

SITE ENGINEERING CONCEPTS, LLC

Consulting Engineering and Land Development Services

December 11, 2020

Steve Norcini, P.E.
Township Engineer
Radnor Township
Iven Ave
Wayne, PA 19087

**Re: Response to Engineering Review
Eagle Road and Radnor Road
Preliminary Subdivision and Land Development Plan
Revision #1**

Dear Steve,

On behalf of the CG Wayne, LLC, SITE Engineering Concepts is pleased to submit the enclosed revision to this preliminary application. Revision #1 addresses the comments in the October 23, 2020 review memo from Roger Phillips, P.E., as follows:

Sewage Facilities Planning

Comment 1. Final plan approval will not be granted until Planning Approval or a Planning Exemption is received from the PA DEP. The applicant has indicated on the plans that the planning modules have been submitted to the authorities for signature and will be forwarded to the PA DEP when completed. To date, the Township has not received a copy for review.

Response 1. PADEP has responded to the mailer with the coding numbers. Planning modules are being prepared for signature by the appropriate agencies and approval by the township then submitted to the PADEP for final approval. The PADEP must approve the required sewage planning modules before any grading or building permits will be issued.

Zoning

Comment 1. The zoning table must be revised to indicate the appropriate zoning district in which the project is located.

Response 2. The zoning requirement tables are revised to show PI, R-1 and R-2 requirements.

Comment 2. §280-20.B – Not more than 18% of the area of each lot may be occupied by buildings. The zoning table on sheet 7 of the plans indicates 30%. This must be revised.

Response 3. The zoning summary tables are revised with the correct percentages.

Comment 3. §280-20.F – The maximum impervious surfaces in 30%. The zoning table on sheet 7 of the plans indicates 35%. This must be revised.

Response 4. The zoning summary tables are revised with the correct percentages.

Comment 4. The zoning table must indicate the actual conditions for the setback and impervious and building coverage in addition to the requirements. The applicant has indicated on the zoning table that the yard setbacks and coverage estimates are based on a preliminary sketch. Actual coverage to be determined at the time of permitting, and not to exceed amounts permitted by applicable code requirements.

Response 5. The zoning summary tables show the preliminary setbacks and coverages. The setbacks and coverage may be revised at the time of permitting.

Comment 5. The Height requirements must be added to the Zoning Table.

Response 6. Height is added to the zoning summary tables.

Comment 6. §280-112.C. – Areas of steep slopes containing slopes steeper than 14% shall be outlined as following (1) Areas containing slopes steeper than 14% but less than 20% shall be distinguished from the areas containing slopes of 20% or steeper. (2) Areas containing slopes of 20% and steeper shall be separately identified. The applicant has shown these on the plan, but the way the slopes are defined on the plans are hard to interpret. We suggest that be revised to an easier way to clearly located the steep slopes.

Response 7. The slopes hatching and legend are revised.

Subdivision and Land Development

Comment 1. §255-20-B(1)(e)[5] – The site plan must show the size of the units (in bedrooms), if known.

Response 1. The anticipated number of bedrooms is added to the plan.

Comment 2. §255-20-B(1)(n) – Existing principal buildings (and their respective uses) and driveways on the adjacent peripheral strip. Sewer lines, storm drains, culverts, bridges, utility easements, quarries, railroads and other significant man-made features within 500 feet of and within the site (this includes properties across streets) must be shown on the plans.

Response 2. A 500 foot offset line is added to the cover sheet. A partial waiver is requested for features not shown on the aerial.

Comment 3. §255-20-B(1)(o)[8] – All streetlights must be shown on the site plan.

Response 3. Existing street lamps are added to the base map. Proposed street lights will be added if required by the Board.

Comment 4. §255-20-B(1)(o)[9] – All fire hydrants must be shown on the site plan.

Response 4. A fire hydrant is added at the end of the cul-de-sac.

Comment 5. §255-27-C(1) – The right of way, ultimate right of way, cartway, curbing and sidewalks must be shown and clearly labeled along Radnor Street Road and Walnut Road.

Response 5. Right-of-ways are shown and labeled.

