderings that will show the appearance of the development from the surrounding roads. Mr. Semon stated the building heights will be consistent with Township zoning and that the final elevations are to be determined. Ms. Adler then asked what traffic improvements are proposed. Mr. Semon stated they will be adding a signalized intersection at 926, several turn lanes, but potential improvements as may be required by PennDOT have not been discussed as of yet. Mr. Lees asked about the omission of the connector road and if Toll has given consideration for its inclusion. Mr. Adelman stated the connector road, after review by their traffic consultant, did not impact their proposed traffic and as a result was not included on the initial plan submission. He did state it can be included as part of future discussions with the Township as a possible public amenity tied to bonus densities. Mr. Lees then asked if anything is proposed for the Darlington Corners Inn. Mr. Semon stated there are no plans currently for its use but that it will be retained.

Mr. Hatton asked how the existing homes relate to the Toll development. Mr. Adelman stated they will be on separate parcels and not owned by Toll. He further noted on the plans areas

owned by the church and a separate property owner that are not part of their application. Mr. Hatton asked if Toll had tried to acquire this property and Mr. Adelman stated they had been unsuccessful in their attempts. Relevant to the areas proposed for the drip irrigation, if they could also be used for recreation. Mr. Adelman stated the DEP does not allow drip fields to be used for active recreation, but do allow for limited passive recreation on them. Mr. Hatton followed by asking if the garages are front loading. Mr. Semon stated the carriages will all be front loading with some of the singles also having front loading garages. Mr. Hatton asked how many existing buildings will be removed and Mr. Semon stated three will be. Mr. Rodia asked about the preliminary bonus density credits, and Mr. Semon stated the figures mentioned were for a previous submittal and not applicable to their current submission. Mr. Rodia then asked if bonus density credits would be discussed at a future meeting and Mr. Adelman stated there will likely be future discussion on this issue.

Mr. Yaw asked if the Township makes provision for sewer, what happens to the areas proposed for drip irrigation. Mr. Semon stated these areas will simply revert to general open space that could potentially be converted into active open space. Mr. Yaw spoke on the issue of the connector road. Mr. Adelman stated their engineers will go into more detail on this, but that their analysis shows the connector road does not impact the congestion at the 202/926 intersection.

Mr. Pomerantz spoke about a recent report by the National Association of Homebuilders (NAB) that states the contemporary need for smaller homes on smaller properties with access to greater amenities and asked how Toll's plan fits within this NAB report. Mr. Semon stated their proposed development generally meets all of the criteria described by NAB with respect to the carriage homes. Mr. Pomerantz followed by asking when Toll anticipates build-out, and Mr. Semon stated in a perfect world from groundbreaking to completion of the final home they would like to see completion within six years. Mr. Pomerantz next spoke of the anticipated population growth to be experienced within Westtown and asked where Toll believes all of the buyers for the new homes will be coming from. Mr. Semon stated they expect many of their buyers to be from the local vicinity. Mr. Pomerantz then followed by asking what will Toll do in the event of a real estate crash similar to that experience in 2008. Mr. Semon stated he cannot foresee the future, but did state that all Toll projects underway in 2008 within the Pennsylvania market were ultimately completed. Mr. Pomerantz then concluded by requesting that Toll provide renderings that illustrate how their development will appear from adjacent roads. Mr. Semon stated this can be provided and then described how the development could appear from 202.

### **Public comments**

Dr. Douglas Anderson – 606 Jacqueline Drive (Westtown): Dr. Anderson first quoted from Toll's website on their commitment to community as a whole. He then stated he see this as being more of an afterthought as they have not shown community amenities to date. Mr. Semon responded that Toll is waiting for feedback from the public and Township to better tailor the development to Township needs. Dr. Anderson followed by asking for Toll to provide a sketch illustrating how the project will appear from 202/926 will look before and after completion.

Scott Sobers – 108 Hidden Pond Way (Westtown): Mr. Sobers asked about the location of the drip irrigation areas, and Mr. Adelman both pointed out these areas and stated they will be refined further if the drip irrigation system is ultimately utilized. Mr. Sobers followed by asking how these systems work. Mr. Adelman stated the treatment is similar to what occurs in a traditional sewage treatment plant with the treated water spread across the proposed drainage fields.

Kristine Lisi – 915 Shady Grove Way (Westtown): Ms. Lisi asked first about traffic concerns at 202/926, and Mr. Semon stated this intersection will be evaluated as required by PennDOT and the Township. Ms. Lisi followed by asking about the impacts of runoff to water quality in the Brandywine watershed associated with the proposed construction. Mr. Adelman stated issues relative to water quality will be addressed as part of the detailed stormwater review associated with the land development process at a future date.

