WEST WHITELAND TOWNSHIP
Planning Commission
Agenda
Wednesday, January 3, 2018
7:00 P.M.

CALL TO ORDER

REORGANIZATION

REVIEW OF MEETING MINUTES

1. Approval of Meeting Minutes: December 5, 2017

PUBLIC COMMENT/ CONCERNS/ QUESTIONS

PLANS

1. Moser Court Parking Expansion
   Address: 390 Waterloo Blvd.
   Second Review: Land Development
   Request: Proposed construction of a 5,220 sq.ft. parking lot expansion

NEW BUSINESS

ANNOUNCEMENTS

ADJOURNMENT

Next Meeting: January 16, 2018
MEMORANDUM

DATE: December 22, 2017
TO: Planning Commission
FROM: John R. Weller, AICP
        Director of Planning and Zoning
SUBJECT: Moser Court parking lot expansion
         Land development plan

APPLICANT: Moser Court, LLP
           1171 Lancaster Ave., Ste. 201
           Berwyn, PA  19312

SITE ADDRESS: 390 Waterloo Blvd.
               Exton, PA  19341

TAX PARCEL: 41-5-5.5

ZONING: O/C, Office Commercial

DESCRIPTION: Expansion of existing parking lot; land development
             review required due to addition of more than 2,000 sq.ft.
             of impervious surface.

EXPIRES: February 6, 2018

Background

The project site is the Moser Court office building at the southeast corner of Waterloo Blvd.
and N. Whitford Rd., where the Applicant is proposing to expand the parking area at the east
side of the property. Eighteen parking spaces will be constructed, but it appears that the
project will eliminate four existing spaces resulting in a net increase of fourteen parking
spaces. No new buildings or building additions are proposed. Land development review is
required pursuant to §325-8 of the West Whiteland Township Zoning Ordinance (“Zoning”):
the definition of the term “land development” includes “...additional impervious surfaces
greater than 2,000 sq.ft. in area...”. Staff has determined that the proposed development
complies with the applicable area and bulk provisions of the Zoning.

The project site is within 300 feet of two Class I historic resources (the “Oaklands” manor
house at 349 W. Lincoln Hwy. and its gatehouse) and was therefore reviewed by the Township
Historical Commission at their meeting of September 11, 2017. At the conclusion of discus-
son at that meeting, the Commission unanimously passed a motion stating their determina-
tion that the project would “have no significant impact” on the nearby historic sites and that
they had no objection to the project.
The Applicant first presented this project to the Planning Commission at the meeting of September 19, 2017. There was no action on the plan, but there was discussion regarding resolution of the various consultant concerns. They were scheduled to appear again at the meeting of November 14, 2017, but elected not to attend in light of the concerns still remaining. Tonight is the Applicant’s second presentation of the land development plan to the Commission.

Consultant Reviews

- **SSM Group (“SSM”) review dated December 20, 2017.** While comment #2 questions the design of the stormwater management system, we note that resolving it will - at worst - require only a minor revision. Comment #3 supports a waiver from the infiltration requirement in §270-20 of the Stormwater Management Ordinance (Staff concurs), and comments #8 and #9 describe various corrections and clarifications to notes and details.

- **Theurkauf Design and Planning (“Theurkauf”) review dated December 11, 2017.** As before, the most serious issue is the proximity of proposed parking area to the adjacent McIlvaine property. Comment #1 notes that the 50-foot buffer required by §281-35.A of the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (“S/LDO”) has not been provided and that the 25-foot buffer that would be required between compatible uses cannot be accommodated either. The Commission should review with the Applicant whether reducing the size of the parking area (as suggested by Theurkauf) is feasible or if the proposed landscaping is sufficient to meet the intent of the requirement and to what extent any waiver may be appropriate. The remaining issues described in the other comments appear to be sufficiently minor to be “will comply” items, but the Commission should confirm this. Comment #11 supports waiving the requirement for plant growth diagrams found in §281-33.C(6)(c) of the S/LDO; Staff concurs.

