WEST WHITELAND TOWNSHIP
Planning Commission
Agenda
Tuesday, May 15, 2018
7:00 P.M.

CALL TO ORDER

REVIEW OF MEETING MINUTES

1. Approval of Meeting Minutes: May 1, 2018

PUBLIC COMMENT/ CONCERNS/ QUESTIONS

PLANS

1. PAC Strapping Products, Inc.
   Address: 307 National Rd.
   First Review: Land Development
   Request: The construction of a 11,668 sq.ft. addition that will connect two existing industrial buildings.

2. Lochiel Farm
   Address: 740 Livingston Ln.
   First Review: Land Development
   Request: The construction 140 Townhomes and adaptive reuse of two historic structures into single family residential units.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

ADJOURNMENT

Next Meeting: June 5, 2018
MEMORANDUM

DATE: May 11, 2018
TO: Planning Commission
FROM: John R. Weller, AICP
Director of Planning and Zoning
SUBJECT: PAC Strapping Expansion
Land development plan

APPLICANT: SB&G Real Estate Partnership
307 National Rd.
Exton, PA 19341

SITE ADDRESS: 307-311 National Rd.
Exton, PA 19341

TAX PARCELS: 41-5-125.2L, 41-5-125.2M, and 41-5-125.2N

ZONING: I-1, Limited Industrial

DESCRIPTION: Construction of a 11,668 sq.ft. building addition and consolidation of three existing parcels into one parcel.

EXPIRES: July 14, 2018

Background

The subject tract comprises three contiguous parcels along the north side of National Rd., an industrial cul-de-sac that extends eastward from Whitford Rd. just north of the Exton By-Pass. The westernmost parcel (311 National Rd.) is already developed with an industrial building, and there is a second industrial building (307 National Rd.) on the line dividing the other two parcels. National Rd. is characterized by low-rise light industrial structures similar to the ones on the subject tract. The property is nearly level; there are no steep slopes or FEMA-designated floodplain areas.

The Applicant is proposing to construct a 11,668 sq.ft. addition that will connect the two existing buildings, making a single building of 47,665 sq.ft. The Applicant will also be consolidating the three parcels into a single parcel with a gross area of 4.16 acres (3.70 acres net). The zoning data shown on Sheet 1 of the plan set are correct, and the Applicant has properly calculated the building and impervious coverage figures based upon the net lot area. As shown, the proposed building will result in a violation of the building coverage limit, but the Zoning Hearing Board granted relief to allow the design shown at a hearing on March 29, 2018. Although the building coverage will be greater than the existing condition, the Applicant is proposing to remove impervious cover to the extent that there will be less impervious cover on the site following completion of the project.
The project is too small to require conditional use review. There are no historic resources within 300 feet of the site, so no review by the Township Historical Commission is warranted.

Tonight is the Applicant’s first presentation of the land development plan to the Planning Commission.

Consultant Reviews

- **SSM Group (“SSM”) review dated May 3, 2018.** It appears that the most serious concern is in regard to stormwater management: as designed, runoff from the parking lot in front of the building will enter the swale along the west side of the lot and will not enter the detention basin, resulting in such a large increase in the peak flow rate for a two-year storm that it will violate §270-22.A of the Stormwater Management Ordinance. This is noted in comment #20, and comment #2 recommends against the waiver requested by the Applicant to allow this.

  The remaining concerns are relatively minor. The Commission should provide guidance regarding the requested waiver from the sidewalk requirement (comment #3) and determine whether the Applicant will be able to revise the grading to bring the slope of the parking lot into compliance with §325-39.F(4) of the Zoning Ordinance (comment #7). Comment #16 properly notes that this project will be subject to payment of a fee in lieu of open space based upon the floor area of the addition.

- **Theurkauf Design and Planning (“Theurkauf”) review dated May 7, 2018.** Theurkauf identifies numerous deficiencies with the landscaping plan, including the design of the storm basin, parking lot screening and internal landscaping, satisfaction of the compensatory planting requirement, building façade plantings, protection provisions for existing trees during construction, and species diversity. Comment #1 notes the same issue regarding sidewalks found in the SSM review, and comment #14 supports a waiver from the requirement to provide plant growth diagrams.

- **Stubbe Consulting review dated April 21, 2018.** Additional information is required (particularly regarding the lighting controls) in order for Mr. Stubbe to confirm compliance with our regulations. Comment #2 recommends a revision to the pole design (or placement) in order to minimize the chance of damage by vehicles.

- **Traffic Planning and Design (“TPD”) review dated May 8, 2018.** Comments #1 and #2 note that a traffic impact fee is required and that the information needed to determine the amount has yet to be provided. The remaining concerns may be summarized as follows:

  - Comments #3, #10, and #11 all involve the design of the parking area. Staff is of the opinion that the conflict described in comment #3 will need to be resolved administratively, as there does not appear to be a design solution that would accommodate all the parking spaces required by the Zoning. Staff concurs with the recommendations in comments #10 and #11.

  - Comment #4 involves the clear-sight distance at the driveways, noting that the issue is the same one raised earlier this year regarding the Horn Plumbing project across the street from this site. At that time, Staff discussed the matter with the Director of Public Works and the Chief of Police. Mr. Otteni and Chief Catov both advised that TPD is correct in that where there is no posted speed limit, the enforceable limit is 55 mph. However, National Rd. is a quarter-mile long cul-de-sac with limited traffic volume, and the Township’s experience is that traffic here is much slower, such that designing for 55-mph traffic would be inappropriate. For
the Horn project, we advised (and the Board approved) that the clear-sight triangle for the driveway be measured ten feet back from the curb line, pursuant to §281-28.E(3) of the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, and that a “stop” sign be placed at the end of the driveway. Staff suggests similar guidance in this case. We note that there is already a “stop” sign at the eastern driveway, but one should be added for the western driveway, as per comment #8.

- Comment #5 raises the same issue as comment #4 of the SSM review. While SSM supports the requested waiver from the curb requirement in the interest of facilitating stormwater management, TPD expresses concern that the lack of any barrier may allow vehicles to intrude into the stormwater facilities. Staff agrees that there should be some provision to protect these facilities that would still allow storm runoff to enter the facilities as intended. We recommend that the Applicant be directed to coordinate a solution with SSM and TPD.

- The remaining issues involve plan notes and details; we expect that the Applicant will advise that these are “will comply” items.

- **Director of Public Works memorandum dated May 8, 2018.** Mr. Otteni has no concerns.
- **Fire Marshal memorandum dated May 7, 2018.** Mr. Moses notes that the entire building, both the existing and proposed portions, will need to comply with various codes and ordinances. He also directs that the driveway along the eastern side of the building be posted as a fire lane.
- **Police Department memorandum dated May 7, 2018.** Chief Catov has no concerns.
- **Chester County Planning Commission review dated May 7, 2018.** The County advises that the plan is consistent with the County Comprehensive Plan. The other issues in the review have also been noted by our consultants. We particularly note comment #3 and the concern regarding sinkholes (also noted in comments #1 and #14 of the SSM review) given that the plan shows an existing sinkhole shown on the site.

**Staff Comment**

Staff notes that the proposed project complies with the Zoning, and we are pleased that a local business is expanding; however, we do not support action on the plan at this time. While all consultant comments must be resolved to our satisfaction, Staff is particularly concerned about the items that have the potential to change the site layout and affect other elements of the design. We therefore advise that SSM’s concerns regarding the design of the stormwater management facilities and the internal circulation issues described in the TPD review be more fully addressed prior to Commission action. We also note that the landscaping plan has failed to address many of our landscaping requirements, as documented in the Theurkauf review, and that information has yet to be provided regarding traffic and trip generation.

We recommend that the Commission provide guidance regarding the sidewalk requirement as well as any other items of Commission concern. The Commission may also wish to review the waivers that the Applicant will be requesting and advise as to whether you support them. Finally, the Applicant should be directed to revise the drawings to address Commission and consultant concerns and to submit the revised drawings for review.
Attachments

1. SSM review dated May 3, 2018.
9. Plan set dated April 12, 2018 (sheets 1-8), April 11, 2018 (sheet LA-1), and April 10, 2018 (sheets SLP-1 and SLP-2), no revision dates.

H:\Plans\NOPQ\PAC\Weller PC memo dated 5-11-18
May 3, 2018

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

RE:  PAC Strapping Expansion
     Preliminary/Final Land Development
     and Lot Consolidation Plan
     SSM File 101008.0321

Dear Mr. Weller:

We have reviewed the above-referenced plan consisting of the following:

• Cedarville Engineering Group plan PAC-17-263, Sheets 1 through 8 dated April 12, 2018.

PAC Strapping intends to consolidate three lots into one lot along National Road and construct a building addition connecting two existing buildings.  Additional parking spaces will be added.  The tract is zoned I-1 Limited Industrial.

We have the following comments regarding the plan.

**WAIVER REQUESTS**

1. A waiver has been requested from the infiltration requirements of Section 270-20 of the Stormwater Management Ordinance.  Due to the underlying karst geology and presence of a sinkhole on site, the applicant’s geotechnical consultant has recommended against infiltration.  We support this waiver request.

2. A waiver has been requested from the peak rate control requirement of Section 270-22.A of the Stormwater Management Ordinance to reduce the post condition 2-year storm rate to the existing condition 2-year storm rate.  All other required rate reductions have been met.  The design suggests that the post condition 2-year rate of 4.46 cfs will be approximately 2.5 times higher than the existing condition 2-year rate of 1.77 cfs.  We do NOT support this waiver request.

3. A waiver has been requested from Section 281-31.A., sidewalk requirement along National Road.  The Township should determine whether sidewalk or a contribution in lieu thereof will be required.

4. A waiver has been requested from the requirement to place curb around all paved areas, Section 281-32.B.  has been requested.  As the uncurbed areas are either existing or are proposed to encourage storm water sheet flow into stormwater basins we support this waiver request.
COMPLIANCE WITH ZONING ORDINANCE
5. Apparently a variance was granted to increase the maximum building coverage. Conditions of the variance shall be added to the plan.
6. The applicant must clarify if the impervious coverage percentage was calculated using developable acreage, per definition.
7. The grade of parking spaces near the rain garden exceeds the maximum permissible 6%, Section 325-39.F(4).

COMPLIANCE WITH ZONING ARTICLE XV: CARBONATE AREA DISTRICT
8. Section 325-77.A(1) – Compliance - A plan note indicates that no USTs are proposed as part of the application.
9. Section 325-77.A(2) – Compliance - A plan note indicates that this facility will not utilize fill containing any material which would represent a potential contamination hazard to ground or surface waters.
10. Section 325-77.A(3) – Compliance - A plan note indicates that this facility will not accommodate the storage, handling, processing, or disposal of toxic materials or any other substance with the potential to contaminate ground or surface waters.
11. Section 325-77.A(4) – Compliance - Based on the information provided in the plans and the E & S Control Report, the site improvements will not directly or indirectly diminish the flow of natural springs.
12. Section 325-77.A(5) – Compliance - The plans indicate that the site will be supplied with public water and public sewer.
13. Section 325-78.A – Compliance - Based on the information reviewed, the applicant has addressed the requirements of this Section.
14. It is recommended that the Applicant repair the sinkhole on their property within the detention basin as it could require permitting through EPA as a Class 5 Injection Well, and may also act as a conduit allowing the contribution of contaminants to an already impacted stream system.