Phillip Jones – 1007 Jennifer Lane (Westtown): Mr. Jones asked who becomes financially responsible for the operation of the proposed drip irrigation systems. Mr. Adelman stated this responsibility will ultimately be dedicated to the Township, Township Authority or third party provider such as Aqua PA.

Bob Dilullo – 1004 Supplee Way (Westtown): Mr. Dilullo stated the open space will be under the control of a HOA, and that public access may not be allowed based on what the HOA determines. Mr. Semon stated a portion of the open space could be deeded to the Township and open to the public if required by the Township.

Marica Hepps – 807 General Howe Drive (Westtown): Ms. Hepps stated her request that renderings are provided for the view of Crebilly post-construction from all four of the perimeter roads, and Mr. Semon this could be accommodated. Speaking next to the issue of public benefit, Ms. Hepps questioned the overall public benefit that may be afforded by the project.

Bill Vosburgh – 1151 Lake Drive (Westtown): Mr. Vosburgh spoke first of his traffic concerns along 926 and then spoke of his concern with parking within the prosed development. Mr. Semon stated areas proposed for parking will be evaluated further as the plan is refined. Mr. Vosburgh then spoke of local wildlife and how the development may impact it as well.

Ray Deluca – 1068 Country Club Road (Birmingham): Mr. Deluca asked about the short-term impact on local business associated with the development of the property. Mr. Semon stated this consideration was not a requirement of the financial impact analysis.

Anthony Lepere – 1065 Dunvegan Road (Westtown): Mr. Lepere stated he relies on well water and is concerned with how it might be impacted from the infiltration areas associated with the drip irrigation systems. He further requested a supplementary study be conducted that identifies impacts this system may have on the aquifer. Mr. Adelman stated the systems will be fully regulated by the DEP/EPA and all water must be fully treated before being discharged.

Gloria Daull – 1163 Lake Drive (Westtown): Ms. Daull stated she has lived on Lake Drive since 1983 and expressed a concern with increased traffic and pollution associated with this increase. She further asked what the distance is proposed between 926 and the prosed cul-de-sac closest to it. Mr. Semon stated the distance will be approximately 400 feet.

Myron Grubaugh – 1024 Dunvegan Road (Westtown): Mr. Grubaugh asked first about the proposed access to West Pleasant Grove Road (WPG) and asked if any improvements are also proposed for WPG. Mr. Semon stated that there are requirements to mitigate impacted roads impacted by the development that will be undertaken that may result in the removal of some trees at the discretion of the BOS. Mr. Grubaugh followed by asking how additional traffic needing to travel 202 northbound will impact the area as a whole and when the traffic counts will be completed. Mr. Semon stated there are specific requirements when traffic counts can be made and they are strictly adhered to.

Chas Crognale – 609 John Anthony Drive (Westtown): Mr. Crognale stated when they bought in 2002 a part of what attracted them was the Crebilly Farm and they were told that at least portions of the farm would likely be preserved. He then spoke of when he inquired about the purchase of 60 acres that could only be limited in subdivision. Mr. Crognale asked first what has changed to allow for more homes and second asked has consideration been given to the increased cut-through traffic that will impact WPG and spoke of his own tragic experience with a traffic fatality resulting from cut-through traffic. Mr. Adelman first stated he is unaware of previous potential sales of the property and could not comment on it. Specific to the traffic concerns, he reiterated how the road will be designed is based on existing standards and specifications from the state and Township.

Allison Corcoran – 1007 Dunvegan Road (Westtown): Ms. Corcoran stated the traffic study should be inclusive of when schools let out and further asked what the impact of the development will be on the school district as a whole. Mr. Semon stated school impacts are included in their fiscal impact study.

Bob King – 806 Kimberly Lane (Westtown): Mr. King stated his concern is not the view from the road, but rather the overall density of the proposed development. He then asked about traffic impacts associated with the proposed development outside of the roads immediately adjacent to Crebilly as well as impacts on WPG. Mr. Semon stated that their study meets all of the requirements specified by PennDOT.

Jacqueline Bonkoski – 822 Serpentine Drive (Westtown): Ms. Bonkoski stated her concerns with impacts on well water and asked if testing will occur post-construction to ensure the development has not impacted residents' wells. Mr. Adelman stated a well inventory is required as part of the overall planning of the disposal system, but deferred the question to one of their experts to answer at a future meeting.