- **Traffic Planning and Design (“TPD”) review dated December 20, 2017.** Comment #1 repeats TPD's earlier concerns regarding the alignment of the new parking area and the need for a new “stop” sign to control traffic within the parking lot. The Commission may recall discussing this issue previously and concluding that there was minimal benefit to either the change in alignment or the sign. While we do not dispute TPD's reasoning nor their conclusion that these changes would improve the design, Staff concurs with the Commission’s prior direction to the Applicant due to the low volume of traffic involved, the fact that the design precludes high-speed travel, and fact that this is private property. Staff does, however, share TPD’s concern expressed in comment #4: clear sight distance must be maintained, especially if there will not be an internal “stop” sign as suggested in comment #1.

Reviews from Stubbe Consulting (regarding site lighting), the Director of Public Works, the Fire Marshal, and the Chief of Police for prior iterations of this plan all indicated no remaining concerns, so we did not request new reviews from them. The County Planning Commission review of August 18, 2017 noted that the number of parking spaces provided for handicapped drivers was deficient, but this issue has been resolved and the plan shows all four spaces as required by §325-39.F(5)(a) of the Zoning.

Staff Comment

Due to the nature of the project, there is no open space requirement nor is there any basis for a traffic impact fee. While our consultants all have remaining concerns, Staff is of the
opinion that they are either sufficiently minor to be made conditions of plan approval or are issues that can be resolved with some direction from the Commission. The latter includes the issue of the buffer along the eastern side of the property (Theurkauf comment #1), the parking lot design (TPD comment #1), and the sight distance concern (TPD comment #4). If the Commission is able to resolve these issues in the course of the meeting, then Staff would have no objection to action on the plan tonight. We recommend the following waivers and conditions of approval:

1. The plan is approved as a final plan, pursuant to §281-10.H of the S/LDO.
2. Waiver of §270-20 of the Stormwater Management Ordinance such that infiltration of stormwater need not be provided, pursuant to comment #3 of the SSM review dated December 20, 2017.
3. Waiver of §281-35.D of the S/LDO to allow a screen buffer less than fifty (50) feet wide along the eastern side of the property.
4. Waiver of §281-33.C(6)(c) of the S/LDO such that no growth rate diagrams are to be provided, pursuant to comment #11 of the Theurkauf review dated December 11, 2017.
5. Resolution of all remaining consultant concerns to the satisfaction of the Township.
6. Any other conditions as may be agreed to in the course of tonight’s meeting.
7. Execution and recording of the Township’s Stormwater Management Facilities Maintenance Agreement and Landscaping Restrictive Covenant, pursuant to Township practice.
8. Execution of a Developer Agreement and a Financial Security Agreement pursuant to Township practice. The amount of such security shall be based upon construction cost estimates for the site improvements, including landscaping, to be provided by the Applicant, which shall be reviewed and deemed sufficient by SSM and Theurkauf.
9. Payment of all outstanding Township invoices within thirty days of the date of final plan approval or at the time of application for the first construction-related permit, whichever comes first.

Attachments

1. SSM review dated December 20, 2017.
December 20, 2017

Mr. John R. Weller, AICP
Director of Planning and Zoning
West Whiteland Township
101 Commerce Drive
Exton, PA 19341

RE: Moser Court
Preliminary/Final Land Development Plan
SSM File 101008.0312

Dear Mr. Weller:

We have reviewed the revised preliminary/final land development plan for the expansion of the parking lot for Moser Court consisting of the following submission:

- Edward B. Walsh and Associates plan 3131, Sheets 1 through 7 dated February 14, 2017, most recently revised December 5, 2017.

The tract is located at the intersection of Waterloo Boulevard and Whitford Road. Eighteen (18) parking spaces will be added in the eastern portion of the lot.

Issues regarding landscaping and buffering, traffic and pedestrian circulation, and lighting will be addressed by Theurkauf Design and Planning, Traffic Planning and Design, and Stan Stubbe respectively.

We offer the following comments.

COMPLIANCE WITH SUBDIVISION AND LAND DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE
1. An improvements agreement and guarantee will be required, Section 281-54.

