

Planning Commission
Radnor Township
Wayne, Delaware County, Pennsylvania

Monday
March 6, 2017
7:00 P.M.

Agenda

1. Pledge of Allegiance
2. Minutes of the January 3, 2017 and February 6, 2017 meetings
3. PLO Ordinance Amendment
4. Public Comment
5. Old Business
6. New Business
7. Adjournment

Next regular scheduled Planning Commission Monday, April 3, 2017

*Radnor Township Planning Commission
Minutes of the Meeting of January 3, 2017
301 Iven Ave., Wayne, Pa*

The meeting was held in the 2nd Floor Administrative Lobby. Acting Chairperson Skip Kunda called the meeting to order, the Pledge of Allegiance was said. The following Commission members present: Kathy Bogosian, John Lord, Regina Majercak, Susan Stern, Elizabeth Springer, and Steve Varenhorst. Charlie Falcone was absent. Attendance included: Roger Phillips, Township Engineer; Amy Kaminski, Township Traffic Engineer and Kevin Kochanski Community Development Director. Steve Norcini, Public Works Director was not present.

Nomination of Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson

As discussed in the last meeting, the nomination committee has selected Kathy Bogosian to be Chair and Skip Kunda to be Vice-Chair. A motion was made by John Lord and seconded by Susan Stern to accept the nominations. The motion carried.

Minutes of the December 5, 2016 Meeting

Skip Kunda made a correction to the spelling of Mike Gretz. A motion was made to accept the minutes, motion carried.

*212/216 Bloomingdale Avenue
Sewage Facilities Planning Module*

Roger Phillips stated that the plans have already been approved and that this was a routine administration action that needs to be filed with the PA DEP.

Public Comment

Barron Gemmer – Reminded the PC that this cannot be constructed for 18-months due to court agreement. He pointed out that the memo indicated 4 new dwellings, but this was for 3 new and 1 existing dwelling.

Motion made by Regina Majercak and seconded by John Lord to approve; the motion carried.

*Radnor Memorial Library
Sewage Facilities Planning Module*

Roger Phillips stated that the plans have already been approved and that this was a routine administration action that needs to be filed with the PA DEP.

Public Comment

No public comment.

Motion made by Regina Majercak and seconded by Kathy Bogosian to approve; the motion carried.
2016-S-14 Preliminary/Final Subdivision Plan

12 Welwyn Road

Amendment of previously recorded plan to construct a common driveway instead of a cul-de-sac.

Nick Caniglia and Rob Lambert appeared on behalf of the applicant. He indicated that Mr. Coppock has met with the neighbors regarding the plans. He stated that this was an existing approved subdivision plan from 1988. He continued by explaining that Lot #3 has an existing home and Lots #1 and #2 are existing open lots. This project is proposing to remove the cul-de-sac from the previously approved plan. Nick indicated that they have no issues with the comments in the Gannett Fleming and Gilmore letters.

Kathy Bogosian asked if there were any board comments. Susan Stern questioned how this plan differs from the last plan and noted the DCPC review letter recommending to deny the plan. Kathy indicated that the denial from the DCPC was due to the cul-de-sac, the DCPC think it should be installed. Rob Lambert indicated that there were no major changes to the plan.

Nick stated that they spoke to the neighbors and the neighbors preferred the driveway to the cul-de-sac. When they met with the neighbors, the biggest concerns were the water flow and how to control it and the cul-de-sac they didn't want to keep. The neighbors are in favor of the plan.

Regina Majercak questioned if the stormwater for this project goes beyond what is required by code. Rob Lambert indicated that the stormwater meets the code. Regina also stated that their preference would be public sewer over on-lot systems.

Public comment:

No public comment.

Susan Stern made a motion to recommend approval of the plan, along with the requested waivers for comments #1 and #2. John Lord seconded the motion; motion carried.

2016-S-15 Minor Final Subdivision Plan

106 & 110 Cambria Court

Subdivision of 106 Cambria Court into 2 parcels and construct 1 home on each lot and adjust the lot line for 110 Cambria Court

Joe Mongeluzi of Momenee and Matt Lombardi of Lombardi Residential appeared before the Planning Commission. Joe discussed the location of the project and explained that this was a 2 lot subdivision along with a lot line revision. The properties front on a public road and are serviced by public water and sewer. Stormwater management is proposed in the rear of the properties and water and sewer will connect in the street. The applicant will request waivers for sidewalks, streetways and cartway width.

Elizabeth Springer questioned if there was a way to adjust lot lines so that sidewalks can be provided. Matt Lombardi explained that the lot lines cannot be adjusted anymore since 110 Cambria is an existing lot and it will make it non-conforming. Susan Stern questioned if you can have a garage out of the buildable lot area.