COMPLIANCE WITH SUBDIVISION AND LAND DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE
15. An improvements agreement and guarantee will be required, Section 281-54.
16. A recreation fee will be required, Section 281-47.C(2).
17. The curb detail shall indicate base, brush finish, sealant and 8 inch reveal, Section 281-32.
18. The telephone number of the applicant shall be indicated, Section 281-17.D(1)(e).

COMPLIANCE WITH STORMWATER ORDINANCE
19. It appears that there is sufficient volume in the rain garden to meet the water quality requirements of Section 270-19. However, since infiltration is not a viable option, the following changes must be made to the rain garden design:
   a. A ponding depth of 1.5 feet is currently proposed. With no infiltration, relying on evapotranspiration for this depth of water will most likely drown the vegetation. We recommend a ponding depth no greater than 6 inches.
   b. A perforated underdrain pipe must be added at the bottom of the amended soil layer. The underdrain shall be wrapped with stone and non-woven geotextile.
   c. A valve must be added to the end of the underdrain pipe to provide the ability to control outflow.
20. The parking lot in the front of the property is proposed to discharge down a steep slope to an existing swale. This area is proposed to bypass the detention basin, resulting in a large increase in the 2-year
storm peak flow rate. The runoff from this area must be captured and conveyed to the existing detention basin.

21. According to the calculations, the proposed building is supposed to drain to the rain garden. This must be noted on the plan, and all downspouts and roof leaders must be shown, Section 270-29.F(2).

22. Operation and maintenance notes must be added for the underdrain valve during vegetation establishment and under normal conditions (open, partially open or closed). During the initial stages of vegetation establishment, stored runoff may be required to be released via the underdrain to help facilitate the establishment of vegetation. Also, under normal conditions, stored runoff may need to be released if ponding persists for a specified period of time. Detailed notes that touch on these subjects shall be provided.

23. Financial security shall be provided for the construction of all stormwater management facilities, Section 270-10.

24. 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.

25. 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.

26. A stormwater operation and maintenance agreement shall be provided, Section 270-43.

27. An easement shall be provided to grant the Township the right, but not the duty, to access the BMPs from a public right-of-way, Section 270-44.A.5.

28. Post Construction Stormwater Management (PCSM) Operation and Maintenance notes in accordance with Article VII shall be provided for the stormwater management system along with the attached Township standard notes.

If you have any questions, please feel free to call me.

Sincerely,
Spotts, Stevens and McCoy

[Signature]

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

Enclosure

cc: Mark Stabolepszy, P.E.
Standard Plan Notes for West Whiteland Township

The following notes have been established by West Whiteland Township as standard language for plan drawings where warranted by the design. The Township deems these notes to be a minimum standard; Applicants may include additional plan notes when necessary, but such notes may not contradict the notes below; all plan notes shall be subject to review by the Township Engineer, Staff, and the various Boards and Commissions of the Township, including but not limited to the Board of Supervisors.

POST-CONSTRUCTION STORMWATER MANAGEMENT BMP INSPECTION AND MAINTENANCE NOTES:

A. No structures that are not components of an approved BMP shall be permitted within or on top of an area designated for stormwater infiltration.

B. Infiltration beds shall be inspected by a Registered Professional Engineer licensed in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania on the following basis:
   - Annually for the first five (5) years.
   - Once every three (3) years thereafter.
Mr. Ed. Theurkauf, ASLA
Theurkauf Design & Planning LLC
1240 Elbow Lane
Chester Springs, PA 19425

Subject: PAC Strapping Expansion Land Development.
Lighting Review

Dear Ed.,

On 04/16/18, West Whiteland Township transmitted Sheets 1-8, Rev. 0 dated
04/12/18, LA-1 Rev. 0 dated 04/11/18 and SLP-1 & SLP-2, Rev. 0 dated 04/10/18, for
the PAC Strapping Expansion Land Development at 307 National Rd.

Proposed lighting, on Sheets SLP-1, Photometric Lighting Plan, and SLP-2, Lighting
Specifications, consists of 8 52-watt 4000K LED, B1 U0 G1 luminaires pole-mounted at
16' AFG and 6 25-watt 4000K LED, B1 U0 G1 luminaires wall-mounted at 16' AFF.

The following comments and recommendations are offered for Township consideration,
based on the requirements contained in SLDO Chapter 281-48, Lighting Control and
reasonable and customary engineering practices:

1. Lighting Control - §281-48.C.(3)(c) requires lighting to be controlled by automatic
switching devices to extinguish outdoor lighting by 11 p.m. and dawn or within 1
hour of the close of business. If all-night lighting is proposed, it shall not constitute
more than 25% of the normal lighting, unless Applicant can demonstrate, to the
satisfaction of the Township, that additional site security lighting is justified.

It is recommended Applicant be requested to specify on lighting plan by what
means the site lighting is to be controlled, at what time site lighting is to be
extinguished, and which luminaires, if any, are proposed to remain on all night
for operations, and/or site safety/security.

2. Installation - 281-48C.(5)(d) requires that poles supporting luminaires directly behind
parking spaces shall be placed a minimum of 5' behind curbs or tire stops or placed
atop a concrete pedestal at least 30" high or otherwise suitably protect poles from
backing vehicles. There are 6 locations where poles supporting luminaires are
vulnerable to being struck by backing vehicles. Electrical General Note #9 states:
"All pole mounted lighting fixtures in parking areas shall be 5' minimum from curb
line and mounted on 30" high concrete founindations unless otherwise approved by
the Township."

It is recommended Applicant be requested to revise Note 9 to read: "Pole-
mounted lighting fixtures located directly to the rear of parking spaces shall
be placed a minimum of 5' behind face of curb or atop concrete pedestals a
minimum of 30" AFG."
3. Plan Content - §281-48.D. requires the names of ies files used to calculate plotted illuminance values be placed on Lighting Plan::

   It is recommended Applicant be requested to add above information to lighting plan.

4. LED Source Correlated Color Temperature - 4000K LEDs are specified. 3000K sources are available.

   To minimize on and off-site glare, it is recommended Applicant be requested to LED sources rated at 3000K.

5. Landscape Plan - Although no potential conflicts between proposed tree and lighting fixture locations were found, it is recommended Applicant be requested to show lighting fixture locations on Landscape Plan, in the event that subsequent revisions to tree locations are made.

If there are questions or concerns regarding this review and its recommendations, please advise.

Sincerely,

Stubbe Consulting LLC

C. Stanley Stubbe

Copy: Mr. Justin Smiley
MEMORANDUM

TO: John Weller, AICP, West Whiteland Township Director of Planning and Zoning
    Justin Smiley, Township Planner
    Roderick M. Chirumbolo, PE, Cedarville Engineering Group
    Thomas H. Kummer, RLA
    Ray H. Ott, Jr., AICP, Ray Ott & Associates

FROM: Edward A. Theurkauf, RLA, ASLA, APA
       Kelsey P. Stanton, Associate ASLA

DATE: May 7, 2018; revised

SUBJECT: REVIEW COMMENTS – PAC STRAPPING EXPANSION
          PRELIMINARY/FINAL LAND DEVELOPMENT PLAN DATED 4-12-18

Please note our review comments pertaining to the following documents, which we received on 4-18-18, and to a site visit on 4-26-18:

- Land Development Plan consisting of 8 sheets;
- Landscape Plan consisting of 1 sheet; and
- Lighting Plan consisting of 2 sheets

These Review Comments reflect revisions in accordance with communications with the Township Planning Commission, and supersede our memorandum previously released today.
REVIEW COMMENTS – PAC STRAPPING EXPANSION
PRELIMINARY/FINAL LAND DEVELOPMENT PLAN DATED 4-12-18

May 7, 2018

1. **Pedestrian Accessibility** – Section 281-31.A of the subdivision and land development ordinance (SLDO) requires sidewalks for all developments. No sidewalk is proposed, and the Applicant has requested a waiver from the requirement.

   It is noted that there are no existing sidewalks along National Road, which is a relatively low volume cul-de-sac street. If the Township elects to waive this requirement, a fee in lieu could be used to provide pedestrian access where the need is more critical.

2. **Perimeter Buffer** – Section 281-35.E (SLDO) requires 25-foot-wide perimeter buffers around stormwater basins and along property boundaries. However, section 325-18.F.3 (ZO) permits the buffer to be as narrow as 15 feet wide. Section 325-F.4 (ZO) requires the buffer planting requirements of the SLDO to be followed in such cases. Thus, landscaping 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>North/95 LF†</td>
<td>Shade Trees</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evergreen Trees</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Large Shrubs</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basin/295 LF</td>
<td>Shade Trees</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evergreen Trees</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Large Shrubs</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   †Width of proposed building addition only
   *Requirement met by existing woodland to remain

   a. The proposed north perimeter buffer exceeds the required 15-foot minimum width. Shade tree and shrub requirements would be met by existing woodland to remain. The plan shall be revised to include the required evergreen trees.

   b. The basin appears to be designed as a naturalistic basin. No buffer is proposed.

3. **Naturalistic Basins** – Sections 281-35.E(2) and 281-35.F(4) (SLDO) allows naturalistic basins without perimeter buffers, provided they have maximum 4:1 side slopes and 100% native vegetation of equivalent value to the buffer requirement. To qualify for exemption from the perimeter buffer requirement, the Applicant shall correct the following:

   - Basin slopes are steeper than 4:1.
   - The Landscape Plan proposes a native seed mix for the basin floor. The PCSM Details sheet proposes native plant plugs for the same area. The plans shall be revised to clarify whether both seeding and plugs are proposed.
   - Proposed native vegetation is of less value than the buffer landscaping requirement. We recommend that additional plugs and native shrubs such as Winterberry Holly be added to increase landscaping value.
May 7, 2018

The plan shall be revised to comply, or waivers justified.

4. **Parking Lot Screening** – Section 281-35.G (SLDO) requires low vegetative screening of parking lots, consisting of small shrubs on maximum 3-foot centers or large shrubs on maximum 5-foot centers.

No screening is indicated for the proposed parking lots. We note the following:

a. The plan indicates proposed parking in the rear of the site where none currently exists. The plan shall be revised to indicate the required low screen.

b. Existing evergreen trees and shrubs to remain on site adequately screen the west side of the front lot.

c. The proposed expansion will increase the visual impact on the streetscape. Parking lot screen vegetation shall be provided along National Road to mitigate this impact.

The plan shall be revised accordingly.

5. **Tree Removal and Compensatory Planting** – In accordance with section 281-34 (SLDO), existing mature trees shall be preserved to the extent possible, and trees of 6-inch or greater diameter at breast height (DBH) that are removed shall have 3-inch shade trees planted as mitigation. Trees to be removed, the calculation of required compensatory trees, and proposed compensatory tree locations shall be indicated on the landscape plan.

There are several trees over 6” DBH within the proposed construction area, including two large Box Elder trees adjacent to the rear parking lot and two multi-stem trees near the southwest corner of the existing 326 SF building (corporate office). Tree removal and compensatory planting requirements are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tree Size</th>
<th>Inches To Be Removed</th>
<th>Required Compensatory Inches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6-12 inches</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-24 inches</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Required Compensatory Tree Inches 11
Total Required 3-inch Compensatory Trees 4

The plan indicates (1) 2½-inch shade tree not within proposed buffer, parking, or façade planting. There is sufficient space on the site for the required compensatory trees. The plan shall be revised to indicate the required compensatory trees.

