



R. Griffith stated that she would like to see the minimum lot size for residential be somewhere between 1.5 and 2 acres. A. Hodge stated that East Coventry has a “Farm Residential” which has a 2-acre requirement and West Vincent has “Rural Conservation” which has a 5-acre requirement. R. Griffith stated that East Nantmeal allows for 4 lots to be a part of any agricultural property, with a minimum lot size of 1.5 acres. R. Griffith stated that the other way to do it is restricting how many lots can be created on a parcel overall.

A. Hodge stated that he is leaning towards preferring the acreage be suggested to stay 2.5 acres minimum for residential lots instead of going to 1.5. A. Hodge asked E. Koopman to explain the basis of the legal memorandum she prepared. E. Koopman stated that there is no magic number, but the case law suggests that once you go over 2 acres for residential minimum lot size it does become more complicated. E. Koopman stated that it really comes down to what purpose the Township can articulate as to why they chose 2.5 acres, if you can articulate a non-exclusionary reason then they are on stronger footing. R. Roeger asked what type of reasons would be given as to why they chose 2.5 acres instead of 1.5 acres. E. Koopman stated that it is hard to come up with a reason that is not exclusionary or arbitrary but could be things such as prime agricultural soils. R. Griffith stated she does not know if it would make sense to require a subdivision and land development application for the parcel to submit an existing features plan and show the existing area being farmed and the proposed lots. A. Hodge stated that since we require the existing features plan with the subdivision land development application, we could combine the requirements. N. Keegan asked if we can't just say we are making the acreage a certain amount because we are following the County Comprehensive Plan and the Township Comprehensive Plan. E. Koopman stated that referencing those things is helpful to the argument.

R. Griffith stated that she would like to leave the RC language as it is currently redlined. A. Hodge stated that the density they are considering for agricultural use in the AP District is 10 acres with a minimum lot width of 200 feet, front yard setback minimum of 100 feet, side yard setback minimum of 50 feet, rear yard setback minimum of 100 feet, maximum building coverage is 15%, maximum impervious coverage is 20%, maximum building height is 35 feet. A. Hodge stated that the density they are considering for the RC is 2 acres minimum lot size, minimum lot width is 100 feet, minimum lot width at street line is 50 feet, front yard setback minimum is 50 feet, side yard setback minimum is 25 feet, rear yard setback minimum is 40 feet, maximum building coverage is 10%, maximum impervious coverage is 20%, maximum building height is 35 feet. E. Koopman asked what they want to do for midsized lots that may not be used agriculturally. A. Hodge stated that if it has the non-prime soils then it could be moved into the residential use, but only if it has non-prime agricultural soils. N. Lynch stated that we have residents in the Township with lots that are 7 or 8 acres that might want to subdivide for their kids, so if we go this route, would they not be able to subdivide. A. Hodge stated that is correct. N. Lynch indicated he is not in agreement with moving in that direction. N. Lynch asked if there are currently any nonconforming properties, C. Ricardo stated that there would be many non-conforming properties in the minimum lot size for residential use is increased to greater than one (1) acre.

**Public Comment:**

- **Elaine Milito of Hallman Mill Road** – E. Milito asked how they would do the sliding scale? E. Milito stated that she looked up another Township and they have three different parts within the AP Zoning District, less than 10 acres, then 10 acres to 20 acres, and then a section on more than 20 acres. A. Hodge stated they will take the sliding scale information into consideration.
- **Michele Adams of Pughtown Road** – M. Adams stated that she lives in the AP District, and they have horses, the soils are terrible, but they are suitable for horses. M. Adams stated that much of the AP and RC districts are in the French Creek Watershed and asked if there has been any analysis of current impervious coverage. M. Adams stated that she urges the analysis of the impact of this on the French Creek Watershed, and how it will impact the traffic.
- **Mark Brancato of Barton Drive** – M. Brancato stated that it sounds like they are trying to wordsmith the document but have not done the homework. M. Brancato stated that it doesn't seem like they have done the planning and checked on the impact of the watersheds. M. Brancato stated that the Board cannot tell the Planning Commission what to do, A. Hodge stated that it is the Board of Supervisors' role to give the Planning Commission direction. M. Brancato stated that someone needs to do a comprehensive overview of this before any changes are made.
- **Mike Trachtman of Traber Lane** – M. Trachtman stated that he is unsure of the problem that they are trying to fix. M. Trachtman stated that he is looking at the Chester County Planning Commission memo and it states that it appears to be consistent, and just recommended tweaking it not changing it completely. M. Trachtman stated that the current ordinance says we have a multiplier which the county likes, and the says all 90% of any AP tract needs to stay agricultural. M. Trachtman stated the focus should be on how much of the AP tract we can reserve for agricultural use. R. Griffith stated that all we heard the last time this was discussed was the multiplier. E. Koopman stated that they thought there was merit to revisit the multiplier, it pointed to problems that they feel need to be addressed because it becomes unworkable for properties and make it less exclusionary. M. Trachtman stated that can be done by adjusting the multiplier. A. Hodge stated that Chester County is the organization that put together the suggested amendments to the AP and RC district, but then the memo they released contradicts their suggested amendments. R. Griffith stated therefore she suggested the sliding scale. E. Koopman stated it won't solve this problem. M. Trachtman stated they should not change the existing text; they should just tweak it.
- **E. Milito** stated that if a house is built where there is no prime farmland, the houses can be larger. E. Milito doesn't see why they are changing the 20 acres to 10 acres.
- **Christine McNeil of Nottingham Drive** – C. McNeil stated that the analysis of agricultural zoning should really be studied and see what the impact will be to the agricultural establishments. C. McNeil stated that to do good farming you may need more than 10 acres. C. McNeil stated that she believes Chester County has supported the Township's Ordinance over the years. C. McNeil stated over the last 20 years they have saved a lot of farmlands.

