



## West Chester Borough Planning Commission

---

### Meeting Minutes Regular Session – March 27, 2018 6:30 pm

---

---

Call to Order - 6:30 PM by Chair John Theilacker

Present: J. Theilacker, A. Burke, Z. Barner, C. Patriarca, M. Mixner, S. Moran, S. Adams

- 1) Citizen Comments of Items not on the Agenda – None
- 2) Approval of Minutes

**MOTION** to approve February minutes as revised (AB/ZB) – Unanimous  
Mr. Mixner provided revisions to the February HARB report. These changes are reflected in the Reports item #4.

- 3) Old Business

- a) SALDO Draft Amendments – Standards & Appendix A

The PC continued their review of the SALDO draft amendments and covered §97.A.14 through §97.A.31.

The only public comments came from a WCUPA student whom stated they were in attendance for the purpose of academic observation.

JT noted the desire of Borough staff for an expeditious adoption of the SALDO draft amendments for the purpose of immediate future development. KG added that a timely adoption of the draft would also be preferred in terms of undertaking planned zoning ordinance amendments.

§97.A.14 – No comments were offered by the PC on this section.

§97.A.15 Lots: CP questioned why §97.A.15.3 indicated that “Flag Lots shall not be created”? KG suggested there was not likely any room in the borough for new flag lots. JT questioned if Flag Lots drive the use of cul-de-sacs? KG also indicated that Flag Lots may drive the need for easements.

§97.A.16 Parking Lots: Off-Street – JT noted corresponding concerns regarding the Legislative Intent and Design Standards, particularly regarding the requirements for side versus rear parking. SA questioned why §97.A.16.5 did not require a street wall as opposed to a green buffer? AB noted some deficiency in the corresponding photos illustrating reference for design. SA inquired if these standards would apply specifically when a developed property with existing parking was to be redeveloped. JT indicated



## West Chester Borough Planning Commission

### Meeting Minutes

Regular Session – March 27, 2018

6:30 pm

that this was a question to ask the planning consultant in order to follow up. Broadly, it appeared that there were questions concerning ambiguities between the designations of “new” versus “existing” parking.

KG suggested adding that “existing parking should not be eliminated below that extent required by zoning”, and that this should be reinforced in the zoning code. JT and AB stated they thought this “was a good caution”. CP noted that standards for parking garages were absent from this draft; something to request of the planning consultant for the next draft.

§97.A.17 Parking: On-Street - Re: §97.A.17.2 (*Typo all*, of). CP commented the supporting ordinance states that if there is no street parking, it shall be provided (aka Drury). CP inquired regarding the need for requirements for on-street handicap parking? KG stated that ADA compliance was not applicable regarding on-street in public rights of way. AB questioned whether there should be exceptions for drop off areas. ZB pointed out that the increase in ride-sharing demands more dropping off. The PC concluded that it had more questions than answers regarding §97.A.17.

§97.A.18 Public Space - Re: §97.A.18.5 (*Typo Spaceshall*, Space shall). JT questioned the appropriateness of the 600 square feet requirement in §97.A.18.2 and AB added this is a challenge. PC agreed this standard should be discussed with the consultant, particularly in light of requirements of Section 97.40.1.C found on page 64. KG questioned if a recreation area can serve as a public space as well. CP commented this requirement seemed excessive outside of Town Center (TC) district. ZB questioned if it should be stated as “all new residential”.  
(FLAGGED)

§97.A.19 Recreational Facilities - MM questioned how “cannot be provided” in §97.A.19.6 will be determined as well as by whom? KG indicated that terminology used to describe this situation was “technically infeasible.” MM indicated that if it was feasible, they should build it, and if not, they just pay the Fee-in-Lieu. ZB questioned if recreational space requirements were the same or different than parking in terms of being required in certain situations.

§97.A.20 Sidewalks - The PC inquired if these design standards for sidewalks included the greenspace (Tree Lawn) and if requirements existed elsewhere in the draft. SA stated the Borough is so varied in terms of building setbacks and existing sidewalk widths, complete consistency with a single standard is impossible. AB indicated the standard needs to match the text regarding the materials when a sidewalk is replaced; brick with brick, etc. Additionally, the PC raised questions regarding differences in the standard between replacement and new residential development. ZB questioned if there should be



## West Chester Borough Planning Commission

### Meeting Minutes

Regular Session – March 27, 2018

6:30 pm

some differentiation based on the type of street, or on-street parking, etc., and if this should be a consideration in the standard applied. KG agreed it should be consistent (Re: 95-11) and that it needs to be revisited. Consistency must exist between SALDO and other Borough Code requirements. Old code requirements should be updated rather than drive new standards in SALDO.