The area of proposed construction should be surveyed for mature trees to be removed. The plan shall be revised to include all required information on tree removal and compensatory landscaping, and all surveyed trees shall be part of the existing conditions plan.

6. **Street Trees** – Section 281-36 (SLDO) requires street trees in addition to required buffer plantings along all streets, to be planted within the right-of-way as follows:
REVIEW COMMENTS – PAC STRAPPING EXPANSION
PRELIMINARY/FINAL LAND DEVELOPMENT PLAN DATED 4-12-18

May 7, 2018

Street | Required Qty. | Proposed Qty.
--- | --- | ---
National Road/ 440 LF | 9 | >9*

*Credit for existing street trees to remain

The plan complies with street tree requirements.

7. Parking Lot Layout and Landscaping – In accordance with section 281-37.B (SLDO), parking lots with five or more spaces shall have 9X18 foot minimum landscape islands placed at the end of each row of parking spaces, separated by no more than 135 feet or 15 spaces. The last parking stall in a row shall be separated from drive aisles by a minimum 9-foot-wide landscape island. Furthermore, section 281-37.B(4) (SLDO) requires that each island contain one shade tree.

The plan shall be revised to correct the following issues:

- A total of (5) landscape islands and their required shade trees are missing from the proposed parking lots as follows:
  - (1) island is missing from a row of parking over 135 feet long in the front lot
  - (1) island is needed to separate the front lot entrance drive aisle from parking spaces
  - (3) islands are needed to separate parking from trucks using two loading areas behind the building

- The plan indicates a large area of striped paving at the entrance of the proposed building addition, the function of which is not clear. Furthermore, only a three-foot-wide paved area is proposed between parking space and parking lot curb for pedestrians to access the building entrance. We recommend that the parking spaces be shifted over and a 5-foot-wide sidewalk be added in place of the 18X22 foot asphalt area.

8. Building Façade Landscaping – Section 281-37.D (SLDO) requires planting between buildings and parking to break up long stretches of façade and provide a comfortable pedestrian environment. The Township has interpreted this requirement to apply to any side of the building with an entrance. Landscaping is required as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Façade/Length</th>
<th>Plant Type</th>
<th>Required Qty.</th>
<th>Proposed Qty.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North/95 LF</td>
<td>Shade Trees</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Small Shrubs</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South/95 LF</td>
<td>Shade Trees</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Small Shrubs</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Value of proposed (3) 2½-inch shade trees

a. Shrubs are proposed along the existing corporate building. This enhances the view from the street, but does not improve the space between the proposed building and the rear lot.
The plan shall be revised to indicate (24) shrubs between the building addition and rear parking.

b. The plan indicates a maximum 6-foot-wide planting area between the proposed building and the front parking lot, which is insufficient for the required shade trees. We recommend that parking be extended further across the front of the building to provide space for islands with the required trees.

The plan shall be revised accordingly.

9. **Tree Protection** – Section 281.34.D (SLDO) specifies required tree protection methodologies for mature trees to remain. A tree shall be considered preserved if there is no disturbance within the tree’s critical root zone, which extends from the tree trunk a distance equal to 12 times the trunk diameter or to the tree’s drip-line, whichever is greater.

The plan shall be revised as follows:

a. The E&S Plan shall show tree protection fencing around all trees to remain.

b. The plan shall include a tree protection detail consistent with the Township details in Appendix I (SLDO).

c. The construction sequence on the E&S Control Details sheet shall be revised to state that tree protection fencing shall be installed before earth disturbance occurs.

10. **Tree Size Specification** – Section 281-33.D(1) (SLDO) requires shade trees at least 3½ inches in caliper at installation. Section 281-34.G(4) requires compensatory trees at least 3 inches in caliper at installation.

The proposed shade trees are under-sized at 2½ inches in caliper. The plan shall be revised to indicate trees of the required size.

11. **Species Mix Requirements** – Per section 281-33.D(7)(c)[1] (SLDO), when 50-99 shrubs are required, no more than 50% shall be of one species. 100% of proposed shrubs are Inkberry Holly.

The plan shall be revised to provide required species diversity.

12. **Plant Cultural Requirements** – Section 281-33.C(4)(b) (SLDO) requires all proposed landscaping to be suitable for site conditions.

Inkberry Holly is sensitive to drought and heat, and therefore is not suitable for the planting area between the south building façade and parking. We recommend that it be replaced with a more tolerant shrub, such as St. John’s Wort, Spirea, or Cinquefoil.

13. **Cost Estimate** – A landscape cost estimate will be required with the final plan in accordance with section 281-33.C(6)(i) (SLDO).
May 7, 2018

14. Plant Growth Diagrams – We would not object to a waiver from the growth rate diagrams required under section 281-36.C(6)(c) (SLDO).

15. Conclusion – The preceding issues shall be resolved prior to preliminary approval. In addition, the Township shall consider the following waivers:
   • Sidewalk along National Road
   • Plant growth rate diagrams

Please call if there are any questions.
May 8, 2018

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

RE: 307 National Road – PAC Strapping  
Preliminary/Final Land Development Plan Review  
West Whiteland Township, Chester County  
TPD# WWT.A.00203

Dear Mimi:

In our role as Township Traffic Engineer, Traffic Planning and Design, Inc. (TPD) has reviewed the Preliminary/Final Land Development Plans prepared by Cedarville Engineering Group, LLC, dated April 12, 2018, which were received in our office on April 18, 2018. Based on our review, we offer the following comments:

**Plan Comments**

1. A trip generation study needs to be provided for the proposed expansion using two methods. The first approach requires using the Institute of Transportation Engineer’s manual Trip Generation to generate the peak hour traffic volumes. The second approach requires conducting peak hour counts of entering and exiting volumes at the site and increasing these volumes by 32.4% to represent the 32.4% increase in building area at the site.

2. This project is subject to a traffic impact fee because the site is located within the Transportation Service Area for the West Whiteland Township Traffic Impact Fee Ordinance.

3. Passenger vehicles accessing the proposed parking lot in the northwest corner of the site will be required to travel through the truck loading area. The traffic study should provide a description of the operation of the loading area and indicate how passenger vehicle/truck conflicts will be mitigated.

4. Sight distance triangles must be shown in accordance with Section 281-28.E(3) of the West Whiteland Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance. The speed limit along National Road is not posted. Therefore, a statutory speed limit of 55 mph applies unless a speed study is conducted to determine if a lower speed limit can be posted. A similar comment was made for the recent Horn Plumbing project.
5. There is no curbing provided along the perpendicular parking adjacent to the proposed rain garden. Curbing must be provided in this area or wheel stops must be provided to help prevent vehicles from entering the rain garden. In addition, the pavement section adjacent to the rain garden between the perpendicular parking and the loading area to the east of the rain garden must be curbed to prevent passenger cars and trucks from encroaching into the rain garden.

6. The existing sign on the east side of the western driveway should be removed from Sheet C-3.

7. The existing sign on the east side of the eastern driveway should be labeled “to be removed”.

8. A “Stop” sign (R1-1), sized 30” x 30”, must be provided on the western access at the intersection with National Road.

9. The label on Sheet C-3 and the details for the handicap parking signs on Sheet C-6 must be revised to indicate that the handicap parking spaces are to be signed with a “Reserved Parking Sign” (R7-8), a “Van Accessible Sign” (R7-8P), and a “Reserved Parking Penalties Sign” (R7-8F).

10. A painted taper is provided between the western access driveway to National Road and the parking space adjacent to the driveway. A full-width curbed area should be provided between the parking space and the driveway to protect vehicles parked in the parking space and to provide a deeper driveway throat length which will help to properly orient vehicles entering and the site.

11. Truck tracking templates should be provided indicating how trucks will access the loading area and how they will turn around under the proposed condition without the western access to the loading area.

12. Consideration should be given to providing a heavy duty pavement section in the drive aisle located north of the rain garden because trucks will likely need to use this area to back into the loading docks and to turn around.

13. The “Curb (Concrete)” detail on Sheet C-6 should indicate a minimum of 4 inches of subbase provided under the curb in accordance with Appendix D in the West Whiteland Township Subdivison and Land Development Ordinance.
Requested Waivers

Waivers have been requested from several sections of the West Whiteland Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance. However, there is no write-up provided describing the reason for or the nature of the waiver requests. Therefore, TPD will respond to the waiver requests once more information has been provided.

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, AICP
    Justin Smiley, AICP
    Ted Otteni, P.E.
    Jerry Baker, P.E.
    Eric Hammond, TPD
MEMORANDUM

DATE: May 8, 2018

TO: John Weller, Director of Planning and Zoning

FROM: Theodore D. Otteni, P.E.
Director of Public Works

SUBJECT: PAC Strapping Expansion Land Development

I have reviewed the submission for the PAC Strapping Land Development Plan dated April 12, 2018. I do not have any comments on the plan at this time.
DATE:      May 7, 2018

TO:        John Weller/Director of Planning and Zoning
           Justin Smiley/Township Planner

FROM:      Mark Moses/Code Administration Officer/Fire Marshal/Assistant
           Zoning Officer

RE:        PAC Strapping Expansion- Land Development Fire Marshal Review

I have reviewed the above land Development plan dated 4/12/208 and have the following comments:

1. The entire building, existing and proposed, shall be tested for full compliance with the Township’s Emergency Communications Ordinance. If it is determined that the building is not compliant the applicant will be required to install a bi-directional amplification system to obtain compliant radio coverage within the building.

2. The entire building shall be equipped with an automatic fire sprinkler system installed in accordance with NFPA 13 and the West Whiteland Township Building Code. Alternatively, the new addition shall be separated into fire areas with U.L. listed 3 hour fire walls. Maximum unsprinklered areas shall not exceed 5,000 square feet.

3. The existing east side driveway shall be posted as a fire lane. Fire lane signs shall be the international type, double-sided and mounted perpendicular to the driveway. Maximum spacing shall not exceed 150.

See me with any questions.
MEMORANDUM

DATE: May 7, 2018

TO: Justin Smiley, Township Planner

FROM: Joseph M. Catov Jr., Chief of Police

SUBJECT: PAC Strapping Expansion Land Development (First Review)

I have reviewed the land development plans for the proposed PAC Strapping Expansion project. I have no issues with the plans as submitted.

[Signature]

Joseph M. Catov, Jr.
Chief of Police
May 7, 2018

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

Re: Final Subdivision and Land Development - PAC Strapping Expansion
# SD-04-18-15394 and LD-04-18-15395 - West Whiteland Township

Dear Mr. Weller:

A Final Subdivision and Land Development Plan entitled "PAC Strapping Expansion", prepared by Cedarville Engineering Group LLC, and dated April 12, 2018, was received by this office on April 19, 2018. This plan is reviewed by the Chester County Planning Commission in accord with the provisions of Section 502 of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code. We offer the following comments on the proposed subdivision and land development for your consideration.

PROJECT SUMMARY:

Location: north side of National Road, east of South Whitford Road
Site Acreage: 4.16
Lots/Units: 1 proposed lot
Proposed Land Use: 11,668 square foot building addition
Municipal Land Use Plan Designation: BP Business Park
UPI#: 41-5-125.2L, 41-5-125.2M, 41-5-125.2N

PROPOSAL:

The applicant proposes the consolidation of three existing parcels into one parcel, along with the construction of an 11,668 square foot building addition that will connect two existing buildings. The project site, which is served by public water and public sewer, is located in the I-1 Limited Industrial zoning district.

