

September 29, 2021

Mr. Jon Altshul, Township Manager
Westtown Township
1039 Wilmington Pike
West Chester, PA 19382

**RE: Stokes Estate
Conditional Use Review
WTT-21-228**

Dear Mr. Altshul:

This letter is in response to the September 17, 2021 Cedarville Engineering Group, LLC (CEG) review of the above referenced Plans by D.L. Howell and Associates, Inc.

Listed below are our responses to the concerns identified in their review of the plans. Also, enclosed for your review are copies of the updated plans. Where applicable, D. L. Howell & Associates, Inc. has addressed each of these comments indicating what action has been taken to resolve the issues. **Any comments that are statements and do not require any action have been omitted in the list of responses.**

Zoning Comments

1. Section 170-402.D.(3)(f) applies to existing natural resources, therefore it has been applied only to the overall lot. It does not apply to the post construction subdivision or the proposed individual lots. Calculations are now provided on the cover sheet showing that the amount of precautionary slopes do not exceed 25% of the overall lot area. There are 486,376 SF of Precautionary Steep Slopes, which is less than 25% of the Gross Tract Area (2,829,474 SF x 25% = 707,368).
2. Acknowledged. No revision necessary.
3. The soils, including any agriculturally suited soils, are shown on both the **Existing Resources Plan** and **Grading Feasibility Plan**. The soils listing on these plans now note any soils that are agriculturally suited. Please note that single family residential development is a use permitted in this zoning district and on this property, and it is not possible to develop this use on this property without placing structures and paving within areas of agriculturally suited soils. Single family home lots are allowed by zoning and are not considered an agriculture use.
4. A. Typical footprints and elevations are included in this resubmission.

- B. The open space plan tabulation has been updated accordingly. Please note, bonus area B5 has been updated to provide a contiguous area of at least 0.5 acres.
- C. Please note, infiltration testing locations are shown on the plan in addition to tested elevations and any limiting zone elevations, and drainage area plans now also provide the Time of Concentration linework and area labels to match the Preliminary Stormwater Report. Basins have been adjusted as needed to allow for underground stone trenches that maintain the necessary 2' foot vertical separation between the bottom and any limiting zone. However, as previously stated, pursuant to Section § 170-2009B(3)(d), a Conditional Use application shall include sufficient information, e.g., preliminary site grading and road profiles, preliminary stormwater management analysis, etc., to preliminarily determine compliance with the Township natural feature, site analysis, conservation design process and density requirements. Detailed grading plans, stormwater calculations, profiles and similar engineering details are not required to be submitted until a preliminary or final plan application is made under Chap. 149, Subdivision and Land Development. The items requested under Comment 4.C. are beyond the scope of the Conditional Use Application requirements and will be provided during Subdivision and Land development. We've provided more than enough preliminary stormwater calculations to show compliance for Conditional Use.
- D.
- II. No response necessary.
- V. Sight distance calculations for vertical curves are provided on the profile sheets. All crest and sag curves are confirmed to meet the requirement provided within the ordinance and noted in AFC's review.
- VI. Sight triangles have been added as required and landscaping adjusted as necessary.
- E. The proposed lighting has been increased as noted, in addition to revising the notes as suggested in the review comment.
- F. No response necessary.
- G. The proposed stormwater infiltration basins will provide for subsurface stone trenches to infiltrate runoff, and also utilize open storage accessory to the infiltration facility. Per the Ordinance Section 170-907.A(5)(e), open storage and settling ponds may be included as part of the base open space where accessory to the subsurface infiltration.
- H. The open space plan has been updated accordingly. See response to #4.B.
- J. Acknowledged. No revision necessary.
- 13.
- Lots 68 and 69 are proposed to utilize the existing access easement which is shown on the plan. The additional easements needed for Lot 68 to cross through Lot 69 is also shown. These proposed easements will be further detailed during land development.
 - Acknowledged. No revision necessary.

Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance

14. This comment is not applicable to Conditional Use. Also, it is our opinion that since the definition of Lot area states, "For purposes of compliance with minimum lot area requirements, the following shall

be excluded: C. Any area within a permanent drainage easement", this would not be applicable to this subdivision since there are no minimum lot area requirements for single family detached dwellings required under the Flexible Development Procedure.

I trust that all comments have been addressed adequately. Please do not hesitate to contact me at 610-918-9002 with any questions.

Sincerely,
D.L. HOWELL & ASSOCIATES, INC.



Denny L. Howell, PE
President



David W. Gibbons, PE
Senior Engineer

September 29, 2021

Mr. Jon Altshul, Township Manager
Westtown Township
1039 Wilmington Pike
West Chester, PA 19382

**RE: Stokes Estate
Conditional Use Traffic Review
Westtown Township, Chester County**

Dear Mr. Altshul:

This letter is in response to the September 16, 2021 Albert Frederico Consulting, LLC (AFC) review of the above referenced conditional use application.

