

Ph. 610-777-8000 374 CIRCLE OF PROGRESS DRIVE POTTSTOWN, PA 19464 <u>www.stackhousebensinger.COM</u>

December 6, 2022

Caernarvon Township Planning Commission c/o Joan Bair, Township Secretary 3307 Main Street
P.O. Box 294
Morgantown, PA 19543-0294

Re: Magnolia Greene Development

Dear Ms. Bair:

Enclosed please find the following information regarding the Green Hills Land, LLC – Magnolia Greene, REVISED Tentative PRD Plan for the proposed PRD Development at 590 Willow Glen Road in Caernarvon Township (Morgantown Airport).

- Eight (8) copies of the Tentative PRD Plans SBI Drawing No. 2022-184-1 of 2 and 2 of 2, dated October 24, 2022, revised December 6, 2022.
- Two (2) half-sized copies of the Tentative PRD Plans SBI Drawing No. 2022-184-C-1.1 through C-1.2, dated October 24, 2022, revised December 6, 2022
- Three (3) copies of the supplemental Twin Valley School District Enrollment Data.
- Three (3) copies of TPD PennDOT Scoping Meeting Notes

The Tentative PRD plan(s) have been revised per the Kraft Engineering review letter dated November 14, 2022 and Berks County Planning Commission review letter, dated November 22, 2022 as follows:

# KRAFT ENGINEERING COMMENTS:

### ZONING ORDINANCE

- The Plan represents a submission of a Planned Residential Development in the IOP Mixed Use Housing Residential Zoning District as permitted by §628.12.
   Response: Statement.
- The Caernarvon Township Planning Commission and the Berks County Planning Commission shall issue a review and recommendation of the Tentative Plan. (§628.4) Response: Reviews from both entities have been received.
- 3. MODIFICATION REQUEST: The first stage and all subsequent stages shall contain at least twenty (20) percent of the dwelling units given tentative approval. Each stage, to the extent possible, shall have the same ratio mix of dwelling unit as approved in the Tentative Plan. (§628.8.b)

Per the request letter, the ratio requested is due to economics and the efficiency of the construction. It should be noted the total of the percentages in the modification request is less than 100% and therefore needs slight modification.

Response: Acknowledged. The correct ratios for residential development are 60% in Stage 1,



21% in Stage 2 and 19% in Stage 3. 100% of the commercial development is proposed for Stage 1, as well.

4. MODIFICATION REQUEST: At least fifty (50) percent of all the dwelling units proposed shall be rented or sold prior to the construction of any commercial development. (§628.8.c)

Per the request letter, the commercial property is proposed for Phase 1 and developed simultaneously with the 58% of dwelling units proposed for the same phase.

Response: Acknowledged. It is our understanding that the Township supports developing the commercial portion of the project as early as possible.

5. MODIFICATION REQUEST: The gross stage residential density may be varied from stage to stage by a maximum of ten (10) percent of the gross residential density as the entire Planned Residential Development as approved. Where it is necessary to allocate Common Open Space to residential densities, the developer shall be required to grant Common Open Space easements or convents to the Municipality, specifying the amount and location of such Common Open Space required to satisfy the density requirements of the plan. (§628.8.d)

Per the request letter, the Applicant is proposing greater than ten (10) percent but does not provide the percentages that are requested for any of the stages. This requirement includes the option of establishing the necessary percentage of Common Open Space with an easement or covenant in order to avoid the need for modification of this section.

Response: As noted above, the Plan proposes 60% of the residential development occur in Phase 1. Constructing all of the townhomes as part of Stage 1 will allow for the most efficient development of that portion of the project. It will allow for a looped roadway. Similarly development of the single family homes along Roads B and E will also allow for efficient development of that portion of the project. Constructing 21% of the residential development in Stage 2 and 19% in Stage 3, clearly are greater than 10% of the gross residential density, but as set out above, staging the project in the manner proposed allows for the most efficient development of the project. The required Common Open Space for each Stage will be provided at each Stage of the development and any required easements or covenants will be provided to ensure that the required Common Open Space is provided.

6. A high-level schedule was submitted in the narrative. As stages progress, the detail of each stage shall be refined and updated accordingly. (§628.8.e)

Response: Acknowledged.