RECOMMENDATION: The County Planning Commission recommends that the issues raised in this letter should be addressed and all West Whiteland Township issues should be resolved before action is taken on this subdivision and land development plan.
COUNTY POLICY:

LANDSCAPES:

1. The project site is located within the **Suburban Landscape** designation of **Landscapes2**, the 2009 County Comprehensive Plan. The subdivision and land development plan is consistent with the objectives of the **Suburban Landscape**.

2. **Watersheds**, the water resources component of **Landscapes2**, indicates the proposed development is located within the Valley Creek (West) subbasin of the Brandywine Creek watershed. **Watersheds**' highest priority land use objectives within this watershed are: reduce stormwater runoff, restore water quality of “impaired” streams, and protect vegetated riparian corridors. **Watersheds** can be accessed at [www.chesco.org/water](http://www.chesco.org/water). We acknowledge that the design of the proposed stormwater management facilities includes rain gardens. The County Planning Commission endorses the use of innovative stormwater management practices.

PRIMARY ISSUES:

3. The site is underlain by carbonate geology in which the presence or potential may exist for formation and/or expansion of solution channels, sinkholes and other karst features. These features can present risk of collapse and groundwater contamination that often can be overcome and avoided with careful stormwater management design. The location, type, and design of
stormwater facilities and best management practices (BMPs) should be based on a site evaluation conducted by a qualified licensed professional that ascertains the conditions relevant to formation of karst features, and the PA BMP Manual or other design guidance acceptable to the Municipal Engineer. We acknowledge the site plan depicts the approximate location of an existing sinkhole on the northern portion of the site, and that carbonate area zoning district notes are provided on Sheet 1.

4. The site contains areas of hydric (wet) soils (Th Thorndale) which have limitations to development. These limitations include drainage problems due to low permeability, low runoff rates and sub-surface saturation. When construction takes place on these soils, it interferes with the natural drainage of the land. On-site alterations to existing drainage patterns should be carefully inspected by the Township Engineer to ensure that off-site drainage conditions are not negatively affected.
ADMINISTRATIVE ISSUES:

5. The applicant is requesting waivers from the sidewalk and curb provisions in Article IV-Design Standards of the Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, along with two waivers from Chapter 270-Stormwater Management of the Township Code. Waiver requests should only be granted following the determination that the proposed project either meets the purpose of these requirements or does not create the impacts that these provisions are intended to manage. We note that land disturbance and land development activities that occur within Chester County must comply with the County-wide Act 167 Stormwater Management Plan for Chester County, PA (July 2013) and the associated Act 167 stormwater management ordinance standards adopted by each municipality.

6. A plan note on Sheet 1 indicates that a variance was granted from the maximum building coverage requirements of the Township Zoning Ordinance. Prior to granting final plan approval, the Township should verify that the plan conforms to the decision issued by the Township Zoning Hearing Board. Any conditions of approval issued by the Board should be indicated on the final plan.

7. The site plan depicts the location of drainage easements along the northern and western parcel boundaries. The details of these easements should be incorporated into the deed of the proposed parcel.

8. A minimum of four (4) copies of the plan should be presented at the Chester County Planning Commission for endorsement to permit recording of the final plan in accord with the procedures of Act 247, the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, and to meet the requirements of the Recorder of Deeds and the Assessment Office.

This report does not review the plan for compliance to all aspects of your ordinance, as this is more appropriately done by agents of West Whiteland Township. However, we appreciate the opportunity to review and comment on this plan. The staff of the Chester County Planning Commission is available to you to discuss this and other matters in more detail.

Sincerely,

Paul Farkas
Senior Review Planner

cc: Ed Brownley, Jr.
S.B.G. Real Estate Partnership
Cedarville Engineering Group LLC
Chester County Conservation District
MEMORANDUM

DATE: May 11, 2018

TO: Planning Commission

FROM: John R. Weller, AICP
Director of Planning and Zoning

SUBJECT: Lochiel Farm Tract
Preliminary land development plan

APPLICANT: Donovan Investment Partners, LP
1595 Paoli Pk.
West Chester, PA 19380

SITE ADDRESS: Livingston La.¹
Exton, PA 19341

TAX PARCEL: 41-5-93

ZONING: O/R, Office / Residential

DESCRIPTION: Construction of 140 townhouse dwellings and renovation of two existing historic structures for single-family detached dwellings on a 32.3-acre tract known as Lochiel Farm.

Background

The Lochiel Farm tract covers 32.36 gross acres (20.16 net) and has over 900 feet of frontage along the north side of Lincoln Hwy., just east of the intersection with Ship Rd. The tract wraps around St. Philip and James Roman Catholic church and an adjacent residential lot and has approximately fifty feet of frontage on N. Ship Rd. The Chester Valley Trail adjoins the northern edge of the property, beyond which lies Exton Park. There are three historic structures on the property, including the Class I Lochiel Farm Manor House, and two non-historic structures. Most of the property is wooded open space.

Due to the number of dwelling units, this project required review as a conditional use. The Board of Supervisors approved a Decision & Order (“D&O”) granting conditional use approval to this project at their meeting of October 25, 2017. The D&O included thirteen conditions. Staff has reviewed the current plan for compliance with these conditions, and we have provided our conclusions on the attached “Compliance with Decision and Order” analysis.

¹The plan drawing and other information provided by the Applicant show the site address as “740 N. Ship Rd.” This is not correct, and we are unaware of its provenance. The site’s (very short) Ship Rd. frontage is in the 100 block, and our records show that the three now-vacant residences on the property were once known as 111-A, 113, and 115 N. Ship Rd. While the Lincoln Hwy. frontage is in the 700 block, addresses on the north side of the road are odd-numbered. Staff has therefore elected to use “Livingston Lane” as the site address. This issue will eventually be resolved when addresses are assigned to the proposed units.
As noted during the conditional review process, the site has significant environmental constraints:

- A tributary of Valley Creek runs along the Lincoln Hwy. frontage and the boundary with the church property. The associated floodplain and riparian buffer areas reduce the developable area and make access difficult as well. The Commission may recall that a number of nearby residents provided evidence of recent flooding in this area and expressed concerns that construction of this project would worsen flood impacts.

- The property that adjoins the site to the east - commonly known as either the Mid-County Mustang or A.I.W. Frank property - is an EPA superfund site. Past activity on that lot resulted in groundwater contamination that is now being remediated. In July 2016, Staff and the Applicant met with EPA representatives regarding this matter and were advised that development of the Lochiel Farm site was permissible, but the development may not affect groundwater flow and the design must allow for continued access to the monitoring wells on the site. The former condition means that groundwater may not be extracted for any purpose, and infiltration may not be used as a means of stormwater management.

- Finally, the entirety of the property is underlain by carbonate geology, indicating susceptibility to sinkholes and presenting an additional factor against infiltration as a means of stormwater management.

Due to the historic structures on the property, the Township Historical Commission must review this plan. The Applicant is on that Commission’s agenda for their meeting scheduled for May 14, 2018. Staff will update the Planning Commission regarding the Historical Commission comments at the meeting.

Tonight is the Applicant’s first presentation of the land development plan to the Planning Commission.

Consultant Reviews

The Commission should note that the Applicant’s traffic engineer is Traffic Planning and Design, which is also the Township’s regular consultant. In order to avoid conflict of interest, we have secured the services of McMahon Associates to review this plan on behalf of the Township.

- **SSM Group (“SSM”) review dated May 7, 2018.** The Commission may recall from the conditional use review that stormwater management was a particular concern for this site given the issues of flooding raised by the nearby residents and the groundwater contamination. Comments #15 through #38 of this review address the proposed stormwater facilities. We note that nearly all of these comments are minor design revisions or administrative items. The most significant issue appears to be documentation of compliance with the water quality and runoff volume requirements of §270-19 of the Stormwater Management Ordinance, and comment #15 advises that receipt of the required NPDES permit from the Department of Environmental Protection will resolve this item.

  Staff is of the opinion that most of the remaining comments are relatively minor issues requiring clarification or confirmation of compliance with Township regulations or conditions from the D&O. We do, however, question the various floodplain configurations shown on the drawing. As stated in comment #2, any change to the floodplain limit
must be approved by FEMA. Staff questions the reason and the need for the revised limits shown.

As noted in comment #14, the Commission may wish to comment upon the configuration of the proposed trail network within the community.

- **Theurkauf Design and Planning (“Theurkauf”) review dated May 3, 2018.** The landscaping appears generally satisfactory, with some modifications and provided that the Township is willing to grant waivers to allow some of the required buffer plantings to be relocated elsewhere on the tract. The Commission has supported such waivers for other projects. Staff notes:
  - Comments #1 and #2 address the open space, trails, and sidewalks. Staff suggests that the Commission discuss these points with the Applicant and provide guidance where needed. Regarding comment #2, Staff is satisfied that the proposed sidewalks are an acceptable alternative to sidewalks along Lincoln Hwy., but we agree with Theurkauf in that they should be wider. Comment #15 of the McMahon review supports wider sidewalks in the interest of ADA compliance.
  - Comments #3 through #6 review the various buffer requirements, advising that they are generally acceptable, subject to some revisions to the proposed species and the Township being agreeable to waivers for location of some plantings and the slope limits of naturalistic basins. Note particularly that comment #6 supports a waiver to allow trees in lieu of large shrubs in the interest of mitigating damage by deer.
  - Comment #7 states that the street tree requirement has not been met, but we note that the deficiencies are small. The Commission may wish to review this aspect of the plan with the Applicant to determine whether the additional trees can be provided or if a waiver would be appropriate.
  - Comment #8 reviews the compensatory plantings, concluding that the plan meets the requirement if we are willing to accept evergreen trees for such planting. This requires a waiver, which Theurkauf supports; Staff concurs. We note that the compensatory requirement is somewhat less than what might be expected on this tract due to the extent of dead or inviable trees and the prevalence of invasive species.

The remaining comments note the need for some additional information, minor revisions, and corrections.

- **McMahon review dated May 9, 2018.** Comments #1 through #5 review compliance with various conditions of the D&O; these are considered in greater detail on the attached analysis. The remaining comments review the design of the proposed road network, the Highway Occupancy Permit plans, and the traffic signal permit plans. Many of the comments are technical items, but Staff notes that there several issues that the Commission should be particularly aware of and where the Applicant may need some guidance:
  - Comments #6 through #9 involve the widths of the rights-of-way and cartways. The Commission may recall from the conditional use review that the segments of Livingston and Lochiel Lanes between the Lincoln Hwy. accesses and where they intersect are to be dedicated to the Township. McMahon notes that neither the rights-of-way nor the cartways of these segments meet public street standards. McMahon also notes that the cartways for the private streets are narrower than stipulated by the Township’s Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (“S/LDO”). Staff notes that narrower cartways tend to discourage speeding and
are therefore safer in dense residential areas such as proposed here; in addition, narrower cartway means less impervious cover, thereby mitigating stormwater runoff. For these reasons, we support a waiver from §281-25.C of the S/LDO regarding the private streets, provided that the Applicant can demonstrate that emergency service vehicles - and fire trucks particularly - will be able to navigate the street network safely. Regarding the public street segments, the required right-of-way must be provided. Staff suggests that the wider cartway would be appropriate for the segment of Lochiel Lane between Lincoln Hwy. and the Livingston Lane intersection. The Commission may wish to discuss if there are other areas where wider cartway would be preferred.