The PC questioned if there were any zoning issues. Joe Mongeluzi indicated that the zoning issue regarding the deck being in the setback has been resolved by changing the size of the deck. Also questions if this project has been to Shade Tree. This project has not yet been to Shade Tree.

Steve Varenhorst discussed the house footprints on the lots and if they can be flipped to change the driveway locations.

Public comment:

Jim Carino 116 Cambria Court - Discussed that there are 12 homes on Cambria Court and that 11 are represented there since notice was not received until December 24th about the meeting. He expressed concern that the homes would change the character of the neighborhood, affect the resale values of the homes, and cause a disruption because 25% of the street would be under construction.

David Stinnett 119 Cambria Court - Agrees with everything that Mr. Carino discussed, and appreciates what is happening on the street and is also worried about the possible changes to the character of the street.

Frank Zirkilton 107 Cambria Court - Reflected on the changes of the neighborhood, he assumes that the home builder will keep with the character of the neighborhood.

Kathy Bogosian indicated that she does not feel that 10 days is enough notice and asked Kevin if the notification can be changed. Kevin said that it can be a recommendation from the PC to BOC to make the change.

Kevin Harper 111 Cambria - Expressed concern regarding the density of the street, the neighborhood losing character and the design that is like overlooking a parking lot.

Jim Carino 116 Cambria Court - Is concerned that the level of development is problematic, Shade Tree, waivers, etc.

Kathy Zirkilton 107 Cambria Court - Stated she had to remove 5 heritage trees off the property. Concerned about the street and that construction would be a nightmare. Thrilled that 110 Cambria will be renovated.

Regina Majercak stated she felt that the developer should meet with the neighbors, take their comments into consideration and then come back more agreeable, that way everyone wins.

Susan Stern discussed the waiver for the cartway width and if it is the difference between being able to make this a viable project and also the decision of the Shade Tree matters.

John Lord made a motion to table the plan, Susan Stern seconded the motion; the motion carried.

2016-D-11 Lot Line Change

Ardrossan Phase 4

Reconfiguration of several of the non-buildable lots to allow flexibility with the possibility of combining several lots to create a large lot grouping.

John Snyder appeared on behalf of the applicant. Discussed the revised Phase 4 plan. There will be no additional building lots and slightly more open space provided. Dave Fiorello stated that the only change would be that the cul-de-sac is not as long and the re-alignment of a sanitary sewer.

Susan Stern questioned the buildable lots and if the investment lots have decreased in size. John Snyder stated that was correct and to see the Gannett Fleming review letter which gives a breakdown.

There were no additional questions from the Board

Public comment:

Colleen Price 537 Atterbury Road – Questioned the existing house and property. After description from John Snyder and Eddie Scott, she stated they would be able to meet privately to discuss. Also questioned the land that the Township purchased and how the overall Ardrossan plans would need to be revised to reflect that.

John Lord made a motion to recommend approval of the plan. The motion was seconded by Skip Kunda; motion carried.

PLO Ordinance Amendment

Kathy Bogosian started the discussion by suggesting the PC review the ordinance section by section. Regina thought it would be easier to review if there was a red-line version that outlined the previous changes. Kevin indicated that there was no red line version at this point, but they could create something very similar to what was seen a few months back. The PC requested a red line version for the next meeting.

The PC discussed how much square footage the ordinance would allow. John Lord suggested that the ordinance be drafted in a way that is easier to read. Kathy would like the definition of Ambulatory use revised. The discussion continued to the topic that it would be unrealistic to not allow the hotel use to include restaurants.

Regina Majercak suggested the PC wait to review until the red lines are available and suggested taking public comment. Kathy stated they cannot work without the red lines and suggested that a separate meeting be scheduled for just the PLO ordinance. They would need the red line ordinance and the language in the ordinance cleaned up. Kevin will e-mail dates for the public meeting. There were no

comments on the PLO ordinance report that was prepared by Richard Booker. The meeting was open to public comment.

Public comment:

Chuck Barber 228 Hilldale Road – Discussed the comprehensive plan with no major development near the blue route, and questioned why we are doing this. Discussed the way the parking will be laid out.

Lloyd Goodman representing Radnor Racquet Ball – Thought the BOC was heading in the right direction, and that the use regulations on page 2 of the proposed ordinance should be the same for B and C.

Austin Hepburn 253 Upper Gulph Road – Stated that he thought 145 KOP Road is a jewel of a property. A good option for the property would be a hotel or senior living. The public rejected Bio-Med because there was no advantage. The community wants limited traffic impact.

