



**WEST WHITELAND TOWNSHIP
Planning Commission
Agenda
Tuesday, July 18, 2023
7:00 P.M.**

[Etiquette for
hybrid meetings](#)

Meeting will be held in-person and via Zoom

[Register for Zoom Meeting](#)

Call by Phone: 1-646-558-8656

Meeting ID: 822 8294 3365 Passcode: 002612

Meeting Packets can be found on Township website

Reminder to meeting participants: Please speak clearly into the microphone

CALL TO ORDER

REVIEW OF MEETING MINUTES

Approval of Meeting Minutes: June 20, 2023

PUBLIC COMMENT/CONCERNS/QUESTIONS

PLANS

1. Doug Strickland
Address: 321 N Pottstown Pike
Second Review: Subdivision and Land Development
Request: Application for reverse subdivision of two lots into one, and proposed building modifications to include demolition of a portion of the existing building and a 2,518 sqft building addition with associated parking and stormwater facilities.

NEW BUSINESS

OLD BUSINESS

PC CONCERNS

TOWNSHIP ANNOUNCEMENTS

ADJOURNMENT

Next Meeting: August 1, 2023



MEMORANDUM

TO: Planning Commission
FROM: John R. Weller, AICP
Director of Planning and Zoning
SUBJECT: 321 N. Pottstown Pk. / Chic Studios land development plan
DATE: July 14, 2023

APPLICANT: Doug Strickland
1525 Canyon Dr.
Downingtown, PA 19335

SITE ADDRESS: 321 N. Pottstown Pk.
Exton, PA 19341

TAX PARCELS: 41-2-64 and 41-2-65.1

ZONING: TC, Town Center

DESCRIPTION: Consolidation of two parcels, partial demolition of an existing building, and construction of a 2,518 sq.ft. building addition and off-street parking on a 0.86 acre lot.

EXPIRES: August 31, 2023

Background

The subject tract consists of two contiguous lots with a total gross area of 0.86 acre at the southeast corner of the intersection of N. Pottstown Pk. and Coeway La. in the Town Center ("TC") zoning district. The western lot features a now-vacant building last used as McNaul's Barber Shop and an attached residence; the eastern lot at 102 Coeway La. is vacant. The tract is nearly level, sloping at a grade of less than 1½% downward from east to west. There are no significant wooded areas nor any FEMA-designated flood hazard areas on the property.

The Applicant is proposing to consolidate the lots into a single parcel, to demolish a portion of the existing building, and to construct a 2,518 sq.ft. addition to the building and a parking lot for 34 vehicles. Tonight is the Applicant's second appearance before the Planning Commission. At the meeting of October 4, 2022, the Applicant presented a slightly different plan that proposed the complete demolition of the existing building and construction of an entirely new 3,774 sq.ft. commercial building. By retaining a portion of the building, the Applicant will be continuing a legal non-conformity, as the existing structure does not comply with front- and side-yard setback requirements. The proposed use is the same as before: the building will provide studio space for hair and make-up stylists and massage professionals. These activities meet the definition of "personal services" found in §325-8 of the West Whiteland Township Zoning Ordinance ("Zoning") and are therefore permitted at this location by right pursuant to §325-

13.(2)(c) of the Zoning. The proposed building is not large enough to require conditional use review under §325-124.A(1) of the Zoning.

Consultant Reviews

- **Spotts, Stevens and McCoy (“SSM”) review dated July 5, 2023.** Comments #1 through #4 review the requested waivers. Two of these involve the Stormwater Management Ordinance (SSM supports one request fully and one partially); the remaining two concern sidewalks and crosswalks.

Comment #5 notes that the Zoning requires the Applicant to show that the project will comply with the Town Center architectural design standards in the course of the land development review.

Comments #6 through #19 review the plan for compliance with the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (“S/LDO”). Most of these address required details and information items missing from the drawing and not any need to change the design of the project. Comment #17 states that the Applicant intends to set aside permanent open space to satisfy the requirement in §281-47 of the S/LDO. This intent is expressed in one of the response letters provided by the Applicant’s engineer and does not appear on the plan drawing and states, “The applicant will utilize the front yard area between the building and the sidewalk to satisfy this requirement. There is ~3300 SF of area available.” Staff notes that virtually all of this area is within the required building setback and therefore may not be counted toward the open space requirement according to §281-47.E(2)(c) of the S/LDO. In addition, §281-47.D(1) of the S/LDO states that, “Where the open space requirement is 2.00 acres or less, the fee option shall be preferred.” Since the requirement is based upon the footprint of only the new construction (2,518 sq.ft.), the open space requirement is 1,259 sq.ft. (0.029 ac.). The Applicant will be required to pay a fee¹ in lieu of setting aside permanent open space.

Comments #20 through #46 address the stormwater management provisions. Virtually all of these are administrative items, requests for supporting documentation, or direct minor additions or corrections to the drawings: none suggest any problem with the proposed design. Comment #1 supports a waiver from the requirement to infiltrate stormwater run-off, and comment #2 supports a waiver from one of the design standards, provided that the slope of one of the pipe segments is increased. The Applicant should confirm whether this revision is feasible.

Comments #47 through #51 list points of non-compliance regarding the proposed lighting and advise that a new illuminance grid may be required after these are addressed. The remaining General Comments (#52 through #64) describe details and informational items that should be added to the plan drawings.

