

**EASTTOWN TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION
WORK SESSION MINUTES**

September 07, 2016

Work Session Meeting

The Work Session was called to order at 6:30 p.m. All Planning Commission Members were present. The Planning Commission discussed the matters that were on the September 07, 2016 Regular Meeting agenda.

**EASTTOWN TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES**

September 07, 2016

The Regular Meeting was called to order at 7:01 p.m. by Chairman Mark Stanish. Other members present were Mike Cappelletti, Tim Brennan, Mary Hashemi, and John McCarty. Also attending were Eugene C. Briggs, Jr., AICP, Zoning Officer; Kristin Camp, Esq., Solicitor; and Kevin McAghon, Township Engineer.

Meeting Minutes

a. August 02, 2016 Meeting Minutes

A motion was made by Mr. Cappelletti and seconded by Mr. McCarty to approve the Meeting Minutes from August 02, 2016. The Minutes were unanimously approved.

b. May 03, 2016 Meeting Minutes Amendment Request

A resident requested via email that the Planning Commission's May 03, 2016 Meeting Minutes be amended to more accurately reflect a question that he had asked. After some discussion the Planning Commission decided to accept the email into the September 07, 2016 Meeting Minutes. The email read, "Dear Commissioners, I would like to have the minutes of the May 3rd 2016 meeting amended to reflect my question to the planning commission concerning the Devon Center Overlay District. My question was if we change the zoning on the south east side of Devon blvd to allow a 100 unit apartment building does the zoning goes with the land or the development. The answer from Ms. Camp was it goes with the land. To which I responded so it really does not matter what the developers envisions for their Devon Yard project because they may not be the group who ends up building the structure Since they may sell the property without ever breaking ground. Correct? Answer was yes but the new owners would need to follow the codes. Thank you for considering my request since Ms. Pogyor had commented she had read all of the minutes on the project from the beginning I realized that this is an important resource to some of our residents. Sincerely, Mark Ward"

Subdivision and Land Development Plan Applications.

a. Sketch Plan – Stonehaven Homes (Mack Oil and Armstrong Properties)

Chairman Stanish explained that this is a Sketch Plan and welcomes all comments from the public before turning the meeting over to the Applicant's Attorney, George Broseman. Mr. Broseman gave an overview of the planning process with the residents and introduced the project before handing the presentation over to the Applicant, John McGrath. Mr. McGrath presented 2 development options with the first option proposing the demotion of the Mack Oil commercial buildings and the retention of the existing Armstrong residence for a total of 44 residential dwellings, including a mix of twin,

townhouse, and single-family detached dwellings on both properties. He explained that a zoning change from R3 – Residential to Village Transition Zoning District would be required for this option. Mr. McGrath then presented the second option which is primarily a by-right plan with 38 townhouses just on the Mack Oil property. Discussion was held on the road configuration and it being public vs private. Mr. Stanish provided a background on the reasoning behind the current zoning for the properties. The Planning Commission indicated its position to not change the zoning unless the Applicant presents compelling reasons to support changing the R3 – Residential to Village Transition Zoning District. The Planning Commissioner's shared what they liked and did not like with each option before receiving public comment.

Matt Kennedy of 585 Conestoga Road, is concerned about traffic and fitting the proposal to the current zoning.

Eric Nielsen of 656 Kromer Avenue, questioned the number of twin homes and their setbacks.

Anna Sicalides of 22 Leopard Road, expressed concern about renovating the Armstrong residence.

Joy Newman of 635 Conestoga Road, does not like adding more traffic to the area.

Property Owner of Kromer Avenue, stated that the Subdivision and Land Development does not allow development to change the face of the neighborhood and this proposal will.

Tom Kennedy of 655 Kromer Avenue, explained the comparison of this proposal to the eyesore that is there now.

Paul Lavalley of 679 Conestoga Road, suggested making Price Avenue an emergency access only and direct traffic on to Branch Avenue.

Brian Walheim of 582 Kromer Avenue, shared concerns over traffic, density, and existing character and that several units border his backyard. Questioned if this is the appropriate density.

Ann Luebbert of 560 Kromer Avenue, would prefer having singles homes instead of the proposed twins.

Jack Taylor of 218 Warren Avenue, expressed his desire against a zoning changed and concern over Old Lancaster Road's capacity under the railroad tracks.

Jeff Starke of 206 Warren Avenue, stated he is against rezoning.

John Niles of 222 Warren Avenue, explained that Warren Avenue is already a pass through and this proposal will make it worse.

Bill Neff of 634 Kromer Avenue, questioned the density of the Mack Oil Property.

Joe Durante of 580 Kromer Avenue, concerned about homes behind his property and wants them relocated.

Will Boyer of 550Kromer Avenue, stated that he is in favor of the first option and likes the developer.

Phran Novelli of 711 Conestoga Road, questioned why zoned Village Transition and why no density limitation.

Property Owner, questioned why houses are split by the municipal boundary and if not rezoned then what will you do with the Armstrong Property.

