WHITEMARSH TOWNSHIP SHADE TREE COMMITTEE

MEETING OF JULY 7, 2020 7:00 PM

ZOOM MEETING PARTICIPATION INFORMATION

The Whitemarsh Township Board of Supervisors will hold their monthly meeting on Thursday, July 9, 2020 at 6:00 p.m. In response to the COVID 19 health pandemic, and to promote social distancing this meeting will be conducted via ZOOM. Members of the Board, staff and public will participate remotely. The public may join this meeting by either telephone using the dial in number or entering the URL on an internet browser. Below you will find instructions on how to access and participate in the meeting:

- **Meeting Date:** Tuesday, July 7, 2020
- **Meeting Time:** 7:00 PM
- **Meeting URL:** [https://us02web.zoom.us/j/83351708820?pwd=elhiTjdQT1dSc1c2cG51S2VPcWhJZz09](https://us02web.zoom.us/j/83351708820?pwd=elhiTjdQT1dSc1c2cG51S2VPcWhJZz09)
- **Meeting via Zoom App:** if you have the Zoom App on your smartphone, tablet, or computer, open the program, click join a meeting, and enter the Meeting ID: 833 5170 8820
- **Meeting dial in number (no video):** 1-646-558-8656
- **Meeting ID number (to be entered when prompted):** 833 5170 8820
- **Meeting Password:** 12345

Public comment via email to Assistant Township Manager Sean Halbom, shalbom@whitemarshwptwp.org must be submitted one hour before the start of the meeting. Public comment will also be accepted via the ZOOM chat button during the meeting. In both cases you will need to provide your name and address for the record.

Persons with a disability who wish to participate in the public hearing and require an auxiliary aid, service or other accommodation to participate in the hearing should contact Whitemarsh Township at 484-594-2601.

“A GREAT PLACE TO LIVE AND WORK”
CALL TO ORDER

ANNOUNCEMENTS

PLAN REVIEWS


901 Washington Street – SLD# 05-14 - Townhomes

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

June 2, 2020 Meeting Minutes

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

NEXT MEETING DATES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>March 3, 2020</th>
<th>April 7, 2020*</th>
<th>May 5, 2020*</th>
<th>June 2, 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July 7, 2020</td>
<td>August 4, 2020</td>
<td>September 1, 2020</td>
<td>October 6, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 3, 2020</td>
<td>December 1, 2020</td>
<td>*Cancelled due to Pandemic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PUBLIC PARTICIPATION INFORMATION

1. Public meetings of the Shade Tree Commission shall follow a prescribed agenda, which will be available to the general in advance of the meeting.

2. If members of the public wish the Commission to address a specific item at a public meeting, a written request to the Staff Liaison shall be submitted by noon on Friday of the week before the meeting. The written request shall specify the item or items the individual desires to be addressed.

3. The Commission may consider other matters for the agenda as they see fit.

4. The Commission will entertain Public Comment at either the beginning of the meeting or prior to specific action items during the meeting, at the discretion of the Chair. Individuals must advise the Chair of their desire to offer such comment.

5. A Public Comment period will be provided at the conclusion of a meeting for input on any subject.

6. The Commission Chair shall preside over Public Comments and may within their discretion:
   a. Recognize individuals wishing to offer comment.
   b. Require identification of such persons.
   c. Allocate total available Public Comment time among all individuals wishing to comment.
   d. Allocate up to a five (5) minute maximum for each individual to offer Public Comment at a meeting, Township Staff shall time comments and shall announce, “one minute remaining” and “time expired” to the Chair.
   e. Rule out of order scandalous, impertinent and redundant comment or any comment the discernible purpose of which is to disrupt or prevent the conduct of the business of the meeting including the questioning of, or polling of, or debating with, individual members of the Commission.
Dear Sean,

Recently we visited The Knolls at Whitemarsh to review the subject tree protection fence. It was observed that all but a small portion was installed and maintained to eradicate entry to the root zones of the trees to remain. The small section has been installed.

In performing the site walk, we ran into Ted and Marc who are developing the site. They stated that two trees need to be removed due to grading and utility insulation. This was clear from my inspection. However, since this was not picked up during their design phase, we will require mitigation planting. 1-15” Catalpa and 1-12” cherry tree is located on the side of Lot 12. We will require 27 Inches of replacement / 9 - 3” trees.