- **Theurkauf Design and Planning (“Theurkauf”) review dated June 26, 2023.** Comment #1 provides a detailed analysis of the pedestrian access and proposed sidewalks, which is much improved from the prior submission. Theurkauf advises that they support the configuration as it is now shown, noting that a waiver from §281-69.C(2) of

¹ As of this writing, the required fee would be approximately \$2,725.00. The Commission will recall that the fee varies according to the Consumer Price Index and is established when the Board approves the final plan.

the S/LDO is necessary to allow sidewalks narrower than eleven feet; Staff agrees. Comment #1c recommends adding a crosswalk across Coeway La., but we note that McMahon disagrees; comment #1d directs additional decorative paving.

Comment #2a directs a minor change to the landscaping along Pottstown Pk.; comment #2b supports a partial waiver of §281-35.G of the S/LDO, which is necessary for nine of the parking spaces to have access to Coeway La.; comment #2c notes that a detail of the trash enclosure should be included.

Most of the remaining comments document that prior concerns have been addressed to their satisfaction, although comment #5 states that the Applicant has not demonstrated compliance with the Town Center architectural design standards.

- **McMahon review dated July 3, 2023.** Comment #1 recalls earlier discussion with the Planning Commission when it was agreed that the Applicant need not widen Coeway La. to a 28-foot-wide cartway. A lesser widening is now proposed (to facilitate access to the nine parking spaces along Coeway), and McMahon recommends that the widened area extend west to provide the same minimum width along the entire Coeway frontage. Staff agrees, noting that this is not a significant addition to what is shown.

Comments #4 and #9 review the expected trip generation and conclude that a traffic impact fee of \$4,347.00 is due to the Township.

Comment #7 reviews the Applicant's request for a waiver from the requirement to provide pedestrian crosswalks. Staff notes that the driveway along the south side of the tract is not on the Applicant's property: the Township cannot require a crosswalk here, and we are therefore of the opinion that no waiver is necessary. Regarding the crossing of Coeway La., McMahon observes that there are steep slopes where the crosswalk would end and advises that it would be better to require the crosswalk at such time that the property at the northeast corner is redeveloped. Staff agrees: we note that there are not only steep slopes on the north side of Coeway but also what appears to be a storm sewer outlet leading to an inlet grate.

The remaining comments generally address paving requirements, the need for additional plan details, and administrative items.

- **Township Code Enforcement review dated July 5, 2023.** Mr. Greenawalt notes that the proposed building is too small to require a fire suppression (sprinkler) system. He also suggests minor design revisions to the parking area to improve accessibility for emergency vehicles.

The Chester County Planning Commission reviewed the prior version of this plan in a letter dated September 22, 2022. The letter advised that the plan was consistent with the County's Comprehensive Plan and raised other issues, which have either been addressed by the current plan or have been noted by our consultants.

Staff Comment

Staff is of the opinion that there are only minor concerns remaining. We suggest that the Commission review the following points with the Applicant tonight:

- Their ability and willingness to adjust the stormwater management infrastructure as described in comment #2 of the SSM review.
- Confirm the acceptability of the sidewalks as shown.
- Confirm the Applicant's understanding that they will be required to pay a fee in lieu of setting aside permanent open space (approximately \$2,725.00) and a traffic impact fee of \$4,347.00.
- The additional paving recommended by McMahon in comments #1, #2, and #3 of their review as well as the revisions described in the Code Enforcement review.
- Confirm the Applicant's understanding that the building will need to comply with the Town Center architectural design standards. This may be complicated by their intent to retain a portion of the existing building.
- Confirm that the remaining consultant concerns are "will comply" items.
- Any other questions or point of concern from the Planning Commission.

If the Commission is satisfied on the preceding points, then Staff has no objection to action on the plan tonight. A draft motion is attached for your consideration.

Attachments

1. SSM review dated July 5, 2023.
2. Theurkauf review dated June 26, 2023.
3. McMahon review dated July 5, 2023.
4. Township Code Enforcement review dated July 5, 2023.
5. Draft motion.
6. Plan set prepared by DLHowell, dated and revised June 20, 2023.

Plans\ABC\Chic Studios\PC memo - 230714



July 5, 2023

Mr. John R. Weller, AICP
Director of Planning and Zoning
West Whiteland Township
101 Commerce Drive
Exton, PA 19341

RE: 321 N. Pottstown Pike
Preliminary/Final Land Development Plan
SSM File 101008.0369

Dear Mr. Weller:

We have reviewed the above-referenced submission consisting of the following:

- Preliminary/Final Land Development Plan of 321 N. Pottstown Pike (16 Sheets), prepared by DL Howell & Associates, Inc., dated June 20, 2023, and;
- Chic Studios, 321 N. Pottstown Pike Post Construction Stormwater Management Report, prepared by D.L. Howell and Associates, Inc., dated September 1, 2022, last revised June 20, 2023.

Strickland Development is proposing to combine two adjacent parcels along Coeway Lane into one lot for the purpose of constructing a salon and related improvements. These parcels total 0.86 acres, and are located on the southeast corner of the intersection of N. Pottstown Pike (SR 100) and Coeway Lane (a private road). The plan proposes to demolish the existing parking area, remove the first story of the existing building and the bay window, and construct a new 2,518 SF building (connected to the existing building) and associated infrastructure.

The proposed Chic Studio salon will be a personal care facility. The parcel and all neighboring parcels are located in the TC – Town Center and Mixed Use zoning district. The building will utilize public water and public sewer. We have the following comments.