- Comment #10 is similar to comment #39 of the SSM review, questioning the suitability of the two perpendicular parking spaces between Units 81 and 82 on the north side of Livingston Lane. The Director of Public Works has not expressed a concern on this point, but given the concerns from our consultants, the Commission may wish to confirm their position on the need for these spaces.

- Comment #18 requests truck turning templates to demonstrate that large vehicles will be able to use the road network safely; Staff concurs.

- Comments #15, #19, #26, and #27 all recommend that the Applicant confirm that the proposed pedestrian accommodations will satisfy ADA requirements. Comment #26 questions the lack of a pedestrian crossing for the south leg of the intersection of Lochiel and Livingston. Staff favors a crossing here unless the Commission finds that it presents a safety concern.

- **Director of Public Works memorandum dated May 8, 2018.** Mr. Otteni requests additional details for various proposed features as well as the opportunity to review the plans submitted with the applications for the Highway Occupancy Permit and the traffic signal permit. He also directs wider sidewalks, consistent with recommendations from our consultants.

- **Chief of Police memorandum dated May 7, 2018.** Chief Catov has no concerns.

- **Fire Marshal memorandum dated April 19, 2018.** Mr. Moses notes when streets must be posted as fire lanes and directs that fire hydrants be included on the plan.

As of this writing, we have not received any comments from the Chester County Planning Commission. The State-mandated County review period will expire on May 18, 2018. Staff will advise the Commission if we receive the County review prior to the meeting.

**Staff Comment**

An early concern about this project was the ongoing remediation of contamination from the adjacent property now owned by 891 E. Lincoln Associates, LP, but more commonly known as the Mid-County Mustang or A.I.W. Frank site. Staff had been advised that the Environmental Protection Agency and the Department of Environmental Protection were both amenable to the development of the Applicant’s property, provided certain conditions were met. Among these conditions was that access to monitoring wells on the property be preserved. By our count, there are nine such wells. It appears that four of these will not be disturbed, but one is adjacent to a proposed underground stormwater bed near Unit 81, three are within proposed cartway in proximity to underground utilities, and one is within the footprint of Unit 57. We note that this last is labelled “to be relocated,” but we cannot find the new location, nor do we have any indication that a relocation is acceptable to the agencies involved. The Applicant should be directed to provide documentation that the plan is satisfactory to the
affected agencies and that the proposed improvements will not unacceptably affect either access or their monitoring function.

In addition to the consultant comments, Staff notes that Sheet 7 of the plan set shows an “overall phasing plan.” It is not clear if this is simply a construction sequence or whether the Applicant is seeking only preliminary plan approval at this time and then intends to submit final plans for the phases individually, pursuant to the provisions of the Municipalities Planning Code and §281-16.I of the S/LDO. The Applicant should clarify.

Due to the number and extent of consultant comments and the number of unmet conditions from the D&O, Staff is of the opinion that action on this plan is premature at this time. While many of the consultant comments are technical issues or express a need for more detailed information, there are some that have the potential to alter the site layout and road configuration. There are also issues where it would be appropriate for the Commission to provide guidance at this time:

- It appears that the Applicant will be requesting waivers from the road width standards in the S/LDO. As noted above in our comments on the McMahon review, the Commission should consider their support for this request.
- Several of the consultants commented at length on the open space and recreational areas. We note that the areas shown are consistent with what was on the conditional use application, but Staff concurs with our consultants in that more details need to be shown on the land development plan, particularly since these lands and the facilities on them are being provided to fulfill the requirements of §281-47 of the S/LDO.
- Similar to the prior comment, the Commission should consider whether the trail system and sidewalks are acceptable and whether you support the consultant and Staff recommendations that they be wider than what has been proposed.
- While the Theurkauf review is generally positive, it notes a number of points where waivers will be needed to allow the landscaping design shown. The Commission should review these and consider whether the waivers are appropriate.

Attachments

1. SSM review dated May 7, 2018.
8. Plan set dated November 28, 2017 (sheets 1 - 28) and April 11, 2018 (sheets 29 - 32), no revision dates.

H:\Plans\JKLM\Lochiel\Weller PC memo dated 5-11-18
May 7, 2018

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

RE: Lochiel Farm (740 N. Ship Road)
Preliminary Land Development Plan
SSM File 101008.0301

Dear Mr. Weller:

We have reviewed the Preliminary Land Development Plan for Lochiel Farm, consisting of the following:

- D.L. Howell plan 3101, sheets 1 through 28 dated November 28, 2017 and sheets 29 through 32 dated April 11, 2018.

140 townhouses are proposed by Donovan Investment Partners. The tract is zoned Office/Residential.

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

We have the following comments regarding the application.

**WAIVER REQUEST**
1. A waiver has been requested from the infiltration requirements of Section 270-20 due to karst geology and existing ground water contamination. We recommend this request be granted.

**COMPLIANCE WITH ZONING ORDINANCE**
2. No revisions to the Floodplain Conservation District shall be made without prior consultation with and approval of the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), Section 325-61.A(3). A letter of map revision (LOMR) will need to be submitted to FEMA prior to approval of the Final Plan.
3. It appears 25 feet setbacks have not been provided in all cases from the loop roadway proposed to be dedicated, Section 325-15.1.D(2)(f).
4. It should be clarified whether coverages have been calculated using gross lot area or developable lot area, per definition.
5. The Zoning Officer should determine, given General Note 13, if the 50 feet rear setback is shown correctly.
COMPLIANCE WITH SUBDIVISION AND LAND DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE

6. The sheet size exceeds 24” x 36”, Section 281-16.B. A waiver will need to be requested.
7. The size of on-street parking spaces shall be indicated, Section 281-16.C(1)(k).
8. A building setback line shall be shown along the portion of Livingston Lane that is proposed to be dedicated, Section 281-16.C(11)(e).
9. Homeowners Association documents will be required, Section 281-16.C(23).
10. Specific Township approval will be necessary for the proposed 40-foot wide right-of-way for roads to be dedicated and for the proposed 24-foot wide cartway for portion of Livingston Lane proposed to be dedicated, Section 281-25.
11. The curb radii proposed at the intersection of private roads with Livingston Lane (portion to be dedicated) is 20 feet rather than the required 25 feet, Section 281-28.D.
12. The Typical Sidewalk Detail on sheet 27 shall indicate 3,300 PSI concrete, Section 281-31.B.

COMPLIANCE WITH CONDITIONAL USE DECISION

13. The applicant is required to provide the open space and recreation area shown on the Conditional Use Plan, including play areas and equipment. No plans have been provided for play areas and equipment.
14. The Township should confirm if revisions to the trail system south of the proposed dedicated portion of Livingston Lane and where Basin 3 is located are acceptable.

COMPLIANCE WITH STORMWATER ORDINANCE

15. It has been assumed by the design engineer that the volume/water quality requirement of Section 270-19 has been met through the use of slow release/extended detention facilities; however, that assumption is incorrect. Since infiltration is not feasible on site, the required volume will not be permanently removed in post-developed conditions. In cases where infiltration is not an option, the applicant can still meet the requirements of Section 270-19 through the water quality approach required by PaDEP for NPDES permits. All water quality calculations should be submitted for review. We note that the issuance of an NPDES permit for this project would satisfy Section 270-19.
16. Most of the proposed BMPs are located in series with each other. This must be properly handled in the PaDEP water quality calculations.
17. The stream channel protection requirements of Section 270-21 have been satisfactorily met through the use of slow release/extended detention facilities.
18. The peak rate control requirements of Section 270-22 have been satisfactorily met.
19. The PVC basin liner detail on sheet C03.7 must also apply to the rain garden. This shall be noted on the detail.
20. All underground stone beds must be wrapped on both sides, top, and bottom with a PVC liner sandwiched between non-woven geotextile. This must be shown and labeled with specifications in all bed details on sheet C03.7.
21. A non-woven geotextile liner must be provided between the stone and sand layers in all underground filtration beds. This must be shown and labeled with specifications in all filtration bed details on sheet C03.7.
22. The perforated underdrain pipes located at the bottom of the sand layer in filtration beds must be wrapped with a non-woven geotextile sock. This must be shown and labeled with specifications in all filtration bed details on sheet C03.7.
23. The underground detention bed detail does not match the outlet structure detail for bed 2 on sheet C03.7. The outlet structure detail shows an underdrain and sand layer, while the bed detail shows neither.
24. The following revisions must be made to the underground detention/filtration bed and outlet structure details for bed 1 on sheet C03.7 in order for it to function properly:
   a. The 6” stub pipe should be removed to allow the 24” pipe to connect directly into the outlet structure.
   b. The underdrain pipe should not be routed around the knee wall and should instead connect directly into the outlet structure from the bed.
   c. The 2” orifice should be provided through the knee wall at the appropriate elevation.

25. Ponding depths in the rain gardens/bioretenion basins are currently proposed to range between 1.5 feet and 3 feet. We believe that this condition could cause the proposed vegetation to be inundated by water and fail. Theurkauf Design and Planning should review the proposed vegetation for adequacy considering these depths.

26. A downspout connection detail has been provided on sheet C03.7, but it is unclear if any building downspouts will be piped to stormwater facilities. Proposed roof leader piping must be shown on the plan.

27. The construction sequence and operation and maintenance notes for all proposed stormwater BMPs must use the word “shall” instead of “should”. Also, any references to infiltration must be removed from these notes since infiltration is not proposed.

28. All storm sewer utilities beneath a paved surface shall be bedded and backfilled with PennDOT No. 2A stone, Section 270-29.E(4). The label in the HDPE Storm Pipe Trench Detail on sheet C06.1 notes AASHTO #57 stone.

29. In carbonate areas, watertight pipe connections are required; appropriate specifications shall be indicated on the plans, Section 270-29.E(5).

30. Headwalls, endwalls, or end sections shall be set on a minimum of 12 inches of AASHTO No. 57 coarse aggregate, Section 270-29.E(6). This must be shown and noted in the Type D-W Endwall detail on sheet C06.1.

31. All storm sewers shall be constructed per PennDOT specifications as outlined in Publication 408 Design Manual, Part 2, Highway Design and Standards for Roadway Construction RC-Series, Section 270-29.E(7). This must be noted on the plans.

32. Financial security shall be provided for the construction of all stormwater management facilities, Section 270-10.

33. 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).

34. The applicant shall provide the Township with a copy of the required NPDES Permit prior to the Township endorsing the plan, Section 270-17.A(1)(b).

35. The applicant statement of Section 270-32.A(3) shall be signed prior to the Township endorsing the plan.

36. The design engineer signature block of Section 270-32.A(4) shall be signed prior to the Township endorsing the plan.

37. A stormwater operation and maintenance agreement shall be provided, Section 270-43.

38. An easement shall be provided to grant the Township the right, but not the duty, to access the BMPs from a public right-of-way, Section 270-44.A(5).

GENERAL COMMENTS

39. Two parking spaces have been added to the portion of Livingston Lane proposed to be dedicated. The Township should determine if this is acceptable.

40. The road cross-section detail on sheet 27 must contain the proposed road names. It currently references “Road A” and “Road B”.

41. Trail and bench details must be provided.

Please contact me if you have any questions.