COMPLIANCE WITH STORMWATER ORDINANCE
2. As previously noted the volume equal to the difference in the 2-year storm from pre to post conditions has been provided for water quality, Section 270-19.A. The detention basin is designed as a slow release detention basin in lieu of infiltrating runoff. Although we concur with this, the calculations must demonstrate that the runoff volume is held between 48 and 72 hours. If this requires that the lowest outlet (the 2" underdrain) needs to be further restricted, we recommend that the pipe remains the same and that the flow be restricted either through the use of a valve or orifice plate inside the outlet structure.

3. The design engineer suggests that the amended soils meets the requirements for infiltration. Although amended soils are specified on this site, they do not meet the ordinance requirements for infiltration nor does the design support such a conclusion. Furthermore, the geotechnical report recommends not infiltrating. Therefore, a waiver of Section 270-20 should be requested.
4. The calculations for rate control, Section 270-22, must consider the outflow from the underdrain.
5. The applicant shall provide the Township with the “letter of adequacy” from the Chester County Conservation District for the E&S Plan prior to the Township endorsing the plan, Section 270-17.A.(1)(a).
6. The applicant statement of Section 270-32.A.(3) and the design engineer signature block of Section 270-32.A.(4) shall be signed prior to the Township endorsing the plan.
7. A stormwater operation and maintenance agreement shall be provided, Section 270-43.
8. The notes that were added regarding adjustments to existing stormwater structures are unclear and must be revised.
9. The “Stormwater Management System” detail on sheet 6 shall be revised as follows:
   a. The underdrain shall be shown.
   b. The bottom of the basin and bottom of the stone shall be shown flat.
   c. The 1.5’ thick amended soils only need to be shown on the bottom of the basin.
   d. The leader to the 10 mil geomembrane points to the incorrect location.
   e. The line type for the geomembrane and the geotextile must be different so that it is clear where these two different materials are to be placed.
   f. The geomembrane must be shown to be properly anchored.

GENERAL COMMENTS
10. The spot elevations provided for the proposed parking space closest to Waterloo Blvd. are incorrect and must be revised to properly direct runoff into the basin.

Please contact me if you have any questions.

Sincerely,
Spotts, Stevens and McCoy

[Signature]

Kent D. Morey, P.E.
Senior Engineer
kent.morey@ssmgroup.com

cc: Mark Stabolepsy, P.E.
MEMORANDUM

TO: John Weller, AICP, West Whiteland Township Director of Planning and Zoning
Justin Smiley, AICP, Township Planner
Pat Layman, Assistant to the Township Manager

FROM: Edward A. Theurkauf, RLA, ASLA, APA

DATE: December 11, 2017

SUBJECT: REVIEW COMMENTS – MOSER COURT PARKING EXPANSION
LAND DEVELOPMENT PLAN DATED 12-5-17

Please note our review comments pertaining to the following documents that we received on 12-9-17 and to a site visit on 7-27-17:

- Land Development Plan consisting of 7 sheets; and
- Response letter from Adam Brower dated 12-5-17.

Previous comments that have been addressed are so noted. New comments are in bold.
1. **Screen Buffer** – Section 281-35.A of the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (SLDO) requires a 50 foot wide planted screen buffer between the office use on site and the adjoining agricultural/residential use to the east. The plan indicates a dramatic reduction in the width of the existing 50 foot buffer, which is inconsistent with the purpose of separating incompatible uses. The required screen buffer width is not proposed along any part of the new parking lot and would be reduced to 11.64 feet at its narrowest.

Planting within the buffer is required and proposed as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Buffer/Length</th>
<th>Plant Type</th>
<th>Required Qty.</th>
<th>Proposed Qty.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East/253 LF</td>
<td>Shade Trees</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evergreen Trees</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Large Shrubs</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Comprised of 18 proposed shrubs and 7 existing to remain

The proposed buffer does not provide screening and separation equivalent to the required screen buffer, nor does it meet even the minimum perimeter buffer width standard. Because the adjacent property is also zoned OC, its future development in a more compatible use is possible. However, in that case a 25 foot perimeter buffer would be required, and we must still address the fundamental inconsistency with the existing agricultural/residential use that predated the office building.