Issues regarding landscaping and buffering, sewage planning, traffic and pedestrian circulation will be addressed by Theurkauf Design and Planning, Carroll Engineering, and McMahon Associates, Inc., respectively.

WAIVERS REQUESTS

1. Section 270-20 – Waiver to not infiltrate the minimum of 0.5 inches of runoff from all proposed impervious surfaces. The July 6, 2022 “Carbonate Assessment/Karst Evaluation” prepared by Ingram Engineering Services, Inc. (IES) states, “IES does anticipate the carbonate geology to have adverse effect on the proposed project site development.” IES does not recommend stormwater infiltration for the site.

Our previous comment was based on a different IES report that the Applicant’s engineer stated that the wrong report was included with the previous submission. Our previous recommendation against a



waiver of the infiltration requirement was based on the previous report. Based on the revised IES report, we recommend a waiver of Section 270-20.

2. Section 270-29.E – Waiver to not require storm sewers to be at least 15” in diameter. We partially support this request subject to the pipe slopes for P11 and P15 shall be increased to at least ¼ in/ft. They are proposed at 0.50%.
3. Section 281-69.A – Waiver to not construct ten (10) foot crosswalks to adjacent properties due to lack of existing infrastructure to connect to. It is our opinion that a crosswalk across Coeway Lane should be provided. Once a pedestrian is past the adjoining property on the north side of Coeway Lane, sidewalk continues to the north and also east on Sunrise Blvd.
4. Section 281-69.C(2) – Waiver to reduce sidewalk width from eleven (11) feet to six (6) feet. We believe that this refers to the sidewalk along the front of the building and the 5 parking spaces (w/2 handicapped spaces). Whereas this is the most likely place for two way traffic to occur, we do not support this waiver request.

COMPLIANCE WITH ZONING ORDINANCE

5. All new construction shall comply with the architectural design standards established by Section 281-67 of the West Whiteland Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance. Where a proposed building requires land development review, documentation of compliance with the said standards shall be as provided for in the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, Section 325-13.D(3).

COMPLIANCE WITH SUBDIVISION AND LAND DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE

6. The engineer’s certification shall be signed prior to the Township endorsing the plan, Section 281-16.B(9).
7. The Zoning Data Tabulation table shall list the use as Personal Services, Section 281-16.C(4). This use has been added to the Parking Tabulation, but shall be noted in the Zoning Data Tabulation.
8. The drawings shall include the following information:
 - a. Signature of the engineer, architect, landscape architect, or surveyor who prepared the plan, Section 281-16.B(4).
 - b. All existing street cartway widths, Section 281-16.C(9). The Route 100 cartway shall be noted.
9. Where off-site sewage disposal will be provided, the plan, shall, as a minimum, show the location and grade of sewer lines, Section 281-16.D(5)(a). The plans shall specify the type of PVC pipe on the sanitary profile.
10. Where off-site water service is anticipated, the plan shall, as a minimum, show the size and location of water mains. The number and location of proposed fire hydrants shall be subject to review by the West Whiteland Township Fire Marshal, Section 281-16.D(6)(a). The plans must include water main and lateral sizes, materials, and inverts as well as the distance to the closest fire hydrant and should be reviewed by the Fire Marshal.
11. Copies of approvals, plans and permits required by other governmental regulatory agencies, including but not limited to PaDEP, PennDOT and the Chester County Conservation District shall be provided



- before the Township endorses the plan, Section 281-16.K(2). Approval of the Erosion and Sedimentation Control plan from the CCCD shall be submitted to the Township.
12. When PennDOT Highway Occupancy Permits (HOP) are issued, those plans shall become part of West Whiteland Township's approved plans, Section 281-20. A plan index of the HOP plans shall be included on the Cover Sheet.
 13. Sidewalks shall be constructed in separate slabs 24 feet or 30 feet long, except for closures, and the slab between expansion joints shall be divided into blocks five feet long by scoring transversely, Section 281-31.B. The sidewalk detail shall be updated to indicate these requirements.
 14. The plans shall note that curbs shall be sealed and the seal material shall extend out a minimum of 12 inches from the face of the curb and a minimum two inches up the face; and the roadway and curb face shall be properly cleaned prior to sealing to provide for maximum adherence of the sealing materials, Section 281-32.E. The detail notes to seal the curb "per SALDO Section 281-32.E". The detail shall note the actual requirements.
 15. New subdivisions and developments shall incorporate adequate provisions for a reliable, safe, and sufficient water supply to support intended uses within the capacity of available resources, Section 281-42.A. The plans now indicate all existing and proposed water main and water lateral connections.
 16. All parking areas shall be line painted. Each parking space shall be delineated with a four inch wide painted line. All line painting placement shall be in accordance with PennDOT Publication 408, Section 481-45.C. The Parking Space (Typ.) Detail notes painted pavement markings, but the General Notes – Pavement Markings notes thermoplastic markings. The plan shall be revised to be consistent.
 17. The Applicant is proposing to set aside open space pursuant to Section 281-47.C(1), by providing 500 square feet of open space for each 1,000 square feet of floor area on the first floor.
The plans shall indicate the open space that is required and how/where it will be provided.
 18. Financial security shall be provided in accordance with Section 281-54.
 19. Proposed buildings and architectural improvements which require land development approval, but are not conditional uses, shall submit conceptual architectural documentation to West Whiteland Township which demonstrates compliance with the architectural design standards as part of the preliminary land development application, Section 281-67.A(1).