7. MODIFICATION REQUEST: The landscaping for each approved stage must be eighty (80) percent completed before proceeding to the next stage. No more than two (2) stages may be incomplete at any time. (§628.8.f)

Although the Applicant is requesting a modification of this section, the intent also states the street trees will be installed along a street at once the dwellings are complete. It seems the intent complies with the section and modification is unnecessary. Clarification of the request may be necessary.

Response: Acknowledged. The Applicant withdraws his modification request.

8. Completion of improvements, guarantees, and maintenance shall comply with §628.9.

Response: Completion of standard, required agreements will be executed upon final approval and prior to recording.

9. The Plan does not appear to provide a description of the existing use and/or the proposed use although



the mixed-use information is indicative of intent. Please note, the description of the proposed use shall also include the commercial component of the development. (§628.10.a and §401.3.e)

Response: The existing use of the property is as an airport. The proposed use is a mix of residential uses including single family and townhome as well as commercial use. The Layout Plan has been revised to depict six potential commercial uses. A description of existing and proposed uses has been added to the plans.

10. The proposed Common Open Space is disjointed and appears secondary to the layout of the residential units and the layout of the street network. The exception is the walk/bike path, which is proposed within Stage 1. Access to each open space is undefined. Some areas appear accessible to just the few adjacent lots which abut them, e.g. Open Space A, K, O and L. The open space areas are spread throughout the development as opposed to a few larger centralized areas that could be accessed by all residents or accommodate permitted recreational facilities. (§628.10.d)

Response: The Layout Plan has been revised to depict additional access to open space areas. However, most open space areas can be accessed from walking trails or sidewalks that pass through the referenced open space areas. This will be discussed further at the next Planning Commission meeting.

Additionally, there was discussion at the Planning Commission meeting on 11/15/22 regarding the size of the individual Open Spaces with reference to §628.13(c)(1), which requires that each open space be at least 1 ac. Respectfully we assert that Ordinance 313, §598.G, titled Site Requirements, sets out a different set of requirements than are set out in §628.13. Specifically, §598.G does not require a minimum area of one acre for each Open Space area. To the extent that the Township asserts that §628.13(c)(1) applies, we request a modification from that section.

11. The feasibility of the water supply, sanitary sewer disposal and storm water management must be included on the Plan. Service letters from the Caernarvon Township Municipal Sewer Authority and the Caernarvon Township Authority should be provided to demonstrate adequate capacity for water and sewer. The Plan does not demonstrate a preliminary utility layout similar to the water shown. (§628.10.f)

Response: Utility plans and engineered designs for water and sewer will be sent to the Township Authorities for review and comment. Serviceability letters will be forwarded upon receipt.

12. The covenants and easements included in the Declaration of Covenants and Structures shall include access provided to the Township as applicable for such facilities as stormwater and open space. (§628.10.g)

Also, the Pennsylvania Turnpike has revised drawings within the 2022 calendar year and provided those to the Applicant. The PRD Plan indicates design Plans from the Turnpike dated 2015. Clarification is needed as to the proposed layout of Willow Glen Road, the Turnpike design including proposed right-of-way, current coordination and feasibility of the PRD Plan as shown.

Response: Acknowledged. The revised Layout Plan sheets depict proposed revisions to address input from PennDOT and the Township.

13. The Plan does not clearly identify the intent of street parking or dedication of proposed streets. This clarification is necessary to determine certain minimum design requirements. (§628.10.h)

Response: The Applicant proposes to dedicate Roads A and B and proposes parking on one side of Road B. In the event of a snow emergency on street parking will be prohibited and



residents will be permitted to park in the Commercial property pursuant to an easement agreement to be prepared to address such shared parking during snow emergencies. Note that required parking for each lot and townhouse are met on each individual lot within driveways and garages.

14. Any required modifications or waivers of the Municipal Land Use regulations (i.e. Zoning or SALDO) shall be shown on the Plan or submitted in writing, (628.2.b and §628.10.i)

Response: Acknowledged.