Comment 6. §255.27.C(4) – When a subdivision abuts or contains an existing street of inadequate right-of-way width, the Board of Commissioners may require the reservation or dedication of rights-of-way to conform with the required standards. Radnor Street Road is a Minor Collector. The right-of-way requirement is 60 feet. The applicant has indicated on the plans that the right-of-way is 33 feet. Walnut Road is a local Road.

Response 6. The Applicant will review additional ROW and cartway requests with the Board.

Comment 7. §255.27.D(2) – Cul-de-sac shall have at the closed end a turnaround with a right-of-way having a minimum outside radius of not less than 60 feet and shall be paved to a radius of not less than 40 feet. This must be shown on the plan.

Response 7. The dimensions are added to Sheet 10.

Comment 8. §255.27.H(6) – Minimum curb radii at street intersections shall be 25 feet for local streets; 30 feet for collectors; 35 feet for arterials; and 10 feet for driveways. This must be shown on the plans.

Response 8. The dimensions are added to Sheet 10.

Comment 9. §255.37.G – The minimum width of all sidewalks and pedestrian paths shall be four feet. This must be dimensioned on the plans.

Response 9. The dimension is added to Sheet 10.

Comment 10. §255.37.G – Sidewalks and pedestrian paths shall be laterally pitched at a slope of not less than 1/4 inch per foot to provide for adequate surface drainage.

Response 10. The cross slope is included in the contour grading and is noted on the detail.

Comment 11. §255.38B – Street trees 2 ½ inches dbh at intervals of not more than 30 feet along both sides of new streets and along one or both sides of an existing street within the proposed subdivision or land development must be shown on the plans. Street trees must be provided. The landscape plan submitted only shows the replacement trees.

Response 11. Street trees are added to the landscape plan.

Comment 12. §255-40.C(2)– Access and circulation for fire-fighting and other emergency equipment, moving vans, fuel trucks, garbage collection, deliveries and snow removal shall be planned for efficient operation and convenience. Turning templates for the culs-de-sac must be provided.

Response 12. A turning template is added to Sheet 14.

Comment 13. §255-43.1.B(1) – For all residential subdivisions or land developments involving a total of four or more lots and/or dwelling units, a minimum of 1,440 square feet or suitable park and recreation land shall be provided per dwelling unit within such subdivision/land development, unless the developer agrees to a fee in lieu of \$3,307 per dwelling unit (existing or proposed).

Response 13. The Applicant is aware of the requirement.

Comment 14. §255-49 – Where appropriate, the developer shall install or cause to be installed, at the developer's expense, metal or fiberglass pole streetlights serviced by underground conduit in accordance with a plan to be prepared by the developer's engineer and approved by the Board of Commissioners.

Response 14. Proposed street lights will be added if required by the Board.

Comment 15. §255-54.B – The central water system should be designed with adequate capacity and appropriately spaced fire hydrants for fire-fighting purposes pursuant to the specification of the National Fire Protection Association. Review and approval by the Township Engineer and the Township Fire Marshall shall be required in order to ensure that adequate fire protection is provided. We note that the applicant is working with the Township Engineer and Township Fire Marshall and will incorporate their input as applicable.

Response 15. Agreed.

Stormwater

Comment 1. The narrative in the stormwater report says the “drainage area map on sheet X of the plan set”. Please revise this statement to indicate the correct sheet of the plan set that the drainage area map can be found.

Response 1. The report is revised.

Comment 2. The narrative in the stormwater report claims the limit of disturbance and stormwater regulatory area is 11,631 sf but the actual area is much greater. Please update this with the correct area.

Response 2. The report is updated with the correct area.

Comment 3. A drainage area map is provided but it does not appear that the drainage areas are shown. Please revise the drainage area map to more clearly identify the extents of the drainage areas. Please provide a drainage area map for both the pre-construction and post- construction conditions.

Response 3. The drainage maps are on Sheet 14.

Comment 4. Basin Volumes & Dewater Times Per Bed in stormwater report: the elevation and volume for the upper elevation of the Lot #14 bed in the of the stormwater report are not filled in. Please revise the report to include these values.

Response 4. The table is updated.

Comment 5. Please provide calculations on how the SCS curve numbers were calculated.

Response 5. The curve number calculations are added to the report.

Comment 6. Please revise the plans to include an overlay of the soil names and boundaries.

Response 6. The soil boundaries are added to the PCSM plan.