Sincerely,
Spotts, Stevens and McCoy

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

cc: Mark Stabolepszy, P.E.
MEMORANDUM

TO: John Weller, AICP, West Whiteland Township Planning Director and Zoning Officer
     Justin Smiley, AICP, Township Planner
     Patrick J. Stuart, RLA, MCRP, ASLA, Orsatti & Stuart Associates, Inc.

FROM: Edward A. Theurkauf, RLA, ASLA, APA
       Kelsey P. Stanton, Associate ASLA

DATE: May 3, 2018

SUBJECT: REVIEW COMMENTS – LOCHIEL FARM
         PRELIMINARY LAND DEVELOPMENT PLAN DATED 4-11-18

Please note our review comments pertaining to site visits on 3-29-17 and 4-26-18, to the Conditional Use Decision and Order dated 10-18-17, and to the following documents received on 4-18-18:

• Preliminary Land Development Plan consisting of 32 sheets;

• Urban Forest Inventory and Judgment prepared by Rockwell Associates dated 5-12-17; and

May 3, 2018

1. **Open Space** – Condition #7 of the Conditional Use Decision and Order (CUDO) states that the Applicant shall provide play areas and equipment suitable for the anticipated residents of the Development. Section 281-47.D of the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (SLDO) requires that open space and recreation areas meet the needs of the community. Recreational trails and a pavilion/BBQ area are indicated in the open space.

The Applicant previously submitted a demographic profile of the anticipated residents which indicated a significant cohort of families with children. The plan should be revised to indicate active play facilities, especially if young children are anticipated residents.

2. **Pedestrian Accessibility** – Section 281-321.A (SLDO) requires sidewalks at all new developments, and section 325-15.1A(1) of the Zoning Ordinance (ZO) states that projects within the O/R district shall facilitate multi-modal transportation. In addition, the Lincoln Highway and Whitford Corridors Plan and the Central Chester County Bicycle and Pedestrian Circulation Plan support strong pedestrian linkages along Lincoln Highway, including a trail connection to the Chester Valley Trail (CVT) through the site and pedestrian & bicycle connections along the Lincoln Highway site frontage.

The plan indicates 4-foot-wide sidewalks throughout the development, with potential future connections to the adjoining properties to the east. In addition, 6-foot-wide recreational trails are proposed throughout the site, with two sidewalk connections to the CVT. We note the following:

   a. The Lincoln Highway sidewalk does not extend along the entire site frontage. As proposed, pedestrians walking along Lincoln Highway would need to enter the subdivision in order to safely access destinations farther along the road. The plan shall be revised to provide a sidewalk along the entire Lincoln Highway frontage.

   b. Four-foot-wide sidewalks are not adequate for either the proposed unit density or for sections along an arterial road. According to the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and to the 2007 PA Standards for Residential Site Development, five feet is the minimum width for two pedestrians to walk abreast or to comfortably pass each other. We therefore recommend that five-foot-wide sidewalks be provided throughout the site.

   c. The FHWA’s 2001 Designing Sidewalks and Trails for Access-Best Practices Design Guide recommends 8 feet as the minimum width for a low-volume, multi-use trail. The proposed trail is too narrow for a multi-use path; furthermore, the proposed 4-foot-wide sidewalk connections to Lincoln Highway and the CVT are inadequate for accommodating trail users. We recommend that the Applicant provide an 8-foot-wide trail from Lincoln Highway to the CVT per County and Township plans.

3. **Screen Buffer** – Section 281-35.D (SLDO) requires 50-foot-wide, vegetated screen buffers along the north, east, and southwest property lines. Plantings are required and proposed as follows:
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Buffer (Length)</th>
<th>Plant Type</th>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East (1,400 LF)</td>
<td>Shade Trees</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>18*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evergreen Trees</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Large Shrubs</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North (975 LF)</td>
<td>Shade Trees</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>36*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evergreen Trees</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Large Shrubs</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest (1,700 LF)</td>
<td>Shade Trees</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>&gt;34*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evergreen Trees</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>39*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Large Shrubs</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Includes credit for existing trees to remain

Per section 281-34.F(1) (SLDO), invasive or weedy tree species to be preserved shall not be credited towards landscaping requirements. Therefore, no credit shall be granted for the following:

- Mulberry trees (#106, #144, #166, on the Tree Survey Plan)
- Norway Maple trees (14” Maple Dbl 5, 12” Maple Cluster Spc1 on the Tree Survey Plan)

As noted in Comment #6, existing trees to remain and trees proposed elsewhere on site are more than equivalent to the screen buffer landscaping deficits. Therefore, we would have no objection to a waiver on buffer planting location.

Buffer evergreen trees are proposed to be planted on 10-foot centers. The proposed species grow to a mature spread of at least 20 feet. To accommodate tree growth and to reduce gaps in the screen at maturity, we recommend that the trees be planted on minimum 15-foot centers.

4. Perimeter Buffer – Section 281-35 (SLDO) requires 25-foot-wide perimeter buffers along the border with the residential property to the west, along Lincoln Highway, and around stormwater basins. Plantings are required and proposed as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Buffer (Length)</th>
<th>Plant Type</th>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West (120 LF)</td>
<td>Shade Trees</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evergreen Trees</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Large Shrubs</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln Highway (865 LF)</td>
<td>Shade Trees</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>112**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evergreen Trees</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Large Shrubs</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Buffer (Length) (cont’d)</th>
<th>Plant Type</th>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Detention Berm (140 LF)</td>
<td>Shade Trees</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evergreen Trees</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Large Shrubs</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Requirement met by proposed ornamental trees
** Credit for existing trees to remain

a. If Basins 1-4 are considered naturalistic basins, they would be exempt from the buffer requirement per sections 281-35.E(2) and 281-35.F(4) (SLDO).

b. As noted in Comment #6, existing trees to remain and trees proposed elsewhere on site are more than equivalent to the west perimeter buffer deficit. Therefore, we would have no objection to a waiver on buffer planting location.

c. No buffer is proposed around a detention berm in the northeast corner of the site. Though it appears to be designed as a basin, it is small and not a significant feature in the landscape, and thus we would not object to waiving the buffer requirement for it. We recommend planting native vegetation in the lowest part of the feature to improve its function and aesthetics.

5. Basin Landscaping – Section 281-35.F(4) (SLDO) requires naturalistic basins to have maximum 4:1 side slopes, and to be planted with 100% native vegetation which shall be of equal value to required perimeter buffer plantings. We note the following:

a. Basin slopes are proposed as steeper than 4:1.

There is insufficient room on the site for basins with less steep slopes. Therefore, a waiver from the slope requirement is necessary in order for the basins to qualify as naturalistic.

Basins 1 through 4 are proposed as naturalistic basins, with extensive plug plantings which more than equal the value of required buffer plantings. The result is a well-vegetated site with considerable habitat value. Therefore, we would not object to a waiver from the naturalistic basin side slope requirement.

b. Proposed basin landscaping includes several non-native plant species.

The proposed Shasta Daisy and Garden Sage are non-invasive species that offer wildlife habitat value. The proposed Japanese Sedge offers minimal habitat and shall be replaced with a suitable native alternative.

6. Buffer Landscaping Compliance – Existing trees to remain and surplus proposed landscaping address the functional aspects of the Township’s screen and perimeter buffer requirements. Overall landscaping quantities are as follows:
REVIEW COMMENTS – LOCHIEL FARM
PRELIMINARY LAND DEVELOPMENT PLAN DATED 4-11-18

May 3, 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Buffer Plant Type</th>
<th>Required Qty</th>
<th>Proposed Qty</th>
<th>Net +/-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shade Trees</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>208*</td>
<td>+115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evergreen Trees</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>247**</td>
<td>+62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Shrubs</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>-421</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes credit for (74) trees to remain, plus credit for (20) proposed ornamental trees
**Includes credit for (1) tree to remain

The value of the proposed surplus evergreen trees plus the existing trees to remain more than equal the value of the shrub deficit. Due to high local deer populations, shrubs in the buffer are likely to suffer from browsing. Therefore, per section 281-33.D(9) (SLDO), we would support the substitution of trees for the required large shrubs.

7. Street Trees – In accordance with Section 281-36 (SLDO), one street tree is required for each 50 feet of road frontage. Plantings are required as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frontage (Length)</th>
<th>Required Trees</th>
<th>Proposed Trees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln Highway (960 LF)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lochiel Lane (1,020 LF)</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Leaf Lane (1,320 LF)</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livingston Lane (1,490 LF)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>55**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Requirement met by existing trees to remain
**Includes credit of (6) trees for 52” Ginkgo to remain

The plan shall be revised to include the required street trees.

8. Tree Removal and Compensatory Planting – Section 281-34.G (SLDO) requires compensatory plantings for mature trees to be removed. As required by Section 281-34.C, the Applicant has provided inventories of mature trees including arborist management recommendations.

Based on the plan, arborist's reports, and site visits, a total of 448 trees with a 6” or greater DBH are proposed to be removed. Of these, 383 are noted by the arborist to be dead, not viable, or invasive. These include all Callery Pears and Ash trees on site; the arborist judged the Ashes not to be viable due to the recent occurrence of Emerald Ash Borer (EAB) at the site. We would support no replacement requirement for declining or invasive trees to be removed. Thus compensatory tree requirement is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tree Size</th>
<th>Inches to be Removed</th>
<th>Required Compensatory Inches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6-12 inch</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-24 inch</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>75.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24+ inch</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Comp. Landscaping</th>
<th>Qty.</th>
<th>3-inch Comp. Tree Equivalent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3½-inch Shade Trees</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evergreen Trees</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total proposed 3-inch Compensatory Tree Equivalent</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We have no objection to a waiver allow evergreen trees as compensatory plantings.

9. **Restoration Landscaping and Management** – A Wetland Mitigation Area is indicated in the southeast corner of the site. In addition, the Applicant had previously proposed maintaining parts of the open space as meadow alongside existing woodland. We note the following:

a. The plan does not indicate meadow areas in the open space. In addition to aesthetic and wildlife benefits, meadows are more cost-effective to maintain than lawns. A management plan will be required in order to prevent meadows from being recolonized by invasive plants. We recommend that the plan be revised to propose meadow areas within the open space, and to include planting and maintenance details.

b. No restoration plantings are proposed for the Wetland Mitigation Area. The plan shall be revised to include suitable planting and maintenance details.

c. The 5-12-17 arborist report described forest restoration which is not shown on the plan. The Applicant should clarify this discrepancy.

10. **Tree Protection** – Section 281.34.D (SLDO) specifies required tree protection methodologies. A tree shall be considered preserved if there is no disturbance within the tree’s critical root zone, which extends from the tree trunk a distance equal to 12 times the trunk diameter or to the tree’s drip-line, whichever is greater.

The plan shall be revised as follows:

a. The arborist shall confirm the adequacy of the plan’s tree preservation measures for the 52-inch Ginkgo to remain. The Landscape Details sheet shall incorporate protective measures recommended by the arborist in the 5-12-17 report for the Ginkgo.

b. The E&S Plan shall show tree protection fencing around all trees to remain.

c. The plan shall include a tree protection detail consistent with the Township details in Appendix I (SLDO).

