AGENDA ITEMS

- Korean War Memorial
- Montgomery Retirement Residence Doylestown Road

MONTGOMERY TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION

May 18, 2017

The May 18, 2017, meeting of the Montgomery Township Planning Commission was called to order by Chairman Jay Glickman at 7:30 p.m. In attendance were Commissioners Michael Lyon, James Rall, Ellen Reynolds, and Andrew Terreri. Commissioners David Fetzer, Steven Krumenacker and Leon McGuire were absent. Also present was Bruce Shoupe, Director of Planning and Zoning.

The minutes of April 20, 2017, were approved as submitted.

There were no public comments.

Korean War Memorial

The first item on the agenda was a presentation of a sketch plan for a Korean War Memorial American-Korean Alliance Peace Park at Montgomery Township. Roy Rodriguez, representing the Shade Tree Commission, Bong Pil Yang, Co-Chair of the Committee, Judy Stern Goldstein, Boucher & James, and Joe Lavelle, architect, were present to discuss this plan. Mr. Rodriguez stated that this memorial would be located by the Memorial Grove at Windlestrae Park. He explained that this was a project of the American Korean Alliance to honor all those who served in the Korean War and those who have served, or are serving presently, on the Korean peninsula. Mr. Rodriguez stated that this has been an ongoing project and that every dollar spent on the memorial will be through fund raising efforts. State Representatives Harper, Stephens and Murt and Congressman Boyle are Co-Chairs of the committee. The Korean Ambassador is also involved in this process. The project is approximately 40% funded. Mr. Rodriguez advised that Ms. Stern Goldstein and Mr. Lavelle have donated their time on this project. The Committee hopes to hold a ceremonial ground breading on April 1, 2018. Mr. Rodriguez explained that they would be asking for a waiver of land development from the Board of Supervisors. The project was diminimus. There would be no impact on stormwater. They had previously discussed the plan with the Township Engineer, so he was familiar with the project. Mr. Rall asked about the plant material being used. Ms. Stern Goldstein stated that they had very carefully decided on the landscaping. She stated that they had used an hibiscus plant as an ode to the native Korean flower, so that it would be both beautiful and meaningful. Mr. Rodriguez also advised that as part of the fund raising effort, there were memorial bricks which could be purchased to be placed along the walkway. The Planning Commission

felt that this was a wonderful project. A motion was made by Mr. Glickman, seconded by Mr. Rall, to recommend to the Board of Supervisors that this project be granted a waiver of the formal land development process. Motion carried unanimously.

Montgomery Retirement Residence

The next item on the agenda was a discussion of the plan for the Montgomery Retirement Residence. James Garrity, attorney, Ron Klos, engineer, and Mark Lowen, Lenity Architecture, were present for this discussion. Mr. Garrity reminded the Commission members that this plan was for the development of several lots at the intersection of Doylestown Road and Montgomery Glen Drive as a Congregate Care/Independent Senior Living use. He explained that this is permitted in the BP Business Office and Professional District as a conditional use and that they had received this approval in 2016. He stated that the development includes 141 congregate care/independent living senior living unit suites and two manager units in a three-story building, along with associated improvements, such as parking, green space, site amenities and detached garages. Access to the site is from a proposed extension of Montgomery Glen Drive. Mr. Garrity stated that this plan had been revised in response to numerous review letters and meetings with the Township consultants and staff. Chairman Glickman stated that the Commission had previously discussed this plan and therefore did not feel that a detailed discussion was necessary at this time. He asked if there were any issues that remained unresolved from consultants' review letters. Mr. Garrity stated that the applicant will comply with the majority of the comments of the Township consultants. However, there were several waivers which had been requested. The waivers were as follows:

- 1. Section 92-2.D(2) the requirement that only two curb cuts be permitted for any single property, tract or lot Three curb cuts are proposed along Montgomery Glen Drive to allow proper circulation in and around the site. (The consultants have no objection to this waiver with the Montgomery Glen Drive extension serving only this site. It is recommended that any future driveways on the southern side of Montgomery Glen Drive extension be aligned with proposed driveways for the Montgomery Retirement Residence site to minimize turning conflicts.)
- 2. Section 205-18.D(3)(e)- the requirement that bottom slopes of detention basins should not be less than 2%. (The applicant proposes flat bottom basin as infiltration is anticipated. Additionally, the applicant indicated in the response letter that an underdrain will not be provided. The flat bottom is difficult to build and maintain while providing for dewatering of the basin to prevent mosquito populations. The consultants have no objection to this waiver provided an acceptable, redundant dewatering method is provided in the extent infiltration does not occur as expected. Due to the size of the basin, it is recommended that the applicant provide at least one additional infiltration test within the area of the proposed basin to support the design infiltration rate.)
- 3. Section 205-18.D(3)(f) the requirement that a low flow channel, or equal, shall be provided from each basin inflow pipe to the outflow structure. (The applicant is proposing to infiltrate stormwater and therefore the channel would be counterintuitive. The consultants have no objection to this waiver.)
- 4. Section 205-52.B(2)(b) the requirement that the buffer area shall be used for no purpose other than planting of trees, shrubs and lawn to meet planting requirements and may include a

- wall or fence. Although the required number of shrubs and trees are planted in the softening buffer, a waiver is technically required to allow these features within the softening buffer. (The consultants have no objection to this waiver.)
- 5. Section 205-52.B(2)(d) the requirement that within the buffer area, no slopes shall be steeper than one foot in height for each four feet in width (slope 25%). Although the required number of shrubs and trees are planted in the softening buffers, a waiver is technically required to allow slopes of 33% within the softening buffer. (The consultants have no objection to this waiver, provided the requirements of SLDO Section 205-52.H Steep Slope Landscaping are met)
- 6. Section 205-52.B(4)(a) the requirement that four shade trees and eight shrubs shall be included for each 100 feet of property perimeter. This requires 26 shade trees in the softening buffer along Montgomery Glen Drive. Twenty (20) street trees are planted along Montgomery Glen Drive as required per the street tree requirements. There is limited space to plant an additional 26 trees along Montgomery Glen Drive. (The consultants have no objection to this waiver, provided the required shade trees are planted elsewhere in the Township or a fee-in-lieu is provided. An additional 26 shade trees are required. 26 Shade Trees x \$350.00 = \$9,100.00)
- 7. Section 205-52.C(2)(b) the requirement that all truck loading, outside storage areas, mechanical equipment and trash receptacles shall be screened from view Due to site configuration, the loading area facing Montgomery Glen Drive cannot be screened with landscaping or access would be restricted. (The consultants have no objection to this waiver.)
- 8. Section 205-52.G the requirement for individual lot landscaping. The proposed three-story building would require 86 total trees. The equivalent of 28 trees are provided throughout the site, with limited area to plant the additional 58 trees. (The consultants have no objection to this waiver, provided the required shade trees are planted elsewhere in the Township or a fee in lieu is provided. An additional 58 trees are required. 58 trees X \$350 = \$20,300)
- 9. Section 205-53.C(1) the requirement for preservation of 60% of trees 8" to 23" in diameter and preservation of 60% of trees 24" to 48" in diameter. The waiver is requested to allow 47.8% of the 8-23" trees to be preserved and 13.7% of the 24-48" trees to be preserved. It should be noted that the site disturbance has been significantly reduced by eliminating the cottages from the site layout. It should also be noted that 43.5% of trees 8-23" are proposed to be preserved, and 11.9% of trees 24-48" are proposed to be disturbed. (The consultants have no objection to this waiver, provided the deficient replacement trees are planted elsewhere in the township or a fee-in-lieu is provided, as outlined in #10 below.)
- 10. Section 205-53.C(4) the requirement for tree replacement/reforestation procedures. A partial waiver is requested. The replacement of 138 trees is required whereas the equivalent of 52 replacement trees are provided. Although deficient by 86 trees, there is limited areas on-site to add these trees without removing additional trees in the wooded areas in the northwest portion of the site. (It should be noted that there are actually 186 replacement trees required. 52 replacement trees are proposed on site, leaving the plan deficient by 133 replacement trees. The consultants have no objection to this waiver, provided the required replacement trees are planted elsewhere in the Township or a fee-in-lieu is provided. An additional 133 replacement trees are required. 133 Replacement Trees x \$275.00 = \$36,575.00.)