Comment 7. Lot #1 Infiltration Bed: Outlet invert is listed as 358.00 on the plans and is listed as 353.75 in the hydrograph report. Please revise this inconsistency.

Response 7. The plan tables and details are now consistent with the hydrograph report.

Comment 8. Lot #2 Infiltration Bed: Outlet invert and outlet pipe length are listed as 356.00 and 22.00', respectively, on the plans and are listed as 355.25 and 10.00', respectively, in the hydrograph report. Please revise these inconsistencies.

Response 8. The plan tables and details are now consistent with the hydrograph report.

Comment 9. Lot #3 Infiltration Bed: Outlet pipe length is listed as 19.80' on the plans and is listed as 10.00' in the hydrograph report. Please revise this inconsistency.

Response 9. The plan tables and details are now consistent with the hydrograph report.

Comment 10. Lot #6 Infiltration Bed: Slope is listed as 14.20% on the plans and 15.50% in the hydrograph report. Please revise this inconsistency.

Response 10. The plan tables and details are now consistent with the hydrograph report.

Comment 11. Lot #7 Infiltration Bed: Outlet pipe length and slope are listed as 156.00' and 2.00%, respectively, on the plans and are listed as 51.60' and 15.50%, respectively, in the hydrograph report. Please revise these inconsistencies.

Response 11. The plan tables and details are now consistent with the hydrograph report.

Comment 12. Lot #8 Infiltration Bed: Barrel length, outlet invert, outlet pipe length, and slope are listed as 60', 380.00, 8.00', and 2.00%, respectively, on the plans and are listed as 70', 379.75, 51.60', and 15.50%, respectively, in the hydrograph report. Please revise these inconsistencies.

Response 12. The plan tables and details are now consistent with the hydrograph report.

Comment 13. Lot #9 Infiltration Bed: Outlet pipe length is listed as 10.00' on the plans and is listed as 20.00' in the hydrograph report. Please revise this inconsistency.

Response 13. The plan tables and details are now consistent with the hydrograph report.

Comment 14. Lot #10 Infiltration Bed: Outlet invert is listed as 372.00 on the plans and is listed as 371.75 in the hydrograph report. Please revise this inconsistency.

Response 14. The plan tables and details are now consistent with the hydrograph report.

Comment 15. Lot #11 Infiltration Bed: Outlet invert and slope are listed as 362.00 and 1.50%, respectively, on the plans and are listed as 361.50 and 0.75%, respectively, in the hydrograph report. Please revise these inconsistencies.

Response 15. The plan tables and details are now consistent with the hydrograph report.

Comment 16. Lot #12 Infiltration Bed: Barrel invert, barrel length, outlet invert, outlet pipe length, and slope are listed as -6.00, 60', 383.00, and 26.00', respectively, on the plans and are listed as 380.00, 70', 382.50, and 47.00', respectively, in the hydrograph report. Additionally, it appears that the Min Final Grade, Top of Stone Elevation, and Bed Bottom Elevation on the plan table are incorrect. Please revise these values and inconsistencies.

Response 16. The plan tables and details are now consistent with the hydrograph report.

Comment 17. Lot #13 Infiltration Bed: Outlet invert and outlet pipe length are listed as 385.00 and 46.40', respectively, on the plans and are listed as 384.50 and 47.00', respectively, in the hydrograph report. Please revise these inconsistencies.

Response 17. The plan tables and details are now consistent with the hydrograph report.

Comment 18. Lot #14 Infiltration Bed: Outlet invert is listed as 389.00 on the plans and is listed as 388.00 in the hydrograph report. Please revise these inconsistencies.

Response 18. The plan tables and details are now consistent with the hydrograph report.

Comment 19. Lot #16 Infiltration Bed: Outlet invert and slope are listed as 403.00 and 1.69%, respectively, on the plans and are listed as 403.50 and 2.25%, respectively, in the hydrograph report. Please revise these inconsistencies.

Response 19. The plan tables and details are now consistent with the hydrograph report.

Comment 20. Lot #17 Infiltration Bed: Outlet invert, outlet pipe length, and slope are listed as 407.00, 150.60', and 3.80%, respectively, on the plans and are listed as 406.75, 89.00', and 2.25%, respectively, in the hydrograph report. Please revise these inconsistencies.

