

EAST GOSHEN TOWNSHIP
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
May 2, 2012

The East Goshen Township Planning Commission held a regularly scheduled meeting on Wednesday, May 2, 2012 at 7:00 p.m. at the East Goshen Township building. Members present were: Chairman Susan Carty, George Martynick, Dan Daley, Jim McRee, Adam Knox, Nathan Cline and Al Zuccarello. Also present were Mark Gordon, Township Zoning Officer; Jon Altshul, new CFO for East Goshen Township; Charles Proctor, Township Supervisor; Monica Close, Historical Commission; Ginnie Newlin, Conservancy Board; and various residents.

A. WORKSESSION – 7:00 PM

1. Mark Gordon explained that the Board of Supervisors requested input from the Planning Commission about the color to use on the cell tower. He passed around paint charts. He described the tower as a unipole, about 4-5 ft in diameter for the first 100 feet, and then it is reduced for the remaining 50 feet. The pole can be extended to 180 ft in the future. There is no beacon on the top. The FAA determined it is not in a flight path. Antennas are inside and cannot be seen. The paint is glossy which repels pollen, dirt, etc. After discussion on various colors, George moved to recommend Mountain Mist #PC825. Jim seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.
2. Jon Altshul, the new CFO for East Goshen Township, introduced himself and spoke to the Commission about the financial reports. If they have any comments, please let him know. George mentioned that sometimes there is no explanation for the expenses. Jon will look into that.
3. The minutes were reviewed and corrected. Dan will abstain from discussion and voting on the Mars request.

B. FORMAL SESSION – 7:30 PM

1. Sue called the meeting to order at 7:30 pm and led the Pledge of Allegiance. There was a moment of silence to remember our armed forces. Sue asked if anyone would be recording the meeting. There was no response. Any non-agenda items – Ginnie Newlin reported that the Conservancy Board and volunteers planted 75 of 100+ trees and shrubs this past Saturday in the open space on Reservoir Road. This Sunday afternoon, May 6th, they will finish the project and need help.
2. Minutes – Sue noted that the minutes of April 4 and April 18, 2012 were approved as corrected.
3. Land Development Plans
 - A. SNC Lavin/Mars Drinks/1301 Wilson Drive (D) – The applicant was represented by Andrew Eberwein, of Edward B Walsh & Associates Inc., Project Manager. He explained that Mars Electronics will move out of the building. Mars Drinks will renovate the building and make it their national headquarters. They will make interior changes and remove 2 acres of impervious coverage. They want to get the Platinum LEED Certification. Rain water will go from the roof to a tank under the parking lot and be recycled into the building. There will be 11 parking spaces for hybrid cars, bicycle racks, a walking trail, additional loading dock, eating places on the patio and a BBQ grill. There will be 3 parking spaces for buses and 284 auto parking spaces. There will be 115 people on the largest shift. Outside lights will be LED. Adam pointed out that the trees that will hide the dumpster on the new loading dock don't appear to be adequate from Airport Road. Andrew said they would adjust the landscape plan. When Jim asked why there were more parking spaces than they needed, Mark explained that this will be the company's global training center. Some trainees will probably rent cars. Sue asked about lighting. Andrew said the existing poles will be painted and some will be removed. George asked if they are going to use the open space for future expansion. Andrew did not know of any plans for the open space.

Ginnie is very excited that they are going to make this a “green” building and asked if the roof will be a “green” roof. Andrew responded no.

Mark commented that the production processes are going to be upgraded to be environmentally sound with no emissions. This is a family owned business. The Board of Supervisors worked with them to get incentives from the State to stay here.

Andrew will bring a company executive to the next meeting.

4. Conditional Uses & Variances

A. Goshen Meadows Investors/1325 West Chester Pike (CU) – The applicant was represented by Scott Fagan, of Goshen Meadows Investors; Mark Thompson, Attorney; David Plonik, Architect; and Dennis O’Neill, Engineer. Mr. O’Neill explained that they want to combine the current apartment complex with the Smith tract. The current complex is 13.64 acres with 9 buildings containing 200 1-bedroom apartments and parking in the center.

The Smith track is 5.12 acres with an existing historic house and several out buildings. The lot is heavily wooded with about 81 trees. Many are at the end of their life cycle and will be removed. They are proposing to construct 5 3-story buildings containing 64 2-bedroom apartments with 4 units in the Smith house. They are proposing an emergency exit onto West Chester Pike which will be made of stone, pavers and grass and will be able to handle the weight of an emergency vehicle.

For storm water management, they are proposing underground infiltration. Total impervious for both sites is 35%. Sue asked what the impervious is for the new site. Mr. O’Neill answered 43%.

Mark explained that because this will be one whole parcel, it can’t be separated.

Scott Fagan reported that all of the kitchens in the existing apartments were upgraded 3 years ago.

The roofs will be done this year, drainage issues were resolved and they are about 95% occupied.

Mark mentioned that the plan does not require any zoning variances.

Comments:

Dan asked about landscaping on the eastern side of the property. Dennis commented that a 50 ft buffer will be planted. Most of the trees there are on the neighboring properties.

Al asked about the lighting plan. Dennis responded that they are working on a plan and want to use high efficiency lights.

Recreation – Dennis mentioned that they want to put in picnic areas and may put in a formal recreation area.