§97.A.21 Streets: Interconnected Network – ZB said technically, the term “stormwater” would come before “streets”, if these standards were being provided in alphabetical order. JT said that this section should include a reference to, and requirement for, consistency with the Borough’s Official Map (for street layout).

§97.A.21.a Streets: Close - §97.A.21.a.14 (*Typo 4,5000* , 4,500) SM questioned who is responsible for maintenance of a close. KG stated it would not be the Borough, but more likely some form of homeowners or property owners association.

§97.A.21.b Streets: Complete Streets - KG commented that grants for Streetscaping projects typically incorporate these standards.

§97.A.22 Street Furniture - CP questioned why dumpsters were considered “street furniture.” KG noted there is already a separate code section for dumpsters. AB noted that either here, or elsewhere, building mechanicals needed to be addressed.

§97.A.23 Street Lights - AB inquired as to whether there was a specific standard for street light design, and if they should all be the same. PC agreed a single street light standard should be illustrated in this Appendix.

§97.A.24 Street Trees - §97.A.24.6 (*Typo of* to the approval) KG questioned as to whether there were standards for tree varieties available that would not lead to sidewalk being damaged. SA questioned whether utilities preventing the compliance with tree design standards should trigger a specific required alternative. Additionally SA questioned whether §97.A.24.11 belonged in the sidewalk section. The PC determined it would only be in the sidewalk section when the situation included a tree lawn.

§97.A.24.15 (*Typo eats*, costs) §97.A.24.15 (*Typo extends*).

§97.A.25 Street Walls - MM recommended §97.A.25.4 be revised, stating it should not be worded as a range, but simply a minimum (~~striking at least~~). SA questioned whether there should be an opaque option for uses other than parking. SA also noted there is an inherent conflict between the suggestion that a solar panel canopy can serve as a street wall when our Borough requires the establishment of street trees (where the shading will reduce the effectiveness of solar panels).



## West Chester Borough Planning Commission

---

### Meeting Minutes

Regular Session – March 27, 2018

6:30 pm

---

§97.A.26 Streetscape – SA recommended that picture #3 illustrating a streetscape with designated bicycle and pedestrian lanes at the bottom of the page be removed. PC determined §97.A.26.4 should be reworded for clarity, regarding “space between buildings, across a street.”

§97.A.27 Stormwater Management - SM stated that §97.A.27.2 would be more appropriately located under Legislative Intent than Design Standards. All agreed that this section doesn't provide actual standards and should be merged with §97.A.12.

§97.A.28 Tree Protection – JT stated that §97.A.28.1 was confusing as worded. Was this intended to protect trees on the edge of a development, or internal to the development? More discussion with the planning consultant was necessary.

§97.A.29 Unit Pavers – KG stated that there should be a language change in §97.A.29.3 from “like type pavers” to “approved equivalent.”

§97.A.30 Utilities – All members indicated this section should provide appropriate cross references. CP commented regarding the legislative intent, stating that these are to correspond with the language (§s 1,2,3) etc., in the code.

§97.A.31 Walls - No comments were offered by the PC on this section.

The PC concluded members will individually review definitions on their own prior to the next meeting in order to expedite the review of the definitions section of the SALDO draft amendments.

#### 4) Reports

MM had earlier in the evening suggested changes to the February meeting minutes for the previous HARB report. He stated that six applications (four for signs, one for window graphics, and one for major facade changes and window graphics) were considered. Five of the applications were approved by the HARB, but in several cases with minor changes recommended by the HARB. The remaining applicant decided to place the window graphics on the interior (which does not require HARB's consideration) and will return to HARB add a future date regarding the façade changes. He then gave a brief overview of a presentation made by Pella on aluminum clad windows for the historic district. The HARB was impressed with their appearance that was indistinguishable from a wooden one. Consideration may be given in the future for these windows or other approved materials at a future time.

JT provided an update on the East Bradford Township Planning Commission meeting



## West Chester Borough Planning Commission

---

### Meeting Minutes Regular Session – March 27, 2018 6:30 pm

---

---

scheduled for March 27, 2018, to discuss the Toll Brothers apartment proposal for the DLN property on Bradford Avenue. He stated their meeting is expected to conclude with the PC making an initial recommendation on the Toll Brothers' proposed redevelopment of the site for a multi-family development with 270 dwelling units. The PC's recommendation will be considered by the BOS in determining whether to initiate a zoning change for the property to allow a high-density residential use.

JT stated that Barclay Friends needs conditional use approval to rebuild and enlarge due to the fire last year. Barclay Friends will simultaneously file their preliminary and final development plans with the CU application. (NC-1 zone)

JT notified the PC about the Municipal Planner Primer event at WCUPA on May 19th.

**MOTION** to adjourn at 8:30 PM (ZB/AB) Unanimous.