

**Wallace Township Planning Commission
Special Public Meeting, June 18, 2008**

Planning Commission members attending

Barbara D'Angelo
Janet Grashof
Skip McGrew
Bill Moore
Ken Nicely

Meeting Purpose: Public questions and comments about the proposed Zoning Amendments for a Planned Country Club Community (PCCC)

Skip opened the meeting and explained that the Board of Supervisors had directed the PC to prepare an ordinance under which a PCCC could be built in the twp. The draft of PCCC ordinances was prepared by the township solicitor, represented by attorney Mike Crotty. The PC is set to decide at its next meeting whether they will recommend the amendment for adoption. The final decision on whether to adopt the ordinance lies with the BoS.

Skip continued by explaining what the ordinance does and doesn't do. It defines a PCCC and lists which elements of the PCCC are allowed uses in each zoning district. It proposes that the subject ordinances only apply under conditional use and it sets standards and limits on the design and construction of all elements of the development. It is designed to have no greater impact on township than the by-right development of the property.

Skip explained how the evening's meeting would proceed. Township residents, by vote, opted to forego spending time to explain the planning process in detail. Skip clarified that this meeting is about the ordinance and not the Greenfield proposed development. Despite that, the comments and questions crossed from ordinance to proposed plan often and I have made no attempt here to separate them, since they have already been linked in the public perception by nature of the ordinance development process.

Planning Experts

AnnaMarie Guglielmo introduced Dick Whiteford, from Defenders of Wildlife to speak for township concerns about the environmental impact of a PCCC in Wallace Township. Dick spoke about concerns with displaced wildlife and watershed issues. Whiteford, a resident of Downingtown, expressed concern about flood damage downstream as a result of destroying watersheds. He mentioned the fact that golf courses have a lot of runoff and add pesticides and herbicides to the water. He also stated his opinion that the Country Club plan is "flimsy", that country clubs are money losers and questioned why it is being proposed since the county is "saturated" with golf courses. He says that the economics behind Greenfield's proposed plan don't make sense in this current environment, and pointed out that analyses have shown that for every tax dollar realized from a new home,

there is a subsequent infrastructure cost of \$2. Whiteford also asked about the Wallace Township Woodlands ordinances which were developed by a tax-funded county grant and were later “dumped” by Wallace Township. In his opinion the township has an obligation to the county tax-payers to see that the ordinances are reinstated.

Anna Marie also introduced Anne Misak from the Clean Water Fund who is working with townships within the Schulykill watershed to protect their water resources. She stated her concern that the proposed ordinances lacks adequate requirements for stormwater management, and do not address the effects of loss of trees on the tract. Misak acknowledged that development will happen, but stressed that it needs to be done in the right way. She spoke of the economic and ecosystem costs to township, and her assertion that the ordinances need to include 100’ stream buffers. It is her opinion that the Audubon ranking system is not sufficient environmental, and pointed out that protecting what we already have is far more effective than trying to replace it.

Skip responded that this is not a stand-alone ordinance; it is an amendment to our current zoning which already includes some of the protections Misak and Whiteford alluded to. He also noted that the PC was not going to dispute points being made during the meeting, but urged people to ask for and study the data about Audubon so they can draw their own conclusions.

Township Resident Concerns

A list of Township residents who gave their names as they spoke at the meeting is appended to these notes. However, the notes are consolidated at this point to express concerns in the aggregate and also highlight those concerns that were most often noted.

- **Meeting Process and Public Inclusion**
 - Not enough time given for residents to research the issues and contact other residents. Request for more time denied.
 - What is the hurry to pass these ordinances?
 - What is the likelihood that the CU plans would not passed through to final plans.
 - This seems to being pushed very quickly. (Several more comments about feeling rushed through the process.)
 - applicant withdrew previous CU and went to committee. What are advantages to going to committee to develop ordinances rather than CU?
 - Can the BoS overturn recommendation of PC.
 - this ordinance grants relief to the applicant but PC should speak for the residents.
 - Since the ordinances were drafted by Twp. Solicitor, who is reimbursed by applicant - in a sense the applicant paid for the ordinances.
 - what do twp. residents get from this PCCC? Seems too transient and exclusionary to be good for the twp. long-term. What is fall-out plan is this doesn’t take off? The taxpayers will get stuck with it.
 - If it fails, what happens to the changes in the I district ordinances

