



UPPER DUBLIN PLANNING COMMISSION

Date: October 23, 2014

To: Upper Dublin Board of Commissioners
Rick Barton, Zoning Enforcement Officer (by email only)

From: Wesley J. Wolf, Chairman

Subject: Proposed Ordinance
MRH-Mixed Use Residential-Historic District
St. Mary's Villa Property

The proposed ordinance establishing the new MRH-Mixed Use Residential-Historic District was reviewed at the October 21st Planning Commission meeting. This current proposal (in lieu of the previously proposed text amendment) would only apply to the St. Mary's Villa property. The conditional use approval requirement would be retained as part of the MRH ordinance.

Uses currently permitted by right or by conditional use on this property would be preserved and included in the proposed MRH ordinance (e.g. school, hospital, medical office, nursing home, library and museum, life care complexes, senior assisted living residences and day-care centers).

This 45 acre institutionally zoned parcel is located at the corner of Bethlehem Pike and Lindenwold Terrace, with minor frontages along Cedar Road, Loch Alsh Avenue and Farm Lane. Due to the concentration of the lake, wetlands and stream corridor in the back portions of the property, most of the developable land is located between the Castle, the Villa Drive properties, Bethlehem Pike and Lindenwold Terrace.

Attorney Richard McBride, Peter Monaghan of Endeavor Property Group and Brad and Peter Guidi of Guidi Homes were present at the meeting.

Laura Ahranjian of KSK Architects Planners Historians Inc. of Philadelphia attended the meeting on behalf of Upper Dublin Township. KSK has been contracted by the Township to provide planning, architectural and historic structure related services. Their presentation of the proposed project utilized 3-dimensional graphic software to show various views and perspectives of the overall site, historic views and 3 and 4 story building options adjacent to the Castle.

Discussion of the KSK prepared "Architectural Design Standards and Guidelines for St. Mary's Villa Property" also took place at the meeting. It is our understanding that these Standards would be part of a Declaration and not incorporated into the Zoning Ordinance. No formal action was taken by the Planning Commission regarding these Standards, however; a separate correspondence will be forthcoming, at a later date, itemizing our general comments and concerns.

Many of the comments from the Planning Commissions July 24, 2014 letter have been addressed and require no further discussion. That said, the density, impervious coverage, building orientation relative to an existing public right-of-way, building and roadway setback from existing right-of-way, fencing and accessory structures within the perimeter setback and tree preservation concerns remain. With the exception of the removal of two twin buildings (4 units) out of a total 378 units, very little has changed. As stated on numerous occasions, almost every healthy mature tree between Lindenwold Ave., Bethlehem Pike and the Villa Drive side of the property will be removed to accommodate the applicant's proposal. Additionally, there has been no justification for the reduction in the parking standards.

The attached October 21, 2014 was prepared for our meeting to cite the major differences between the applicant's plan and our July, 2014 recommendation letter. Please note that item nos. 1 through 4 are nonissues for the Planning Commission. Item nos. 5 through 12 and 14 through 17 clearly highlights the differences between the applicant and Planning Commission. No Planning Commission consensus could be reached regarding the Senior Independent Living Building height immediately adjacent to the Castle. (item no. 13). Three (3) members were comfortable with 3 story structures whereas other three (3) members would be amenable to 4 story buildings, with the appropriate architectural treatments. Concerns were also raised regarding the lack of public access to the historic castle and the grounds.

The Planning Commission recommended by a vote of 3-3 that the proposed MRH-Mixed Use Residential-Historic District Ordinance not be adopted by the Board of Commissioners as it does not meet the intent of preserving the historic assets. Please note that the three members voting against the motion felt the reasons for denial should be itemized, which prompted their nay vote.

Cc: Paul Leonard, Township Manager (by email only)
Deb Ritter (by email only)
Jeff Wert, Township Engineer (by email only)
Jim Rudolph, Metz Engineers (by email only)
Gil High, Township Solicitor (by email only)
David Brooman, (by email only)
Upper Dublin Planning Commission members (by email only)
Richard McBride, Esq. (by email only)
Peter Monaghan (by email only)

ZONING ITEM

JULY 2014 PC RECOMMENDATION

OCTOBER 2014 PROPOSED
ZONING

1- Impact on Other Institutionally Zoned Properties	Concerned with Impact on the 182 acre Temple Ambler Property	In lieu of the originally proposed INST text amendment, new MRH Mixed Use Residential Historic District proposed for St. Mary's Property
2- Senior Independent Living (SIL) Unit Size	1 Bedroom 850 SF 2 Bedroom 1250 SF Max. No. of Residents per unit - 2	Unit with 1 Resident 500 SF Unit with 2 Residents 700 SF Max No. of Residents per unit 2 + caregiver
3-Senior Independent Living Use	Not a required use	A required use
4- Dwelling Unit Mix	Requested Recommendation	SIL- 50 to 80% Other Residential Uses - Min 5%
5- Structure Orientation along existing public right-of-way	Front of building must face existing public right-of-way	No restrictions
6- Density	SIL-11 units/acre (max 200 units)* Other Uses - 4 units/acre*	SIL-14 units/acre Other Uses 5 units/acre
7-Impervious Surface Coverage	35%	40%
8-Perimeter Setbacks from State Highway	100 feet for front, side and rear yards	60 feet for front, side and rear yards
9-Perimeter Setback from Township Road	80 feet for front, side and rear yards	60 feet for front yard 50 feet for side and rear yards
10-New Internal Roadway Setback from Existing Residential Uses	50 feet	40 feet
11-New Internal Roadway Setback from Existing Township R:O:W	30 feet	20 feet
12-Fencing or Accessory Structure within the perimeter Setbacks	Not Allowed	Can extend 20 feet into the perimeter setback
13-Building Height for SIL	Three stories was considered reasonable, but no concurrence on four stories. Also recommended special definition of height be added due to historic nature of the property and proposed view sheds.	Four Stories (or 55 feet) for buildings greater than 200 feet from an adjoining residential district otherwise buildings cannot exceed three stories or 45 feet. See proposed ZO 255-90.2 Historical Preservation-Mixed Residential Community for additional criteria.
14-Parking Requirements	PC requested staff recommendation regarding parking for the following uses: SIL Units-1.5 spaces per unit of which 0.25 spaces per unit may be held in reserve TH's, SF's & Twins - 2.5 spaces per unit including garage and driveway Apartment Units - 2 spaces per unit including garage driveway and shared parking	No justification has been provided for this reduction in parking as compared to the current UDT ordinance.
15-Parking Setback from Buildings	Concerned with 10 foot setback from historical structures and features	10 feet
16-Open Space	Minimum Criteria Required	20% with some public access
17-Tree Preservation & Buffering	Requested Input from Township Consultant	Memo regarding buffering provided today. No info on Tree Preservation.

*PC members agreed that the density was too high. Several members recommended the 11 and 4 units per acre.