In addition, it was reported that the following are completely dead. These trees were impacted by Emerald Ash Borer. 1-24” ash-dead / 1-16” ash-dead -/ 1-15” ash-dead. Due to the insect epidemic, I do not feel these trees require mitigation as they were most likely impacted prior to the design phase.
Dear Sean,

On Sunday I reviewed the updated landscape/site plan for the above referenced subject property. In addition, I also visited the site. This subject property has been in front of us before and I believe members from the STC also attended a site review.

The applicant is removing a total of 18 hazard trees. These were confirmed during our walkthrough. In addition, they are removing 3 trees (no heritage) that will require 64 inches to be replaced or 21 3" trees. They are requesting a waiver to increase the percentage of shrubs from 20% to 43% for better stabilization of the riparian corridor, to decrease the percentage of trees from 50% to 27%, and to provide replacement trees at the rate of three (3) one inch caliper trees for each (1) three inch caliper tree required in order to improve the viability of trees planted on the riparian slope. (see revised Landscape plan).

In addition, they are removing more than 50% of the trees on their property along with a small percentage along the stream corridor.
I would like the applicant to further explain, in detail, the basis and benefits of utilizing the 1” stock and more shrubs so that the STC can review the objectives prior to the meeting so they have a full understanding of the concept.

In addition, I would like to see a deer protection detail for the smaller trees, a maintenance plan to manage the invasive plants and a more diverse palate of plants for the shade trees.

Signed,

[Signature]

[Seal]
TO BE REMOVED AND REPLACED PER CALIPER INCH

(3) BOXELDER @ 10,15,15 CAL. INCH. (40") TOTAL
(1) MAPLE @ 24 CAL. INCH. (24") TOTAL

TOTAL CAL. INCH TO REPLACE: 64" TOTAL

Per req. (1) 3" cal tree as replacement
Total inches/3 = replacement trees
64/3 = 21 trees (SEE NOTE)

NOTE: 24" caliper maple may end up being saved, resulting in 40 caliper inches of required replacement. However, developer agrees to replace tree material equivalent of 64 caliper inches regardless.

HAZARD TREE (NO REPLACEMENT REQUIRED)

R REMOVE AND REPLACE PER CALIPER INCH.

S TREES TO BE SAVED. INCLUDES HERITAGE TREES

18; 6 off property
4
8; 38 off property

REV. 6-2-2020

PPM DESIGN/ BUILD
LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE
LAND PLANNING
DESIGN/BUILD
MEMO

To: Members of the Whitemarsh Township Shade Tree Commission
C.C. John Hosbach; Sean Halbom
FROM: Michael Wagoner, RLA
DATE: July 1, 2020
RE: Rational for modified percentage of replacement trees

The purpose of this memorandum is to provide further explanation as to the reasoning behind the developer’s request to modify the planting requirements for replacement trees.

For the past seven years, I have been working with the Brandywine Conservancy to enhance riparian corridors along the Brandywine River in Chester County. We have experimented with different types and sizes of plantings to see which ones stabilize the riverbanks best and which ones thrive over time and are resistant to deer attack. In my experience overseeing stream, creek and river riparian plantings, we have learned that it is imperative to get a good shrub layer established to stabilize embankments, increase wildlife cover and restore the layered system of a wooded area.

Shrubs grow more rapidly than trees and have a greater impact in stabilizing the soil around them and contributing to the understory. The SALDO section 55-4(B)(6)(f)(2) affords the opportunity for the STC to grant permission to substitute 20% of replacement trees with shrubs at the rate of six shrubs per one three-inch caliper tree. We have therefore requested permission not only to avail ourselves of this provision, which would yield 25 shrubs, but to go further and ask for 43 percent or 54 shrubs. The proposed shrubs include Blackhaw Viburnam, Spicebush and Chokeberry which are native to the area.

