

**WHITEMARSH TOWNSHIP
SHADE TREE COMMISSION
Tuesday, June 2, 2020 at 7:00 PM
ZOOM Meeting Minutes**

CALL TO ORDER:

_X_ZIEGLER _X_D'AMORE _X_BORKOWSKI _X_FASSBENDER _X_TURENNE
_X_BOS LIAISON: TOLL _X_TOWNSHIP STAFF: GUTTENPLAN
_X_TOWNSHIP ARBORIST: HOSBACH

ANNOUNCEMENTS:

Act 15 requires advertising meetings 5 days in advance. This meeting was published in the Times Herald on May 27, 2020 and has been on the website since May 29, 2020. Zoom Meeting procedures were discussed.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

On a motion by Mr. Fassbender, seconded by Ms. Borkowski, the Shade Tree Commission moved to approve the March 3, 2020 meeting minutes. The motion passed unanimously.

PLAN REVIEWS –

Henry Lane – Permit #2018-04, -08, -09: Review of existing landscaping plan versus approved landscaping plan. A copy of the “As Built” tree plan was submitted for the homes of 6201, 6202 and 6205 Henry Lane. The plan was altered due to the small parcel sizes that were left after the homes were built. Some trees had to be moved around the lots because of the utility areas and the small workable space. When doing this, additional Arborvitae were planted along Bethlehem Pike. A memo from Mr. Hosbach (dated May 6, 2020, read into the record) stated that he has performed a review of the plan and matched up the subject planted trees (actual) vs on the plan set. It was observed that 3 extra trees were planted that were not noted on the plan. He also reviewed the site for potential locations for additional trees, and believes 5 additional trees can be planted to the left of the entrance behind the fence. This does not bring them up to code as per the requirements (they are off by 9 trees). They added extra evergreens as a buffer but in terms of shade trees they did not meet the requirements.

Joan Biddle offered public comment stating that the developer clearly thought they took care of the landscaping by putting in so many arborvitae knowing the site constraints before construction. The Shade Tree Commission approved a plan with an entirely different landscaping configuration. She asked if anyone was apprised of the changes the developer thought they could make and was approval granted for that.

Cindy and Ray Wolkiewicz; Colleen Heaney; and Kevin Vesce (homeowners of the three properties) had concerns about the specific location and placement for the 5 additional trees. They agreed with planting trees in the back of the property, they do not want any more trees planted on Henry Lane. The Township Arborist put a few solutions/options on the table: more evergreens; plant 5 trees in the front; or beef up the area with large shrub masses along the fence. The deficit of trees could be planted elsewhere in the Township if offered by the developer. With all 3 property owners in agreement they will be planting 3 evergreens between the Heaney/Vesce properties, 5 trees in the back along the fence, and 1 shade tree in the front with the approval of placement affected homeowners, M/M Wolkiewicz.

Mike and Joe Venezia, the developers, want to be part of the resolution and have no objection to planting the additional trees elsewhere in the Township.

Mr. D’Amore made a motion to accept the option agreed upon by the property owners, provided the developer resolves the deficit of the 7 trees; seconded by Mr. Fassbender. The motion passed unanimously. (Motion was originally passed to resolve deficit of 6 trees and was corrected to 7 trees and re-voted upon.)

UPDATE: Fields Drive – Permit #2016-08: During the final inspection of the approved landscaping plans, the Arborist noticed that two of the Spruce trees planted were smaller than required. The applicant agreed to plant an additional tree on site to make up for the difference. The Township Arborist commented they met all the requirements for the trees that needed to be planted but 2 were a little small so he asked that they put in one large evergreen to make up for the loss. The tree has been ordered and Mr. Hosbach asked that they send pictures once the tree is planted.

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

Eli Glick offered public comment from a prepared statement regarding the work being done in the Township. He feels that the Shade Tree Commission needs to be more involved and go to sites regularly and take pictures, don’t leave it up to the Township staff. Chair Ziegler stated his comments have been noted. For the benefit of the Commission, Mr. Guttenplan explained the Township inspection process. Mr. Glick also commented that the STC was ‘white-washing’ the minutes.

Chair Ziegler mentioned that they have been working on the language between the 2 ordinances (Chapter 55, Tree Protection Standards and Chapter 105, Subdivision and Land Development) with the Planning Commission and they will be asking the residents for their input. Due to Covid-19 this process has been interrupted.

Tam Paulits offered public comment regarding the work being done at Koontz Park. They are taking some trees down and planting some trees and asked if they follow the same count and ordinance guidelines. She commented that Parks & Recreation does a great job with camps and programs and hopes that they have professionals take care of the landscaping.

Sarah Peck offered public comment regarding 901 Washington Partners, LP (of which she is one of the partners). A tour was offered that allowed the Commission a first-hand look at the site to see what needed to be cleaned up. Ms. Peck wanted to give credit to Mr. Fassbender who came out and went tree-by-tree on what they are proposing. Ms. Peck will submit plans sometime shortly with more ideas and suggestions in advance of the next meeting in July; she hopes to be on that agenda .

BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS: No additional comments.

NEXT MEETING DATES

March 3, 2020	April 7, 2020*	May 5, 2020*	June 2, 2020
July 7, 2020	August 4, 2020	September 1, 2020	October 6, 2020
November 3, 2020	December 1, 2020	*Cancelled due to Pandemic	

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. Borkowski motioned that the meeting be adjourned. Ms. Turenne seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously. The meeting was adjourned at 8:30 PM.