

## **Birmingham Township Planning Commission (BTPC)**

### **Minutes of the meeting March 9, 2021**

The regular meeting of the BTPC was called to order by Ms. McCarthy at 7:32pm via Zoom.

PRESENT: Scott Garrison, MaryPat McCarthy, David Shields, Brendan Murphy, Eric Hawkins

ABSENT:

Also present: Kurt Hutter, Brian Atkins, Matt DiGuilio, Colin Hanna, Kim Venzie

Mr. Murphy made a motion to approve the February 9, 2021 minutes. Motion was seconded by Mr. Garrison and it passed unanimously.

### **Review Radley Run Country Club Sketch Plan**

Kurt Hutter is in attendance tonight to present this proposal. He is a long-time resident of the township, a Radley Run country club member and volunteer Board member. He is joined by Colin Hanna (another local resident, club member and acting interim General Manager) and Matt DiGiulio another local resident, club member and volunteer Board member. Lastly, they are joined by Brian Atkins the civil engineer and the person who prepared the sketch plan that is being discussed this evening.

A quick background on Radley Run is that it is a member owned club – very family oriented and geared toward the families in the neighborhood. The club was established in 1965. There are approximately 500 families who are members of the club – ranging from full golf members to social members. The facilities consist of an 18-hole golf course, tennis courts, paddle ball courts, a pool, dining facilities and other customary country club facilities that you would expect.

They are proposing a new golf building to enhance and better support the golf experience for members - they shared a rendering of what it will look like. They are not proposing new services with this building, but are planning to move the lockers and existing casual pub/grill that are in the current main building on the other side of Country Club Drive. They are proposing moving those functions to the new building across the street that would be a 4,000 square foot footprint. The lower level would house the locker rooms and the upper level would be the proposed new casual dining grill for members. The grill would have an indoor (seating 50-60 people) and an outdoor patio area (seating the same number of people).

Not necessarily part of the proposal tonight, but the overall plan does include renovating the existing club house to become a larger event space. The weakness of the current club is the facilities as they are original to 1965 with limited updates over the years (the last interior update was done 25 years ago) – definitely not up to par with the surrounding country club facilities. They had a membership vote in the fall and the vote was overwhelmingly in favor of this proposal. It is really a way to maintain and attract

new members. Hoping to begin this project as soon as possible – will hope to have building permits and plans in July and they expected it to be a 7 month +/- project.

This plan has been a year or so in the making already. They hired an architectural firm, Chambers Architects – they are a renowned country club architect. They are helping design the new building. This will position the club for long term success over the next 50 years.

Brian Atkins shared the conceptual plan that was submitted. He reviewed where the existing facilities are located and where they are proposing to move those facilities. He showed where they are proposing a circular drop off at the entrance to the new building. This is also where deliveries and emergency vehicles would have access. He also showed where proposed parking would be located – noting that these parking modifications may or may not be part of the actual project at this time. He states they are not looking to add parking as they are not adding any functions but rather re-locating existing functions. Thus, the parking is being modified to be closer to the new facility.

With this new proposal they have to look at storm water management and design – as well as the overall stormwater management of the site. They are looking at an area to the left side of the proposed building for a potential above ground dry basin. Mr. Murphy asked for clarification of where the water retention basin would be located. Mr. Atkins showed the location again and also the various land parcels that are country club owned on that side of the road. He notes again that they are planning for an above ground basin. If they need anything underground, it would be below the payment areas in the front – this is more expensive.

Ms. McCarthy asked if there are any other questions from the committee. If not, she wants the applicant to address the items listed in the VanDemark & Lynch township engineer review letter:

1. The location of the new golf house does straddle two parcels (the 93-acre golf course and the parcel supporting other miscellaneous golf course features like parking areas). Item one notes either a variance or subdivision will be required. Mr. Atkins indicated that they are looking to proceed with this as a consolidation of parcels but they need to look into the agreements that currently apply to each parcel. They have located the open space agreement from 1965 and the most recent subdivision of the area and they are working with VanDemark & Lynch to determine the best way to proceed.
2. Yes, there are steep slopes in excess of 25% and they agree to provide the calculations needed
3. This is all R1 zoning which only allows 10% impervious coverage. This is why they are looking to consolidate or will need to apply for a variance.
4. Mr. Hutter addressed this item – they acknowledge and are aware that there are historic buildings and realize they will have to work with HARB and HC. They have an existing relationship with HARB already.

