



UPPER UWCHLAN TOWNSHIP
Planning Commission Meeting
April 9, 2015
Minutes
Approved

In Attendance:

Bob Schoenberger, Sally Winterton, Joe Stoyack, Brett Hand, Jim Dewees, Derald Hay
Josh Hagadorn, P.E. – Gilmore & Associates, John Theilacker, Associate Director – Brandywine
Conservancy, Cary Vargo - Township Manager, Gwen Jonik – Secretary

Bob Schoenberger called the meeting to order at 7:37 p.m. A quorum was present.

McKee Group – Proposed Ordinance Amendment

John Jaros, Esq, - Riley Riper Hollin & Colagreco; Kevin McLaughlin and Mark McGonigal –
McKee Group; Matt Hammond – Traffic Planning & Design; Nancy Templeton – Glackin
Thomas Panzak were in attendance.

Mr. Jaros summarized a proposed ordinance amendment to add provisions to the R2-F1
Overlay District for “Active Adult Community”. The amendment is proposed to increase the
base density from 1.1/units per acre to 2.9/units per acre, specifically for ‘active adult
communities’ which target residents over 55-years old as that age group doesn’t adversely
impact the school district or the same level of Township services of typical residential
development. The proposed amendments drew comments and concerns by the Planning
Commission in February and the draft amendments have been revised.

The McKee Group has introduced a concept plan for an active adult community on the Fetters
and Styer properties on Milford Road. The current concept totals 437 residences, including 232
carriage homes (townhomes), 82 villas (twins) and 123 single-family homes. The concept is
consistent with the Township’s Comprehensive Plan, Chester County’s Landscape 2 Plan and
other community plans and has been modeled after several other active adult communities by
McKee Group. The increased density is proposed in order to build 400 units which allows the
Developer to provide amenities such as a large clubhouse, swimming pool, outside sports or
recreation areas (bocce), trails, etc. for an affordable purchase price and monthly homeowners’
association fee. Residents would be over 55 years old – no school-age children except for
visitors up to 30 days. The fiscal benefits of this age group are: no school impact, less water
usage / less wastewater, less traffic/road maintenance; private roads. The concept proposes
40% of site as open space. The Planning Commission asked if that percentage was total open
space or usable open space. Ms. Templeton advised the calculation includes the wastewater
disposal field and some environmentally-restricted areas. The Commission said
restricted/constrained acreage shouldn’t be included in the open space calculation, or the base
density shouldn’t be increased. Mr. Jaros referenced Comprehensive Plan page 149 regarding
environmental constraints permitted in the open space calculation. Mr. Theilacker countered
that the section referenced relates to base zoning, not flexible overlay.

In answer to Commission members’ questions, each unit would include a 2-car garage; pocket
parking for guests; no on-street parking (enforced by HOA); private roads; the Community would
have 2 access points on Milford Road; in traffic studies, 437 active adult homes generates @

35% less traffic than 210 single-family homes, especially during peak hours (437 “active adult homes @ 113 peak AM trips, 132 peak PM trips).

John Theilacker favors the active adult use and amenities proposed but not that heavy of a base density, echoing the Planning Commission’s comments. The low impact to the schools, roadways, and wastewater system is favored, as is the benefit to the income tax base. An increased density of up to 2.2 units/acre, plus bonus density for providing sewer disposal areas and/or increased open space, and including recreational areas in the open space calculation, would be acceptable. An “active adult community” definition would need to be added to the overall Ordinances, as well as provisions for trails, protection for historic resources, adequate open space and protection of natural resources within ‘active adult communities’. Other properties/area within the R2-F1 overlay district that could be impacted by the proposed amendment are the Frame property, Jankowski property, Operating Engineers property, as well as parcels on Greenridge and Moore Roads. The Planning Commission wasn’t comfortable envisioning that density in some of those areas. Mr. Theilacker suggested an eligibility criteria be defined for this use to be applicable, such as 150+ acres. The Commission believes that to be spot zoning.

Mr. Jaros reiterated the concept -- to provide the amenities at a decent price, 400-500 units are needed, which equates to the 2.9 density. They will review the feasibility of using a base density of 2.2 and adding in the bonus multipliers.

Bob Schoenberger restated the Commission’s agreement with an active adult community use and the language in the proposed ordinance amendment, however they do not agree with a base density of 2.9 units /acre. If 2.2 plus bonus density isn’t feasible, and 2.9 is needed, restricted/constrained open space cannot be included in the usable open space calculation.

Economic Development Overlay in LI Distriction – Proposed Zoning Amendment

Cary Vargo introduced a zoning amendment proposal by John Shelton, regarding an economic development liquor license to potentially market the Shryock property, or portions thereof, for use as a brew pub or restaurant. While the Board of Supervisors would like to encourage the economic development and establishment of a pub / eatery, that use isn’t permitted as currently zoned, as it doesn’t follow the definition of an ‘adult-oriented’ use.

John Shelton proposes an amendment to the LI District uses to allow for a traditional bar/tavern/restaurant. Mr. Shelton is aware that adding a bar/tavern/restaurant use might not be acceptable in all current LI Districts, therefore he’s proposing an Economic Development Overlay. An Economic Development Overlay allows an owner/developer to acquire less expensive financing, and application to the County for approval of a liquor license even if all liquor licenses are already sold.

Joe Stoyack asked how the proposed cell phone tower on the Shryock property might affect the habitation of structures on the property. Cary Vargo replied that the Zoning Hearing Board Solicitor has advised that habitation of buildings doesn’t come into question** with towers under 200’ tall.

John Shelton distributed a list of current zoning uses and adding supplemental land uses he has in mind, such as bakeries with retail sales, manufacture of wood or metal products, and a full-service restaurant as a ‘destination’, which would accommodate a variety of potential tenants. He also suggested flexible uses for ‘unique buildings’, provided the building is over a certain square footage.

Another suggestion was to change the zoning of the Shryock property from LI to Commercial, but Mr. Shelton doesn't care for that idea as that would remove the ability to manufacture products.

Bob Schoenberger commented his preference would be to amend the uses within the LI District and not 'unique' property zoning. John Shelton advised that an Economic Development Overlay would be over all LI Districts but the eligibility is for blighted properties.

Mr. Vargo advised the Economic Development Overlay is of interest and offered to coordinate further investigation of that, including the addition of wood and metal manufacturing, with John Theilacker (Brandywine Conservancy) and John Good, Township Solicitor. The Commission agreed to Mr. Vargo's offer and looks forward to an update at the May meeting.

Approval of Minutes

Sally Winterton moved, seconded by Joe Stoyack, to approve as presented the minutes of the March 12, 2015 Planning Commission meeting. The Motion carried unanimously.

Open Session

Jim Dewees commented he is in favor of an active adult community use and believes it should be open to all R2-F1 zoned properties.

Bob Schoenberger announced the next Planning Commission meeting is scheduled for May 14, 2015.

Adjournment

Derald Hay moved to adjourn at 8:58 p.m. Joe Stoyack seconded. So moved.

Respectfully submitted,

Gwen A. Jonik
Planning Commission Secretary

** Zoning Section 200-91.A.(5).