15. Common Open Space is shown on the Plan but there are no recreation facilities in accordance with §628.10.m. Sample recreational facilities listed in §598.G.3.a and §598.E.4 are mirrored on the Plan. The Common Open Space does not demonstrate whether any of the suggested recreation facilities could be accommodated by the area afforded. A discussion of what recreation facilities may be appropriate for the area or consistent with the Township's Parks and Recreation planning would be beneficial to both the Applicant and the Township.

Response: The revised Layout Plan depicts proposed recreational facilities in certain Common Open Spaces. The Applicant has had discussion with the Planning Commission and the Recreation Committee and has expressed a willingness to contribute toward improvements on existing Township owned property to allow for increased recreational activity to all Township residents. In the event that the parties cannot come to an agreement for such off-site improvements, the revised Layout Plan depicts the required recreational facilities.

- 16. The Applicant provided a narrative titled "Caernarvon Township Impact Evaluation" in accordance with §628.10.n. This should be identified as Exhibit N to be consistent with the Tentative Plan Submission Narrative. Comments are as follows:
  - A. As required by §302.5 of the SALDO, the Township's Police, Fire and Roads Department may provide written comments relative to their specific interests regarding this narrative and the Plan. The same representatives may attend the Planning Commission to provide comments.

Response: Ackknowledged.

B. The Transportation and Circulation section of the narrative does not indicate whether an active bus program passes through the Township. If one exists, the Plan should demonstrate access is provided to the bus stop.

Response: The Applicant is not aware of any active bus program.

C. Stormwater management areas are identified on the Plan with no anticipated design. An NPDES permit will be required by DEP and the development will be required to comply. As shown, stormwater compliance and impacts are indeterminate.

Response: Acknowledged. An NPDES permit will be obtained and detailed E&S and Stormwater designs will be prepared as part of the Final Plan approval. The Tentative Plan is not the functional equivalent of a preliminary plan, the requirements are more conceptual for a Tentative Plan.

D. The Parks and Recreation narrative states the taxes generated from the PRD development can be allocated to provide recreation facilities to this development. The PRD development should include the recreation facilities as noted in §628.10.m.

Also, the narrative states the open space is to be dedicated. The Township is not required to accept dedication of open space generated by residential developments.

Response: The Open Space is not intended to be dedicated. As noted above, the Applicant



is willing to discuss funding improvements to the Township's nearby recreational facilities, if the Township is interested in having such improvements made.

E. The Education section of the narrative calculates the projected students per housing unit on a national calculation and the number of projected students seems low. The School District or a regional study may have historical data that is more representative of the anticipated impact to the school system.

Response: Supplemental information has been provided to address this comment.

17. All design standards and requirements contained in the Township's Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance and elsewhere in the Zoning Ordinance shall apply, except as may be modified by this section §628.21.

Response: Acknowledged.

18. All structures on the IOP parcel shall demonstrate access. As shown, there is no access to the lot and therefore the lot is non-compliant. (§603)

Response: The revised Layout Plan sheets depict the proposed access to the IOP Parcel and were discussed with PennDOT at a scoping meeting on 11/15/2022.

PennDOT issued comments on September 19, 2022 regarding the Scoping Application for the subject property. Those comments indicated necessary revisions to the access points, as well as restrictions to the access points onto Main Street (S.R. 0023). As shown, the access points of proposed Road A and Road H are not complaint with PennDOT requirements. Furthermore, the Scoping Application is inconsistent with the Tentative Plan specific to the access drive not shown on the Tentative Plan, but indicated to the west of the 4<sup>th</sup> leg of the Crossing Boulevard traffic signal.

Response: The Layout Plan sheets have been revised to addressed this comment. In addition, information submitted by Eric Mountz from Traffic Planning and Design has been submitted since the 11/15/2022 meeting and is incorporated into this submission.

19. The IOP parcel is proposed as a single lot. More than one principal structure and use is proposed (as detailed in the Scoping Application from August 2022) but no details provided regarding any of the uses, buildings, or layout. More than one principal structure is permitted on a single use if yard and other requirements of the Zoning Ordinance are met for each structure as if it were on an individual lot. (§604)

Response: As noted above, the Layout Plan has been revised to depict six typical commercial uses which could be developed as part of the IOP parcel.

