

Honey Brook Township and Borough Multi Municipal Comprehensive Plan Update

Task Force Meeting #5

February 4th, 2026, at 6:30PM-8PM (Honey Brook Township Office and Zoom)

6:30-6:35pm Welcome and Call to Order

Gary McEwen, Task Force Chair

Meeting Overview

Sarah Sharp, Brandywine Conservancy

6:35-6:40pm Public Comment (see Township guidelines for public comment)

** When called, provide your name and address for the record. After this, you have three (3) minutes to share your comments regarding any matter related to the Comprehensive Plan Update. There will be additional opportunity for public comment at the end of the meeting.*

- No public comment

6:40-6:55pm Initial Community Survey Results

Sarah Sharp, Brandywine Conservancy

- Sal: Soft close for survey?
 - o SS: January 31st, but wanted to utilize the Farmers Dinner (previously Breakfast) as an opportunity to provide paper surveys to plain sect; after the March meeting we will begin drafting the plan and that would be a good cut off; Survey responses: 290 completed; 390 “submitted”
- Sal: Cost of postcard?
 - o BB: Estimate provided to Warren for BOS approval in 2025; roughly \$2,500 from my memory but give or take a bit; very close to the estimate provided in Nov/Dec 2025
- SS: Provided overview of Community Survey
- Sal: Is there anyway to look at the top three of rec activities/facilities and determine the age group of the survey taker?
 - o SS: We did not ask the age of the survey respondent but maybe there is a way to infer based on other question answers.
 - o Sal: If that is not super difficult, it may be useful to determine who took the survey (if it’s an older demographic, etc.)
- Dawn: Can I take blank paper surveys with me?
 - o SS: Yes
 - o Warren: Copies in the lobby.
- Susan: Can you share this information now?
 - o SS: Yes, will provide on the project website and will send to TF following this meeting

6:55-7:15pm Multi Modal Transportation: Discussion and Input; Issues and Opportunities

Sarah Sharp, Brandywine Conservancy

- SS: Provided overview of Task Force Survey Responses
- M. Halvorsen: Not going to be able to widen 322 and 10 in the Borough due to sidewalk and buildings; might do a study to change the traffic pattern.
- Sal: Any updates from PennDOT for 322 or 10 for long term?
 - o M. Hal: 322 hasn't been on PennDOT's long term plan for a long while
- SS: County Improvement Plan and items identified for HBB and HBT; then escalates to a Priority Plan (10 Corridor Safety and 322 Corridor Intersection Improvements); County then works with State to get listed on the PA TIP; Didn't see anything on DVRPC Transportation Plan or State TIP; Will find out what stage of the DVRPC/TIP they are on; other method for improvements is through the land development process
 - o Sal: Was this tied to a recent-ish survey?
 - o M. Hal: County Planning survey was sent this time last year related to roadways/transportation?
 - o Greg: Through the Land Development process would be the fastest. If the Horton Plan ever comes to fruition, aren't Chestnut Tree and 322 in it?
 - Warren: Chestnut Tree and 322 will be addressed through West (East?) Nantmeal development?
 - Greg: If Horton ever came back, could they be mandated to address this?
 - Warren: Yes
- SS: Truck Traffic rerouting plan from the 2015 Comp Plan, specifically for the truck traffic to the Lanchester Landfill; is this still feasible? Something that would like to be pursued?
 - o Greg: Huge cost burden on the Township because the planned roads aren't able to handle truck traffic.
 - o Erin: Not realistic.
 - o M Hal: Agree, it is not realistic.
 - o Greg: How many more years for the Landfill?
 - Warren: Another 20-25 year extension
 - Matt Hal: Bob Wise believed 6 years ago they have another 30+ years
 - o Dawn: A good idea for a bypass but it would almost have to go into Lancaster County; to build a new road/bypass
 - o Greg: Any money could come from expansion of landfill?
 - Warren: are tipping fees come from the percentage of the waste in the township. Most are in Lancaster but they are looking to increase tipping fees; not required to provide

money to Borough but they do because they recognize the truck traffic; only 10% of landfill in Chester County is active

- SS: Table the rerouting plan and if it's feasible in the future, it's in the 2015 plan and can be revisited.
- Greg: Cambridge and Rt 10 and Walnut road and Rt 10 are showing traffic lights, would they need warrants? Is it a calming intersection instead of a traffic light intersection? Does the amount of traffic warrant this?
- Erin: What is Welcome Gateway/Traffic Calming?
 - SS: Towns and Boroughs add entry signage for visual differentiation to help people recognize they are entering a defined village/town/borough; also helps placemaking
- Greg: Triangle for safety improvements, beaver dam and route 10: what would be a safety improvement that would benefit these locations?
 - Susan: Behavioral issue.
 - Greg: would these be a good location to widen the shoulder for buggies? Specifically Beaver Dam.
 - Susan: Doesn't think widening the road would help either.
 - Dawn: A shoulder would allow for buggies to be more safely passed.
 - SS: 2015 plan rec – improve road alignments, and site lines; we can take a look into that and identify specific things
 - M Hal: A traffic study needs to be complete before anything can be changed? Does PennDOT do free traffic studies?
 - Greg: remove straight throughs? Only right turns?
- SS: Traffic Counts
 - Dawn: Not just truck traffic
 - M. Hal: 17,000 for 322 – would be green – had a traffic count completed, all over
- SS: Public Transit: Bus route proposed in Landscapes3 running from HBB to Downingtown Station; and a potential park and ride
- SS: Multimodal trails: Struble and Hibernia