Response 20. The plan tables and details are now consistent with the hydrograph report.

Comment 21. Lot #18 Infiltration Bed: Outlet pipe length and slope are listed as 46.40' and 3.71%, respectively, on the plans and are listed as 11.00' and 2.00%, respectively, in the hydrograph report. Please revise these inconsistencies.

Response 21. The plan tables and details are now consistent with the hydrograph report.

Comment 22. Lot #19 Infiltration Bed: Outlet invert and slope are listed as 394.50 and 11.00%, respectively, on the plans and are listed as 394.00 and 11.30%, respectively, in the hydrograph report. Please revise these inconsistencies.

Response 22. The plan tables and details are now consistent with the hydrograph report.

Comment 23. Lot #20 Infiltration Bed: Barrel invert and outlet invert are listed as 353.00 and 356.00, respectively, on the plans and is listed as 359.00 and 361.50, respectively in the hydrograph report. Please revise these inconsistencies.

Response 23. The plan tables and details are now consistent with the hydrograph report.

Comment 24. It appears that storm pipe PP-PP11 and Outfall A5 may pose a risk of eroding Infiltration Bed #1. Please revise these items to minimize risk to the infiltration bed.

Response 24. The outfall and basin are relocated farther apart.

Comment 25. Please revise the endwall at Outfalls A2, A3, and A4 to a level spreader to discharge runoff in a disperse, unconcentrated manner. Please provide a level spreader detail.

Response 25. Endwall and discharge apron details are added to Sheet 9.

Comment 26. The 2-year pre-development volume is listed as 46,928 cf in the Retention Volume Compliance Summary table and is listed as 58,591 cf in the hydrograph report. Please revise this inconsistency and ensure that the correct value is used for the 2-year post-development volume as well.

Response 26. The compliance summary is revised to be consistent with the hydrograph report for the pre and post development volumes.

Comment 27. Peak Flows & Runoff Volumes Per Outfall table:

- a. The 2-year volume for Outfall A3 appears to be calculated incorrectly. Please revise this calculation to include all applicable volumes, including Hydrograph 39 "12-Post-Bed Inflow".*
- b. The 2-year volume for Outfall A4 is inconsistent with the value found in the hydrograph report. Please revise this inconsistency.*
- c. Please update the 2-year volume for POI-A Total to reflect these revisions.*

Response 27. The volume table is revised to be consistent with the hydrograph report.

Comment 28. It appears that the infiltration rate in the Basin Volumes & Dewater Times Per Bed table and the Test Pit IDs in the Proposed Infiltration Bed Dimensions table are inconsistent with the Infiltration Testing Report for Lots #1, #6, #10, and #20. Please revise so that the correct infiltration rates and test pit IDs are referenced within these tables.

Response 28. The table is revised to be consistent with the testing results. Please note that not all basin are associated with a test pit with the same number.

Comment 29. It appears the infiltration test elevation does not correspond to the bed bottom elevation for Lots #1, #6, #8, #11, #18, and #20. Please revise the bed bottom elevations to incorporate to the appropriate elevation.

Response 29. The table is revised to be consistent with the testing results.

Comment 30. It appears that the proposed bed bottom elevation for Lot #11 (358.5) is less than two feet from the perched water limiting zone shown on the Infiltration Testing Report (358.6). Please revise the design to provide a bed bottom at least two feet above any limiting zone.

Response 30. The basin is redesigned to be at least two feet above the report limiting zone.

Comment 31. The Overall Bed Dimensions on the Proposed Infiltration Bed Dimensions table on the plans are inconsistent with the bed footprints found on the plans for Lot #2, #10, #12, #17, #18, and #19. Please revise these inconsistencies.

Response 31. The plan view and tables are now consistent with the hydrograph report.

Comment 32. The Basin Footprints on the Basin Volumes & Dewater Times Per Bed in the stormwater report are inconsistent with the bed footprints found on the plans for Lots #1-3, #6-14, and #16-20. Please revise these inconsistencies.

Response 32. The plan view and tables are now consistent with the hydrograph report.

Comment 33. The Min. Final Grade is listed as 376.00 for Lot #9, and 359.00 for Lot #20 on the Proposed Infiltration Bed Dimensions table but it appears that the plans show a lower final grade. Please revise this inconsistency.