5. Mr. Atkins indicates that they will work with the Zoning Officer on this item.
6. The existing 14 spaces are just a one-way aisle and they will have to deal with the existing septic system that may need to be abandoned. They may need to pursue a variance for this expansion if they keep it as part of the land development plan this time or they may defer it to a future time. Ms. McCarthy asked if they have a parking calculation for all the spots and the square-footage they have for all the activities they provide as a country club.
7. A landscape plan will be included with the full land development submission.
8. They plan to talk with the township as the buffer may not make sense in some of these areas as the entire area is R1.
9. They will need to weigh if this expansion will be included with this land development plan or not
10. They discussed this in an earlier item and will need to discuss the parking issues with the BOS – they show 50 existing parking spaces and 77 proposed between these parking areas-- demand is not expected to dramatically increase as it is for members only
11. If they add the additional entrance on Country Club Drive, they will review sight distances, et cetera
12. They will comply with a Lighting Plan and will be in compliance with the code requirements.
13. Perimeter screening will be in compliance per the Landscape Plan.
14. They will comply.
15. They do not anticipate an additional dumpster to be required for the proposed building.
16. They will comply during the land development submission.
17. Currently the width of this driveway is 16 feet and they believe they can accommodate the 20-foot requirement.
18. They can also widen this striped area from 10 ft to 14ft
19. They will comply during the land development process with ability for the largest delivery vehicle to maneuver this area - box trucks and a potential fire truck would be the largest vehicles using this area
20. They will comply with handicap accessible access to the building and potentially relocating the existing handicap parking.
21. They are in the process of evaluating this open space agreement from 1965 to make sure that the interpretation is accurate.

Ms. Venzie notes that they should do some parking calculations because although they are stating that the demand won't increase, the idea of this project to generate new membership will potentially generate additional parking requirements. They have many parking lots - some require valet for certain events. She likes the consideration of them consolidating the parcels, because many of the items on this review letter will go away if they do consolidate the lots.

Mr. Hawkins states that this is technically a subdivision/land development plan and going that route will make this a much cleaner application and process. He also asked if it will be served by a private or public sewer system. Mr. Hutter indicated that they

have public water and they have an on-site sewer plant that serves the existing facilities and some of the private residences. The system is located near the paddle courts. Mr. Hawkins noted they already mentioned the NEPDES permit, but that they will need to go through the county health department also for an assembly use. They have already verified that their sewer treatment plant is permitted for in excess of 4000 gallons and thus the system flow is adequate for the proposed needs.

Mr. Murphy discloses that he is a member of Radley Run country club and a neighbor living to the south side of the club. His two issues that he would like the applicant to consider whether they will indeed use the existing dumpster due to its far location for the proposed building, and stormwater run-off to the road since they already have puddling on the road.

Ms. McCarthy asked about noise. Mr. Hutter wants to determine hours of usage and get back to the group on this item.

Mr. Hanna wanted to note for the record that one of the rational points for this new building is safety. He notes that the existing club house being located on one side of the road and the golf course on the other side has for years lead to a situation where golf carts are crossing a public thoroughfare creating a potential safety issue. Re-locating the club house to the same side as the golf course will eliminate this issue and is a substantial safety improvement.

Mr. Hutter states that the next steps will be talking with the HC, HARB and starting the land development plan. They expect to be back to the PC in the next couple months.

Mr. Murphy asked about neighbor notification. Mr. Hawkins noted that they will be notified as part of the land development planning.

Mr. Hawkins notes a couple of items that the PC should be aware: (1) The PC should look at the 1965 document and; 2) also look for the court case that occurred in the 60s or 70s to make sure that the decision made at that time doesn't impact this expansion. Ms. Venzie stated that possibly the township already has these documents, but if not, they should be reviewed.

Ms. McCarthy asked Mr. Murphy if he normally walks to events at the club house, because anytime she has attended events there, parking is an issue. He noted that on a normal day, parking isn't an issue, but when they host events, parking is an issue.

Mr. Hawkins reiterates that the parking should be part of this process since they could have a golf event in the new building and a wedding at the existing building concurrently and parking would definitely be an issue.

Mr. Shields asked if the adjacent neighbors are aware of the proposal. Mr. Murphy noted that the adjacent neighbors were on the zoom call tonight and that the landscape buffer comments were directed toward their concerns.

Ms. Venzie thinks that the consolidation of the lots will make the process easier and they definitely will need to address the parking issue as part of the subdivision and land development process. The code is very specific about the number of parking spaces that are required for employees, et cetera.

**New Business/Public Comment:**

None

Motion to adjourn the meeting was made at 8:39pm by Ms. McCarthy and seconded by Mr. Garrison and approved unanimously. Next meeting is scheduled for April 13, 2021.

Respectfully submitted,  
Jennifer A. Boorse  
PC Secretary