

Minutes of the Meeting of February 7, 2013

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

Present

Julia Hurle, Chair
Doug McCone

Kathy Bogosian
Susan Stern

John Lord (arrived late)

Absent

Steve Cooper

Skip Kunda

Regina Majercak

Also present: Kevin Kochanski, Zoning Officer, Peter Nelson, Esq., Solicitor, and Suzan Jones, Administrative Assistant.

Mrs. Hurle called the meeting to order.

Nick Caniglia, in a recent memo, mentioned that he felt Radnor Township has one of the most restrictive ordinances in the Commonwealth. In 1928 Radnor had no institutional zoning and has increased and become a tighter ordinance through the years. In his findings, practically every other municipality has higher height requirements than Radnor. Set back requirements were discussed. He would like to see set back lines reduced when two properties abut each other and they are both institutional. Construction closer to each other would ultimately pull the construction away from the residential zoning districts. The proposed ordinance that is being modified is more restrictive and limits institutional development.

Susan Stern requested that staff provide documentation of growth for institutions if possible.

Changes of the most recent update were discussed. It was suggested that the shade tree commission and the EAC view the proposed verbiage regarding vegetative screenings, etc.

Public comment

Jim Schneller feels an entity owning both sides of the street should not be given too much emphasis. People are used to the institutional feel in Radnor Township and know the risks if they buy adjacent to an institution. Too much has been built against riparian in recent years. Strong emphasis should be on the comfort of the township. Traffic issues will rise with major expansion. On incentives for environmental architecture, he feels that 5% extra for green roof is arbitrary. Vending trucks have been singled out—they would blend in. Language should be included with the necessity of projections on traffic studies. County Line Rd. and Roberts Rd.

should be added to the list of scenic roads. The township growth in 2010 was the lowest in the county. He requests that the verbiage regarding a minor street be expanded to a two-lane street.

Colleen Price has issues with tract, lot parcels. Permitted by-right is the worst thing that can be done. Accessory uses should be contiguous to that use. Heights should be a conditional use. Children of faculty members of the institutions go to Radnor schools for free—that should be changed. Has a concern with green roofs in comparison to building tracts especially if the site is several different properties, not just one large one. She prefers a traffic level of a C over a D. Parking issues need to be defined and accounted for possibly a 20% bump up; she feels this is spot zoning. Conservation easements are nothing more than a shell game.

Christina Perrone questioned the process and requested that public comment be permitted after each topic is discussed. Having public comment at the end can be very confusing.

Philip Ahr feels the meeting was run fair and balanced. He prefers the 125 feet setbacks for streets. Height regulations with respect to arterial roads aren't covered. An unoccupied lot should also be protected. Permitted uses are an issue that needs to be discussed.

Lot vs. tract, height vs. setbacks, principal uses, provide a list of all scenic roads within the PI district, setbacks vs. institution owned land and park land, riparian buffer setbacks, spacing between buildings, screening and buffers, adjacent dwellings on other lots or empty residential or PLU lots and parking need to be discussed.

Susan stern feels the by-right uses list has grown and the zoning districts should be noted, not the property line of the institution. The riparian buffer distant referenced in the original comprehensive plan should be utilized in this ordinance. She feels this process has in fact lengthened the original ordinance and some issues have been disturbed to a questionable point. Accessory vs. principal issues needs to be defined. Categories of different uses in Lower Merion were referenced to compare with current proposed changes. She is concerned with Section 280-68 and would like to see what it originally said compared to what it is now with regard to uses, setbacks and categories. It appears that this section has changed dramatically.

The next meeting will be Thursday, March 7, 2013. The meeting will begin at 7:30 PM. There being no further business, the meeting adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Suzan Jones

Suzan Jones