

**EASTTOWN TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION
WORK SESSION
MEETING MINUTES**

February 2, 2016

Work Session Meeting

Planning Commission members discussed the Devon Yard Overlay District and the hearing that has been scheduled and advertised by the Board of Supervisors at Beaumont Elementary School for Wednesday, February 10, 2016. All of the Planning Commission members were in attendance except Mary Hashemi: Mark Stanish, Mike Cappelletti, Tim Brennan and John McCarty. Members further discussed the Application of Stacey Ballard as they were advised by Eugene Briggs, Township Zoning Officer, that the Application to the Zoning Hearing Board is withdrawn. The Applicant will be pursuing a five (5') foot easement from St. Monica's Roman Catholic Church instead of an actual conveyance of five feet of property. There was a question as to whether the Planning Commission had any issues with the easement and no member did. Therefore, this matter will not come before the Planning Commission this evening.

The Planning Commission further discussed 435 Beaumont Road minor subdivision and thought that the plans were not sufficiently drawn and certain outstanding items as outlined by the Township consultants needed to be provided to the Planning Commission before the Planning Commission would be acting on the application. They intended to let the applicant make their presentation and discuss the outstanding issues with the applicant at the regularly scheduled meeting at 7:00 p.m.

The Work Session was completed.

**EASTTOWN TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MONTHLY MEETING
MEETING MINUTES**

February 2, 2016

The regular meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Chairman Mark Stanish. Other members present: John McCarty, Tim Brennan, Mike Cappelletti. Also attending: Eugene Briggs, Assistant Township Manager/Zoning Officer, Kevin McAghon, P.E., Township Engineer, and Joseph E. Brion, Esquire, Solicitor.

1. **Approval of Minutes from the January 5, 2016 Meeting.**

The Planning Commission unanimously approved the Minutes. Motion by Mike Cappelletti and second by Tim Brennan.

2. **Subdivision and Land Development Plan Applications.**

- a. SD 507 – 435 Beaumont Road – Final Minor Subdivision Plan
 - i. The Subdivision (SD) Application was deemed complete by the Township Engineer on January 13, 2016. This SD Plan proposes to reconfigure three lots (two vacant and one residential) into two residential lots for the construction of a new single-family detached dwelling on the newly created vacant lot. This is the first time that the Planning Commission (PC) will review the proposal. The SD Plan has received the following review letters, which are attached for your consideration:
 - 1. Township Engineer Review Letter dated January 22, 2016.
 - 2. Township Landscape Architect Review Letter dated January 22, 2016.
 - 3. Township Transportation Engineer Review Letter dated January 27, 2016.
 - 4. Township Zoning Officer Review Memorandum dated January 29, 2016.

Dave Fiorello, P.E. of Momenee and Associates was present representing the applicant. Also Ms. McCoy, daughter of the applicant was present. There were comments and discussions by the Planning Commission that there are four deeds that comprise the lots and they would like those four parcels in the deeds to be shown on the plan. They advised the applicant's engineer that additional information needs to be provided to the Planning Commission before they would act on the plan. That information is as follows:

- 1. Impervious coverage calculation for Lot 2. Momenee suggested that that information is in their office, but they do not have it with them this evening.

2. Issue as to the conservancy. The suggestion by the applicant's engineer was that the property can be subdivided into three lots and they are only subdividing it into two lots. He presented a letter dated January 22, 2016 from the Brandywine Conservancy as admitted into the record stating that the Conservancy had no objection to the two-lot subdivision as submitted. Applicant's engineer agreed that they would be giving up all other development rights on the property if the subdivision was approved and the property would consist of two lots with no additional conveyance or subdivision in the future.

3. Additional information as to the septic testing and the location of the septic field and tank.

4. Further information with regard to the stormwater management and how that will occur. In particular, any feedback or information with regard to the NPDES Permit as required.

There were some concerns with regard to the location of the driveway and if there is sufficient sight distance as well as the removal of trees for sight distance. Confirmation was also requested that the applicant would apply for a PennDOT Highway Occupancy Permit for Church Road.

The Planning Commission discussed the possible fee in lieu of sidewalks. Sidewalks are required under the Ordinance. However, the Planning Commission understands the distance of the frontage of the property along Church Road and that conversation would need to be discussed further as to whether a fee would be required and, if so, how to calculate the fee.

There was a question as to the structure close to and adjacent to the rear of Lot 1. The adjacent landowner said that was a reservoir on his property utilized for sprinkler system.

Another resident asked the question as to whether there would be any stormwater retention ponds. The answer was no. All stormwater will be handled underground.

The following Township consultants submitted comments on this application:

1. Township Engineer Review Letter dated January 22, 2016.
2. Township Landscape Architect Review Letter dated January 22, 2016.
3. Township Transportation Engineer Review Letter dated January 27, 2016.
4. Township Zoning Officer Review Memorandum dated January 29, 2016.