COMPLIANCE WITH STORMWATER MANAGEMENT ORDINANCE

20. Permits or other regulatory requirements may apply to certain regulated activities and shall be met prior to final approval by the Township of the SWM site plan and prior to commencement of any regulated activities, as applicable. Any BMP or conveyance that would be located on or discharge to a state highway right of way is subject to approval by PennDOT, Section 270-16.D.
21. The applicant shall provide the Township with the "letter of adequacy" from the Chester County Conservation District for the E&S Plan prior to the Township endorsing the plan, Section 270-17.A(1)(a).
22. The plan shall identify and delineate all existing natural resources and natural and man-made hydrologic features listed in Section 270-32.B(8) that are located within the site, or receive discharge from, or may be impacted by the proposed regulated activity, Section 270-18.A. The predevelopment



conditions indicate that there is a closed depression at the northwest corner of the site. This depression shall be excluded in the pre-development analysis. The design engineer's response acknowledges that there is a depression; however, they do not exclude it from the predevelopment conditions as suggested nor do they quantify or qualify why it is left in. The depression shall be excluded as previously noted or the engineer shall quantify why it was not.

23. All calculations using the Soil Cover Complex Method shall use the appropriate design rainfall depths for the various return period storms consistent with this chapter. Rainfall depths used shall be obtained from NOAA Atlas 14 consistent with a partial duration series, Section 270-23.B. All calculations using the Rational Method shall use rainfall intensities consistent with appropriate times of concentration (duration) and storm events with rainfall intensities obtained from NOAA Atlas 14 partial duration series estimates, or the latest version of the PennDOT Drainage Manual, Section 270-23.C. The narrative shall include copies of the NOAA rainfall tables used in the calculations as it appears the rainfall data is not for the project location.
24. Any stormwater management facilities regulated by this chapter located on or flowing into state highway rights-of-way or stormwater systems shall be subject to approval by PennDOT, Section 270-25.M.
25. All storm sewer utilities beneath a paved surface shall be bedded and backfilled with PennDOT No. 2A stone in six-inch lifts and solidly compacted to the satisfaction of the Township, Section 270-29.E(4). The maximum lift requirement shall be added to the plans.
26. Except for single-family homes, proposed roof drains and collector locations shall be shown on the storm drainage plans. Roof drains and collectors shall meet all appropriate Township Code Requirements, Section 270-29.F(2). The location of all downspouts and their tie-ins to the collector pipes shall be shown. The means of providing a watertight connection to the collector pipes shall also be shown.
27. A listing of all regulatory approvals required for the proposed project and the status of the review and approval process for each shall be noted on the plan. The list shall include the approval of the Chester County Conservation District approval of the E&SC plan. Final approval adequacy letters must be submitted to the Township prior to the Township's issuing final approval of the SWM site plan, Section 270-32.A(2).
28. The applicant statement of Section 270-32.A(3) and the design engineer signature block of Section 270-32.A(4) shall be signed prior to the Township endorsing the plan.
29. The following O&M plan items could not be found on the plans and shall be added:
 - a. The landowner acknowledgement in Section 270-42.B(4) shall be added to Sheet 6.
 - b. Timeframe for remedy of deficiencies found for the underground facility.
30. Stormwater Management Note 6 shall be revised to require annual inspections for the first five years instead of three years.



31. There are numerous sets of O&M notes on Sheets 5 and 6, some of which refer to the underground stormwater BMP as a constructed filter, detention bed or basin. The notes on both sheets shall be revised to be consistent in reference to the underground BMP.
32. The storm sewer calculations shall demonstrate that the proper tailwater elevations have been applied. The starting tailwater elevation in MH7 shall be set closer to the maximum storage elevation in the MRC bed.
33. The following comments shall be addressed in the PCSM Report:
 - a. In Section 3.1, Managed Release Concept, BMPs 6.6.3, 6.6.4 and 6.7.3 shall also be included in the evaluation of BMP options.
 - b. The dewatering calculations and ponding time sections of the MRC Design Summary do not match. Dewatering calculations for the 10-, 50-, and 100-year storms shall be provided.
 - c. Sheet 3 of the MRC Design Summary shall be completed.
 - d. Calculations for the storm inlet weighted runoff coefficients used in the storm x. sewer computations shall be provided, including a drainage area plan for the contributing areas to each inlet and CO structure.
 - e. The BMP Name in the DP001 PCSM Spreadsheet refers to a wet pond BMP, and shall be revised to note the appropriate BMP.
 - f. The peak post-construction runoff rates in the DP001 PCSM Spreadsheet shall be revised to reflect the computed flows.
34. The O and M notes and procedures must include all BMP's (i.e., Underground MRC Systems). The O&M notes that are under the Constructed Filter with MRC and Outlet Structure Detail shall also be listed under the Operation and Maintenance Procedures notes on Sheet 5.
35. The PCSM BMP Inspection and Maintenance Notes, Note B refers to infiltration beds, and shall be revised to note the correct BMP.
36. The reference to failure due to soil compaction/smearing leading to poor filtration rates under the BMP Failure Defined notes on Sheet 5 shall be removed.
37. The following comments are in regards to the Stormwater Management Notes on the PCSWM Plan:
 - a. Note 2, regarding O&M responsibility shall include inlets as well.
 - b. Note 6 conflicts with PCSM BMP Inspection and Maintenance Notes, Note B, and shall be removed or revised to require annual inspections for the first five years.
38. The existing and proposed contour line elevations shall be labeled on all applicable plan sheets, including the drainage area viewports.
39. The following items are specific to the Operation and Maintenance notes for the Constructed Filter with MRC and Outlet Structure Detail:
 - a. The dewatering time limit in Note 10 conflicts with the BMP Failure Defined time limit. The note shall be revised or removed.



