

**Table 3** Corrections/Revisions made from the **December 2011 Revised Draft** to the **March 2012 Final Draft**

Page	Per December 2011 Revised Draft	Per Final Draft
Pg v		<p>(Added)</p> <p><u>IN MEMORY</u></p> <p><u>We dedicate this plan to the memory of Eleanor May Morris, a pioneer in using conservation easements to save over 7,000 acres of land in the watersheds of the French and Pickering Creeks. May we all continue her legacy of vision, perseverance, and accomplishment to protect the lands, parks, watersheds and cultural heritage of northern Chester County for future generations.</u></p>
Pg 1		<p><u>(Added as the closing paragraph of This Plan)</u></p> <p><u>The plan was prepared as a guide for providing parks, recreation and open space protection in the interest of public health and wellness and environmental conservation. It was adopted as a supplement to each municipality’s comprehensive plan and can be implemented, in whole or in part, among two or more willing municipalities.</u></p>
Pg 10	<p>East Vincent and South Coventry follow the most common practice of specifying an acreage (or square footage) to be dedicated based on the number of residential units. East Coventry, East Pikeland, and North Coventry require a percentage of the proposed development site, including proposed commercial, industrial, and institutional uses, to be dedicated as recreational lands.</p>	<p><u>East Coventry, East Vincent and South Coventry follow the most common practice of specifying an acreage (or square footage) to be dedicated based on the number of residential units. East Pikeland and North Coventry require a percentage of the proposed development site, including proposed commercial, industrial, and institutional uses, to be dedicated as recreational lands.</u></p>
Pg 14		<p>(Inserted full-page text box)</p> <p><b>Benefits of Parks, Recreation, and Open Space (and Trails, too!)</b></p> <p><b>Environmental Benefits</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Research shows that trees in parks have an individual, annual value of between \$94 and \$250 in energy savings and deterrence of environmental degradation. This has a total value of about \$17 million annually in the Delaware Valley.</li> <li>• Parks help to improve water quality by providing green space that absorbs runoff and filters pollutants. Southeastern Pennsylvania realizes \$61 million in annual cost savings from protected open space’s</li> </ul>

**Table 3** Corrections/Revisions made from the **December 2011 Revised Draft** to the **March 2012 Final Draft**

Page	Per December 2011 Revised Draft	Per Final Draft
		<p>filtration of pollutants and replenishment of the water supply.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Parks and open spaces preserve and buffer vital land and water resources, provide important habitat for plants and animals, and demonstrate low-impact environmental management practices. They can also important venues for environmental education and community-based environmental stewardship activities.</li> <li>• A well-connected parks system supports wildlife movement and is essential to the life cycles of some species.</li> <li>• Parks and open spaces can protect significant historic features of the natural landscape.</li> </ul> <p><b>Economic Benefits</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Open space adds \$16.3 billion to the value of homes in southeastern Pennsylvania. Parks increase property values. Homes within 2,000 feet of a park have a premium of about 20 percent over similar homes farther away. Open space generates \$240 million in property tax revenues annually.</li> <li>• Parks attract businesses. The availability of parks and recreation opportunities is the top reason that business owners choose a location next to location and availability of labor force.</li> <li>• Parks are one of the most direct ways that our country can save money on health care costs by offering physical activity opportunities. The United States spends \$147 billion annually on direct and indirect costs of the obesity epidemic which stems largely from lifestyle choices of inactivity and poor diet. Improved health saves \$800 million in annual health care costs in the Delaware Valley.</li> </ul> <p><b>Social Benefits</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recreation has been found to be the number one factor in creating healthy family bonds, the foundation of our society.</li> <li>• Parks and recreation is second only to the role of faith-based institutions in contributing to the happiness of the citizens about their</li> </ul>

**Table 3 Corrections/Revisions made from the December 2011 Revised Draft to the March 2012 Final Draft**

Page	Per December 2011 Revised Draft	Per Final Draft
		<p>community.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Community facilities, including parks and open spaces, are the source of community pride and identity.</li> <li>• Trails connect people to nature, provide transportation, create jobs, attract tourists and stimulate the local economy.</li> </ul> <p><b>Personal Benefits</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Children’s play is essential to the human development process.</li> <li>• Physical activity and leisure are important to fostering a positive self-image and essential to stress management. Recreation opportunities for youth provide alternatives to delinquency and gang-related activity.</li> <li>• Parks and park facilities provide important opportunities for regular physical activity – one of the best methods of health insurance. Each household with close to home public recreation opportunities saves \$392 annually.</li> </ul> <hr/> <p>Sources: National Recreation and Park Association, Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission, Penn State University, Canadian Parks and Recreation Association, American Trails, and the Rails to Trail Conservancy.</p>
Pg 17	Permitted trail users should use these opportunities to share benefits...	<u>Those who have permission to use trails on private lands should use these opportunities to speak with landowners to share benefits...</u>
Pg 23 Table 4-1		(Added Fricks Lochs as example Heritage park)
Pg 36 Table 5-2	Wineberry Estates Park (no details)	<p><u>Site known as Wineberry Estates</u></p> <p><u>Plan limited development in conjunction with the adjacent Maack Property</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Develop trails and establish permitted trail user groups</u></li> <li>• <u>Include identification/welcome signage at park entrance and</u></li> </ul>