11. **Species Requirements** – Section 281.33.D(7)(a)(2] (SLDO) requires that when 50 or more shade, street, evergreen, or compensatory trees are required, no more than 30% shall be of one species. The plan shall be revised to correct the following:
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a. Princeton Elm and Honeylocust Trees each make up more than 30% of proposed street trees. The plan shall be revised to provide a greater variety of street trees.

b. American Holly makes up more than 30% of proposed evergreen trees. The plan shall be revised to provide the required species diversity.

12. **Plant Cultural Requirements** – Eastern Redcedar is proposed adjacent to stormwater management swales and drain inlets. This tree is intolerant of flooding and shall be moved out of the swales.

13. **Plan Errors** – The plan shall be revised to correct the following errors:
   a. A path in the open space conflicts with a 13” existing tree to remain.
   b. The plant schedule proposes (33) total Summersweet, but (19) are shown on the plan.
   c. The plant schedule proposes (38) total Winterberry Holly, but (24) are shown on the plan.
   d. The plant schedule proposes Red Twig Dogwood, Sweetspire, Fothergilla, Allegheny Viburnum, Doublefile Viburnum, and Bayberry, but none are shown on the plan.
   e. The Deciduous Tree and Evergreen Tree planting details allow for the bottom half of a tree’s wire cage to remain. Wire cages shall be removed from root balls before planting.

14. **Plant Growth Diagrams** – We would not object to a waiver from the plant growth rate diagrams requirement of section 281-33.C(6)(c) (SLDO).

15. **Cost Estimate** – A landscape cost estimate will be required with the final plan in accordance with section 281-33.C(6)(i) (SLDO).

16. **Conclusion** – The preceding issues shall be addressed prior to preliminary approval. The Township shall consider the following waivers:
   - Permit landscaping proposed elsewhere to count towards buffer requirements
   - Side slope requirement for naturalistic basins
   - Compensatory tree requirement for non-viable and invasive trees to be removed
   - Permit surplus evergreen trees as compensatory plantings
   - Plant growth diagram requirement

Please contact this office with any questions.
May 9, 2018

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

RE: Traffic Engineering Review - Lochiel Farm Residential Development
West Whiteland Township, Chester County, PA
McMahon Project No. 818347.11

Dear Ms. Gleason:

McMahon Associates, Inc. has completed a traffic engineering review of the proposed residential development, located on the north side Lincoln Highway (S.R. 3070) just east of Ship Road. Based on the plans, 140 townhomes and two existing single-family homes are proposed with access provided via a new site accesses along S.R. 3070 opposite Belden Boulevard, as well as an improved driveway in the location of the existing alignment of Livingston Lane at the east end of the property.

This traffic review is based on the following documents.

3. Traffic Signal Design Study Associated with Lochiel Farm Development, prepared by Traffic Planning and Design, Inc. and dated April 6, 2018

We offer the following comments for consideration of the Township and the applicant.

Conditional Use Decision and Order

1. Condition 2 – This condition requires the applicant design the main site access opposite Belden Boulevard with a traffic signal and other associated intersection improvements, for which the applicant will obtain a PennDOT Highway Occupancy Permit (HOP). The applicant’s engineer has prepared the HOP documents for this intersection, which includes a traffic signal. Review comments related to HOP documents is provided later in this letter.
2. Condition 3 – The applicant shall pay a Traffic Impact Fee pursuant to Township Ordinance No. 427. Based on the ITE publication *Trip Generation, 10th Edition*, the proposed 140 townhomes generate 82 trips during the weekday afternoon peak hour. As such, the number of trips subject to the Traffic Impact Fee is 82, and based on the Township’s fee of $1,219.65 per trip, the total Traffic Impact Fee for this development is $100,011.30. The fee should be paid no later than at the time of building permit issuance.

3. Condition 4 – The applicant shall cooperate with the Township for PennDOT approval of improvements at the intersection of Lincoln Highway and Ship Road, including but not limited to left-turn signal phasing on Lincoln Highway eastbound and westbound. If the applicant constructs these improvements, then the cost of construction shall be credited towards the Traffic Impact Fee. Our office is aware that to date, PennDOT does not support the left-turn phasing improvements at this intersection; however, PennDOT does support the addition of a Ship Road southbound left-turn lane. Furthermore, the Township recently expressed its support for the Ship Road southbound left-turn lane as an interim improvement until implementation of the Township’s plans for a new road parallel to Ship Road that will function as a one-way road system pair with the existing alignment of Ship Road. Please update the Township on any new conversations with PennDOT with regard to this intersection, and at minimum, please update the HOP plans to include the southbound Ship Road left-turn lane.

4. Condition 5 – The plans indicate the roads within the development shall be private roads not offered for dedication, except for the first segment of both Lochiel Lane and Livingston Lane to the point of their intersection, which will be offered for dedication to the Township. This condition requires the applicant to review the road segments and offers of dedication with the Township’s Director of Public Works. Please verify this coordination has occurred.

5. Condition 6 – The plans should be revised to show a driveway connection between Livingston Lane and the Exton Properties, Inc. Property immediately to the east of the site. The plans should be revised to show the required access connection. Also, presently the westernmost driveway along S.R. 3070 serving the Exton Properties, Inc. Property is closed using concrete barriers. Therefore, as part of the Livingston Lane access improvements, please show permanent closure of the western driveway with curbing.

*Land Development Plans*

6. SALDO Section 281-25 – Both Lochiel Lane and Livingston Lane from their intersection with S.R. 3070 to their intersection with each other at approximately STA 4+76 and STA 8+42, respectively, should provide a 50-foot right-of-way and a 28-foot cartway (or wider where
needed at the intersection with S.R. 3070). Also, the design of these roads at their intersections with S.R. 3070 should reflect the design shown on the HOP plans.

7. SALDO Section 281-25 – There is no right-of-way labeled for the other roads within the community, which is presumably because these roads are proposed as private roads. However, the cartway width of the other roads are shown as 24 feet wide, whereas the Township requires the width of private streets to be no less than the width of a local street, or 28 feet wide.

8. SALDO Section 281-23 and 281-25 – The existing legal right-of-way along Ship Road appears to be 35 feet (or a 17.5-foot half width). As such, the applicant should provide a 30-foot half width right-of-way along the small section of Ship Road frontage to meet the Township’s standards for a collector road. This right-of-way should be labeled as “Required Legal Right-of-Way To Be Deeded to PennDOT”.

9. SALDO Section 281-23 and 281-25 – Please provide a half width ultimate right-of-way of 40 feet from the road centerline along the S.R. 3070 frontage, or wider if needed for the Township’s planned road improvements in this area. Please add a right-of-way note to the plans indicating the ultimate right-of-way is offered for dedication to the Township and/or PennDOT in perpetuity at no cost.

10. SALDO Section 325-37.A(2)(c) – Please confirm with the Township their normal practice of allowing perpendicular parking along public and private streets. At minimum, we recommend consideration to remove the perpendicular parking spaces along the public roads within the community, for which it appears there are two such spaces located between units 81 and 82.

11. SALDO Section 281-26.C – The plans should show the PC and PT stations for all horizontal curves. Based on our preliminary review, it appears that one location along Lochiel Lane (between approximately STA 7+40 and 8+10) and two locations along Red Leaf Lane (between approximately STA 3+30 and STA 4+10, as well as between approximately STA 5+25 and STA 5+90) provide less than 100-foot tangents between reverse curves.

12. SALDO Section 281-28.D – Please revise the curb radius at all of the internal roadway intersections to 25 feet at minimum unless larger radii are needed based on truck templates.

13. SALDO Section 281-28.E – No vegetation or other features should be placed within the clear sight triangles of the proposed intersections that will obstruct vision according to the requirements of this section of the ordinance. Please review and revise the landscaping plan. Also, this section of the ordinance requires 100-foot clear sight triangles, whereas the sight triangles shown on the plans measure 75 feet. If permitted by the Township, our office can support a 75-foot sight triangle provided clear sight distance is available at all intersections. The sight distances should be shown on the plans, including the landscaping plans.
14. SALDO Section 281-29 – The following comments pertain to the signing and striping shown on the plans:
   a) Provide a pedestrian crosswalk (and ramps) across the southern leg of Lochiel Lane at the intersection with Livingston Lane.
   b) Provide “All Way” plaques at the stop-controlled intersection of Lochiel Lane and Livingston Lane.
   c) Appropriate pedestrian crossing warning signs should be provided at the mid-block pedestrian crossing of Livingston Lane at approximately STA 3+25.
   d) Please provide a crosswalk across the proposed access to the CDS Investment Co. Property.

15. SALDO Section 281-31 – In order to meet ADA requirements, we recommend the proposed sidewalks should be five feet wide.

16. The applicant should specify whether the proposed naturalized trails will provide some type of paving material (such as stone) or whether these areas will be maintained as grass. Please consult with the Township as to their preference also. Please also label the width of all trails. In addition, we recommend the two trails connecting to the Chester Valley Trail should be at least six feet wide and should be constructed of a durable pavement surface. If the Township agrees, then we recommend trail pavement should provide 1.5 inches of wearing course, three inches of bituminous concrete base course, and four inches of 2A stone.

17. Please contact Chester County regarding the two proposed trail connections to the Chester Valley Trail with regard to any permitting and approval requirements.

18. Truck turning templates should be provided which demonstrate the largest delivery vehicle, as well as the Township’s largest emergency service vehicle can access and circulate in the site.

19. The applicant and the applicant’s engineer should ensure that all proposed pedestrian facilities within the site and within the public right-of-way (including curb ramps and pedestrian access routes) are consistent with current ADA requirements. The applicant’s engineer should provide larger scale details of all proposed curb ramps along the proposed development roads, including separate grading details, and all dimensions for construction, including widths, lengths, and all slopes to assist during construction. All proposed curb ramps should provide labels for the ramp types.

20. Please review the location of the pedestrian connection to SS. Philip and James Church and School with the Township. The connection location should be clearly visible and not obstructed by parked vehicles, as well as logical with regard to circulation with the Church Property.
21. Please confirm the spelling of Lochiel Lane which does not match the spelling on the HOP plans, which reads Lochiel Lane.

**Highway Occupancy Permit Plans**

**Roadway/Access Improvements**

22. Per comment 3 above, please update the HOP plans to include the southbound Ship Road left-turn lane.

23. Please consult with PennDOT with regard to the need for improved shoulders along the S.R. 3070 site frontage consistent with PennDOT’s criteria.

24. The proposed sidewalk to the left of STA 197+25 to 197+75 appears to be too close to the roadway. The applicant should evaluate moving this sidewalk as far from the edge of road as feasible to meet the minimum buffer requirements set forth in PennDOT DM-2.

25. The applicant should evaluate if extending the guiderail at STA 197+LT is warranted due to the existing headwall and drainage ditch.

26. Please discuss with Township staff the need for pedestrian crossings across the east leg of S.R. 3070 and the south leg of Belden Boulevard and the associated ADA compliant curb ramps at the Lincoln Highway/Belden Boulevard intersection, in the context of the Township’s overall vision for multimodal circulation in this area, and as it relates to bike and pedestrian interaction between the office park on the south side of Lincoln Highway, and the residential community and Chester Valley Trail on the north side of Lincoln Highway.

27. Please provide a pedestrian crossing and ADA compliant curb ramps across Site Drive B.

28. It appears the WB-62 truck turn for S.R. 3070 westbound into Site Drive A conflicts with the access curbing. Please review and revise the driveway design as needed.