- b. The orifice size and water level elevation in Notes 18.1 and 18.2 are not consistent with the design calculations, and shall be revised.
40. Note 1 under the Basin Liner Notes for the Constructed Filter with MRC and Outlet Structure Detail notes a different geotextile weight than the Plan View and Sectional View, and shall be revised.
41. The following revisions shall be made to the 18” Drain Basin & Sediment Filter detail:
- a. Clarify if this detail applies to CO structures and YD structures; however, Nyloplast drain basins do not provide for connections to concrete pipe.
 - b. The noted baffle basket conflicts with the water quality inlet filter specified for these structures.
 - c. The type of cover for the CO structures shall be noted.
42. The Outlet Structure (OS-1) Detail for Constr. Filter with MRC #1 shall include a note to seal the orifice plate (under and along the edges) with silicone caulk, to ensure water only drains through the 3/4” orifice.
43. The following revisions shall be made on the PCSWM Plan:
- a. The pipe labels corresponding to the storm profiles shall be added.
 - b. IM9, YD14 and YD18 shall be labeled.
 - c. The MRC bed cleanouts/observation ports shall be labeled.
 - d. The reference to failure due to poor infiltration rates shall be removed from the BMP failure notes for the MRC bed.
 - e. The Inspection notes and Maintenance notes for inlets under Operation and Maintenance Procedures refers to inlet sumps, drain holes in the bottom of the inlets, anti-siphon tubes and hoods; however, the plans do not provide for these features. The notes shall be revised to reflect the proposed BMP.
 - f. The proposed seepage pit shall be removed from the Legend.
 - g. General PCSM Notes, Note 5 shall be revised to reference the correct receiving surface water.
 - h. Stormwater Management Notes, Note 8 appears to refer to sediment removal from a surface BMP, and shall be revised or removed.
44. The specific water quality inlet filters to be used for the different inlets shall be noted on the Water Quality Structure Detail – Filter detail.
45. The minimum slope for the 6” downspout pipe on the Downspout Detail shall be revised to 2.0%.
46. A detail for the trash enclosure post footings shall be provided that will not penetrate the underground detention bed.

LIGHTING

47. Fixtures selected for building wall mount façade that are not “Full Cut-off” may be considered to be permitted only with the approval of the Board of Supervisors. 281-48.C(2)(b). Cutsheets shall be included to determine if fixtures selected are “Full Cut-off” and in compliance, Section 281-16.D(9).



48. The lighting control sequence is not satisfied to meet the requirements for all-night safety or security lighting. Levels shall not exceed 25% of the levels normally permitted, Section 281-48.C(3)(c).
49. It shall be identified on the cutsheets that the LED sources do not exceed 3000K, Section 281-48.C(3)(i).
50. Pole bases that do not meet the 30" AFG requirement for protection shall be placed a minimum of 5' behind curb face or tire stops, Section 281-48.C(5)(d). A pole base detail shall be provided.
51. Substitution of light fixtures, mounting height, or revised locations shall result in the need for a revised point-by-point illuminance grid plot for review by the townships engineer for compliance prior to installation. This shall be noted on the plans.

GENERAL

52. The replacement line striping within Coeway Lane shall be noted.
53. The plan shall show the current information on the water and sewer utilities for the recently demolished house on the east side of the site.
54. The Grading and Utilities Plan shall show the light standard locations in order to evaluate their location with respect to other existing and proposed features. In addition, the water service material and size shall be noted, particularly since the water usage will be increased compared to the former use.
55. Details shall be provided for the light poles and foundations. The sign post detail that has been added to the plan does not apply to the proposed sign types and refers to other details that have not been provided; appropriate details shall be provided.
56. The Landscape Details drawing number shall be revised.
57. The word "should" must be replaced with "shall" in the third paragraph of the Topsoil Application notes.
58. In our previous review, we expressed concern about the 9 parking spaces proposed along Coeway Lane requiring a driver to either back into or out of the space. The Applicant's engineer stated in their response letter that the Planning Commission felt the proposed parking along Coeway Lane will be safe. The layout has since been revised to widen the north side of Coeway Lane by 2' to 3.2' in order to provide a 24' wide maneuvering area on/along Coeway Lane for these spaces.
59. The building square footage in the Lot Area Tabulation is not the sum of the two building footprint areas noted on the Title Plan, and shall be revised.
60. All curb, edge of paving and pavement marking radii shall be noted on the Title Plan.
61. The following revisions shall be made on the Grading and Utilities Plan:
 - a. The proposed seepage pit shall be removed from the Legend.
 - b. The relocated sign at the southeast corner of the site shall be moved off the existing sanitary sewer line.
 - c. Construction Notes, Note 5 shall be revised to note connection of the roof drains to the storm sewer system.



62. The Typical Sidewalk Detail shall provide specifications for the required expansion and control joints.
63. The 8" Curbing & Paving Section detail shall note 2.5" minimum depth for the binder course per PennDOT requirements for 19.0mm Superpave binder course.
64. A paving cross-section detail shall be provided for the proposed widening of Coeway Lane and permanent storm sewer trench restoration.

If you have any questions, please feel free to call me.

Sincerely,
Spotts, Stevens and McCoy

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Kent D. Morey", with a long, sweeping flourish extending to the right.