**Table 3 Corrections/Revisions made from the December 2011 Revised Draft to the March 2012 Final Draft**

Page	Per December 2011 Revised Draft	Per Final Draft
		<p><u>orientation signage at parking areas</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <u>Include public art on one or more themes of nature, culture, or history</u></li> <li>● <u>Include benches for sun and shaded seating</u></li> <li>● <u>Designate parking for permitted trail users and their vehicles</u></li> </ul>
<p>Page 38 Rec 1.4</p>	<p>Future parkland already owned by the municipalities will help to meet the need for additional sports fields, walking paths and trails, and other recreation facilities. However, their individual sizes, locations, and site constraints may not enable them to fulfill all present and projected future needs.</p> <p>Municipalities should strengthen their mandatory dedication of parkland provisions and create consistency among their standards. This will enable each municipality to continue to acquire and protect larger land areas where appropriate (especially flat lands suitable for active recreation) and to make strategic use of the fee-in-lieu of parkland dedication alternative (fee-in-lieu) to fund for site development when available lands are not suitable for public parkland.</p>	<p>Future parkland already owned by the municipalities will help to meet the need for additional sports fields, walking paths and trails, and other recreation facilities. However, their individual sizes, locations, and site constraints may not enable them to fulfill all present and projected future needs. <u>Municipalities should continue to acquire parkland through municipal land acquisition as well as revised mandatory dedication of parkland provision and fee-in-lieu provisions.</u> Municipalities should strengthen their mandatory dedication of parkland provisions and create consistency among their standards <u>to acquire parkland through the actions of private developers, i.e., at minimal cost to the townships.</u> <u>Stronger provisions</u> will enable each municipality to continue to acquire and protect larger land areas where appropriate (especially flat lands suitable for active recreation) and to make strategic use of the fee-in-lieu of parkland dedication alternative (fee-in-lieu) to fund for site development when lands are not suitable for needed facilities. <u>Consistency will reflect a shared vision and value for parkland and will encourage interconnectivity of parkland and trails.</u> <u>Municipalities should gather their provisions for comparison and assemble a regional model for municipal consideration.</u> <u>North Coventry and South Coventry, which outline provisions for eligible lands, and East Pikeland, which has the most detailed trail provisions, should be considered.</u></p>
<p>Page 39</p>		<p>(All bullets revised and Table 5-3 SALDO Requirement at 28 acres per 1,000 residents added. See end of document for Table 5-3.)</p> <p><u>The regional model should incorporate or update the following:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <b><u>The application of mandatory dedication of parkland to all land developments</u></b> not just residential development. <u>Where in use, this</u></li> </ul>

**Table 3** Corrections/Revisions made from the **December 2011 Revised Draft** to the **March 2012 Final Draft**

Page	Per December 2011 Revised Draft	Per Final Draft
		<p><u>provision is applied as a percent of the parcel.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b><u>The amount of land to be dedicated.</u></b> A parkland standard of 28 acres per 1,000 residents is needed meet the true need to support active, healthy lifestyles among citizens. <u>Table 5-3 shows this as an acreage per dwelling unit for each municipality based on the 2009 estimate of average household size, and a percentage of the parcel for proposed non-residential land uses. These figures should be recalculated using current household sizes when ordinance provisions are prepared.</u></li> <li>• <b><u>Lands eligible for dedication,</u></b> based on this plan and other municipal planning for open space, which may specify natural drainageways, steep slopes, woodlands, prime farmland, significant natural areas, historical sites, and existing trails.</li> <li>• <b><u>Other design considerations,</u></b> such as length/width configuration (except for trails), maximum area of passive open space, accessibility from public right-of-way, and interconnectivity.</li> <li>• <b><u>Provisions and Standards for Fee-in-Lieu of Mandatory Dedication of Parkland,</u></b> including               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Conditions under which the governing body should require a fee in lieu of parkland dedication, such as                   <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ when the land is incompatible ...;</li> <li>▪ when the land otherwise does not conform ...;</li> <li>▪ when it is impractical ...; or</li> <li>▪ Upon specific recommendation of the Township Park and Recreation Board <u>to the Board of Supervisors for its consideration.</u></li> </ul> </li> <li>○ Fee Value and Determination that specify that the value of the fee in lieu of land dedication is equivalent to the fair market value (FMV) of buildable acreage on the property</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

