

Birmingham Township Planning Commission (BTPC)
Minutes of the meeting August 25, 2021

The regular meeting of the BTPC was called to order by Ms. McCarthy at 7:00pm in the Birmingham township building.

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

Also present: Kim Venzie, Esq
Dave Schlott, Jr., PE
Kurt Hutter, Brian Atkins, Matt DiGuilio, Colin Hanna
Adam Brower, Roger Josephian

A motion to approve the minutes of the July 13, 2021 meeting was made by **Mr. Murphy** and seconded by **Mr. Garrison**. Motion passed unanimously.

Review Radley Run Country Clubhouse Improvements Preliminary/Final Land Development Plan

Mr. Kurt Hutter and Mr. Brian Atkins from SR3 Engineers are in attendance to present and answer any questions that are outstanding from the last meeting as well as walk through the items that were presented in both the Chester County Planning Commission letter and the Arro Engineering review letter. The biggest issue from the last meeting was parking so they brought some additional information tonight to help clarify this issue.

Per Dave Schlott from Arro (the township engineer) there are currently no glaring issues with the proposal. The review letter is broken down into various sections and addresses the issues that require clarification. Currently the applicant has not submitted a new plan with any of the items corrected or updated on it. He has been in contact with their engineer and has requested additional information on the site distance, parking and storm water modifications. The biggest issue that he sees is that the ordinance requires a 20-foot access for emergency response vehicles and the southern exit for the one-way driveway is only 14-feet wide. Mr. Atkins responded that per a conversation with Vandemark and Lynch in March (the original township engineer firm that has since been replaced by Arro) that the applicant widened the access in the turn-around and they had discussed if emergency vehicles could simply utilize the entrance as an exit in order to preserve the mature trees that would need to be taken down if they are required to make the exit a 20-foot access. Ms. McCarthy asked if this has been run by the Fire Marshall yet for input? There was some additional discussion on this topic but it was determined that they need widened as much of the driveway area to 14-feet as possible, gather input from the Fire Marshall and also determine if the exit can be widened any further without impacting the mature trees.

Ms. McCarthy would like to go through the engineer review letter dated August 13, 2021 section by section so as not to miss anything. The first section is Subdivision and Land Development and per Dave Schlott there are no issues.

In the Zoning section of the review letter, there are a couple of items to be addressed. As far as the landscape plan, that has not currently been included on the proposed plan as they are working with the homeowners of the adjacent parcel of land to determine where they would like to field locate the landscape buffer and visual screening.

Per item number 11 in the zoning section, they have provided a parking analysis document tonight to address the parking calculations. The document notes that the required parking for the project is 204 spaces. They calculate that they have 209 existing spaces (some in gravel lots) plus they are adding a net of 8 additional spots taking the number to 217. The future proposed expansion, which they have asked to not be required to put in at this time, will include an additional 42 spaces in parking area #3 and increase the total number of parking spaces to 259. Ms. Venzie asked how many total paved parking spaces are on the property at this time? Mr. Atkins states 129 spaces are paved and 80 (lots 4 and 5) are gravel and not striped. The gravel lots are primarily used for banquet events and they provide valet service during those events. Ms. McCarthy notes that these lots will not be practical for everyday use as they are not located in close proximity to the new clubhouse. The valet services are planned for banquet events as they know well in advance the number of people projected to attend such events.

Mr. Mark LaTrenta (current General Manager) adds that there is a walking path from the lot to the clubhouse and practice range and that many members walk this often. He added that a number of the members have their own golf carts that they ride to the club – thus not using a parking space because it is a neighborhood family environment. Ms. McCarthy agrees that this makes sense, however, she notes that the goal for spending this money on a state-of-the art facility is to make the Club more profitable by enhancing the space to hold larger banquet events which will not be attended by members in golf carts. She wants to address this parking issue now so that an acceptable solution can be found before the project begins. Mr. LaTrenta also noted additional information about the timing of events such as a wedding and golf/tennis, noting the fact that those activities do not occur at the same time. Early in the day the golf, tennis and pool activities occur and then diminish around 3pm. Then, the dining and wedding receptions will be the next round of parking that occurs and these special events won't be every day or even every single weekend.