David Falcone representing 145 KOP - Stated that the ordinance has turned into an assault on University of Penn. They intend to develop the site. They could build a 475,000 sq.ft medical office on the site by-right. Discussed less overall traffic impact for the site and ambulatory care facility.

Kathy Bogosian suggested that this would be held until the next meeting when the red-lines are available and that Amy Kaminski will prepare additional information. Susan Stern made a motion to table the plan. The motion was seconded by John Lord; the motion carried.

Old Business

None.

New Business

The PC would like to recommend that the code be revised to increase the public notification period from 10 days to at least 20 days. Roger Phillips explained how cumbersome the process was in detail. The PC would like to recommend that the public notification period in the code be changed to 15 days.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

*Radnor Township Planning Commission
Minutes of the Meeting of February 6, 2017
301 Iven Ave., Wayne, Pa*

Chairperson Kathy Bogosian called the meeting to order, the Pledge of Allegiance, the following Commission members present: Skip Kunda, Regina Majercak, Susan Stern, Steve Varenhorst, Matt Golas and Charlie Falcone. Attendance included: Roger Phillips, Township Engineer; Amy Kaminski, Township Traffic Engineer. John Rice, Esq., Township Solicitor; Elizabeth Springer, John Lord and Public Works Director, Steve Norcini were not present.

The first part of the meeting was not recorded [filmed], the meeting starts recording at the beginning of 409-411 & 413 E. Lancaster Ave.

131/133 Garrett Avenue

Planning Module

Motion carries to Approve
Motion carries

2016-SD-07

409-411 & 413 E. Lancaster Avenue

Zoning Hearing Board Application

Numerous discussions took place

Public Comment:
Lesley Morgan – Does not like the plan

Sara Pilling – Does not like the idea of parking in front of building

Motion: Recommendation – Grant the variance subject to a 10% reduction in impervious and do not allow parking in the front yard setback.

Motion carried 7-0

2016-D-13

Academy of Notre Dame

Final Land Development Plan

Representative for Notre Dame: Nick Caniglia

No Public Comment

Motion – Approved Final Plan
Motion carries 7-0

Will comply with all items

- Asking for waiver to put in 3 trees instead of 5
- They will donate money to the Shade Tree fund
- They have agreement with neighbor to clean up area along property lines. They are putting up a fence and heavy planting on both sides.

Skip: Parking dimension

- They will comply or get rid of a space

Going to DRB for sign

No Public Comment

Motion – Recommended for Approval

Motion carries 7-0

PLO Ordinance

Charlie recused himself

Amy spoke regarding her letter.

Numerous discussions took place; Kathy asked to go over ordinances.

Public Comment: Rick Leonardi from Aldan Lane – Stated he serves on the Villanova Project CARE Committee. They are a group tasked with providing ongoing updates and information, sharing concerns, etc. for the Villanova construction.

Rick spoke regarding contaminant testing, traffic analysis, and notes several concerns in relation to the Villanova construction project. The Planning Commission noted his concerns.

John Rice noted that the BOC asked the PC to look at the ordinance and to give their opinions. He stated that if they [PC] don't like it, then they should speak up and say so.

Kathy noted that they will continue to look it over and another meeting will be held.

No general public comment, no new business

Adjourned



GILMORE & ASSOCIATES, INC.

ENGINEERING & CONSULTING SERVICES

MEMORANDUM

Date: February 24, 2017

To: Steve Norcini, P.E.
Radnor Township Public Works Director

From: Amy Kaminski, P.E., PTOE
Transportation Services Manager

cc: Kevin Kochanski, ASLA, R.L.A., Director of Community Development
John B. Rice, Esq., Grim, Biehn and Thatcher
Peter Nelson, Esq., Grim, Biehn and Thatcher
Roger Phillips, P.E., Senior Project Manager, Gannett Fleming, Inc.
Damon Drummond, P.E., PTOE, Gilmore & Associates, Inc.

Reference: PLO Zoning Amendment Traffic Impact Analysis
Radnor Township, Delaware County, PA
G&A 15-06038

At the most recent Planning Commission meeting held on February 6, 2017, Planning Commission members discussed the parking requirements for the Medical/Dental Office Use and the Gilmore & Associates, Inc. (G&A) memorandum regarding the PLO Zoning Amendment Traffic Impact Analysis (dated February 3, 2017). Following the meeting, I was approached by both the solicitor and engineer for 145 King of Prussia Road (Penn Medicine) asking me to clarify the Maximum Mixed Use internal composition and trip generation calculations for both the 30% Medical/Dental Office Use and the 45% Ambulatory Healthcare Use. The discussion with representatives of 145 King of Prussia Road (Penn Medicine) was to remind me that the Ambulatory Healthcare Use presented in the Penn Medicine trip generation memorandum although it is identified as an Ambulatory Healthcare Use actually includes both a Medical/Dental Office Use and a separate Ambulatory Healthcare Use and the use should be more likely identified as a Mixed Medical Use.