20. Access and access points will be subject to the requirements of §608. Again, no access to the parcels is shown, and therefore, the Plan cannot be verified for compliance.

Response: The Layout Plan has been revised to show access and the supplemental information submitted by Mr. Mountz is incorporated into this submission.

21. The loading area and parking requirements associated with the IOP parcel cannot be verified for compliance with §612 and §613 since the parcel provides no geometric layout or improvements for the proposed uses or buildings.

Response: The Layout Plan has been revised to show typical loading and parking requirements for the six proposed uses.



22. Screen plantings shall be maintained permanently, and plant material which does not live shall be replaced within one year. (§609.3)

Response: Acknowledged. Notes will be added to the plans describing responsibility of maintenance and replacement of required plantings.

23. Any portion of the site that is not used for buildings, other structures, loading or parking spaces and aisles, sidewalks, and designated storage areas, shall be planted with an all-season ground cover and shall be landscaped according to the overall plan. (§609.4)

Response: Understood.

24. 25% to 35% of the Common Open Space shall be improved for active recreational facilities. The areas identified as active recreation calculate to 34% of the Open Space in the chart (the chart is the discrepancy noted in the previous comment). The active recreation areas identified include proposed and existing stormwater management facilities and do not appear to qualify as "improved for active recreational facilities." (§598.G.3.a)

Response: The Layout Plan sheets have been revised to depict active recreational facilities within the Common Open Space.

25. The Plan shall demonstrate that no more than 25% of the Common Open Space shall be comprised of stormwater management facilities. A calculation should be provided to demonstrate this requirement is satisfied, as well as the other Common Open Space percentages required. (§598.G.3.c)

Response: Preliminary limits of surface stormwater management facilities have been provided on the plans. These limits include the entire embankment and interior slopes up to the top of berm elevation. The percentage is preliminarily determined to be less than 25% and will be reevaluated at the time of detailed engineering. However, the percentage will be kept below the 25% threshold. It should be noted that underground stormwater management facilities are not included in this calculation since the area above underground facilities can still serve the community as usable open space.

26. All design standards and requirements in the Township SALDO and elsewhere in the Zoning Ordinance shall apply, except as may be modified by Section §589.L.1. B.

Response: Understood with the reference changed to §598.L.1.B.

27. Streets shall have a minimum cartway width of 28 feet and right-of-way (ROW) width of 33 feet for all streets not intended to be dedicated. Roads C, D, E, F, G or Internal Street have a cartway width of 24 feet and a ROW width of 28 feet. The Plans shall clearly specify the intent of each street regarding dedication. (§598.L.1.d)

Response: The plans were revised to specify 28' cartway and 33' ROW widths for all streets not intended to be dedicated.

28. The Home Owners Association(s) (HOAs) shall maintain all private streets within the proposed development pursuant to a Declaration to be reviewed and approved by the Township Solicitor. (§598.L.1.f)

Response: Understood. This will be developed and shared with the Township Solicitor for review and approval.



29. The plan shall note if parking will be permitted on any streets within the proposed development. Additionally, if parking is restricted to one side of the street, then that shall be noted and signage added as required. As shown, no parking will be permitted on Roads C, D, E, F, G or Internal Street I since widths are less than the Township minimum. (§598.L.1.g)

Response: Notes have been added to the plans.

30. An open space management plan shall be submitted with an application for final subdivision and land development is accordance with §598.M.2.

Response: Acknowledged.

31. Consideration should be given to screening common open spaces from the proposed dwelling lots as suggested in §598.N.1.

Response: Acknowledged.

32. Additional screening shall be added to the three (3) properties just east of Road B. Only the rear of these properties proposes landscaping. The eastern property boundary is also lacking the required screening, specifically along the properties identified as Burkholder Ventures, LLC and Jamsky Holdings, LLC. (§598.N.3.b) Additional improvements such as berms or fences may be appropriate at these locations in consideration of the close proximity and the uses. (§598.N.7.b and c)

Response: Acknowledged.

33. The Plan does not include a reference to woodland disturbance and whether replacement plantings will be required in accordance with §598.N.6.a.

Response: There are no woodlands to be disturbed on the property.