Listed below are our responses to the concerns identified in their review of the conditional use application. Also, enclosed for your review are copies of the updated plans. Where applicable, D. L. Howell & Associates, Inc. has addressed each of these comments indicating what action has been taken to resolve the issues. **Any comments that are statements and do not require any action have been omitted in the list of responses.**

1. a. i.
 - 1) The source of the survey, which was field run topography provided by Howell Kline surveying, is now noted on the site distance exhibits.
 - 2) The stationing is consistent between the plan and profile. In order to make it clearer, stationing is also now provided along the sight line of the existing driver to match with that profile exhibit. For the Road A and Shiloh Road sight distance analysis, two separate alignments with different stationing are required. One based on the centerline of Shiloh Road, and the other follows the actual sight line measured 10 feet back from the edge of paving. Both sets of stationing are now provided on the exhibit.
 - 3) The table has been updated to include the PennDOT desirable sight distance values found in PennDOT Chapter 441, Section 8.(h)(1). However, the PennDOT desirable sight distance values are provided for informational purposes only, and do not reflect a requirement per the Township's SALDO. Per Easttown Township SALDO Section 149-908.C. "Stopping sight distance at all intersections shall be in accordance with PennDOT standards." The "Required SSSD" noted on the table is the PennDOT Safe Stopping Sight Distance from PennDOT Chapter 441.8.(h) and is reflective of the SALDO requirement.

The project's access points are situated at locations within the property frontage (Shiloh Road) or Township ROW (Little Shiloh Road) to maximize sight distance along the respective roadway.

- 4) We believe AFC is referring to the existing grade along the frontage of 67-2-7, however this is not an obstruction, as he refers, as the sight line, measured 10 feet back from the existing travel lane, can see above the grade.
- ii. The plans have been updated to show the improvement of the Vanscovich Driveway to Shiloh Hill Drive (extended) and the necessary spot elevations and slope to show compliance with the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, ie. the grade within 20' of the curblin shall not exceed 4% and the remainder is less than 15%.
- iii. Section 170-1513E is not applicable as this driveway is not being converted from serving a residential use to serving a principal non-residential use. However, similar to the Vanscovich driveway, spot elevations and slope have been added verifying compliance.
- b. ii. The applicant is willing to further discuss trail connections. The open space plan now notes two potential future trail connections with other adjacent future trails proposed as part of the comprehensive plan.
- c. v. Acknowledged. No plan revision necessary.
- vi. The vertical curves have been revised to meet the required sight distance with a K value for sag curves of 0.37 or greater. Calculations for sight distance are provided on the profile sheets.
- vii. This does not apply to through streets. It is standard engineering practice to provide a leveling area when the vehicle will be coming to a stop.
- viii. Pursuant to the definition of Block in the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, the lots between Road B and C do not form a block as they are not entirely bounded by streets, therefore this ordinance section is not applicable.
Block -A tract of land bounded entirely by streets; by streets and a watercourse; by streets and a railroad; by streets and the corporate boundaries of the Township; or by streets and public land, or any combination of the above.
- x. The sidewalk has been revised to run on the western side of Road C, therefore allowing the crossing to be made across Road A where the cross slope requirement can be met.
- xi. The centerline has been updated to be a maximum of 7 percent (%).
- xii. The grade has been reduced to 7% maximum as noted in xi. above. Our office believes this alignment and grade to be safe considering the speed at which vehicles will be traveling through the community.
- xiii. As stated in viii. above, this area noted in the comment is not a "block" as defined by the ordinance and is therefore not applicable.
- xiv. This section of the ordinance does not apply to Lots 14, 15, 47 and 50 as they are located along a through street on the opposite side of the intersecting road or along an "eyebrow" bump out which our office wouldn't consider an intersection. The intent of this section, which references being measured from the point of intersection of the

nearest right of way lines, is to avoid having a driveway exit too close to a stopped vehicle.

- xv. The required minimum safe sight stopping distance of 182' for the driver exiting Lot 68's driveway has been added to the plan and confirmed it does not encroach into the building envelope of Lot 67.
- 2. a. Revised exhibits are attached which shows the sight distance profile of Shiloh Hill Drive at Little Shiloh Road. Note, this is not an access point, but a current Township intersection used by Township residents on a daily basis.
- b. It is recommended the Developer contribute monies toward an escrow fund for future traffic signal retiming.
- c. i. As noted by the reviewer this comment will be addressed during land development.
- 3. No response necessary

I trust that all comments have been addressed adequately. Please do not hesitate to contact me at 610-918-9002 with any questions.

Sincerely,
D.L. HOWELL & ASSOCIATES, INC.



Denny L. Howell, PE
President



David W. Gibbons, PE
Senior Engineer