

**Tredyffrin Township  
Planning Commission Regular Meeting Minutes  
January 19, 2006**

---

A regular meeting of the Planning Commission was held on January 19, 2006 at the Tredyffrin Township Building. Members present included: Robert O'Leary, Chairman, Sean N. McCauley, Vice Chairman, Marlen Kokaz, Libby Brinton, Giovanni D'Amato, Edward Sweeney, and Thomas J. Cooper.

Members absent: Michael Tierney, Victoria Snyder.

Also present: Mimi Gleason, Township Manager; Steve Norcini, Director of Public Works

**CALL TO ORDER:**

Chairman O'Leary called the meeting to order at 7:10 PM.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

Motion made by Mr. O'Leary, seconded by Mr. McCauley to approve the December 15, 2005 regular meeting minutes.

**CARRYOVER MATTERS:**

Application (#03-05) **Bentley by Design, L.P.**; Preliminary/Final Subdivision Plan: Proposal to consolidate 2 lots on 2.5 acres and resubdivide into 3 lots at 24 Bodine Road in an R-1 Residence District. [Plan prepared by Chester Valley Engineers, Inc., dated 8-18-05, revised 11-30-05.]

- Debbie Shulski, attorney for the project, presented the final plan for which the applicant is seeking approval. She stated that the applicant had received the ARRO and Township review letters dated January 12, 2006, and that they were willing to comply with all items on those letters. She noted that the driveways would stay as drawn on the plans. To address the concern expressed in a letter from Vince Pompo, Township Solicitor, Ms. Shulski agreed that the applicant would grant an easement to the property owner for the small section of Woodland Road abutting his property. Ms. Gleason explained that the Township solicitor had concerns regarding a small section of Woodland Road which abuts a piece of property that is privately owned and identified as UPI #43-10J-20. He felt that access rights to this property could be blocked unless the applicant granted an easement for use of that portion of Woodland Road. It was also brought up that a deed restriction should be placed on that easement so that it could not be built on in the future. This easement and any deed restrictions should be noted on the plans.
- Mr. McCauley asked the applicant if they had an adequacy letter from Chester County yet. Brett MacKay, engineer for the project, responded that they had been waiting to get stormwater management worked out to the satisfaction of the Township and had not applied for their NPDES permit yet. Mr. McCauley questioned how they could be seeking final approval without the necessary permits. Ms. Shulski explained that the applicant was seeking only preliminary approval pending the receipt of all permits before final approval.

**Action:** Motion made by Mr. O'Leary, seconded by Mr. McCauley, and carried unanimously to recommend preliminary approval of the above referenced plan with the condition that the easement and any deed restrictions for Woodland Road be noted on the plan before submission to the Board of Supervisors.

Application (#25-05) **Keystone Property Group**; Preliminary Land Development Plan: Proposal for exterior refinishing to 6 office buildings and a 26,000 s.f. addition to 2 office buildings at the Valley Forge Office Center, 656-676 Swedesford Road, in the P Professional District. [Plan prepared by Nave Newell, dated 1-04-06].

- Mr. O’Leary stated that the applicant had appeared before the Zoning Hearing Board and had been granted a variance for impervious coverage with or without sidewalks. He noted that the Planning Commission, as stated at the previous meeting, definitely wanted sidewalks along Swedesford Road; but none were shown on the plans. Ms. Shulski, attorney for the applicant, said that the applicant had not gotten the impression that all members of the Planning Commission wanted sidewalks, so they had not been included on the plan. Mr. O’Leary reiterated that the Planning Commission did want sidewalks along Swedesford Road. He also indicated that they had requested a bus stop shelter be added to the plans, but he did not see one. Paul Lepard, engineer for the project, pointed out that a shelter was shown in the east corner of the property. However, there is ongoing discussion with SEPTA and PADOT about who has jurisdiction over the structure, so placement could change. Ms. Gleason stated that nearby Liberty Property was considering a bus stop shelter on their property and were going to meet with Township staff to discuss. Mr. Lepard agreed that he would also be willing to attend that meeting in an effort to coordinate placement of the two shelters.
- Mr. O’Leary questioned the number of handicapped parking spaces noting that they had been reduced from 15 spaces to 12. He requested that the required number from the zoning ordinance and the actual number provided be noted on the plans.
- Questions arose about the height of the retaining wall located at the stormwater basin in front of the property. Mr. Lepard stated that the wall will be used to help increase the depth of the basin and will vary in height from 4 to 6 feet. Mr. O’Leary remarked that any wall over 4 feet high would require protection along the top and engineered calculations. He also brought up some stormwater issues on the west side parking lot, noting that it is relatively flat and does not drain well. He suggested that the applicant consider adding another inlet to help alleviate the problem. Mr. Lepard agreed to study the issue. Mr. O’Leary asked if all roof drains will hook into a drainage system? Mr. Lepard said that stormwater management will be better than currently exists because roof drains from existing buildings as well as the new addition will be piped into a drainage system. Also, the basin on the front of the property will have increased capacity and a slower release which should help significantly.
- Ms. Shulski asked for clarification of the sidewalk issue. A show of hands by the Planning Commission members showed that all were in favor of sidewalks along Swedesford Road.