29. Per PennDOT requirements, the applicant should include a roadway drainage report including spread calculations.

30. Please coordinate with SEPTA with regard to the location and design of the existing bus stop(s) along Lincoln Highway in this area in light of the proposed intersection improvements. Please consider relocating the bus stop to the intersection, which will allow for pedestrian crossings across S.R. 0030. Also, at minimum, a concrete pad should be provided at the bus stop location. Please include the Township in this discussion with SEPTA.
Traffic Signal Permit Plans

31. A new TE-160 form must be prepared and submitted to the municipality for resolution and signature for PennDOT’s final acceptance and issuance of the traffic signal permit.

32. Please prepare a Traffic Signal Construction Plan and follow West Whiteland Township’s Traffic Signal Specifications in preparing this plan.

33. The applicant should evaluate the condition and location of the existing school flasher (STA 197+95 LT) in relation to the proximity of the proposed traffic signal. Additionally, as part of this project the applicant should dedicate an easement for this flasher if it does not already exist.

34. Please provide signs L and K on the Belden Boulevard median.

35. Please clarify the reason for the 10% reduction in letter spacing for Sign A (Lincoln Highway).

36. Series C Font (Highway Gothic) should be converted back to Clearview Font.

37. Please show the controller assembly on the plan.

38. All vehicular signal heads should include tunnel visors.

39. On the MSTD, signal heads 1, 2, 3 and 4 must flash R during FLASH.

40. On the MSTD, Max 1 and 2 times for Phase 2+6 are less than the programmed times tabulated on the System Plan. Please confirm that these times should be greater than or equal to the programmed times.

41. The right turn lane ‘ONLY’ legend should be centered in the lane.

42. The new double yellow lane lines required for the left-turn lanes should start 30 feet from the 10-foot broken yellow (based in the center left-turn lane marking).

43. The traffic volumes block should provide the redistributed traffic volumes previously reviewed by the Township and PennDOT. These volumes should also be used in the Traffic Signal Study.

44. In the Title Block, the additional driveway name should be added to the ‘Intersection’ name (BELDEN BOULEVARD/LOCHIEL LANE).
45. Please revise the Traffic Signal Permit Plan at Ship Road (62-1485) to indicate the “Nearest Signal 1048’ @ Belden Blvd/Lochiel Lane.

46. Please revise the Traffic Signal Permit Plan at Springdale Drive (62-2446) to indicate the “Nearest Signal 1553’ @ Belden Blvd/Lochiel Lane.

47. The revised System Plan (#I-0023) shows Ship Road receiving a fixed time during peak period operations, as well as a zero offset, and as such, we question whether all related corridor intersections are now offset from Ship Road. Please confirm.

48. Within the Pedestrian Accommodations text of the Traffic Signal Study, the “Distance to next available crossing” should show Ship Road at 1,048 feet to the west (not Valley Creek Blvd).

**General**

49. Upon resubmission, the applicant’s engineer should compose a response letter that describes how each comment has been addressed and where any plan and/or report revisions are located.

50. Additional comments regarding the traffic improvements and/or land development plans may follow upon receipt of future submissions.

If there are any questions or if additional information is requested, please contact our office.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

James J. Kouch, P.E.
Senior Project Manager

JJK/JDG/ab

c:  John R. Weller, AICP, West Whiteland Township
    Theodore D. Otteni, P.E., West Whiteland Township
    Justin Smiley, AICP, West Whiteland Township
MEMORANDUM

DATE: May 8, 2018

TO: John Weller, Director of Planning and Zoning

FROM: Theodore D. Otteni, P.E.
       Director of Public Works

SUBJECT: Lochiel Farm Land Development

I have reviewed the submission for the Lochiel Farm Land Development Plan dated November 28, 2017.

I offer the following comments:

1. For sidewalks adjacent to the roads to be dedicated to the Township, please provide sidewalks with a 5 ft. width.

2. Assuming the structure (culvert/bridge) under Lochiel Lane is to be dedicated to the Township with the roadway, substantially more information needs to be provided prior to approval.

3. With respect to the notes requiring concrete encasement of the sanitary main when crossing other utilities, this is only necessary when necessitated by the County Health Department regulations.

4. Provide details for the proposed “Naturalized Trails”.

5. Traffic Signal Plans and PennDOT HOP plans were not provided. Please provide for review.
MEMORANDUM

DATE:        May 7, 2018
TO:          Justin Smiley, Township Planner
FROM:        Joseph M. Catov Jr., Chief of Police
SUBJECT:     Lochiel Farm SD Land Development (First Review)

I have reviewed the land development plans for the proposed Lochiel Farm SD project. I have no issues with the plans as submitted.

[Signature]
Joseph M. Catov, Jr.
Chief of Police
DATE: April 19, 2018

TO: John Weller/Director of Planning and Zoning
    Justin Smiley/Township Planner

FROM: Mark Moses/Code Administration Officer/Fire Marshal/Assistant Zoning Officer

RE: Livingston Lane (Lochiel Farm) LD Fire Marshal Review

I have reviewed the above land development plan dated 11/28/2017 and have the following comments:

1. Streets with a width of 26 feet or less shall be posted as fire lane on both side. Streets with a width greater than 26 up to 28 feet shall be posted on at least one side as fire lane. Fire lane signs shall be the international type, double-sided and mounted perpendicular to the cartway. The requested signs are not visible on the plan.

2. The previously requested fire hydrants have not been shown on the plan.

See me with any questions.
Staff has prepared the following analysis of the conditions established by the Decision and Order ("D&O") granting conditional use approval on October 25, 2017 for the development of the property commonly known as the Lochiel Farm Tract. The conditions of the D&O are shown verbatim in italics; Staff evaluation of compliance with the condition immediately follows and is shown in plain text; our conclusion is in bold.

1. **As per the discussion between the Applicant and the Township Historical Commission and as shown on the Plan, the Applicant shall renovate the Lochiel Farm manor house (Township Historic Site #341, Class I) for use as a single-family detached dwelling, and shall relocate and renovate the Lochiel Farm tenant house (Township Historic Site #339, Class II) for use as a single-family detached dwelling.** The Class III tenant house/harness shop for Lochiel Farm (Township Historic Site #340) may be demolished in accordance with the provisions of §325-85 of the Zoning Ordinance. None of the other structures on the Property have particular historic value and may be demolished pursuant to the Township’s standard permit process.

   The current plan is consistent with this condition, but unless the renovations are completed prior to land development approval, this condition should remain.

   **This condition should be carried forward as a condition of final plan approval.**

2. **The Applicant shall revise the design of the main entrance to the Development on the Plan (i.e., the entrance on Lincoln Highway directly across from Belden Boulevard) as may be directed by the Township as advised by Traffic Planning and Design ("TPD") pursuant to TPD’s review of the Applicant’s traffic study.** Such revision shall include, at a minimum, a four-way traffic signal and other associated intersection improvements. The Applicant shall obtain the necessary PennDOT Highway Occupancy Permit for these improvements.

   The current plan is consistent with this condition, and the Applicant is in the process of securing PennDOT approval.

   **This condition is not yet satisfied.**

3. **The Applicant shall pay a traffic impact fee pursuant to Township Ordinance No. 427 and the Transportation Capital Improvements Plan as referenced therein.**

   The current review by McMahon advises that the impact fee for this project will be $100,011.30 and that it should be paid not later than when the Applicant applies for a building permit.

   **This condition should be carried forward as a condition of final plan approval.**

4. **The Applicant shall cooperate with the Township and the Township traffic engineer in obtaining PennDOT approval of improvements to the intersection of Ship Road and Lin-
coln Highway, including but not limited to, left-turn signals on Lincoln Highway east-bound and westbound into Ship Road. Should the Applicant be agreeable to constructing or assisting in the construction of any road improvements at this intersection, the cost of such construction shall be credited toward the amount of the traffic impact fee.

The Commission will recall that the project does not abut this intersection, but it will clearly have an effect upon it. The Applicant has participated in meetings with Township officials and other interested parties regarding this issue, but it has yet to be determined whether a construction project will be identified prior to when the traffic impact fee will be due.

The Applicant has been cooperating as required, but this condition has not yet been fully met and may need to be carried forward as a condition of final plan approval.

5. Prior to land development approval, the Applicant shall obtain the review and comment of the Director of Public Works as to the road segments within the Development, if any, to be offered for dedication to the Township.

The Director’s most recent memo does not express any concerns on this matter, but there are issues in our traffic engineer’s review that should be resolved.

This condition has not yet been met.

6. The Plan shall be revised to accommodate driveway access from Livingston Lane to the adjoining properties of Exton Properties, Inc.

The current plan shows the required access.

This condition has been met.

7. The Applicant shall provide the open space and recreational areas shown on the Plan in order to meet the requirements of §281-47.B(1) of the SLDO, such that no fee in lieu of open space shall be required, provided that the open space to be preserved shall not be revised to be less than what is required by §281-47.B(1) of the SLDO. The Applicant shall provide play areas and equipment suitable for the anticipated residents of the Development within the open space area.

The open space areas are shown as required, but there is no information regarding play areas or equipment.

This condition has not been fully met.

8. Prior to land development approval, the Applicant shall clarify the ownership of the Chester Valley Trail and shall memorialize the same on the land development plan.

The owner of the Trail is now shown as “Lands of County of Chester.” This is consistent with Township records.

This condition has been met.
9. The Applicant shall resolve the concerns raised by SSM Group, TPD and Theurkauf Design and Planning to the satisfaction of the Township.

The current reviews by SSM and Theurkauf include remaining concerns.

This condition has not been fully met.

10. The Township acknowledges that the design as shown on the Plan requires relief from various provisions of the Stormwater Management Ordinance and the SLDO. Such relief shall be duly considered and may be granted to the extent necessary to accommodate this design, subject to a determination by the Township that such relief will not adversely affect the public health, safety, or welfare and the advice of the Township’s various consultants.

No action required by the Applicant.

11. The Applicant shall execute and provide to the Township a recordable, notarized copy of a memorandum containing a metes and bounds description of the Property in question and stipulating the terms and conditions of this approval and shall consent to the recording by the Township in the office of the Recorder of Deeds of Chester County no later than at the time of recording of final subdivision and land development plans.

To date, the required memorandum has not been provided.

This condition should be carried forward as a condition of final plan approval.

12. Within 30 days of the date of this Decision and Order, Applicant shall pay in full all fees charged and properly invoiced by Township consultants for review of the conditional use Application and plans and preparation of this Decision and Order.

The Township Finance Department advises that as of April 1, 2018 there were outstanding invoices relative to the conditional use approval. Staff will inform the Commission in the event that the Applicant resolves this matter prior to the meeting.

This condition has not been met.

13. Applicant shall express to the Board in writing delivered to the Township Administrative offices within 10 days of the Applicant’s receipt of this Decision its full and complete consent to the conditions specified herein above or the Application for conditional use is denied; the Board expressly finding and concluding that the Application, in the absence of compliance with the said conditions, is inconsistent with the standards, criteria, purposes and policies codified in Code §325-124.C.

Staff has no record of the required written acceptance.

This condition has not been met.

This concludes the conditions attached to the D&O.
SUMMARY and CONCLUSION

In the opinion of Staff, of the thirteen (13) conditions attached to the D&O:

- Two have been met to our satisfaction,
- One does not require any action by the Applicant,
- Three should be carried forward as conditions of final plan approval, and
- Seven have not been met either fully or in part and are not appropriate as conditions of final plan approval.