7:15-7:40pm Multi Modal Transportation: Recommendation

Sarah Sharp, Brandywine Conservancy

- SS: Made notes after each recommendation about where it came from; a lot of 2015 recs repeated similar themes so they were consolidated; splitting recs between HBB and T, just HBB, and just HBT; Rec #4 is the bypass and will be removed
- Susan: What is a Traffic Impact Fee?
 - SS: A PennDOT Process where you have a group from the Township—probably applies best in the Township—and identify a

study area for a Traffic Impact Fee, a seven square mile area and if any development occurs within that area, you can charge the developer a traffic impact fee (specific equation determines this) and this money can be used to make traffic improvements within the seven square mile area; specific process to enact that and the Board would need to adopt?

- Greg: Act 209; if you do a 209 through the whole township; study gets pretty expensive
- SS: Area has to be 7 square miles, so East Bradford had two study areas but you can't mix and match study areas; you can remove protected land from the study area, the border needs to remain contiguous; can provide more information on this topic
- Erin: How much would a fee typically be? Does it offset the study or should you just do the improvements?
- SS: Imagine this would far outweigh the study; planning process is maybe 6-8 months
- Greg: Better off working directly with the developer to negotiate improvements.
- Erin: Why should a developer have to pay for something further away from the development?
- SS: This is why it's kept to the square mileage, and the cars do leave the development and can impact other infrastructure.
- Erin: A lot of this is out of our hands, especially the state roads; focus on the Township roads; a lot of these can be consolidated
- SS: May still be value in listing the needs so you have something to point to when working with PennDOT and trying to get it on the TIP
- Sandra: And to show the residents that this is something that is noted.
- SS: Maybe we can sift out the PennDOT one.
- Greg: TIP is somewhat political.
- SS: Limiting access to go between uses
 - Greg: We don't really have this so it may not be useful
 - SS: If a new development comes in
 - Erin: It should be part of the traffic study for development; might want to remove or consolidate further.
 - Greg: Keep it in for the future but if it's in the ordinances, maybe it's not necessary, if aligned with ordinance it could be consolidated, not sure you want to take it out of there fully.

- Susan: Community trails, has there been conversation with Parks and Trails Committee?
 - SS: These trails would be a point to point, serves a multi-modal purpose; TF has a representative from this committee; reviewed most recent plan on Parks and Rec
- M. Hal: Pedestrian crossings -- blinking lights – started conversation with PennDOT
- SS will look to consolidate these recommendations, is there a ballpark for number of recommendations?
 - Sandra: Will need to decide if the ones from 2015 will be completed in the next ten years
 - Erin: Less than 10 – as few as possible to get the message across
 - Susan: Quality of recommendation is more important than the number; if some many didn't get completed from last plan than it's not feasible and it should be realistic
 - SS: How they are prioritized can be decided as we go; some of these need to be kept because having it in a plan is important
 - Dawn: Number 1 rec is very important
 - Erin: Consolidate and next time we can prioritize as a group.
- SS: We can prioritize recs at our June meeting before the first draft meeting or vice versa but taking an extra meeting to really prioritize recommendations
 - Sandra: Do we get a draft prior?
 - SS: Yes, we would send a draft about a month prior to the meeting.
 - Erin: See the recs prior to the draft.
 - Greg: How large do you think the plan will be?
 - SS: Past plans were hefty; they've gotten smaller with a lot of background info going into appendix, the body is maybe 100 pages
 - Greg: Recs first
 - Sandra: How would we get the recs?
 - SS: In a similar format; plan will have an implementation matrix
- All good for the review of the recs at the scheduled June TF Meeting
- Sandra: percentage of recs completed from 2015?
- SS: can figure out a general percentage

7:40-7:50pm Questions/Concerns/ Outstanding Items
Sarah Sharp, Brandywine Conservancy

7:50-8:00pm Public Comment (see Township guidelines for public comment)

** When called, provide your name and address for the record. After this, you have three (3) minutes to share your comments regarding any matter related to the Comprehensive Plan Update.*

- Mary Perez, HBT: How many postcards were mailed? (SS: 4,600+) No issue posting flyers on the survey in stores? (No Issue from the TF); Concern there are no Amish Surveys; have not done one yet

Next Meeting – March 4th @ 6:30- Task Force Meeting #6 – Resiliency Preparedness