- concern that the developer might “flip” the development.
- Potential legal issues are driving this. What advice have we gotten about that? Based on fear of litigation – not the right way to go about this.
- Suggest that we look at plan for negotiable items. This is all too much too soon and slight modifications might make it more palatable.
- Need a sound financial plan.
- Much discussion about how to get the word out to twp. Residents and make the meetings more accessible to them.
- importance of the fact that it is the BoS that makes these decisions.
- **Proposed ordinances comments**
 - Why are they even planning this PCC when golf courses are failing all around?
 - why is this development (PCCC) good for the twp?
 - Why not put all the details you will ask for in the CU in the ordinances instead
 - Concerns about unit calculations
 - Does Wallace Township need a PCCC
 - How does a PCCC fit into the “rural atmosphere” of WT
 - Concerns about the amount of impervious surface allowed and the effects of run-off
 - Why not extend buffers now to protect our (the residents) concerns.
 - pg. 1 last sentence states that ordinance 1323 takes precedence over pre-existing ordinances – why not let the “more stringent” standards be the preferred?
 - Pg. 6 minimum setbacks – existing FRR perimeter tract req’t of 100’ – asks for the same in here.
 - Did we look to see if other municipalities in the area have tackled similar problems?
 - We need to protect the area because of the proximity to stream and Marsh Creek Park. Wants twp. To propose purchasing parts of Cornog quarry.
 - Struble trails – will they be public and dedicated to twp.
 - Escrow funding required?
 - How will affect our taxes?
 - I grew up in this town. Doesn’t think PCCC is consistent with WT.
- **Woodlands ordinances**
 - You had good ordinances but you pulled them. Why not write them back in now.
 - What protects wells from being depleted. Consider a well head protection ordinance.
 - curious timing of applicant filing against Woodlands ordinances. It was a race and the residents lost. We’re fighting to get them back and not making headway. We’re feeling rushed and forced and we need to take time to think about what we are doing. The applicant has opportunity to change community feelings towards this plan.
- **Population Density – strain on the infrastructure**
 - how can we absorb that number of new people

- studies need to be done about the affects on traffic, police, ambulance, fire, etc.
- **Appropriate uses in FRR districts**
 - Designed as a resort and not a PCCC
 - Is this what the people of WT want for their community
 - Some commercial aspects (Jacuzzis, fitness centers, etc) of the private golf club seem inappropriate in the FRR.
 - Question about liquor license (it is not within the purview of the twp).
 - Will they golf course be deed restricted
- **Appropriate uses in Industrial districts**
 - considers guest suites to be retail
- **Approved ordinances vs. conditional use**
 - conditional use hearing comes very quickly and it is up to residents to fight for changes once ordinances go forward.
 - what is being changed with this proposed ordinance vs. what we currently have now.
 - proposed ordinance is based on Greenfield plan and seems to give preferential treatment for this development – looks suspiciously like contract zoning.
 - How many other planned PCC has the app done?
 - conceptual plan seems to perfectly matches the ordinance. Do we do zoning for plans? This was tailored for one applicant.
 - if many of the details of the PCCC in current ordinance, why an ordinance amendment instead of just CU.
 - Seems to be a burden on residents during CU to ask BoS to impose conditions. The legal rep for BoS does not represent residents. We would have to pay for our own attorney. CU is a burden on the residents.
- **Noise and Light Pollution**
 - Speedway noise is bad enough – can’t imagine what the amphitheatre will be. Why would anyone want to spend \$\$\$ to listen to that.
 - concern about sound during construction. How do you limit decibels?
 - are there consequences built in? (Zoning officers sanctions violations).
 - Anything about helicopter pad?

Township Residents who spoke at Meeting

Adrienne Drexel	John Frock	Mark Eschbacher
Bob Bock	Deborah Bock	Ellen Youngdahl
Jim Acey	Melanie Kirkpatrick	Nancy Andal
Betty Pike	John Hofstra	Sandy Neufeld
Tom Cooper	Mr. Satyen	John Trexler
Phil Sears	Jim McKrell	Tom McClung
Karen Cooper	Jane Christie	Scott Beagle
	Steve Christie	