Mr. Hawkins commented that if the PC gives approval for the sketch plan and it includes "future parking", then the applicant won't need to come back for additional approval. So, he stated that since the applicant is proposing these future spaces for when they are hosting 20 events a year, they need to assume that those 20 events per year could begin as soon as the project is completed. Discussion ensued about whether the proposed parking can be held off until the future or if it needs to be built at this time. Mr.

Hutter asked if the approval could be contingent on a statement that the future parking must be added within 24 months of certificate of occupancy of the new building – this would bridge the gap.

Mr. Murphy states that the parking analysis document shows that the parking numbers will be sufficient. Ms. Venzie notes that the document is based on the applicant's analysis and that the township engineer needs to verify the information they have provided and make sure that it is valid according to the ordinance. Ms. Venzie commented that this discussion is really a moot point, because the zoning ordinance is very specific and that the township engineer needs to review the information and determine if they are attempting to deviate from the ordinance. If they are, then they will need to go before the Zoning Hearing Board and request a variance to put off the additional parking spaces until a future date. Her concern in the entire parking analysis is that they are assuming that the gravel parking spaces qualify under the ordinance requirement. The zoning ordinance states "parking spaces shall have an approved all-weather surface and have a safe and convenient access in all seasons". She states that this needs to be taken into consideration and needs input from the township engineer.

Mr. Matt Diguilio is asking if it can be made a condition of the PC approval for the applicant to reserve the 14 spaces so that as they build the new facility and move the operations to the new facility with no net gain, however as they turn the current facility into a new banquet/wedding facility, they would then add the parking. Because on day one, they are not going to have 20 events – it will take time to get the current facility up to condition it needs to be in to host banquets/weddings and the parking will be completed prior to hosting those events. Mr. Hawkins states that there is too much speculation and not enough concrete information for the PC to make a decision.

Ms. McCarthy sums the discussion up with the fact that Dave Schlott needs to review the parking lots at the Club and then run the calculations and determine if the gravel lots meet the ordinance requirements or not. Mr. Hutter responds that they want to move forward as soon as possible, so if this item is going to hold up the process, then they will find a way to fund this earlier rather than later.

Ms. Venzie asked for clarification on the applicant's position for all the other items in the zoning section – numbers 10-17. Mr. Atkins confirmed they are going to be in compliance with all of those items and that they will have the Fire Marshall review the plans for the emergency vehicle access.

In the Stormwater Management section of the review letter, all items will all be addressed. Mr. Schlott noted that they made some modifications to the stormwater management on the existing plans and the applicant has noted that they will comply with all of these recommendations.

Mr. Shields noted that all these items need to be addressed and notes correctly on the plans in order to gain approval. Mr. Schlott noted that he reviewed the June 25th plans, but yes, some items have changed and they will have to make the required changes as

discussed and noted. Mr. Hawkins stated that the applicant is asking for preliminary/final approval and yet there are many outstanding items that make him uncomfortable making that recommendation – usually those type of approvals are based on very minor revisions.

Under the General section of the review letter, they are planning to meet the ADA requirements.

Mr. Atkins confirmed that they are prepared to be in compliance with all 49 items in the township engineer review letter.

Ms. McCarthy moved on to the review letter from Chester County Planning Commission for this project. She asked Mr. Schlott if he has any concerns with the applicant's ability to meet the Landscapes and Watersheds sections of the CCPC review letter. He stated no. She asked if they have any concerns about meeting requirements of items 4 and 5 under the Primary Issues section. Mr. Atkins noted that his understanding is that once they apply for the building permit, the project will then go to the Historic Commission for their review and input. Mr. Hutter stated that their architect took the proximity of the historic resources into account when they designed the new club house. Mr. Hanna weighed in on this item that they have taken the nature of the area into account in their design and the materials they are using.