Mark commented that Oxford Gateway has a dog run area. Scott reported that Goshen Meadows has designated buildings for dogs, with an area behind them for the dogs to run.

Adam asked about connecting both sites since the pool and tennis courts are on the north side of the property. Dennis explained that they intend to install walkways to connect them.

Dennis feels they are within all requirements regarding the historic house and will try to have the historic impact study done for the June meeting.

Traffic in and out of the entrance was discussed. The embankment from Rt. 3 up to the parking area is 19 feet higher than West Chester Pike. They don’t anticipate cutting the grade.

Al asked why another historic impact study has to be done since one was done in 2005. Mark explained that the plan in 2005 was for 18 condos with a different applicant. Goshen Meadows decided to go through with the study after asking for a waiver.

Public Comments:

Ginnie commented that the Conservancy Board walked this property in the past and feels there are some historic trees there. They want to be consulted before the plan is finalized.

Goshen Meadows will be at the June 6th meeting. The new date for the hearing is June 12, 2012.

B. Tommasso Londrillo, 1603 Ivy Drive (DV) – Mr. Londrillo explained that a tree fell on the garage at the rear of his property during a storm. He removed the garage and started construction on a pole barn. The Township had him stop work because he needs a variance. In 1971 there was a barn, corral and hen house. He took them all out and planted spruce trees. He has letters from his neighbors stating that the tree fell down during a storm. The old garage measured 20’ x 30’ and the pole barn measures 30’ x 32’. He said it is 18’ high. He asked the installer if the height could be lowered to 14.6’ as it was supposed to be but they said it was done and couldn’t be changed. He

verified that he owns a masonry company, but all of the business materials are stored at other locations. There is no driveway to this pole barn.

Mark explained that an accessory building can be 30' tall but there are setbacks. The issues here are location and setbacks.

Adam asked if electric, water or HVAC was being provided to the pole barn. Mr. Londrillo said he has installed a pipe for water for possible use in the future.

Public Comment

1. Mike Sabrick, 116 Shandon Place – He has been a resident in the Rossmore development for 14 years. His home was new at that time and lot premiums were \$5,000 to \$30,000. He feels there is a visibility issue here. There are no sheds or structures allowed in Rossmore. He passed around some photos. The previous structure was much smaller and couldn't be seen. The placement of the new structure is much closer than the previous structure. His concern is how it will look in the future. If electric is installed, the lights will shine into his yard.

Mark explained that if a variance is given, it may have conditions which will follow the property when it is sold to the new owners. The new structure is not closer to the property line than the previous one. The setback is 20'.

Al commented that he lives in a planned development. You don't have control over a property that is not part of the development. Also, the lot premium doesn't guarantee what it will look like in the future. It is upsetting when changes occur to surrounding properties.

Sue asked about a driveway to the new structure. Mr. Londrillo answered that there will only be grass. Mark verified that an accessory building does not require paved access.

Mr. Sabrick suggested that the Township allow a longer period of time from receipt of the letter to the date of the meeting.

2. Dana Pizarro, 1602 Ivy Lane – Mr. Pizarro lost his view when Rossmore was built. The property at 1603 Ivy Lane was originally a mess. This is the first improvement in 30 years. He can only see one corner of the pole barn from his porch. He researched to find old photos and it seems to him that the original building was bigger. He has no objection to this building.

3. Tom Klieber, 118 Shandon Place – He has the same issues as Mr. Sabrick. He also provided some photos. He requests that the building be moved to the proper setback to diminish visual issues. He is concerned about the future and wants very strict conditions that will be enforced.

Mr. Londrillo will agree to install larger trees and screening and he will use a landscape designer if needed. Mark will add conditions for no driveway, no electric, no plumbing and no HVAC.

Chuck suggested checking the code. He feels it will have to be a deed restriction and should be added to the deed. He also pointed out that if Mr. Londrillo is forced to move the structure, he could also take down the trees. A compromise is the answer.

Al made the following motion – Madam Chairman, this property contained a legal non-conforming structure that was destroyed by a tree that fell on it during a storm in early 2012. The new structure is erected in the same general location and is somewhat larger, however, the building is well screened by an established vegetative area. I recommend that the Planning Commission recommend that the Board of Supervisors support Mr. Londrillo's request for a variance due to the fact that the proposed building is replacing one of similar size and utility in the same general location and it will not alter the character of the neighborhood; with the following conditions:

1. Mr. Londrillo agrees to enhance the vegetative screening with evergreens as determined appropriate by the Township and will use a landscape architect. The buffer maintenance shall be the responsibility of the property owner.

2. The building shall only be used for storage for the principle single family use and not for any business storage use.

3. No driveway, walkway or additional pervious pavement to access the building shall be constructed.

4. No mechanical plumbing or electrical improvements shall be made.

5. These conditions shall be added to the deed as restrictions.

Dan seconded the motion.

Discussion: Al suggested that the Rossmore homeowners go to their association. They responded that they did and the association refused to address the situation. There being no more discussion a vote was taken. The motion passed with 5 yes votes and 2 no votes which were Jim and George.

C. OLD BUSINESS

1. Sign Ordinance – After some discussion it was agreed to send the amended Sign Ordinance to the Board of Supervisors.

D. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, a motion to adjourn the meeting was made by Jim and seconded by George. The meeting adjourned at 11:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted, _____
Ruth Kiefer, Recording Secretary