Dr. Celia Wright – 1151 Lake Drive (Westtown): Dr. Wright stated her concern with traffic at all times of day. She further stated that this development will result in 400+ vehicles as well as additional school buses onto 926. She further stated she visited Liseter and stated everyone should visit it before making a final determination on what the final road network as well as overall lot layout should encompass.

Eugene Hough – Saving Hallowed Ground (Radnor): Mr. Hough was dressed as a Revolutionary War soldier and provided a historical narrative of what occurred at the Crebilly site during the Battle of Brandywine. He noted there are numerous sites through the area that share this history. He requested sensitivity be given to the portions of the site impacted by the Battle of Brandywine. He spoke of a map drawn by a Hessian soldier that suggests action occurred in this area. He requested of Toll they bring in a proper archeologist to survey and investigate the site prior to commencement of construction activities. Mr. Semon stated Toll has met with the CCPC and PAHMC on this issue and sited their development in such a way as to respect the area of the Battlefield.

John Helion – 1164 Lake Drive (Westtown): Mr. Helion asked if the proposed sewage treatment system will have buried holding tanks, and Mr. Adelman stated the design of the system will be subject to final DEP approvals. Mr. Helion followed by asking if the project is connected to public sewer would there also be availability for it to be extended to serve other existing Township residents. Mr. Semon stated their potential tie-in would be at Piedmont Road and further connections would need to be discussed with the Township.

Kelly Hershey – WCU Student Veteran Group (West Fallowfield): Mr. Hershey is a combat veteran representing the WCU group and discussed his groups concerns with the development as it relates to the Battle of Brandywine. Specifically he mentioned the first shots from the Hessians may have occurred in this area as well as been the location from Where General Washington could have seen General Howe. Mr. Hershey stated a closer look needs to be had of the site to ensure history will not be forever lost.

Jennifer Kramer – 1046 Dunvegan Road (Westtown): Ms. Kramer asked if any evaluations have been made on the impacts of the development of local wildlife, and specifically mentioned the deer population. Mr. Adelman stated as there are no requirements for a wildlife study, one has not been undertaken.

Pat McDonough – 7 Oakbourne Road (Westtown): Mr. McDonough stated he sat on the Township Open Space Committee and stated a need for active open space, and asked if the potential buyers of adjacent homes will be made aware of the potential for active recreational uses. Mr. Semon stated Toll is open to a discussion with the Township for active recreational facilities on-site and if they were implemented would be noted as part of agreements of sale with their potential buyers. Mr. McDonough followed by asking if their historical report would be public and if the Robinson Chapel would be retained. Mr. Semon stated the historical report will be available in the future and the chapel will be preserved.

Suzanne Lauer – 1154 Lake Drive (Westtown): Ms. Lauer stated her primary concern is traffic. Specific to the drip irrigation system she noted her experience in utilizing this type of system and expressed a concern with who will pay for the long-term maintenance of it as part of the Toll project. Mr. Semon stated the costs of the system will be the responsibility of the homeowners in the development. Ms. Camp stated the only people responsible paying for this sewage treatment will be those within the development as a separate sewer district.

Helge Gunther – 606 John Anthony Drive (Westtown): Ms. Gunther asked if pedestrian amenities such as sidewalks and bicycle paths are proposed for inclusion with their overall road network. Mr. Semon stated specific requirements like this will be part of a land development application in the future.

Ken Hemphill – 39 Mill Race Place (Concord): Mr. Hemphill asked if the property was considered part of Act 319 for taxing purposes and asked if they know how much in tax revenue was lost with the ground classified as part of the program. Mr. Adelman was unable to address this as Toll is not the landowner historically. Mr. Hemphill followed by asking if trees can be grown in the open space dedicated to the drip irrigation areas. Mr. Adelman stated that some limited plantings can be placed in these areas as permitted by DEP.

Ken Lawson – 334 King Street (Malvern): Mr. Lawson expressed his concerns with impacts on the Brandywine Battlefield. He stated Crebilly is where the fighting began during the Battle of Brandywine as part of the Revolution and noted this was one of the battles where General Washington was present. He further suggested that a heritage center be constructed on this site as an alternative to preserve the battlefield.