Following the above discussions, the Planning Commission advised the applicant to satisfy by plan revisions the majority of the comments made by the above listed Township consultants contained in their review letters and resubmit for additional review by the Planning Commission. No further action was taken.

b. Sketch Plan – 4 Midland Avenue

- i. This optional Land Development Application was received on January 14, 2016 and the Applicant requested that the Township Consultants provide review comments. The Applicant proposes to demolish the existing commercial building and construct 2 multi-family buildings housing a total of 17 apartments. This is the first time that the PC will review this proposal. The Sketch Plan did not receive Township Consultants' Review Letters as of the date the Agenda Packet was delivered. Therefore, the Township Consultants' Review Letters will be provided at the PC's Workshop.
- ii. The following Township consultant review letters were submitted to and reviewed by the Planning Commission:
 - (a) McMahon Associates, Inc. Traffic Engineering Review Letter dated February 2, 2016.
 - (b) Glackin Thomas Panzak Landscape Architecture Review Letter dated February 2, 2016.
 - (c) Arro Consulting, Inc. Township Engineer Review Letter dated February 2, 2016.

Rob Lewis of Kaplin Stewart represented the applicant and also Chuck Dobson of Inland Design. Mr. Lewis explained to the Planning Commission the following:

1. Location of the property. Zoning is Village of Berwyn District. The sketch plan is for a multifamily use of 17 units with two buildings, 9 units in one building and 8 units in the other. It is a sketch plan submission to discuss with the Planning Commission any issues that the Planning Commission would have as to the sketch as designed. Applicant understands that the property is a challenging site and wants as much input as possible. They are trying to accommodate pedestrian and vehicular access on the property knowing full well that the Ordinance does not like to breakup pedestrian façade. They also in the future have to vet the sewer issues for capacity and also public water.

2. It is the intention of the applicant to develop this as a planned community and all services provided for it will be through the planned community. The units will be owned by the residents and the open space area, parking and stormwater basin will be owned by the association.

There were discussions with regard to the units. They are 42 feet tall. The Planning Commission had some concerns that the units were townhouses as designed and, therefore, not permitted in the VB District. The applicant suggested that they are not townhouses and they could comply with the height requirements of the Ordinance. They wanted input back from the Planning Commission as to whether the units as designed, in the Planning Commission's opinion, meet the use requirements in the Ordinance. There were also discussions with regard to Section 274-48.C. of the SLDO in which only six units were permitted in line. The Planning Commission had some concerns that a reconfiguration may be better for the neighbors. Applicant disagreed and suggested that reconfiguring the buildings would cause certain open areas of the lot to be utilized for building. Some concerns by the Chairman, Mark Stanish, were:

(a) All cars coming out on Berwyn Avenue and people cutting through the property.

(b) There should not be a solid area between the buildings of paving. There should be some plantings and breakup. Applicant suggested that they would soften the area between the buildings and that this is just a sketch plan. They have not proceeded to prepare a landscaping plan.

(c) The sidewalks would need either brick between the curb and the sidewalks or a green area against the curb. Applicant suggested that they would have a green area with street trees between the sidewalk and the curb. Again, that will be placed on a future plan.

Comments by the residents:

(a) David Warwick, 14 Midland Avenue, queried as to whether a rezoning is needed for this type of development and is concerned that the infrastructure around the building is excessive. He is concerned about traffic as the area has a very high traffic volume. He also has concerns about stormwater in that stormwater backs-up on the road systems in the area. Applicant suggested that they would increase the impervious coverage from 60% to approximately 77%. The Planning Commission commented then that they would have to manage the entire site and stormwater calculations would have to be reviewed by the Township Engineer. John Benson, the applicant, suggested that they would manage the stormwater correctly.

(b) Justin Buchanan, 20 Midland Avenue, stated he was concerned about parking on the property for commercial uses as people may park there and walk to some other commercial uses in the area.

(c) Elisa Mendoza, 1 Waterloo Avenue, is concerned about traffic and people visiting the area will park at the property. She would like to see parking along Midland Avenue. Members of the Planning Commission thought that

parking along Midland Avenue made sense. Applicant agreed to add parking along Midland Avenue. Applicant further agreed to provide the necessary property from Applicant's parcel to meet the Township's Code requirements of 9 foot widths for the parallel parking along Midland and also would design landscape islands and breaks in the parking as per the Township Planning Commission's request. She also asked if a fence would be along the property line to the north adjacent to tax parcel 55-2G-42. Applicant agreed that a metal or similar metal-looking fence would be placed along the entire perimeter of the property to the north and to the east. Gene Briggs questioned an easement between the Handler's property and this property as it shows that there is no easement or abandonment of an easement. Applicant was going to check to see if an easement shows on the title report.

The Planning Commission suggested that the Applicant review the comments by the Township consultants, take the comments from the Planning Commission, revise the plan accordingly and come back to the Planning Commission for further discussion. Planning Commission took under advisement Applicant's suggestion that the units are not townhouses and the units will meet the height requirements of the ordinance. Those issues are still outstanding and unresolved.

6. Announcements.

- a. Next tentatively scheduled Workshop is Tuesday, March 01, 2016 at 6:30 p.m.
- b. Next regularly scheduled Regular Meeting is Tuesday, March 01, 2016 at 7:00 p.m.

7. Meeting adjourned at 8:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Joseph E. Brion, Esquire
Buckley, Brion, McGuire & Morris LLP
Planning Commission Solicitor