Upon further review, it appears the trip generation discussion regarding the traffic impact for the Mixed Use Zoning Amendment requires a modification as the provided calculations did not consider the identified Ambulatory Healthcare Use includes a Medical Office Use component within the calculated trip generation rates for the Ambulatory Healthcare Use as presented in the Pennoni Trip Generation Memorandum dated September 23, 2016; revised October 12, 2016. This memorandum serves as a follow up to both the parking requirement discussion for the medical/dental office use and to clarify the Maximum Mixed Use trip generation based on the most recent PLO Zoning Amendment.

I. DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

1. PLO Zoning Amendment; Chapter 280.62, 63, and 64, Ordinance 2016-13, revision date January 31, 2017.
2. Mixed Use Medical/Ambulatory Healthcare Use Discussion Letter from Pennoni, dated February 10, 2017.

II. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The following summary table indicates the maximum peak hour and daily trips generated under the existing PLO zoning ordinance and the proposed PLO Mixed Use zoning amendment.

Table 1: PLO District Comparison of Trip Generation for By-Right & Mixed Use Zoning Amendment

PLO District TRIP GENERATION	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	24 Hour ADT
Maximum By-Right 65% Site Constraint 100% General Office Use	4,453	4,310	28,484
Maximum By-Right 65% Site Constraint 100% Medical/Dental Office	8,027	8,119	135,817
Maximum By-Right 65% Site Constraint 70% General & 30% Medical/Dental Office	5,756	5,931	61,411
Maximum By-Right 45% Site Constraint 100% General Office Use	3,320	3,154	21,550
Maximum By-Right 45% Site Constraint 100% Medical/Dental Office Use	5,557	5,831	93,564
Maximum By-Right 45% Site Constraint 70% General & 30% Medical/Dental Office	4,161	4,345	43,442
Maximum Mixed Use (PLO Amendment) 40.56% Gen Office 15% Hotel 44.44% Mixed Medical (30% Medical/Dental Office & 14.44% Ambulatory Healthcare)	4,357	3,523	41,290

III. MEDICAL/DENTAL OFFICE PARKING SPACE REQUIREMENTS

Several sources were researched to provide an average parking space calculation for the Medical/Dental Office use as indicated in Table 2 below:

Table 2: Medical/Dental Office Use Parking Space Requirements

Land Use	Parking Rate	Source
Medical/Dental Office	1 sp./150 SF GFA	Steve Gabriel
Clinic & Medical/Dental	1 sp./143 SF	Fountain Valley CA:
Medical & Dental Offices	1 sp./200 SF GFA	Temecula, CA
Medical & Dental Offices	1 sp./285 SF GFA	Clinton Co, PA
Medical clinic building	1 sp. / 250 SF GFA	Tredyffrin Twp., PA
Medical/Dental Office Building	1 sp. /250 SF GFA	ITE Parking Generation, 4 th Edition
AVERAGE	1 Space per 213 SF GFA	
Medical/Dental Offices & Clinics	4 sp per practitioner + 1 sp/employee peak shift (Practitioner is considered an employee)	Pocono Township, PA
Medical, Dental, Vet Office/Clinic	4 sp per practitioner	Lititz Borough, PA
Medical or Dental Offices	5 sp per practitioner	Pottsville PA
Medical or Dental Office/Clinic	5 sp per practitioner	Wilkes-Barre, PA
Medical or Dental Office/Clinic	5 sp per practitioner	Scranton, PA
Medical & Dental Clinics	3/practitioner + 1 sp/2 employees	Bethlehem, PA
Offices or Clinic/Medical & Dental	5 sp per Physician or PA; 4 sp per Dentist	Colebrookdale Twp., PA
AVERAGE	4.5 spaces per Practitioner	

IV. MIXED MEDICAL USE: Medical Office Use v. Ambulatory Healthcare Use

As discussed in the Gilmore & Associates, Inc. memorandum to the Township, dated November 4, 2016 reviewing the most recent Penn Medicine *Pennoni Trip Generation letter* (dated September 23, 2016; revised October 18, 2016), review comment III.1., discusses in detail the Ambulatory Healthcare Use should actually be identified as a Mixed Medical Use as each of the studied facilities and the proposed 145 King of Prussia Road facility include a clinical use (medical office use) and an Ambulatory Healthcare use. **To avoid further confusion and for consistency, the Ambulatory Healthcare Use will more appropriately be referred to as Mixed Medical Use with the internal programming identified as Medical Office Use and Ambulatory Healthcare Use.** The internal programming for each of the existing sites studied and the proposed 145 King of Prussia Road site breaks down as follows:

Table 3: Breakdown of Internal Programming for Mixed Medical Use

Location	Clinical/Medical Office Use	Ambulatory Healthcare Use
250 King of Prussia	75.7%	24.3%
Penn Med Valley Forge	65.4%	34.6%
Fern Hill	61.5%	38.5%
Average of Studied Sites	67.5%	32.5%
Proposed 145 KOP-G&A	57.3%	42.7%

As indicated in Table 3 above, for every 100,000 SF of Mixed Medical Use, there is a de facto 67,500 SF programmed for Medical Office Use and 32,500 SF programmed for Ambulatory Healthcare. The PLO amendment includes a maximum 30% Medical Office Use restriction for the site. As such, the Medical Office Use present in the Mixed Medical Use must be tracked and determined in order to fully develop the maximum number of trips generated existing PLO zoning ordinance and the proposed PLO zoning amendment without exceeding the 30% cap for the Medical Office Use proposed under the PLO zoning amendment

V. EVALUATION

Mr. Kevin Kochanski, ASLA, R.L.A., Director of Community Development in Radnor Township prepared an Excel spreadsheet identifying the Maximum Allowable Gross Floor Area under the existing PLO Regulations for a 3 story building (considered the By-Right PLO); in addition, Mr. Kochanski identified a reasonable 45% and 65% achievable GSF based on the existing site constraints. The by-right option takes into consideration the all PLO sites are developed to the full 3 story height at 45% and 65% of the site GSF due to the assumed site constraints. Trip generation calculations are based on Mr. Kochanski’s Excel Spreadsheet for the GFA calculations and the detailed trip tables are provided following this memorandum.

PLO Zoning Amendment Transportation Impact:

To evaluate the transportation impact the PLO Zoning Amendment will have on the PLO district a commensurable analysis must be developed for each of the land uses based upon a consistent unit of measure. The Institute of Transportation Engineer’s (ITE) *Trip Generation Manual* provides vehicular trip generation rates based on the various independent variables for each particular land use. For example, the *Hotel* land use relies on the number of rooms in the hotel; while the *Assisted Living* land use relies on the number of beds. Therefore, it is necessary to convert the independent variables to a consistent unit of measure.

For purposes of this evaluation, the analysis is based on the trip generation rate associated with the common size of 100,000 SF for the highest trip generation rate under the List “B” category. As indicated in **Table 4 List “B” Trip Generation Comparison**, the highest yielding land use under List “B” is the Ambulatory Healthcare use.

Table 4 List “B” Trip Generation Comparison¹

Land Use	Assumed Size	100,000 SF Yield	AM Peak Hour ²	PM Peak Hour ²	24 Hour ADT ²
General Office	100,000 SF	1	156	149	1,103
Medical/Dental	100,000 SF	1	239	291	3,874
Hotel	910 SF /Room	110 Rooms	56	77	981
Assisted Living	910 SF /Bed	110 Beds	20	32	301
Mixed Medical Use ³	969 SF /Patient Position	103 PP	165	109	1,860

¹ All vehicle trips were generated based on ITE *Trip Generation Manual* with the exception of the Ambulatory Healthcare. The Ambulatory Healthcare trips were developed utilizing a Pennoni study from three existing sites located near Radnor Township with approximately 969 SF/PP; the trip rates are as follows: 18.02 ADT Trips/Patient Position; 1.60 AM Peak Hour Trips/PP; & 1.06 PM Peak Hour Trips/PP

² Total vehicular trips generated during the peak hour of the adjacent street or roadway (typically 8AM-9AM and 5PM-6PM weekdays)

³Mixed Medical Use on average is comprised of 67.5% Medical Office use; and 32.5% Ambulatory Healthcare use.

In an effort to compare the maximum buildout of the PLO district under the existing zoning ordinance and the proposed PLO amendment for a mixed use option, several factors weigh into the calculations. The PLO Amendment includes the following limiting factors:

- 280-63.A. – A minimum of 40% of the GFA of the site must be from the List “A” uses (General Office and Medical/Dental Office)
- 280-63.A.(3) – The total GFA for Medical/Dental Office may not exceed 30% of the GFA of the site
- 280-63.B. – The total GFA for the List “B” uses may not exceed 60% of the GFA of the site.