Response 33. The Lot 20 contours are revised and the Lot 9 basin relocated.

Comment 34. The Impervious Used in Storm Design exceeds the impervious area used in the hydrograph calculations for every lot. Please revise this column to accurately reflect the impervious area used in the stormwater design.

Response 34. The table is revised to be consistent with the hydrograph report.

Comment 35. It appears that the area used for the Water Quality Volume calculation in the Compliance Summary table is less than the area found in the hydrograph report. Please revise these values to be consistent.

Response 35. The table is revised to be consistent with the hydrograph report.

Comment 36. It appears that stormwater piping (PP-11 to Outfall A5) will cross proposed infiltration bed PIB-1. It also appears that this pipe will not have adequate cover. Please clarify, or revise the layout of the piping and/or infiltration bed to avoid this interference, and to provide at least one foot of cover.

Response 36. The outfall and basin are relocated farther apart and 1 foot of cover provided.

Comment 37. Please provide conveyance pipe capacity calculations.

Response 37. Pipe capacity is added to the Sheet 12.

Comment 38. Please revise all storm profiles to include all pipe and utility crossings.

Response 38. The crossings are added to the profiles.

Comment 39. Please revise the Radnor Storm Main Profile and Walnut Storm Main Profile to display the proposed grade.

Response 39. The proposed graded is added to the profile.

Comment 40. It appears that storm pipe PP-18 will not have adequate cover. Please revise the plans to provide at least one foot of cover.

Response 40. The pipe run is revised to provide 1 foot of cover.

Comment 41. It appears that storm pipe PP-P9A will not have adequate cover. Please revise the plans to provide at least one foot of cover.

Response 41. The pipe run is revised to provide 1 foot of cover.

Comment 42. Please provide an endwall detail.

Response 42. An endwall detail is added to Sheet 9.

Comment 43. Final approval of the stormwater management plan will be required as part of the Grading Permit process. Any revisions to the size or location of the individual structures or other features will be addressed at that time.

Response 43. Acknowledged.

Sanitary Sewer

Comment 1. The sanitary sewer line in Radnor Street Road and Walnut Avenue must be shown on the plans.

Response 1. The sewer lines are now shown on the base map.

Comment 2. The existing sanitary sewer connections and disposition of the laterals must be provided on the plans.

Response 2. The existing connections are shown on Sheet 2 and a decommission note is added to Sheet 4.

Comment 3. All manholes not located in the paved areas must be equipped with watertight frames and covers.

Response 3. The note is added to the detail on Sheet 11.

Comment 4. Manholes in non-improved areas must be extended 18 inches above grade.

Response 4. The note is added to the detail on Sheet 11.

Comment 5. All utilities crossing the sanitary sewers must be shown on the profile view to insure adequate vertical clearance.

Response 5. The crossings are added to the profiles.

Comment 6. Rim and invert elevations of the sanitary manholes must be shown on profile view.

Response 6. The manhole elevations are shown on the profile view.

Comment 7. The size and type of sewer must be shown on the profile view.

Response 7. The pipe size and type are added to the profiles.

Comment 8. Minimum depth of cover for all pipe sewers shall be 5 feet. There are numerous locations where this condition is not met and it appears that the coverage is approximately 2 feet.

Response 8. The sanitary sewer main pipe inverts are revised to provide 5 feet of cover.

Comment 9. When pipe is to be laid in fill, the embankment height shall be at least four feet above the top of pipe before the trench is excavated. Compact embankment material to a minimum final density of not less than 90% of the maximum dry weight density at its optimum moisture content.

Response 9. The note is added to Sheet 11 and 12.

Comment 10. The grades of the sewer runs must be shown on the profiles.

Response 10. The grades are added to the profiles.

Comment 11. A minimum 10-foot horizontal and 18-inch vertical separation must be maintained between the sanitary sewer and the water and storm sewer lines.

Response 11. The lines are revised to maintain a 10-foot horizontal separation.

Comment 12. Profiles of the sanitary sewer laterals must be provided.

Response 12. A profile is provided for laterals with potential utility conflicts. All sewer lateral connections are shown on the main profiles.

Comment 13. Depressed curbing (12 feet) is required where the sewer line leaves the street to provide access in the easement to the sanitary sewer line.