Randall Spackman – 1256 Thornbury Road (Thornbury): Mr. Spackman represents the Thornbury Farm Trust and the Thornbury Historical Commission. He first asked about at the 202/926 intersection and if land was accounted for in the realignment of the intersection. Mr. Semon stated he is aware of this need from PennDOT. Mr. Spackman next asked if PennDOT

will allow for a traffic signal at 926. He further stated consideration should be given to allow for public access to a trail system to connect back into the Thornbury system at South New and 926. Mr. Spackman also stated there should be consideration of a deer management program to be managed by the HOA to address this issue as well. Mr. Semon stated they are open to discussing a deer management program.

Jill Tatios – 603 Cricklewood Road (Thornbury): Ms. Tatios noted as a millennial, her generation cannot afford general afford what Toll is proposing and if consideration has been given to providing for more multi-generational housing options. Mr. Semon stated that Toll does market products to a multi-generational audience.

Mindy Rhodes – 331 Broad Run Road (West Bradford): Ms. Rhodes stated she grew up on General Howe Drive and rode her horse all across the Crebilly property. She stated she feels there is a disconnect in that the community values the farm as it stands. She spoke of the importance of the Brandywine Battlefield and how the development will impact it as well as impact the serpentine area at South New and 926. Mr. Semon stated that Toll has been very open and transparent throughout the process and hopes to make the project even better through the public process.

Dr. Douglas Anderson – 606 Jacqueline Drive (Westtown): Dr. Anderson noted the property will be forever changed and requested that Toll provide for a topographic mapping to illustrate what the elevations will be post construction. Mr. Semon stated as part of the conditional use application, rough road grades are included at this time.

Elizabeth Roche – 102 Pennfield Drive (Kennett): Ms. Roche read a prepared statement on this proposed development as a co-chair of the Neighbors For Crebilly citizen group. She stated this group hopes to preserve the Crebilly Farm as an alternate to the Toll project. She sympathized with the Robinson family as the long-time stewards of the property. She then stated they respect the rights of Toll to develop the property and hoped they will be respectful of the property as well. She stated that neighboring Townships have cash reserves that have been leveraged to purchase open space and questioned by Westtown does not have this type of reserve. Ms. Roche then referenced Article 1, Section 27 of the Pennsylvania State Constitution that references the natural and historic resources being a public right and questioned if the proposed development violates this provision. She further requested that Westtown residents join their group in order to lead the fight to preserve the farm.

Peter Dufault – 110 Forelock Court (Thornbury): Mr. Dufault asked where the proposed road intersecting 926 will be located. Mr. Semon stated presently it is proposed to intersect between the two intersecting street to the south in Thornbury.

Richard Cole – 208 Pony Court (Thornbury): Mr. Cole asked if it would be possible for Toll to make enough money on the development with fewer units and why they are looking at a minimum of 300 homes. Mr. Semon stated the ordinance allows for this amount of homes and as a developer they look to build homes. Mr. Cole then asked if anything in the development exceeds current ordinances, and Mr. Semon stated they are not to that point yet in the process.

Manu Patel – 114 Hidden Pond Way (Westtown): Mr. Patel stated he has lived in the area for over 30 years and noted the areas of open space have been significantly developed. He spoke first of the traffic concerns of the community and specifically mentioned those experienced by residents in the western portion of the Township.

Myron Grubaugh – 1024 Dunvegan Road (Westtown): Mr. Grubaugh asked the PC if anybody has talked to conservancy groups or other groups that may be able to purchase the farm as a whole. Mr. Pomerantz stated that until there is an approval, it is not a done deal, and that he is unaware of efforts at the BOS level. Ms. Camp further stated that Toll does have legal rights as well as equitable owners of the property in addition to the Robinsons.

Hillary Hannock – 5 Cherry Street (Media): Ms. Hannock stated she grew up in Pleasant Grove and stated that she was encouraged from the discussion had for everyone involved to continue to fight to preserve the farm.

Chris Feryo – 1156 Lake Drive (Westtown): Mr. Feryo stated that in relation to traffic that the light proposed for 926 will not be an improvement and should not be included. He then asked if the traffic studies include hypothetical traffic movements that may show more of an impact on South New Street. Mr. Pomerantz stated the Township traffic consultant is reviewing the application and will speak on the issue at a future meeting.

Phil Jones – 1007 Jennifer Lane (Westtown): Mr. Jones stated that he cannot imagine adding additional units to the development with the already congested roads.

Kelly Murray – 320 West Gay Street (West Chester): Ms. Murray spoke of the beauty of the Crebilly Farm as a whole driving south on 202. She further spoke of the overdevelopment of where she grew up in New Castle County and her concern with the same happening in Chester County.

**Adjournment**

9:45 pm (RP/RH)

Respectfully submitted,

Chris Patriarca  
Planning Commission Secretary