Kent D. Morey, P.E., CLCP
Senior Engineer
kent.morey@ssmgroup.com

cc: Mark Stabolepszy, P.E.



July 3, 2023

Mr. John R. Weller, AICP
Director of Planning & Zoning / Zoning Officer
West Whiteland Township
101 Commerce Drive
Exton, PA 19341

RE: Traffic Engineering Review
321 N. Pottstown Pike – Chic Studios
West Whiteland Township, Chester County, PA
McMahon Project No. 822958.11

Dear Mr. Weller:

McMahon, a Bowman Company, completed a traffic review of the proposed 4,317 square-foot personal services/commercial building located on the east side of N. Pottstown Pike (S.R. 0100) just south of Sunrise Boulevard. The site currently contains a commercial building with direct access to N. Pottstown Pike via a single driveway. It is proposed to modify the existing building, close the direct driveway access to Pottstown Pike, and provide a new site access via Coeway Lane. Our traffic review is based on the following document.

- *Preliminary/Final Land Development Plan of 321 N. Pottstown Pike* prepared by D.L. Howell & Associates, Inc, last revised June 20, 2023.

Based on our review of the above document, we offer the following comments for consideration.

1. SALDO Section 281-25.C - Coeway Lane is shown to be a 17-foot wide private road with a 40-foot wide private right-of-way. However, the ordinance requires the cartway width for a private street shall not be less than that required for a local street, which is 28 feet wide. The applicant's engineer indicates the Planning Commission did not express the need to widen the road at the October 4, 2022 Planning Commission. Our office will defer to the Township as to the need to widen Coeway Lane; however, although not the entire length of Coeway Lane, we note the applicant is proposing minor road widening to achieve 24 feet in the area of the proposed perpendicular parking only, which is accessed directly from Coeway Lane. We recommend a minor extension of this widened area to the west across the limits of the proposed driveway in order to achieve at least 24 feet from the site driveway to the eastern property line.
2. SALDO Section 281-30.B(6) – The plans should be revised to provide a separate pavement section for the proposed minor widening on the north side of Coeway Lane to establish a 24-foot wide area. The pavement depth should match existing or be no less than the following (as outlined in Appendix D of the SALDO):
 - a. 1.5 inches of bituminous wearing course

835 Springdale Drive, Suite 200, Exton, PA 19341
P: 610.594.9995

mcmahonassociates.com | bowman.com

- b. 1.5 inches of bituminous binder course
 - c. 4.0 inches of bituminous base course
 - d. Five inches of subbase
3. Due to the amount of road work proposed along Coeway Lane on both sides of the road, we recommend a new pavement overlay from the eastern property line to PA Route 100 in order to avoid longitudinal pavement joints between the new and existing pavement.
4. ZO Section 325-42 – Based on the information provided on the plans, the existing building of 3,050 s.f. will be reduced to one story or 1,799 square feet (with removal of second floor), and the proposed addition consists of 2,518 square feet. In total, the future building will measure 4,317 square feet. It is our understanding that the existing building previously housed a barber shop (on the first floor only), for a total existing usable square-footage of 1,799 square feet. Furthermore, according to information provided by the applicant’s engineer, the use of the future expanded building will be hairstyling/massages/makeup services. Based on information provided in the Institute of Transportation Engineers publication, *Trip Generation, 11th Edition* for Land Use Code 918 (Hair Salon), the trip generation of the existing building, the proposed building, and the increase in trips generated by the proposed addition is provided in Table 1 below. As shown in Table 1, the proposed expansion will generate an additional three trips during the weekday morning and weekday afternoon peak hours, which does not meet the Township’s threshold of 100 peak hour trips for completion of a traffic impact study. Therefore, a traffic impact study is not required for this development.

Table 1. Vehicular Trip Generation ⁽¹⁾

Land Use	Size	Weekday Morning Peak Hour			Weekday Afternoon Peak Hour		
		In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total
Existing Building ⁽²⁾	1,799 s.f.	1	1	2	0	3	3
Proposed Building ⁽²⁾	4,317 s.f.	3	2	5	1	5	6
Expansion	+2,518 s.f.	+2	+1	+3	+1	+2	+3

(1) Based on the ITE publication, *Trip Generation, 11th Edition*.
 (2) ITE Land Use Code 918 for Hair Salon.

5. Based on the truck turning templates provided, it appears that delivery and trash trucks must use the proposed parking spaces to maneuver within the site. As such, all delivery and trash truck activity must take place outside regular business hours.
6. SALDO Section 281-31 –The plans should include detailed design of the proposed ADA curb ramps on either end of the proposed sidewalk along the site frontage. The design should include detailed grading with spot elevations at all proposed grade breaks, labeling for all widths and slopes, ADA ramp types, and all appropriate PennDOT standard details. Our office previously requested a new ADA ramp and crosswalk across Coeway Lane; however, as indicated by the

applicant's engineer, there is no sidewalk on the north side of Coeway Lane and the existing site topography on the north side of Coeway Lane makes it very difficult to build a receiving ramp on the north side of Coeway Lane. As such, it may be more appropriate to provide a receiving ramp and crosswalk at such time as the northern property redevelops.