Therefore, it is recommended that if relief on buffer width is granted, it should be no narrower than the 25 foot perimeter buffer requirement. Within this buffer, a continuous and opaque buffer of evergreen trees, decorative wall, or fence should be provided to make up for the diminished screen buffer width between incompatible uses. This could be accomplished by shortening the proposed parking area, which would reduce the new parking lot from 18 to 12 spaces.

2. **Naturalistic Basin** – Section 281-35.F.4 (SLDO) permits naturalistic basins without a 25 foot wide perimeter buffer if graded with 4:1 maximum side slopes and with 100% native vegetation of equivalent value to the buffer plantings otherwise required. The proposed basin lacks the native planting or seeding specification and shall be revised accordingly.

3. **Parking Lot Islands** – This issue has been resolved.

4. **Building Area Landscaping** – This issue has been resolved.
5. **Site Element Screening** – Section 281-35.G.1.a (SLDO) requires a low site element screen around parking lots consisting of dense shrubs.

   Proposed shrub plantings would not screen the northeast parking lot corner as required. Screen buffering as recommended in comment #1 would resolve this issue. The plan shall be revised accordingly.

6. **Additional Required Landscaping** – This issue has been resolved.

7. **Lighting Conflict** – This issue has been resolved.

8. **Tree Removal and Replacement** – This issue has been resolved.

9. **Tree Relocation** – In accordance with section 281-34.E (SLDO), the following trees are labeled as “Relocate Tree” on Sheet 2:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transplant Tree Type</th>
<th>Size (DBH)</th>
<th>Transplant Location Shown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deciduous</td>
<td>6”</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deciduous</td>
<td>6”</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deciduous</td>
<td>5”</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deciduous</td>
<td>4”</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deciduous</td>
<td>4”</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deciduous</td>
<td>3”</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evergreen</strong></td>
<td>5”</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evergreen</td>
<td>3”</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evergreen</td>
<td>3”</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   **The proposed locations of two additional tree transplants must be shown.**

10. **Tree Protection** – Section 281-34.D.4 (SLDO) requires tree protection fencing around the critical root zone of trees to be preserved. The following corrections shall be made:

    a. **An 8 inch evergreen tree is shown with grading in its critical root zone.** The grading shall be modified accordingly.
b. The note on the tree protection detail is unclear and shall be revised as follows: “Place fencing at drip line or at 1 foot per inch tree DBH from the trunk, whichever distance is greater”.

11. **Plant Growth Diagrams** – We have no objection to a waiver from the plant growth diagram requirement of section 281-33.C.6.c (SLDO).

12. **Landscape Plan Preparation** – Section 281-33.C.7 (SLDO) requires that the landscape plan be sealed by a Pennsylvania registered landscape architect prior to final plan recording.

13. **Cost Estimate** – A landscaping cost estimate will be required upon final plan approval in accordance with section 281-33.C.6.i (SLDO).

14. **Plant Cultural Requirements** – *This issue has been resolved.*

15. **Plan Error** – The plant label for (5) Viburnum pragense should be revised from VB to VP consistent with the plant schedule.

16. **Conclusion** – Prior to preliminary approval, the following issues shall be resolved:
   
   - Screen Buffer width waiver
   - Naturalistic Basin planting specification

   The remaining issues shall be resolved prior to final approval.

Please contact this office with any questions.
December 20, 2017

Ms. Mimi Gleason, Township Manager
West Whiteland Township
101 Commerce Drive
Exton, PA 19341

RE: Moser Court Parking Expansion
Preliminary/Final Plan Review
West Whiteland Township, Chester County
TPD# WWT.A.00074

Dear Mimi:

In our role as Township Traffic Engineer, Traffic Planning and Design, Inc. (TPD) has reviewed the following items which were received in our office on December 8, 2017:

- Preliminary/Final Land Development Plans prepared by Edward B. Walsh & Associates, Inc. dated February 14, 2017, last revised December 5, 2017;

Based on our review, we offer the following comments using the same numbering system as our August 14, 2017 and November 1, 2017 review letters for those comments not yet addressed. Comments that were addressed are not shown.