Under item #6 they need to move the existing striped pedestrian walkway to better line up with the driveways. They plan to comply.

Mr. Hawkins asked about the water and sewer approvals. The applicant has already spoken with Aqua PA about tying into the existing water main in the street and that the sewer is handled by the small private on-site sewer plant.

Ms. Venzie asked for the timeline or clock on this project. Ms. McCarthy noted that they Planning Commission must make a decision at the September 14, 2021 meeting. Then it will go to the Board of Supervisors at the October meeting.

Review Jaguar/Land Rover Land Development Plan for 1330 Wilmington Pike

Mr. Brower notes that they are planning to comply with all the items in the engineers review letter dated August 12, 2021. He also noted that the items are not nearly as extensive as the plan that Dave reviewed. Apparently, the plans that Dave Schlott reviewed were dated June 2, 2021 and there is a newer plan dated July 7, 2021. Ms. McCarthy asked if Mr. Schlott has any major concerns about this plan in terms of Zoning. Mr. Brower noted that they plan to comply – some of the items have already been complied with on the newer plan.

Mr. Hawkins asked if there was already a conditional use approval for this project. Mr. Brower stated that there was a conditional use approval and that he does not believe that needs to be revisited as they are planning to decrease the impervious coverage.

Under Zoning section of the review letter item #8, Ms. McCarthy noted that again the Fire Marshall should review the plans for adequate emergency vehicle radiuses.

Under the Subdivision and Land Development section of the review letter they plan to meet and comply with all the items. The sewer will not change. That connection will be added to the plan for Arro review. It is located in the back and the connection is already existing – Acura hooked up at the time of the connection, Mazda has just recently hooked up to it. The water will be a new service due to the increase in fire water demand. Aqua will need access to the main and that note may need to be added to the plan. They are working with Aqua and will provide a letter to the township indicating any issues or demands that Aqua has. Thus, all items are “will comply”.

Under the Stormwater Management section Mr. Brower wanted to address item #24 as there is a decrease in impervious coverage. When the original Phase one land disturbance permit plan was reviewed by VandeMark and Lynch they had noted that they original basins needed to be returned to their original depth and status. Because they are using the existing stormwater management and in light of the slight decrease in impervious coverage, the applicant is requesting a waiver on this item. This waiver will need to be added to the final plan.

Under the Stormwater Management section, items #29 and #30, Mr. Schlott and Mr. Brower have had discussions about the basins and the easements. The applicant is prepared to provide a blanket easement for the township to be able to access the property for future issues or problems. Discussion ensued about the best way to record this easement – either as a specific location or a blanket easement. The Commission members were split on which easement would be the best option.

There is no review letter from the Chester County Planning Commission for this project at this time.

The Planning Commission reviewed the timeline/clock for this project also. The Planning Commission would like the applicant to come back to the September 14, 2021 meeting for a recommendation. This additional time will give the engineer the opportunity to review the most up-to-date set of plans and handle the outstanding items and requested waivers. It will then go before the Board of Supervisors at the October meeting.

Mr. Roger Josephian expressed concern about the delay as they are attempting to continue moving forward on the Phase one part of the plan. Mr. Schlott explained that some of these issues are related to the transfer of the duties from the previous engineering firm and the Zoning Officer. Mr. Hawkins noted that those issues are administrative and not related to the decision that the Planning Commission is attempting to make. Mr. Schlott taking this into account has suggested that he will have a discussion with Vincent DiMartini (the new Zoning Officer) from Arro to not hold up discussing aspects from the Phase one project.

There was brief discussion of the number of paper copies needed of the revised plan. Most members have agreed to electronic copies, but Mr. Hawkins and the township office will want paper copies.

New Business/Public Comment:

None

Motion to adjourn the meeting was made at 8:37pm by Mr. Shields and seconded by Mr. Garrison and approved unanimously. Next meeting is scheduled for September 14, 2021.

Respectfully submitted,
Jennifer A. Boorse
PC Secretary