- 11. Section 205-78.B(1) the requirement that existing features within 400 feet of any part of the land to be subdivided be shown on the plan. (The applicant has supplied an aerial that depicts these items. The consultants have no objection to this waiver conditioned upon the applicant supplying any of the information should it be deemed necessary to complete the review.)
- 12. Section A237-1 Street Lighting the requirement for street lights to be placed on Route 202. No street lights currently exist along Route 202 in this area of the site. (The consultants have no objection to this waiver.)
- 13. Section 205-52.F(6)— the requirement for perimeter landscaping around stormwater facilities. A partial waiver is requested. There is sufficient room around the facility that is adjacent to Route 202 to plant the required shrubs; however, there is insufficient room to plant the required 18 shade trees. (The consultants have no objection to this waiver, provided the plans are revised to include the required thirty-six (36) shrubs around the facility adjacent to Route 202, and the remaining required shade trees are planted elsewhere in the Township or a fee-in-lieu is provided. An additional 18 shade trees are required. 18 Shade Trees x \$350.00 = \$6,300.00)
- 14. Section 205-10.D(3) the requirement for temporary turnarounds to have a minimum radius of 35 feet. Montgomery Glen Drive is proposed as a stub street to allow future extension by others. There is sufficient circulation in and around the site for emergency vehicles to access the property as necessary. (The consultants have no objection to this waiver for such a low volume private road. The road will essentially function as a driveway for the proposed site which will generate relatively low traffic volume.)
- 15. Section 205-10.D(2)(b) the requirement that any cul-de-sac longer than 500 feet to provide a circular turnaround with a minimum right-of-way radius of 62 feet and an outer paving radius of 50 feet. Montgomery Glen Drive is proposed as a stub street to allow future extension by others. There is sufficient circulation in and around the site for emergency vehicles to access the property as necessary. (The consultants have no objection to this waiver provided that the following conditions are satisfied: the applicant maintains the street (snow removal, etc., the applicant provides access to abutting properties, the applicant provides signage to the satisfaction of the Township Traffic Engineer, the applicant offers the road for dedication and that the Township Fire Marshal review and approve the plan relative to site access.)
- 16. Section 205-52.F(6) It should be noted that the correct ordinance section that should be referenced for this waiver is Section 205-52.A.(2)(e). A waiver is requested to permit more than 80 foot spaces between trees due to conflicts with sight triangles and driveway widths. (The consultants have no objection to this waiver.)

Mr. Garrity advised that the consultants had indicated that they had no objections to these requests. However, there were two items which the applicant would like to discuss: 1) park and recreation fee in lieu; and 2) tree replacement fee in lieu. Chairman Glickman advised that this discussion should be with the Board of Supervisors. The Planning Commission could not make decisions on these items. It was further mentioned that the applicant should meet with the Fire Marshal to discuss his review letter, especially the issue of fire flow. The Fire Marshal had stated that the required fire flow is 1,650 gallons per minute. The last fire hydrant water flow test indicated that the water flow is 1,300 gallons per minute. This needs to be resolved. Mr. Garrity stated that they would discuss this

with the Fire Marshal. A motion was make by Mr. Rall, seconded by Mrs. Reynolds, to recommend to the Board of Supervisors that this plan be approved, subject to satisfactory compliance with all comments of the Township's consultants. The motion further recommended that the requested waivers be approved in conjunction with the comments of the Township's consultants. The questions of the park and recreation fee in lieu and tree replacement fees were deferred to the Board of Supervisors. Motion carried unanimously.

This meeting was adjourned at 8:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted:

Marita Stoerrle
Development Coordinator/
Recording Secretary