Under the Mixed Use Option (280-64.G); the following limits apply:

- 280-64.G(1)(a) – The List “B” uses must be a minimum of 30% of the total GFA of the site.
- 280-64.G(1)(b) – The combined total of the medical/dental office use may not exceed 30% of the GFA of the site.
- 280-64.G(1)© – With Ambulatory Healthcare use, 15% of the total GFA must be occupied by another List “B” use.

Therefore, under the Mixed Use option, a maximum of 60% of the site could be utilized by the List “B” uses and the balance of the site, 40%; would be developed with the List “A” uses.

Furthermore, proposing an Ambulatory Healthcare use requires that 15% of the site be developed as another List “B” use. The Hotel use is the next highest trip generator use under the List “B” uses so the maximum buildout under the Mixed Use option would require 15% of the Hotel Use.

Table 5: Summary of Site Distribution under Mixed Use Option

<u>List "A" Use</u>	<u>List "B" Use</u>
40% General Office or Medical Office	15% Hotel Use
	45% Mixed Medical Use

As indicated above, under section IV. *Mixed Medical Use: Medical Office v. Ambulatory Healthcare Use*, on average, the Mixed Medical Use includes 67.5% of Medical Office Use and 32.5% Ambulatory Healthcare use. Amending **Table 5 Summary of Site Distribution under the Mixed Use Option** to distribute the 45% Mixed Medical Use to both the Medical Office Use and Ambulatory Healthcare Use leads to **Table 6 Summary of Site Distribution with Break Out of Mixed Use Option**. However, the total Medical Office use for the entire developed site cannot exceed 30%; therefore, 0.38% of the Medical Office Use from the Mixed Medical Use must be "shifted" to the List "A" uses AND a proportional amount of Ambulatory Healthcare Use must also be shifted to the List "A" use as shown in Table 7 below.

Table 6 Summary of Site Distribution with Break Out of Mixed Use Option

<u>List "A" Use</u>	<u>List "B" Use</u>
40% General Office or Medical Office	15% Hotel Use
	30.38% Medical Office Use
	14.62% Ambulatory Healthcare Use

Table 7 Amended Summary of Site Distribution with Break Out of Mixed Use Option

<u>List "A" Use</u>	<u>List "B" Use</u>	<u>Summary List "B" Use</u>
40.56% General Office or Medical Office	15% Hotel Use	15% Hotel Use
	30% Medical Office Use	44.44% Mixed Medical Use
	14.44% Ambulatory Healthcare Use	
TOTAL "A" Use = 40.56%		TOTAL "B" Use = 59.44%

Table 8 PLO Mixed Use Maximum Trip Generation*

Address	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	24 HR ADT
100 Matsonford Road	1,881	1,504	17,926
280 King of Prussia Road	257	210	2,480
201 King of Prussia Road	577	469	5,386
250 King of Prussia Road	274	224	2,642
259 Radnor Chester Road	411	347	3,820
175 King of Prussia Road	231	188	2,220
145 King of Prussia Road	727	582	6,816
TOTALS for PLO District	4,357	3,523	41,290

*Note: Based on 40.56% General Office; 15% Hotel; 44.44% Mixed Medical Use; supporting data for Table 8 is provided following this memorandum.

A summary table is provided below showing the comparison of the By-Right and Mixed Use Zoning Amendment. (See **Table 9 Comparison of Trip Generation By-right and Mixed Use PLO Zoning Amendment**) Table 10 is resorted by AM and PM Peak Hour in subsequent tables and the PLO Amendment Maximum Buildout with the Mixed Use Option is shaded grey for easier viewing.

Table 9 Comparison of Trip Generation By-Right and Mixed Use PLO Zoning Amendment

PLO District TRIP GENERATION	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	24 Hour ADT
Maximum By-Right 65% Site Constraint 100% General Office Use	4,453	4,310	28,484
Maximum By-Right 65% Site Constraint 100% Medical/Dental Office	8,027	8,119	135,817
Maximum By-Right 65% Site Constraint 70% General & 30% Medical/Dental Office	5,756	5,931	61,411
Maximum By-Right 45% Site Constraint 100% General Office Use	3,320	3,154	21,550
Maximum By-Right 45% Site Constraint 100% Medical/Dental Office Use	5,557	5,831	93,564
Maximum By-Right 45% Site Constraint 70% General & 30% Medical/Dental Office	4,161	4,345	43,442
Maximum Mixed Use (PLO Amendment) 40.56% Gen Office 15% Hotel 44.44% Mixed Medical (30% Medical/Dental Office & 14.44% Ambulatory Healthcare)	4,357	3,523	41,290