7. SALDO Section 281.69.A – The applicant requests a waiver to not construct a crosswalk across Coeway Lane (to the north) nor across the access for 319 Pottstown Pike (to the south). Since sidewalks are not currently provided along the frontage of these neighboring properties, and due to the site topography challenges along the frontage of the neighboring property to the north (as described above), we could support this waiver at this time, and the crossings could be provided if and when the neighboring properties redevelop in the future.
8. Since N. Pottstown Pike (S.R. 0100) is a state road, the closure of the existing driveway and the proposed sidewalk along the Route 100 frontage will require a Highway Occupancy Permit from PennDOT. Please copy the Township on all PennDOT submissions.
9. Chapter 295-12 – The subject development is located within the Township's Act 209 Transportation Service Area, and as such, it is subject to the Township's Transportation Impact Fee which is equal to \$1,449.00 per new weekday afternoon peak hour trip. As outlined in comment 4 above, the proposed building expansion will generate three new weekday afternoon peak hour trips, and the resultant Transportation Impact Fee for this development is **\$4,347**.

As part of future submissions, the applicant's engineer should compose a response letter that describes how each comment has been addressed and where any plan revisions are located. Additional comments may follow upon receipt of future submissions.

If there are any questions or if additional information is requested, please contact our office.

Sincerely,



Christopher J. Williams, P.E.
Vice President & Regional Manager – Mid-Atlantic

I:\eng\WESTWH1\822958 - 321 PtwN Pk\Reviews\2023-07-05 Review\Review\DRAFT 2023-07-03 Weller 321 N Pottstown Pike Review.docx



MEMORANDUM

TO: John Weller, AICP, West Whiteland Township Director of Planning and Zoning
Caroline O'Connor, Assistant Township Planner
Ellen Tracey, RLA, Designs etc.
Justin Brewer, P.E., DL Howell & Associates, Inc.

FROM: Edward A. Theurkauf, RLA, ASLA, APA

DATE: June 26, 2023

SUBJECT: **REVIEW COMMENTS – CHIC STUDIOS**
PRELIMINARY/FINAL LAND DEVELOPMENT PLAN DATED 6-20-23

Please note our review comments pertaining to the following documents that we received on 6-21-23, and a site visit on 9-9-22:

- Land Development Plan consisting of 16 sheets;
- Response letter from Justin Brewer dated 6-20-23; and
- Waiver request letter from Justin Brewer dated 6-20-23.

Issues that have been addressed are so noted. New comments are in bold.

**REVIEW COMMENTS – CHIC STUDIOS
PRELIMINARY/FINAL LAND DEVELOPMENT PLAN DATED 6-20-23**

June 26, 2023

1. Pedestrian Accessibility – The Central Chester County Bicycle and Pedestrian Circulation Plan and the Township Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan propose sidewalks along Route 100 and across this development, with the Township plan specifically citing gaps between Target and Exton Mall as priorities for new sidewalks. Section 325-13.A.1 of the zoning ordinance (ZO) establishes the Town Center District as a pedestrian-oriented central area. Sections 281-31.A of the subdivision and land development ordinance (SLDO) require sidewalks along all streets and drives, and section 281-69.C (SLDO) specifies required pedestrian infrastructure in the Town Center.

Pedestrian facilities shall be provided as follows:

- a. Perimeter Sidewalks – Section 281-69.C.1 (SLDO) requires minimum 6-foot-wide sidewalks that serve commercial and mixed use buildings. Section 281-69.C.3 (SLDO) requires that sidewalks be placed along both sides of all streets and drives in the Town Center district. **The plan indicates a six foot wide sidewalk along the Pottstown Pike frontage, and along Coeway Lane only as far as the rear building entrance.**

Township staff has stated that Coeway Lane is expected to remain a low volume dead end street and not a pedestrian route. If the Board of Supervisors agrees, this comment would be resolved.

- b. Interior Sidewalks – Section 281-69.C.2 (SLDO) requires minimum 11-foot-wide sidewalks between parking lots or cartways and public entrances to commercial buildings. **The applicant has requested a waiver to permit 6-foot wide sidewalks as depicted on the plan**
The TC design standard of 11 feet width is based on the concept of a broad pedestrian way along the fronts of multiple commercial and buildings. Since the interior sidewalks are serving only one use, and there is no potential connection to other uses, I would not object to the requested waiver.
- c. Crosswalks – Section 281-69.A (SLDO) requires minimum 10-foot-wide crosswalks with decorative surface treatments at all street and driveway intersections. Crosswalks shall connect sidewalks on opposite sides of intersections and access drives. No pedestrian crosswalks are indicated.

If the Township does not require a sidewalk along Coeway Lane, no crosswalk would be necessary for the proposed driveway that intersects Coeway.

On the Route 100 frontage, the majority of the width of Coeway Lane lies within the subject property. Moreover, a sidewalk exists north of the Berkheimer/Creditech parcel and to the south of 319 N Pottstown Pike into Fairfield Place. A crosswalk of Coeway Lane should be provided to facilitate future pedestrian connectivity along Pottstown Pike.

**REVIEW COMMENTS – CHIC STUDIOS
PRELIMINARY/FINAL LAND DEVELOPMENT PLAN DATED 6-20-23**

June 26, 2023

- d. **Decorative Sidewalks** – Section 281-69.C.4 (SLDO) requires 20% of sidewalks to have decorative surface treatments. **The plan indicates ornamental paving for a patio area on the south side of the building. However, that constitutes only 10% of the total paved area, and no detail or specification of the decorative surface is provided.** The plan shall be revised to provide minimum 20% decorative sidewalks with accompanying details and specifications.

