



West Chester Borough Planning Commission

Meeting Minutes

Regular Meeting - June 26, 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, K. Gore

T. Comitta - WC Borough Planner

Call to Order

- 1) Citizen comments of items not on the Agenda – None
JT noted representatives in attendance to present materials for the Mosteller property.

- 2) Approval of Minutes

May 14 (SALDO Session) Minutes
MOTION TO APPROVE - (ZB/CP) - APPROVED

May 29 (Regular Meeting) Minutes
MOTION TO APPROVE - (CP/ZB) - APPROVED

JT inquired if the PC had comments or questions on the final SALDO draft or the incomplete Mosteller submissions available to date.

- 3) Old Business

TC stated he addressed 95% of the PC's comments into the final SALDO draft. He indicated the remaining issues regarding "Fee in Lieu" provisions were waiting on responses from the appropriate departments. TC noted Kristin Camp would be submitting revisions for the Rec Fee in Lieu prior to submitting the final draft to the County for 247 review.

- 4) New Business

Representatives were in attendance to present the Mosteller development plans. In the interest of time the PC agreed to hear the revisions and new materials which complete the Preliminary plan submission first.

JT inquired if other departments had received the updates to the submission. KG indicated the process of getting each department the full plan submission and getting the feedback was in progress; engineering, public works, etc.

JT inquired if the Shade Tree Commission (STC) or the Sustainability Committee (SC) had

reviewed the preliminary plans yet. KG indicated the SC submitted a review letter and felt the most recent additions or revisions to the plan would not their review. KG recommended a representative from the SC attend the next PC meeting in order to address their comments. KG noted that the plan would be on the Arts Commission's (AC) July agenda. AB noted representatives from the SC attended the last PC Work Session and the PC encouraged them to submit a revised letter with all of their comments together.

Erin Holliday (EH) from and 3 other members from Bernardon (BERN) presented on the Mosteller plans.

JT inquired if there were lights in the steps or the fountain. EH - Yes
KG - In terms of the borough street lights, do we know the spacing requirements?
EH - It is calculated by a foot-candle standard. KG indicated that he had to check spacing with the borough engineer.

JT inquired if there was lighting in the back alley. EH - Indicated there was, and that it was for security reasons. KG noted that the borough provided the information to make sure the fixtures conformed to standard. JT inquired if the address sign was illuminated. EH - Yes. AB inquired if the lighting in the plan was the same as borough lighting going forward. KG - Yes. AB inquired if the amount of light the building will emit can be measured or compared to other buildings. EH - Unsure if that can be measured.

A representative from Bernardon noted that all the lights were on in the rendering for marketing purposes. KG - They have energy requirements to meet; all the lights will not be on all the time
SM inquired if there were other renditions of what the lights will look like. SA inquired if the first floor would always be lit. BERN indicated the 1st floor lighting would be on sensors. JT inquired if the dining areas would have separate lighting. TC noted the recent SALDO recommendations included no up-lighting and specific spacing requirements. SM inquired if the lighting plans meet the most current ordinance provisions.

KG indicated there was still no design submission for the fountain, questioning if there was seating in the design. BERN - What is present in the rendering is a placeholder for the final fountain design. KG noted that ordinance requires landscaping if there is seating in the fountain design. BERN indicated that they would take that into consideration.

JT inquired as to how deep the trees would be planted under the plaza surface.
BERN - Some flush; some in boxes. TC - indicated a desire to be certain about the tree basins dimensions and design specifically. KG agreed in terms of growth damage. KG asked TC if there were metrics to guard against growth buckling.
TC indicated a hope that BERN would reflect on long term tree selection; the best, over time, for all involved.

AB noted the importance of the trees as they soften the look of the structure when compared to the surrounding character. AB indicated that this creates a concern regarding the size of the trees as some have been inadequate in the past. AB noted that the trees in the rendering look significantly bigger than 3.5 - 4.0 inch caliper, inquiring how many years from now was the rendition intended to portray. AB inquired how tall a 3.5 - 4.0 inch tree was. BERN - About 12 or more feet.

TC - A 3.5-4.0 tree is about 13-15 feet in similar recent projects. Branches start at 7 feet;

canopy goes from 13 to 15 feet. AB - Same problem as Art View. KG noted that more can not be required by ordinance. KG inquired if TC had an opinion on the tree selection. TC indicated they were good. TC questioned if it was called 44 West or 17 N. Church, indicating to KG that it needs to be accurate for the paperwork.

BERN indicated that the fountain was in design now. TC inquired if there would be a stormwater storage tank or would if there be infiltration. BERN indicated they would be in compliance. TC inquired if the soil was suitable for infiltration. BERN - Our goal is to get stormwater out. KG - What's your offset; are you considering a green roof? BERN- I don't think so, we are relying on the engineer. JT inquired if a stormwater management plan had been filed. KG indicated that it had been filed.

AB - **Item # 502 Height**. KG - I will have to check ordinance for height of cornice with flat roofs, requires further examination.

JT inquired as to who was reviewing for Town Center compliance, Historic overlay, SALDO, and if the PC would get written confirmation. KG - Yes.

SA inquired about the pavers and their installation in terms of materials and draining, noting that the SC recommended pervious. BERN - That hasn't been decided yet. We don't have that information yet. SA indicated that the PC just wants to hear from the other committees. KG indicated that waivers mean that impervious day not be possible.

KG Re: Impact Assessment Report (p.3 #7) - The 125-150 occupancy estimate seems low; occupant load numbers say more like 300. A restaurant makes the numbers higher as well. I would like to see more realistic numbers. BERN - Some of the numbers may have to be revisited.

JT inquired if tonight (6.26.18) was when the application clock begins, with Borough council having to decide in 90 days. BERN - Hopefully at the at the next PC meeting we can address all ongoing concerns. ZB - We have time to review before the PC meetings on 7/24 and 7/31, plus all other boards will have reviewed it by then.

5) HARB

MM - Re; HARB preliminary on Mosteller. MM - A councilman questioned the idea of an easement, there were additional concerns about façade. KG - Did HARB give any indication about *Factory* look. SA inquired if HARB had any comments about articulation. MM indicated that HARB seemed to want more detail on façade. KG - The design intent is to fit neighboring buildings. KG inquired if HARB has weighed in on brick color. AB noted the structure was a large interruption, indicating that anything which might be done through color, façade, etc. to minimize should be PC goal. TC indicated a hope that they would come back with more trees. SA agreed that color is a big issue and noted surprise that HARB didn't address windows. SA inquired as to how much discretion HARB had.

JT - Quite a bit.

JT - **MOTION** to ADJOURN (ZB/MM) - UNANIMOUS