Response 13. The curb depression is noted on Sheet 10.

Comment 14. Laterals cannot tie directly into manholes.

Response 14. Laterals 7, 12, 17 and 18 are revised.

Comment 15. Sanitary sewer branches must not tie into manholes at acute angles to the flow.

Response 15. PSANH-5 is revised to remove the acute angle connections.

Comment 16. A note must be added to the plans stating no planting will be done in the Sanitary Sewer easements.

Response 16. The note is added to Sheet 3 and 11.

Comment 17. A note should be added to the plans stating who the owner of the sanitary sewer system will be and who will be responsible for its maintenance.

Response 17. The applicant plans to dedicate the sewers to the Township. A note is added to Sheet 3 and 11.

Comment 18. The laterals for lot #19 and #16 do not connect into the sanitary sewer.

Response 18. Lots 16 and 19 laterals are revised.

Comment 19. The lateral for lot #18 requires an easement crossing lot #17.

Response 19. The Lot 18 lateral is relocated to preclude the need for an easement.

Comment 20. The attached Radnor Township frame and cover detail and cast-iron trap detail must be added to the plans.

Response 20. The details are added to Sheet 12.

General

Comment 1. The Radnor Township Tree protection detail must be added to the plans.

Response 1. The detail is on Sheet 5.

Comment 2. Will the Beech Lane extension roadway be public or private?

Response 2. The applicant plans to dedicate the roadway to the Township. A note is added to Sheet 3.

Comment 3. Information for the retaining walls located on several of the lots must be provided.

Response 3. All walls are under 4 feet high. Any revisions to the size or location of the individual structures or other features will be addressed with the grading permits.

Comment 4. The applicant must appear before the Shade Tree Commission and gain approval prior to this plan being presented to the Board or Commissioners.

Response 4. The Applicant is aware.

We trust these revisions satisfactorily address your comments. Should you have any questions and/or additional comments, please contact me at pspellman@site-engineers.com or 610.523.9002.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Patrick Spellman". The signature is stylized and cursive.

Patrick Spellman, P.E.

SITE ENGINEERING CONCEPTS, LLC

Consulting Engineering and Land Development Services

December 11, 2020

Steve Norcini, P.E.
Township Engineer
Radnor Township
Iven Ave
Wayne, PA 19087

**Re: Response to Traffic Engineering Review
Eagle Road and Radnor Road
Preliminary Subdivision and Land Development Plan
Revision #1**

Dear Steve,

On behalf of the CG Wayne, LLC, SITE Engineering Concepts is pleased to submit the enclosed revision to this preliminary application. Revision #1 addresses the comments in the October 22, 2020 review memo from Damon Drummond, P.E., PTOE, as follows:

SUBDIVISION AND LAND DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE COMMENTS

Comment C.1. §255-20.B.(1)(m) – Show the existing streets adjacent to the site with rights-of-way.

Response C.1. The view port on Sheet 7 is widened to show the right-of-way on both sides of the adjacent streets.

Comment C.2. §255-20.B.(1)(o)[1] & §255-21.B.(1)(o)[1] – Label the proposed cartway width of the Beechtree Lane Extension.

Response C.2. A cartway width is dimensioned on Sheet 10.

Comment C.3. §255-20.B.(1)(o)[7] & §255-21.B.(1)(o)[7] – Label the proposed sidewalk width.

Response C.3. A sidewalk width is dimensioned on Sheet 10.

Comment C.4. §255-21.B.(5)(a)[1] - Label the proposed centerline with bearing distances.

Response C.4. The center line bearings are added to Sheet 13.

Comment C.5. §255-21.B.(5)(a)[2] - Label the proposed intersection radii.

Response C.5. A intersection radii are now dimensioned on Sheet 10.

Comment C.6. §255-21.B.(5)(b)[2] - On the centerline profile, provide proposed center-line grade, with percent on tangents and elevations at fifty-foot intervals.

Response C.6. The grade and elevations are added to the profile on Sheet 12.

Comment C.7. §255-21.B.(5)(c) – Provide a typical section for the proposed cul-de-sac. Label the centerline, cross grade, and right-of-way.

Response C.7. The cul-de-sac cross section is added to Sheet 12.

