

## Minutes of the Meeting of October 4, 2012

The meeting of the Radnor Township Planning Commission was held at 7:30 PM in the Municipal Building, 301 Iven Ave., Wayne, Pa 19087.

### Present

Edward DiMarcantonio, Chair  
Kathy Bogosian  
Regina Majercak

Julia Hurle, Vice-Chair  
Skip Kunda  
Doug McCone

### Absent

Stephen Cooper

Susan Stern

Also present: Peter Nelson, Esq., Solicitor; Kevin Kochanski, Zoning Officer and Members of the Press.

Mr. DiMarcantonio called the meeting to order.

### *Presentation and Discussion on Planned Institutional Zoning District*

This is the fourth special meeting on the discussion of the PI Zoning District. Charlie Schmehl, URDC, again gave the presentation.

Revised documents were submitted detailing the proposed changes to date. There was a suggestion of a trade off with regards to height restrictions. If an institution wanted a building over the standard 38' height limit, they would have to trade off some buildable green space with a conservation easement with a limit of 99 years. No building or parking could be placed in this area. In return, a building up to 58' could be constructed, but only if its location was more than 500 feet from a residential property line. Lands that are floodplains or wetlands would not be accepted for the tradeoff.

The issue of increased traffic on residential roads is still of utmost importance. Increasing the height of buildings, instead of length, saving green space and reduction of impervious surfaces was discussed. The placement of taller buildings on the interior of the lots was preferred as to the perimeter of the lots. An attractive streetscape (south side of Lancaster Ave.) can be obtained and still achieve the goal of keeping buildings further away from residential properties. Buildings, instead of parking areas, on the south side of Lancaster Ave. would help streetscape. It was suggested that parking areas should be in the rear. Comparison to the Garrett Hill District was made. Buildings interrupted by space would create a more attractive look.

Doug McCone is strongly against the streetscape of Garrett Hill being compared to institutional zoned areas, especially along the major arteries. Setbacks should emphasize the desire for large open green spaces along these public right-of-ways. For example, setbacks along south side of Lancaster Ave. near Ithan Ave. should be very large, similar to the north side. The distance from the rear of any structure on the southwest corner of Lancaster and Ithan Aves from the houses behind is not as important because the trolley tracks will be between them. He is concerned with the resident's desire for an open view.

Kevin Kochanski reminded everyone that the present discussion sounded as if it was reflecting Villanova. Since Villanova would be a separate issue, it should be discussed at a different time. Kathy Bogosian feels it should be discussed in case the Villanova ordinance doesn't happen.

The distance of setback lines from right-of-ways and residential districts was discussed with respect to student housing buildings, classrooms, etc. The use of the building would determine the setback. Impervious surface numbers would still control the limit of development. NPDES permits are beginning to require more green space as part of their requirements which would force more green on institution lands. Forced buffers around institutions would be preserved areas. Riparian buffers are recommended to be widened. Longer buildings could be permitted as long as offsets were in place every 100-120' or so. It was suggested if a building is to be longer, it should also be placed further away from residential areas and deeper into the interior of the institution's land. Facades could be used to give the appearance of several buildings even though it could be one long one.

Suggestions also included that buffers be utilized around parking areas near streets and when any type of institutional use is near a house. The size of solar panels and skylights was discussed with respect to their heights. They shouldn't extend beyond the roof and no more than 3' above the roof.

A traffic study will need to be submitted at the same time of the introduction of this ordinance. Noise, with respect to deliveries was added to the document. The construction of a parking structure or surface parking should be considered on new plans. In depth discussions centered on parking issues both currently and future. The construction of a green roof could be suggested in return for the addition of 1 more level in height. Convenient off-site parking with shuttles for extra curricular events was suggested. If an institutional plan is updated, a parking management plan should be simultaneously submitted. Parking requirements can be increased for any new construction if the township desires to change the existing numbers. New buildings could be required to handle new numbers. Parking requirement calculations could be utilized the same as restaurants, etc. Trees within a 75' area would be preserved as part of a buffer on the sites. Lighting stands would have height and timing limits as well as spillover issues onto neighboring

properties. Electronic illuminated signs would only be permitted if they are placed out of view of any neighboring street or property line. Signs should have a time limit placed upon them.

Skip Kunda requested information on uses in the summer with respect to any uses that may have certain restrictions.

#### Public comment

Christina Perrone – 234 Walnut Ave. – She lives in close proximity to three institutions. Trying to understand where the mandate came from to do the changes to the existing ordinance, as the verbiage sounds more favorable to the institutions rather than the neighboring communities. Some of the comments mentioned this evening were questioned as to their validity. She feels that the township ‘gives’ more than they ‘get’ with respect to institution requests. Her concerns reflect on; where is the center of campus for the taller buildings—not just 500’ from property lines—a scale should be developed for all sites, more than one person should have the final say with respect to conservation easements, building lengths, non-contiguous parking, the document sounds more favorable for the institutions than the township, wants to make sure the community has the opportunity to voice their comments and concerns before the document is finalized. She requested that the document be placed on the web as a word document so people can print out and read at home. Can Colleen Price, an attorney, and other neighbors meet with Charlie?

Kevin Kochanski mentioned that residents can send in letters with their comments as the process moves forward. Their comments will be forwarded onto the Planning Commission and Charlie at the appropriate time. He restated that this ordinance will not affect Villanova University because many of the comments and questions seem to be pushing in that direction. A Villanova ordinance would be a separate document.

Kevin Geary – Black Friar Rd. – It appears that the township is losing and the institutions are winning. Setbacks from roads should be increased. The conservation issue sounds like it has numerous loopholes—if an institution has given a 10-year plan showing an ‘open’ space, then with new construction that open area could not be used as an easement area. He requested that a map be shown at the next meeting and the 500’ as mentioned tonight be shown on all campuses.

Bob Esgro – 46 Aldwyn La. – Is concerned with the additional height and the guarantee of the additional setback. Setbacks seem to benefit the institutions and not the township. Is concerned with summer use as well and overflow parking. Density, sightlines and parking are concerns of his.

Philip Ahr – Meredith Ave. – Vice-Chair of the Garret Hill Implementation Committee. Comparing a 20’ setback on Lancaster Ave. should not be compared to Garrett Hill. The setback in his area shouldn’t be compared to Villanova. Any street is an edge, not just a property line.

Tony Bailey – 132 Barcladen Rd. – Her questions reflected on Villanova’s total acreage and the comparison to the building coverage. Is there a cap on how much can be developed on a university? Is Villanova in the process of acquiring more land? Where would the cars park that utilize the church on Villanova’s campus?

Colleen Price – 352 Chamounix Rd. – This ordinance is Villanova’s plan. It should be torn up and the township should stay with the old ordinance and just work on the parking issues. Why was the portion that speaks with harmonious impact on the neighbors taken out? Accessory uses should be restricted on their locations. All benefits are for institutions, not the neighbors. All conservation easements should be on the perimeter of the properties. Measurements should be against residential property lines, not just a residence in case there is an empty buildable lot. Universities will do a green building on their own for a higher rating. She is concerned with parking issues. She feels that the institutions are governing this ordinance, not the township.

Charlie reinforced his previous comment that he has had no communication with the universities with regard to this document. The township is governing this, not the institutions.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

*Suzan Jones*

Suzan Jones