Mr. Briggs outlined the next possible steps for the Applicant followed by Ms. Camp explaining the public notice process for rezoning.

b. Sketch Plan – 311 Lancaster Avenue (Maserati of the Main Line)

Chairman Stanish explained that the Applicant pulled themselves from the Agenda.

c. LD 109 – 4 Midland Avenue – Preliminary/Final Land Development Plan

Chairman Stanish provided background on the project highlighting that this Land Development Application proposes to demolish the existing commercial building and construct 3 multi-family buildings with 18 condominium dwelling units. Mr. Broseman representing the Applicant, John Benson, stated that they are seeking Preliminary Plan approval. He explained that most of review comments will be complied with and that he believes that the buildings are under 42 feet and will not exceed 3 stories. Mr. Broseman stated that a note suggested by Mr. Briggs will be placed on the Plan that the garage counts as 1 of the 3 stories. When the Planning Commissioners asked how many stories will the buildings be neither Mr. Broseman nor Mr. Benson provided a direct answer only that they would follow the note placed on the Plan as suggested by Mr. Briggs. Mr. Benson added that the building height would not change, but the interior floor plan would include lofts or bi-levels to comply with the 3 story maximum. Chairman Stanish reminded the Applicant that the Planning Commission has consistently asked for accurate elevations, which he has yet to provide to confirm the height. Mr. Benson explained that the internal circulation will comply with the 22 foot width and that he is willing to extend the sidewalk along Berwyn Avenue to Woodside Avenue. Bo Erixon handed out an updated Plan and explained that there were changes to the requested waivers. Chairman Stanish expressed concern about the 9-foot wide garages. Ms. Camp

questioned the Traffic Engineer's comments regarding the extension of a sidewalk along Midland Avenue to Lancaster Avenue, which the Planning Commission was okay with the Applicant not providing it. Mr. Broseman questioned the Township Engineer's comment about providing Open Space/Recreation and offered providing a fee-in-lieu of with the consideration of a cost reduction for extending the sidewalk along Berwyn Avenue.

Justin Buchanan of 20 Midland Avenue, asked if the sidewalk will be the same level of the street.

Betsy Fadem of 200 Hedgemere Drive, asked what are the building heights looking from the courtyards and what will the back of the buildings look like from the street.

Casey Buchanan of 20 Midland Avenue, asked if there were multiple drives into the site, is there a wall along the private road, and will the units have roof access.

Stacey Ballard of 72 Main Avenue, asked what is the space between the brick pattern within the Courts.

Marc Heppe of 506 Newtown Road, asked if there will be any emergency access via the private road.

At the conclusion of the discussion and upon a motion by Mr. Cappelletti, seconded by Mr. McCarty, and unanimously approved was a recommendation that the Board of Supervisors approve the Plan as a Preliminary Plan subject with the following conditions:

1. Applicant shall comply with the following review letters:
 - McMahan Associates, Inc. letter dated August 18, 2016;
 - ARRO Consulting, Inc. letter dated August 18, 2016;
 - Zoning Officer memorandum dated September 01, 2016;
 - Glackin Thomas Panzak, Inc. letter dated August 18, 2016; and
 - Berwyn Fire Company memorandum dated August 31, 2016.
2. Applicant shall include a restriction in the Condominium Declaration that prohibits parking in Courts A or B.
3. Applicant shall add a note to the Plan that includes a restrictive covenant that prohibits parking in Courts A or B and provides the Township with legal authority to enforce such restriction.
4. Applicant shall submit architectural drawings for each of the three buildings which depict the building elevations from all four sides. Such architectural drawings must demonstrate compliance with the maximum building height of three stories or 42 feet, whichever is lower.

5. Applicant shall extend the sidewalk along Berwyn Avenue to Woodside Avenue and install two handicap ramps at this intersection.
6. Applicant must satisfy the requirements in Section 400-25.D(5) and 400-58.C regarding the construction of recreational facilities or pay a fee-in-lieu of open space, if determined necessary by the Board of Supervisors. Should the Board of Supervisors determine that the fee-in-lieu of is acceptable, the Planning Commission supports that the additional cost to extend the sidewalk along Berwyn Avenue be credited towards satisfying the fee-in-lieu of, however, the specific amount of the fee should be based on the formula outlined in Section 400-58.C and found to be acceptable by the Board of Supervisors.

Act 537 Supplement for Tredyffrin Township's Wilson Road Force Main.

Brady Flaherty, Easttown Township Municipal Authority Engineer, presented the details of the Act 537 Supplement and explained that he has reviewed the Supplement and recommends that the Planning Commission Chairperson send a letter to Tredyffrin Township stating that the Planning Commission has no comment.

A motion was by Mr. Brennan and seconded by Ms. Hashemi to authorize the Planning Commission Chairperson to send a letter to Tredyffrin Township that the Planning Commission has no comment on the Act 537 Supplement. The motion was unanimously approved.

Announcements

Next tentatively scheduled Workshop is Tuesday, October 04, 2016 at 6:30 p.m.

Next regularly scheduled Regular Meeting is Tuesday, October 04, 2016 at 7:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Eugene C. Briggs, Jr., AICP
Assistant Township Manager/Zoning Officer