Previous Comments

1. The proposed parking lot is offset from the access driveway on Waterloo Boulevard. While a larger radius has been provided on the landscaped area in the vicinity of the northeast corner of the building to ease the lateral shift for vehicles entering the site, a lateral shift still exists for this movement and for vehicles exiting the proposed parking area. Shifting the northern end of the proposed area approximately four feet to the west so that the rear of the parking spaces on the eastern side of the proposed parking area align with the existing curbing on the egress side of the driveway would improve the safety at this internal intersection because this change improves the alignment with the existing driveway as indicated on the sketch included with the November 1, 2017 review letter.
The response letter indicates that it is not necessary to align the parking area due to a minimal number of vehicles traveling at a low rate of speed. However, in our opinion, the suggested driveway alignment improvement should be provided unless it is determined that it creates undue hardship or is technically infeasible. Aligned driveways are always preferred because they reduce the possibility of vehicles striking the curbs and improve internal circulation.

In addition, a "Stop" sign must be provided on the landscaped area located in the vicinity of the northeast corner of the building for the eastbound parking aisle approaching the intersection with the Waterloo Boulevard access as indicated in our previous review. The "Stop" sign should be placed west of the ingress curbline on the Waterloo Boulevard access so that eastbound vehicles stop before entering the intersection with the Waterloo Boulevard access.

The response letter indicates that a stop sign is unnecessary because this is a private parking lot and the applicant has decided not to provide a stop sign. Section 281-45 of the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance states that "Traffic-control devices shall be provided when required by the Township and their location shown on the plans." A "Stop" sign is a traffic control device. Furthermore, Section 276-22.B of the Township Ordinance states "For nonresidential or multifamily residential driveways, provisions shall be made for safe and efficient ingress and egress to and from public streets and highways serving a developed use without undue congestion or interference with normal traffic flow." In our opinion, peak hour accidents at this new three way internal intersection due to the lack of a traffic control device and any possible sight distance obstructions such as those identified in Comment #4 will lead to queues extending into Waterloo Boulevard thus interfering with normal traffic flow on Waterloo Boulevard and impacting traffic safety at this roadway due to the short separation distance between the two locations.

For all of these reasons, TPD does not support the improvements for the proposed parking lot expansion.

4. Existing vegetation located near the monument sign at the access driveway will restrict sight distance for drivers looking to their left when stopped at the STOP sign recommended in Comment 1. Currently, the sight distance obstruction only applies to right turn vehicles from Waterloo Boulevard that desire to access one of the three parking spaces located directly ahead of them once they enter the site. With the proposed parking expansion, the sight distance obstruction will apply to such right turn vehicles desiring to access any of the eighteen parking spaces located east of the building. Not only will there be six times as many interactions in the future, but with thirteen of the new spaces located deeper into the site, left and right turn entering vehicles will be traveling faster to access these thirteen spaces than they do today at the point they would interact with left turning vehicles at this STOP sign. Therefore, a clear sight distance triangle in addition to the existing clear sight triangle must be provided on the plans and maintained in the future for a driver on the eastbound parking aisle approach to the north-south main access driveway so that drivers at the internal
intersection can see traffic entering the site via a left turn and a right turn from Waterloo Boulevard.

The response letter indicates that the vegetation is an existing condition that will be addressed during regular maintenance of the landscaping and that a note requiring said maintenance is provided on the plans. However, even the vegetation height proposed in the note would obstruct sight distance. Therefore, we recommend that the applicant's engineer contact our office to discuss what would be an appropriate speed to incorporate into the required clear sight distance triangle.

We reserve the right to make additional comments upon receipt of subsequent submissions.

Sincerely,

Kevin L. Johnson, P.E.
President

kjohnson@TrafficPD.com

Cc: John Weller, A.CP
    Justin Smiley, AICP
    Ted Otteni, P.E.
    Jerry Baker, P.E.
    Eric Hammond