Additionally, we are requesting the opportunity to substitute “whips” in lieu of three in caliper trees as replacement material. Instead of one 3-inch caliper tree, we are proposing three (3) one-inch caliper trees for each replacement tree. When have large canopy trees in the area including heritage trees, the objective is to replant for future canopy trees and to ensure that their planting does not disrupt the root system of the existing large trees. Narrower trees plant easier and will do better on the steep slopes as survivability is greater when the trees go in at smaller size. As well, the smaller trees give us the ability to plant get closer to the main trees. The whips will be protected with sheathing and to ensure survivability. I have provided a detail of this with this memo.

Finally, the SALDO section 55-4(B)(6)(f)(1) provides for the STC to grant permission to substitute 30% of replacement trees as flowering or evergreen trees. We have proposed the opportunity to take advantage of this provision so as to provide nine (9) evergreen trees and (4) flowering trees elsewhere on the site, most notably on a berm to screen the train activity along Washington Street.

This direction, combined with the other planting requirements, will give a much-improved appearance and ecological function along the riparian corridor. Thank you for your consideration of this request.

cc. Jim Vesey, Sarah Peck
Tree Shelter Installation and Management Fact Sheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tree shelter stakes</th>
<th>Pros</th>
<th>Cons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1&quot;x1&quot; white oak or other rot resistant wood.</td>
<td>Readily available, ready to use. Sturdy. Easy to drive with steel post driver.</td>
<td>Expensive. Some will break at installation. Some break from wind and deer. May rot too soon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1&quot; diameter bamboo</td>
<td>Cheaper than wood stakes. Easy to drive with steel post driver.</td>
<td>Can shatter when driven in hard or rocky ground. May rot or break too soon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3 or #4 rebar</td>
<td>Available locally at a reasonable price. Easy to install by hand, maul or steel post driver. Reusable.</td>
<td>Heavy. Can tip with wind or animal rubbing. If forgotten, tree can grow around the rod.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Installation**

Drive stake in ground 2" to 3" from seedling or seed, to a depth of 1’, ensuring that top of stake will be below top of tube, but 3" to 6" above the topmost tie position. Note: To prevent PVC from flexing while driving into hard ground, slip a capped sleeve (1½’ shorter than the PVC stake) of steel conduit or pipe, over the PVC and pound on the steel cap.

Insert ties in appropriate holes on tube and tie loosely, or leave open, as instructed by manufacturer. Slip ties over stake. Center the seed or seedling in the middle of the tube. Press the tube firmly against the soil surface (preferably ½” to 1” into the soil.) Ensure tree limbs are not caught under the ties. Tighten ties on stake. If installing bird netting, follow manufacturer’s instructions.

**Maintenance**

Inspect at least annually. Straighten tipped shelters. Replace broken stakes. Remove bird netting if trees are at or above the top of the tube. Use fabric, mulches, mowing, or herbicides to control weeds around trees. Remove shelters and stakes when the tube begins restricting tree stem diameter growth. Some types of tree shelters will be destroyed when removed. Removing tubes too early may result in a tree unable to support itself. Trees need to grow above the shelter for several years to develop wind hardness. Freshly exposed tree bark may take several weeks to “harden” and become resistant to damage.

Tree shelters may encourage weak, V-shaped branch angles within the tube, especially on opposite branching species. Prune off these weak branches when the tubes are removed.

Tree shelters restrict limb formation for the height of the tree shelter. When tall tree shelters are installed on windbreak trees, additional rows of shrubs or conifers may be needed to provide wind protection close to the ground.

**References**

Berta, Scott, Registered Forester, Tree Protection Supply, Newnan, GA, Personal Communication.

Ehni, Anne, Wells Co. Soil Conservation District Manager, Fessenden, ND, Personal Communication.

Lais, Joseph, CEO, Plantra®, Mendota Heights, MN, Personal Communication.

Tree Shelters: “A Multipurpose Forest Management Tool,” College of Agricultural Sciences, Penn State Univ.

“Tree Shelter Installation Tips”, Timber Management and Seed Company, LLC., Robins, IA.
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 Vesci (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/Vesci 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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>March 3, 2020</th>
<th>April 7, 2020*</th>
<th>May 5, 2020*</th>
<th>June 2, 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July 7, 2020</td>
<td>August 4, 2020</td>
<td>September 1, 2020</td>
<td>October 6, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 3, 2020</td>
<td>December 1, 2020</td>
<td>*Cancelled due to Pandemic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.