**Table 3** Corrections/Revisions made from the **December 2011 Revised Draft** to the **March 2012 Final Draft**

Page	Per December 2011 Revised Draft	Per Final Draft
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ where “fair market value” (FMV) ... over multiple years. <u>This approach keeps fees in line with increasing market values without the need to amend the fixed fee provision of the ordinance.</u></li> <li>▪ based upon a written appraisal report ....</li> <li>▪ with a specified process to resolve disputed appraisals.</li> </ul> <p><u>In addition, municipalities partnering to implement this recommendation should consider developing an intergovernmental agreement to enable municipalities that prefer resource conservation to apply their fees-in-lieu of dedication toward active recreation parks facilities in another municipality. Under the Pennsylvania’s Municipalities Planning Code provisions for regional (multi-municipal) planning, additional tools are granted for implementation, where an intergovernmental agreement is in place and based on the regional plan. This provision allows for revenue sharing and may allow for the type of fee transfer suggested here. A legal opinion should be sought prior to taking action on this aspect of mandatory dedication of parkland.</u></p>
Pg 46 Bullet 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Secure public access to privately-owned sports fields through long-term lease, easement, or acquisition to protect open these existing fields for public use.</li> </ul> <p>Potential locations include:</p>	(Removed Ludwigs Corner Horse Show Grounds)
Pg 66 Rec 11.2	Work toward aligning the municipal operating budgets for parks and recreation with the \$28.78 per capita annual average of Pennsylvania municipalities.	(Added footnote) <u>Pennsylvania Department of Conservation &amp; Natural Resources and Pennsylvania Recreation &amp; Park Society, Pennsylvania Parks &amp; Recreation Budget and Salary Survey, 2002. Pennsylvania Department of Conservation, Harrisburg, PA.</u>

**Table 3 Corrections/Revisions made from the December 2011 Revised Draft to the March 2012 Final Draft**

Page	Per December 2011 Revised Draft	Per Final Draft
Pg 81 (Rec) 1.4 in Table	Steps: 1. Review model standards and provisions for parkland, open space and trails	Steps: 1. Review <u>recommended</u> standards and provisions for parkland, open space and trails
App 1 Pg A1-3 Table A1.4		(Deleted table column: Urbanized Area (acres))
App 2 Pg A2-9	Four sites acquired by ECT...total 111.3 acres of land.	<u>Three</u> sites acquired by ECT...total <u>51.4</u> acres of land.
App 2 Pg A2-16 Table A2-6	Longstreth Academy, East Vincent	Longstreth Academy, East Coventry
App 2 Pg A2-17	Longstreth Training Academy is located at 88 Wells Road in East Vincent Township	Longstreth Training Academy is located at 88 Wells Road in East <u>Coventry</u> Township
App 2 Pg A2-19	There are 13 township-owned sites on 395.6 acres held in reserve for future parkland development	There are 13 township-owned sites on <u>411.0</u> acres held in reserve for future parkland development
App 2 Pg A2-20	<p>This analysis applied to Northern Chester County results in a deficiency of 230.5 acres for the 2010 population. If all the undeveloped land in holding for public parks was developed and there was no additional increase in population, the region would have a surplus of 226.2 acres. Even so, projected regional growth through 2030 would not fully absorb the surplus parkland.</p> <p>However, this analysis is simply a land acreage calculation and does not account for the types of recreational facilities provided in the parks and those desired by residents. A detailed sports field level of service analysis has been prepared and is</p>	<p>This analysis applied to Northern Chester County results in a deficiency of 252.3 acres for the 2010 population. If all the undeveloped land in holding for public parks was developed and there was no additional increase in population, the region would have a surplus of 204.3 acres. Even with projected population growth through 2030, there is likely to be surplus parkland.</p> <p>However, this analysis is simply a land acreage calculation and does not account for the development of parkland for recreational use, i.e. the availability and types of recreational facilities provided in the parks, and their match to residents' needs. This requires a local analysis of residents' needs and comparison to available parkland and acquisition rates. An analysis of municipal mandatory dedication of parkland is reported in Appendix 8.</p>