Comment C.8. §255-27.D(2) – Label the paved and right-of-radius of the proposed cul-de-sac.

Response C.8. .

Comment C.9. §255-28.B – Provide the available and proposed sight distance at the intersection of Beechtree Lane and Radnor Street Road. Provide the sight distance at the driveway for Lot 1-6, 16, and Lot 20.

Response C.9. Sight Distance triangles are provided on Sheet 10.

Comment C.10. §255-37.C – Provide an easement for the existing and proposed sidewalk along Radnor Street Road and Walnut Avenue.

Response C.10. The easement is added to Sheet 3.

Comment C.11. §255-37.H –Sidewalks and pedestrian paths shall not exceed a seven-percent grade. Provide labels for sidewalk grades.

Response C.11. The paths are revised to not exceed 7% except for stretches along the existing road where the existing grade exceeds 7%.

Comment C.12. §255-47.C. - Along the existing street on which a subdivision or land development abuts (hereinafter called a "boundary street"), improvements shall be made to the street. The improvements to the boundary street shall be determined by the width of the required cartway and built to the specifications established by the Township §255- 27.C(1). The following half widths for the roadway are required.

	ROW/ Cartway
• Eagle Road (Major Collector)	40 feet/ 24 feet
• Radnor Street Road (Minor Collector)	30 feet/ 18 feet
• Walnut Avenue (Local Street)	30 feet/ 14 feet

Response C.12. The Applicant will review additional ROW and cartway requests with the Board.

D Traffic Impact Assessment Comments

Comment D.1. The Traffic Impact Study was conducted following acceptable standards. There are very minor technical analysis input discrepancies which will not impact the overall conclusions. We find the Traffic Impact Study acceptable.

Response C.13. Thank you.

E. GENERAL COMMENTS

Comment E.1. PennDOT will require a Highway Occupancy Permit (HOP) for the access to Eagle Road (S.R. 1042) on Lot 20. The Township requests the opportunity to review all HOP plans submissions to PennDOT; as well as be given the opportunity to attend all meetings with PennDOT and carbon copied on all correspondence regarding same.

Response E.1. Acknowledged.

Comment E.2. Provide spot elevations at the bottom of curb, top of curb, at minimum 25' intervals along the proposed curblines and at minimum 10' intervals along radius returns. In Additional spot elevations and slope labels must be provided within the areas of curb ramps, driveway aprons, crosswalks, and sidewalk to ensure ADA compliance.

Response E.2. Spot elevations are provided on the grading plan, Sheet 10.

Comment E.3. Revise the plans to include the details for the proposed sidewalk, curb, ADA compliant ramps and crosswalk on Beechtree Lane.

Response E.3. Additional details are provided on Sheet 10.

Comment E.4. Provide an ADA ramp at Radnor Street Road and Walnut Avenue with the proposed sidewalk at the intersection.

Response E.4. The ramp is shown on Sheet 7 and detailed on Sheet 10.

Comment E.5. A shared driveway is proposed for Lot 17 and Lot 18. In lieu of a shared access, consider, having one of the lots access Eagle Road. If a shared access remains, it will require an access easement between the two lots.

Response E.5. The Applicant considered access to Eagle Road but it was concerned potentially hazardous and would impact tree designated to be saved. An access easement will be provided.

Comment E.6. Provide ADA connection at the intersection of Eagle Road/Radnor Street Road. Consider removing the existing steps and construct an ADA accessible walkway to the intersection.

Response E.6. ADA requirements and deposition the existing steps will be investigated with PennDOT and the Township.

Steve Norcini, P.E.
December 11, 2020
Re: Eagle Road and Radnor Road Subdivision and LD Plan, Revision #1
Page 3 of 3

Comment E.7. Provide ADA compliant crossings at the intersection of Eagle Road and Radnor Chester Road. Provide crosswalks for crossing the eastern and northern leg for the intersection. The crossing improvement would include curb ramps, pedestrian signal heads and push buttons.

Response E.7. ADA requirements will be investigated with PennDOT and the Township.

We trust these revisions satisfactorily address your comments. Should you have any questions and/or additional comments, please contact me at pspellman@site-engineers.com or 610.523.9002.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Patrick Spellman". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a large initial "P" and "S".

Patrick Spellman, P.E.