**Action:** None

Application (#29-05) **Iko Zakarija**: Preliminary/Final Subdivision Plan; Proposal for a lot line change between 121 and 3 Woodmere Court in an R-1 Residence District. [Plan prepared by Howard W. Doran Engineering and Surveying, dated 10/3/2005].

- Ms. Gleason presented some background on this application. Mr. Zakarija spoke at the initial meeting for this plan and had questions regarding the sewer easement that the Township would require. Since that time he has not returned to the Planning Commission, nor has he submitted a withdrawal letter. If there is no vote to deny this application tonight, it would be deemed an approval per the Municipalities Planning Code.

**Action:** Motion made by Mr. O’Leary, seconded by Mr. McCauley, and carried unanimously to recommend that the Board of Supervisors deny the above referenced plan.

Application (#30-05) **Users, Inc.**; Preliminary Land Development Plan: Proposal to build a 56,000 sf addition to the building at 1250 Drummers Lane in a P Professional District. [Plan prepared by Associated Engineering Consultants Inc., dated 1-05-06].

- Karen McManuels, engineer for the project, presented revised plans indicating that the new addition and parking lot to the rear had been moved slightly in order to avoid steep slope areas. The entrance drive and handicapped parking had also been adjusted to meet the new addition placement. Mr. O’Leary noted that stormwater in this area is a serious concern and questioned what the applicant was doing to manage it. Ms. McManuels said that the existing parking and building will still drain into the current detention pond but all stormwater for the addition and new parking area will be connected to an underground storage system. The existing accessory parking lot is flat and hard to manage, so the new parking area had been over engineered to provide adequate stormwater management. Mr. McCauley asked if some sort of landscaping could be done around the accessory parking lot to help with the stormwater runoff. Ms. McManuels did not think this would be a problem.
- Mr. O’Leary requested that existing lighting as well as new be shown on the plan and wondered what type of new lighting would be installed. Ms. McManuels stated that there would be shoeboxes and fixtures similar to what exist now.

**Action:** None

**NEW MATTERS:**

Application (#01-06) **National Penn Bank**; Land Development Sketch Plan; Proposal to demolish existing buildings and parking lot, and construct a 3,064 sf. one story bank with 2 drive through lanes and 12 parking spaces at 1714 Lancaster Avenue in the SPDD, Special Paoli Development District [Plan prepared by Chester Valley Engineers, Inc., dated 1-05-06].

- Brett McKay, engineer for the project, presented a sketch plan for a new bank building at 1714 Lancaster Avenue just east of Fairway Avenue. The existing buildings will be demolished and replaced with a 3,064 sf bank building that will have two drive thru bays. Patrons will enter from Lancaster Avenue on the west side of the building and exit onto Lancaster Avenue from the east side of the building. He noted that the applicant would comply with all amenity requirements for the SPDD, and that stormwater management will be an underground system.
- Mr. O’Leary had several suggestions for items to be shown on the preliminary plan. He asked that the applicant check the Zoning Ordinance to make sure that all lane widths for drive thru facilities are met. Also, parking is shown as twelve spaces which may not be adequate if there are 4 or 5 taken up by employees. Perhaps the applicant could put in signs directing traffic to the back where some additional parking spots could be added. Decorative paving is shown, but the Township has noticed problems with pavers and stamped cement; so they would recommend heat embedded vinyl brick patterns. Streetlight heads are shown but no poles. Show both on the plans as well as the location where they will be installed. It is suggested that they be placed in the brick verge area as close as possible to the entrance and exit sites. The old fixtures will have to be returned to the Township. The grade on the driveway will have to be adjusted so that the sanitary inlet in the west side entrance can be driven over. Any revised plans need to show an area for unloading and trash storage, landscaping in the narrow strip between the parking spaces and the existing stone wall, and the features and conditions of the adjacent properties.
- Ms. Snyder would like the design to include some sort of connection between neighboring properties as our ordinance encourages this in order to avoid traffic having to go back onto Lancaster Avenue to travel between businesses.
- Ms. Brinton was concerned about the stone wall running along the entrance and wondered if the turn into that drive would be a problem given the 15’ width.
- Mr. McCauley asked if there would be a walk up or drive thru ATM machine and mentioned that it would need to be shown on the plan.

- Mr. Norcini requested that the plans indicate how many cars could be stacked in the drive thru lanes before they would encroach into the parking area. The applicant might want to consider putting the parking in a double row so that the drive thru lanes could accommodate more cars.
- Thomas Perry, Office Manager for the bank, addressed parking concerns by stating that there would be one part time and four full time employees. Also, the ATM would not need additional parking spaces as it would be a drive thru not a walk up.

**Action:** None

**OTHER MATTERS:**

**ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 8:30 PM.  
Respectfully Submitted,

Carol O'Neill  
Recording Secretary