**Table 3 Corrections/Revisions made from the December 2011 Revised Draft to the March 2012 Final Draft**

Page	Per December 2011 Revised Draft	Per Final Draft
	reported in Appendix 8.	A detailed sports field level of service analysis has been prepared and is reported in Appendix 9. A composite level of service analysis is presented in Appendix 10.
		Revised table – see end
App 2 Pg A2-22	The Region holds more than 400 acres of land in 14 tracts for future parkland development. Of the 14 sites in holding as future parkland, only the Snyder Avenue Park	The Region holds more than 400 acres of land in <u>13</u> tracts for future parkland development. Of the <u>13</u> sites in holding as future parkland, only the Snyder Avenue Park
App 2 Pg A2-24	(Finding 9) A conventional analysis of local parkland applied to the Region results in a deficiency of 230.5 acres of developed local parkland for the 2010 population.	A conventional analysis of local parkland applied to the Region results in a deficiency of <u>252.3</u> acres of developed local parkland for the 2010 population.
App 3 Pg A3-3 Bullet 3 after table	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Towpath Park, Kenilworth Park, Kimberton Community Park, Pine Creek Park, and Andrew Evans Park have walking paths. These paths provide a smooth surface for internal circulation. Their functionality to support walking for fitness varies with their length and configuration.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>Ellis Woods</u>, Towpath Park, Kenilworth Park, Kimberton Community Park, Pine Creek Park, and Andrew Evans Park have walking or “fitness” paths. These paths provide a smooth surface for internal circulation. Their functionality to support walking for fitness varies with their length and configuration. <u>None offer facilities for strength-building, flexibility or other aspects of fitness.</u></li> </ul>
App 3 Pg A3-6 P 1	Trails are also present though most are laid out for internal circulation, and none offer facilities for fitness beyond walking.	Trails are also present though most are laid out for internal circulation, and none offer facilities for strength-building, flexibility or other aspects of fitness.
App 6 Pg A6-6		(Replaced Survey Figure 4 with revised Survey Figure 4)
App 7 Pg A6-19	According to the Pennsylvania Department of Conservation and Natural Resources the average annual municipal investment in parks and recreation is \$28.78 as adjusted for inflation.	(Added footnote) <u>Pennsylvania Department of Conservation &amp; Natural Resources and Pennsylvania Recreation &amp; Park Society, Pennsylvania Parks &amp; Recreation Budget and Salary Survey, 2002. Pennsylvania Department of Conservation, Harrisburg, PA.</u>

**Table 3 Corrections/Revisions made from the December 2011 Revised Draft to the March 2012 Final Draft**

Page	Per December 2011 Revised Draft	Per Final Draft
App 8 <b>A8-4</b>	<p>East Vincent and South Coventry follow the most common practice of specifying an acreage (or square footage) to be dedicated based on the number of residential units. ...</p> <p>East Coventry, East Pikeland and North Coventry require a percentage of the proposed development to be dedicated, based on the proposed use.</p>	<p><u>East Coventry</u>, East Vincent and South Coventry follow the most common practice of specifying an acreage (or square footage) to be dedicated based on the number of residential units. ...</p> <p>East Pikeland and North Coventry require a percentage of the proposed development to be dedicated, based on the proposed use.</p>
App 8 <b>A8-5</b> <b>Table</b>	<p>East Coventry, Fee-in-Lieu, None</p>	<p>East Coventry, Fee-in-Lieu, <u>Value of fee-in-lieu of dedication is to be equal to the total fair market value of the required land.</u></p>
App 8 <b>A8-9</b>	<p>Findings</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. East Vincent and South Coventry follow the most common practice of specifying an acreage (or square footage) to be dedicated based on the number of residential units. ...</li> <li>2. East Coventry, East Pikeland and North Coventry require a percentage of the proposed development to be dedicated, based on the proposed use.</li> </ol>	<p>Findings</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <u>East Coventry</u>, East Vincent and South Coventry follow the most common practice of specifying an acreage (or square footage) to be dedicated based on the number of residential units. ...</li> <li>2. East Pikeland and North Coventry require a percentage of the proposed development to be dedicated, based on the proposed use.</li> </ol>

**Table 5-3 SALDO Requirement to Achieve Parkland Protection of 28 acres per 1,000 residents**

	SALDO Requirement to Achieve Parkland Protection of 28 ac/1,000 residents		
	2009 Estimate of Average Household Size	Residential uses (Acres per dwelling unit)	For non-residential uses (Percent of tract)
East Coventry	2.67	0.07	Commercial and industrial uses (20%)
East Nantmeal	2.68	0.08	
East Pikeland	2.66	0.07	Institutional uses (25%)
East Vincent	2.73	0.08	
North Coventry	2.44	0.07	
South Coventry	2.98	0.08	
Warwick	2.53	0.07	
West Pikeland	3.08	0.09	
West Vincent	2.72	0.08	

Source: Gannett Fleming

	2010	Population	Parkland Acres per 1,000 Residents	Parkland Acres at 10.5 Acres per 1,000 Residents	Surplus (+) / Deficiency (-)
Developed local public parkland	208.7	43,907	4.8	461.0	-252.3
If all undeveloped public parkland were developed (no change in population)	619.7	43,907	14.1	461.0	158.7
If all undeveloped public parkland were developed (projected 2020 population)	619.7	48,860	12.7	513.0	106.7
If all undeveloped public parkland were developed (projected 2030 population)	619.7	53,100	11.7	557.6	62.2