B. 446 Stony Run Road & 1241 W. Bridge Street – Preliminary SDDL Application

**Present: Joan London, Esq., Attorney for Applicant**  
**Joan Hodges, Applicant's Representative**  
**Jackie Erixson, Applicant's Representative**

A. Hodge stated that the applicant is proposing to consolidate two existing parcels consisting of 67.9 acres (58.65 acres net) within the Low-Density Residential (LR) Zoning District. A. Hodge stated that the site is partially within the Flood Hazard District, contains prime agricultural lands, wetlands, and wooded areas. A. Hodge stated that the consolidated lot will include new construction of eighty-five (85) single-detached dwellings with two-car garages, with an existing farmhouse and its accessory structures to remain. A. Hodge stated that the 85 new dwellings and the farmhouse will be served by public water and sanitary sewer service. A. Hodge stated that the applicant proposed to develop the tract in accordance with the requirements of the Open Space Design Option of the Zoning Ordinance, which is a permitted use when approved as a Conditional Use, and to utilize Transferrable Development Rights (TDRs). A. Hodge stated that the plans note the maintenance will be by a homeowner's association. A. Hodge stated that the Applicant was present at the November 15, 2022, Planning Commission meeting and denial was recommended for the Conditional Use portion of the application. A. Hodge stated that this presentation is for the preliminary part of the application only.

Joan London stated that the AP portion of the property will remain protected, the proposed changes to the AP district language will have no impact to the project. J. London stated that Artisan has been in discussion with PennDOT about the sight distance and signage at the intersection of Stony Run and W. Bridge Street. J. London stated that there is a stone pickup and drop off area for the school bus. J. London stated that there is natural buffering proposed. J. London stated that there are large areas of open space. J. London stated that in the center of the proposed development is proposed to have benches and other community open space amenities, along with sufficient parking spaces. J. London stated that community is proposed with walkability in mind. A. Hodge asked if they talked to the school district about the proposed bus stop. Jackie Erixson stated that they had a conversation with the school district, and they shared the plan with them and did not have any concern or comment. A. Hodge asked if they were planning to have multiple bus stops within the community, J. Erixson stated that they were not planning to have multiple. A. Hodge stated that it seems like it is an odd spot because it is a busy road. A. Hodge asked if they have decided which elementary school they will be going to, either Coventry or East Vincent, they do not know at this time.

A. Hodge asked if there will be any kind of play equipment at the park. J. Erixson stated there will be a fire pit and other amenities but no playground. A. Hodge asked about snow removal. J. Hodges stated that the HOA will be taking care of snow removal and most of the time they use a small Bobcat for snow removal not an actual snowplow so it does not affect the curbs, but she will investigate it. A. Hodge stated that he is not happy with the overhead streetlights, he would much prefer the streetlamps. A. Hodge stated that about half of the consultants' comments were not addressed by the Applicant. J. London stated that a lot of the comments are technical and have since either been satisfied or Artisan will comply. J. London stated that tonight they are asking for a recommendation or their concerns for the Conditional Use application.

Michael Crotty, Special Counsel for the Planning Commission for the Conditional Use Hearing, stated that he does not think all comments have been satisfied, and the review comments all seem to open or at least partially open. M. Crotty stated that if they would like to move off their Conditional Use recommendation, he would like to see the open items addressed first. J. Hodges went through the review comments and gave updated information. C. Ricardo stated that the sewer criteria have not been met yet and no sewer capacity exists for this project. C. VanHise reviewed her engineer comments. R. Griffith stated she would like to see buffer plantings on the south side of the basin. R. Griffith thinks a playground would be an added benefit to the amenities. R. Roeger asked if 60 days is enough time for the Applicant to satisfy the requirements. C. Ricardo stated that before the 60 days, new information needs to be submitted to the Township for the professionals to review. A. Hodge stated that they will have an extension until May 4<sup>th</sup> which is just after the May Board of Supervisors meeting.

**Public Comment:**

- **Dana Ciaffone of Hearthstone Circle** – D. Ciaffone asked what the steps are for the sewer approval. C. Ricardo stated that they need Planning Module approval and demonstrate that they have sewer capacity. C. Ricardo stated that the Planning Module will need to be approved by the Board of Supervisors. D. Ciaffone stated that the TDR certification never mentioned where the TDRs were going.
- **Bill Fields of Stony Run Road** – B. Fields stated that having streetlights in that area is a problem, and he thinks many of the residents would agree. B. Fields also questioned the school bus stop. A. Hodge suggested contacting the school district to discuss moving the bus stop.
- **Mike Sorber of Stony Run Road** – M. Sorber stated that the back of the room cannot hear what is being said. M. Sorber stated that he does not agree with streetlights either, it will make it hard to see coming up and down the road.
- **M. Brancato** asked for clarification on the TDRs.
- **E. Milito** stated she wants to clarify the certification of the TDRs, the Bridge Street property is a totally separate property from the Ruth Farm. E. Milito stated that the Board certified that the TDRs can be transferred but not depicting where they can be used. A. Hodge stated that this is a question to pose to the Board of Supervisors.

**5. Miscellaneous Discussion**

**A. Planning Commission Annual Report**

A. Hodge stated that the Planning Commission is required by the Municipalities Planning Code to prepare an annual report of the prior year's activities to be shared with the Board of Supervisors. No action was taken.

Motion to adjourn the meeting at 9:49 PM.

**Moved:** A. Hodge

**Second:** R. Roeger

**Vote:**

Unanimous