2. **Site Element Screens** – Section 281-70.A (SLDO) states that screen and perimeter buffer landscaping standards do not apply to Group II commercial developments on lots of less than 10 acres in the Town Center District. Site element screen standards apply as follows:
 - a. **Route 100 Site Element Screen** – Section 281-70.B (SLDO) requires site element screens along Route 100 frontages to define the corridor.
Shrub plantings along the Route 100 frontage are in a linear configuration to define the corridor as required. The row of shrubs stops short of the property lines to accommodate clear sight triangles. Since the road is divided, with only northbound traffic accessible, a clear sight triangle north of the 319 N Pottstown Pike driveway is not necessary. The hedge should continue south to the driveway curb.

 - b. **Parking Lot Screen** – Section 281-35.G (SLDO) requires low screens consisting of small evergreen or dense deciduous shrubs around parking lots that are within 200 feet of a property or right-of-way line.
The site element screen south and east of the parking lot is compliant.

There is no screen from Coeway Lane, as proposed parking spaces are accessed directly from the street. We defer to the Township as to whether this is a safe and desirable arrangement. If so, a partial waiver on parking lot screening would be required.

 - c. **Trash Enclosure Screen** – Section 281-35.G (SLDO) requires low screens for decorative trash enclosures, and high screens consisting of large evergreen shrubs or evergreen trees for enclosures with fencing or plain block walls.
A high vegetative screen is proposed around a “solid fence trash enclosure”. The plan shall be revised to include a trash enclosure detail.

3. **Building Façade Landscaping** – Section 281-37.D (SLDO) requires landscaping between building façades and parking. Landscaping is required and proposed as follows:

**REVIEW COMMENTS – CHIC STUDIOS
PRELIMINARY/FINAL LAND DEVELOPMENT PLAN DATED 6-20-23**

June 26, 2023

<u>Façade/Length</u>	<u>Plant Type</u>	<u>Required Qty.</u>	<u>Proposed Qty.</u>
East/60 LF	Shade Tree	1	1
	Small Shrubs	6	12

This issue has been resolved.

4. Street Trees - Section 281-36 (SLDO) requires one street tree planted within the right of way for each 50 feet of road frontage. Street trees are required and proposed as follows:

<u>Frontage/ Length</u>	<u>Required Qty.</u>	<u>Proposed Qty.</u>
Route 100/ 124 LF	2	3
Coeway Lane/ 224 LF	4	4

The requirement has been met with native species. This issue has been resolved.

5. Architecture – Section 325-13.D (ZO) requires adherence to the architectural standards established in section 281-67 (SLDO), specifically with regard to:

- Façade articulation and fenestration
- Building entrance definition
- Roof line variation
- Building materials and colors

In addition, section 281-33.C.8 (SLDO) requires building elevations showing the relationship between façade treatments and proposed landscaping. **No architectural elevations have been submitted. The plan shall be revised accordingly.**

6. Tree Removal and Compensatory Trees – Section 281-34.G (SLDO) requires compensatory plantings for mature trees that are removed. The plan indicates removal of three evergreen trees of less than 24 inches DBH, which would not require compensatory plantings. However, a number of other trees were removed just prior to the application, including large trees that may have been subject to compensatory planting requirements.

Any proposed trees meeting the size requirements of section 281-34.G.5 (SLDO) may be credited toward the compensatory tree requirement.

The response letter states that the size and number of the trees removed is unknown. Based on PASDA historical aerial imagery, the trees that were removed were more than 50 years old. Google Earth historical imagery documents removal of the trees occurring between November of 2021 and July of 2022. Property ownership has not changed since 2003, so the current owner obviously had the trees removed.

In the absence of any such record, aerial photographs indicate at least four large trees removed from the site. If we assume they were in the 12-24 inch DBH range (based on their

**REVIEW COMMENTS – CHIC STUDIOS
PRELIMINARY/FINAL LAND DEVELOPMENT PLAN DATED 6-20-23**

June 26, 2023

age), that would translate to 72 caliper inches removed, for which 18 replacement tree inches (9 trees) are required.

The plan indicates 23 trees proposed. This issue is resolved.

7. Landscaping Size Standards – **This issue has been resolved.**
8. Cost Estimate – A landscape cost estimate will be required upon approval of the final plan in accordance with section 281-33.C.6.i (SLDO).
9. Conclusion – **The identified issues shall be addressed prior to approval. Issues of particular concern are:**
 - **Parking spaces accessed from Coeway Lane**
 - **Pedestrian crosswalk of Coeway Lane**
 - **Compliance of building architecture with Town Center Design Standards**

Please contact this office with any questions.



MEMORANDUM

TO: Caroline O'Connor

FROM: Todd Greenawalt, Codes Administrative & Enforcement Manager

SUBJECT: Chic Studios Preliminary/Final Plan review

DATE: July 5, 2023

I have reviewed the Chic Studios Preliminary/Final Plan dated June 20, 2023, and offer the following comments:

1. The proposed building square footage combined with the existing building square footage totals 4300+ square feet. Any building above 5000 square feet requires a sprinkler system per Section 129-16.E of the Township Codes. It appears a fire suppression system is not required.
2. Codes Department has concerns regarding access with the Township's aerial fire truck. Efforts should be considered to widen Coeway Lane to the minimum width of 24 feet from the proposed widening area out to Pottstown Pike. Also, the applicant should consider making the curb in the proposed parking island closest to Coeway Lane mountable to provide an aerial fire truck adequate room to turn around. The truck turning templates presented on the plan show the truck having to mount a vertical curb to egress the site. This will help prevent an aerial truck having to back out onto Pottstown Pike.

Let me know if you have any questions