In rank order by AM Peak Hour (Highest to Lowest):

PLO District TRIP GENERATION	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	24 Hour ADT
Maximum By-Right 65% Site Constraint 100% Medical/Dental Office	8,027	8,119	135,817
Maximum By-Right 65% Site Constraint 70% General & 30% Medical/Dental Office	5,756	5,931	61,411
Maximum By-Right 45% Site Constraint 100% Medical/Dental Office Use	5,557	5,831	93,564
Maximum By-Right 65% Site Constraint 100% General Office Use	4,453	4,310	28,484
Maximum Mixed Use (PLO Amendment) 40.56% Gen Office 15% Hotel 44.44% Mixed Medical (30% Medical/Dental Office & 14.44% Ambulatory Healthcare)	4,357	3,523	41,290
Maximum By-Right 45% Site Constraint 70% General & 30% Medical/Dental Office	4,161	4,345	43,442
Maximum By-Right 45% Site Constraint 100% General Office Use	3,320	3,154	21,550

In rank order by PM Peak Hour (Highest to Lowest)

PLO District TRIP GENERATION	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	24 Hour ADT
Maximum By-Right 65% Site Constraint 100% Medical/Dental Office	8,027	8,119	135,817
Maximum By-Right 65% Site Constraint 70% General & 30% Medical/Dental Office	5,756	5,931	61,411
Maximum By-Right 45% Site Constraint 100% Medical/Dental Office Use	5,557	5,831	93,564
Maximum By-Right 45% Site Constraint 70% General & 30% Medical/Dental Office	4,161	4,345	43,442
Maximum By-Right 65% Site Constraint 100% General Office Use	4,453	4,310	28,484
Maximum Mixed Use (PLO Amendment) 40.56% Gen Office 15% Hotel 44.44% Mixed Medical (30% Medical/Dental Office & 14.44% Ambulatory Healthcare)	4,357	3,523	41,290
Maximum By-Right 45% Site Constraint 100% General Office Use	3,320	3,154	21,550

Radnor Township:

PLO ZONING DISTRICT

Trip Generation Analysis

Supplemental Tables:

PLO By-Right Option

PLO Amendment with Mixed Use Option

EXISTING PLO ORDINANCE MAXIMUM TRIPS GENERATED

Table A: 65% Site Constraints with 100% General Office:

A	H	65% MAXIMUM By-Right 100% General Office			
		65% of F	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	24 HR ADT
100 Matsonford Road	1,469,709		1,643	1,725	10,123
280 King of Prussia Road	174,301		298	274	2,003
201 King of Prussia Road	369,498		544	492	3,545
250 King of Prussia Road	212,525		350	316	2,328
259 Radnor Chester Road	266,905		420	377	2,768
175 King of Prussia Road	178,378		304	278	2,038
145 King of Prussia Road	687,011		894	848	5,679
TOTALS for PLO District:			4,453	4,310	28,484

Table B: 65% Site Constraints with 100% Medical/Dental Office:

A	H	65% MAXIMUM By-Right 100% Medical/Dental Office			
		65% of F	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	24 HR ADT
100 Matsonford Road	1,469,709		3,513	3,273	59,881
280 King of Prussia Road	174,301		417	480	6,912
201 King of Prussia Road	369,498		883	945	14,894
250 King of Prussia Road	212,525		508	574	8,475
259 Radnor Chester Road	266,905		638	705	10,699
175 King of Prussia Road	178,378		426	491	7,079
145 King of Prussia Road	687,011		1,642	1,651	27,877
TOTALS for PLO District:			8,027	8,119	135,817

Table C: 65% Site Constraints with 70% General Office & 30% Medical/Dental Office:

A	H	65% MAXIMUM By-Right 70% General & 30% Medical/Dental Office			
		65% of F	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	24 HR ADT
100 Matsonford Road	1,469,709		2,289	2,339	25,533
280 King of Prussia Road	174,301		349	378	3,450
201 King of Prussia Road	369,498		674	688	7,021
250 King of Prussia Road	212,525		415	439	4,167
259 Radnor Chester Road	266,905		507	527	5,170
175 King of Prussia Road	178,378		357	384	3,527
145 King of Prussia Road	687,011		1,165	1,176	12,543
TOTALS for PLO District:			5,756	5,931	61,411

Table D: 45% Site Constraints with 100% General Office:

A	H	45% MAXIMUM By-Right 100% General Office		
		AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	24 HR ADT
	45% of F			
100 Matsonford Road	1,017,491	1,224	1,218	7,655
280 King of Prussia Road	120,670	222	214	1,514
201 King of Prussia Road	255,806	406	365	2,681
250 King of Prussia Road	147,133	261	243	1,761
259 Radnor Chester Road	184,780	313	285	2,093
175 King of Prussia Road	123,493	228	218	1,551
145 King of Prussia Road	475,623	666	611	4,295
TOTALS for PLO District:		3,320	3,154	21,550

Table E: 45% Site Constraints with 100% Medical/Dental Office:

A	H	45% MAXIMUM By-Right 100% Medical/Dental Office		
		AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	24 HR ADT
	45% of F			
100 Matsonford Road	1,017,491	2,432	2,351	41,390
280 King of Prussia Road	120,670	288	345	4,719
201 King of Prussia Road	255,806	611	679	10,245
250 King of Prussia Road	147,133	352	412	5,801
259 Radnor Chester Road	184,780	442	506	7,341
175 King of Prussia Road	123,493	295	352	4,835
145 King of Prussia Road	475,623	1,137	1,186	19,233
TOTALS for PLO District:		5,557	5,831	93,564

Table F: 45% Site Constraints with 70% General and 30% Medical/Dental Office:

A	H	45% MAXIMUM By-Right 70% General & 30% Medical/Dental Office		
		AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	24 HR ADT
	45% of F			
100 Matsonford Road	1,017,491	1,650	1,672	18,104
280 King of Prussia Road	120,670	254	290	2,420
201 King of Prussia Road	255,806	488	509	4,967
250 King of Prussia Road	147,133	301	334	2,933
259 Radnor Chester Road	184,780	367	394	3,648
175 King of Prussia Road	123,493	259	294	2,475
145 King of Prussia Road	475,623	842	852	8,895
TOTALS for PLO District:		4,161	4,345	43,442

PLO AMENDMENT WITH MIXED USE: MAXIMUM TRIPS GENERATED

Table G: PLO Mixed Use Distribution of GFA

PLO Amendment Mixed Use Option at each Site	General Office Use 10% (30% Medical Office under Mixed Medical Use)	Hotel Use 15%	Mixed Medical Use 44.44% (Caps Medical Office at 30%)
Percent GFA Distribution→	40.56%	15%	44.44%
100 Matsonford Road	547,548	202,496	599,927
280 King of Prussia Road	70,745	26,163	77,512
201 King of Prussia Road	149,971	55,463	164,317
250 King of Prussia Road	75,296	27,846	82,498
259 Radnor Chester Road	103,118	38,135	112,982
175 King of Prussia Road	63,298	23,409	69,353
145 King of Prussia Road	193,514	71,566	212,025

Table H: PLO General Office under Mixed Use Option

	General Office Use Trip Generation for 40.56% GFA		
	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	Average Daily Traffic
100 Matsonford Road	746	692	4,780
280 King of Prussia Road	110	105	780
201 King of Prussia Road	265	246	1,786
250 King of Prussia Road	117	112	831
259 Radnor Chester Road	196	194	1,344
175 King of Prussia Road	99	94	698
145 King of Prussia Road	324	295	2,168
TOTAL	1,857	1,738	12,387

Table I: PLO Hotel Use under Mixed Use Option

PLO Amendment:	Hotel Use Trip Generation		
	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	Average Daily Traffic
100 Matsonford Road	144	156	1,989
280 King of Prussia Road	19	20	259
201 King of Prussia Road	41	43	544
250 King of Prussia Road	21	22	277
259 Radnor Chester Road	28	29	375
175 King of Prussia Road	17	18	232
145 King of Prussia Road	53	55	705
TOTAL	323	343	4,381

Table J: PLO Mixed Medical Use

PLO Amendment:	Mixed Medical Use Trip Generation		
	AM	PM	ADT
100 Matsonford Road	991	656	11,157
280 King of Prussia Road	128	85	1,441
201 King of Prussia Road	271	180	3,056
250 King of Prussia Road	136	90	1,534
259 Radnor Chester Road	187	124	2,101
175 King of Prussia Road	115	76	1,290
145 King of Prussia Road	350	232	3,943
TOTAL	2,177	1,442	24,522

Table K: PLO District Mixed Use Maximum Trip Generation

PLO Amendment:	TOTAL PLO District Maximum Trip Generation under Mixed Use Option		
	AM	PM	ADT
100 Matsonford Road	1,881	1,504	17,926
280 King of Prussia Road	257	210	2,480
201 King of Prussia Road	577	469	5,386
250 King of Prussia Road	274	224	2,642
259 Radnor Chester Road	411	347	3,820
175 King of Prussia Road	231	188	2,220
145 King of Prussia Road	727	582	6,816
TOTAL	4,357	3,523	41,290