34. The total linear footage of new and existing public and private road frontage on both sides is noted as 11,687 feet total. As scaled from the Plan, the total amount of linear foot frontage is closer to 18,000 feet total. The discrepancy could result in an additional 63 trees. Stationing on the Plan could help clarify the distances. (§598.N.6.a)

Response: Centerline stationing has been added to the plans.

35. §598.N.6.a allows for required plantings to be dispersed throughout the tract to meet certain objectives. The positioning of evergreen trees to create a year-round buffer from adjacent properties should be considered when designating specific trees on the Landscape Plan.

Response: Acknowledged. Distribution of evergreen plantings and species will be further developed and indicated on Final Plan.

36. As shown, the Plan does not demonstrate complaint yard, density and other zoning requirements for the potential IOP commercial space in accordance with §628.5.b. The residential areas also require additional verification of the density provided for open space.

Response: The Layout Plan has been revised to depict six typical commercial uses to address this comment.

37. The purpose, location and amount of Common Open Space shall be further determined to meet the Zoning requirements and whether the areas identified are appropriate for the residential development in accordance with §628.5.c.

Response: The Layout plan has been revised to specify the type or purpose of active recreational areas.



38. The Plan must provide a physical design in which it provides adequate control over vehicular traffic in accordance with §628.5.d. As presented, the trip generation evaluation and Plan do not present any control of vehicular traffic. A Traffic Impact Study will be required by SALDO §516 as well as by PennDOT. Anticipated vehicular impacts to the adjacent roadway network have not been evaluated and therefore have not identified the anticipated improvements, or in accordance with this section, adequate controls over vehicular traffic.

Response: The Layout Plan has been revised to show access and the supplemental information submitted by Mr. Mountz is incorporated into this submission. Acknowledged that a Traffic Impact Study will be required. The parties participated in a scoping meeting with PennDOT on 11/15/2022 and the Applicant has a clear understanding of what will be required for the Traffic Impact Study and for the HOPs required by PennDOT. Meeting Notes are included with this resubmission.

39. The Plan provides for Common Open Space, but recreation facilities are not proposed in accordance with §628.5.d.

Response: As noted above, the Layout Plan has been revised to depict types of active recreational facilities as required by the referenced provision.

40. The development proposes modifications to the staging requirements and, therefore, would not be consistent with the terms and conditions required by the Zoning Ordinance intended to protect the interests of the public and residents of the PRD. Unless the requested modifications are approved, compliance with §628.5.f cannot be verified.

Response: Acknowledged.

### SUBDIVISION AND LAND DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE

1. The proposed traffic signal and any stormwater facilities within PennDOT ROW will require Caernarvon Township to be the permittee during the submittal process. The Applicant will be expected to enter into a separate agreement with Caernarvon Township addressing the installation and maintenance of specific facilities associated with the HOP. The Applicant should contact the Township Solicitor for further details pertaining to said agreement.

Response: Acknowledged. Ongoing coordination with PennDOT and Township through the PennDOT permitting process.

2. Land proposed for Subdivision or development shall not be developed or changed by grading, excavating or by the removal or destruction of the natural topsoil, trees or other vegetative cover unless adequate provisions for minimizing Erosion and sediment are provided as per criteria contained in Title 25, Chapter 102, Rules and Regulations, Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Resources, and the requirements of the Caernarvon Township Ordinance. (§501.5)

Response: The project will require NPDES permitting and will be submitted to the Berks County Conservation District for their review and approval.

3. Prior to the Record Plan being endorsed by the Planning Commission and Governing Body, the Applicant shall submit a completed original copy of the Subdivisions and Land Development Improvements Agreement (Appendix G). (§501.7)

Response: Understood. This will be developed between the Developer and Township at Final Plan, prior to release of plans for Recording.



4. All improvements installed shall be constructed in accordance with the design specifications of the Municipality, including promulgated by the Municipal Water or Sewer Authority. (§501.8)

Response: Acknowledged.

5. Supervision of the installation of the required improvements shall in all cases be the responsibility of the Municipality of the appropriate state regulatory agency. (§501.9)

Response: Understood. Coordination with Township and Authorities having jurisdiction to observe, inspect installation of required improvements will occur.

6. Road F, where it surrounds Open Space N, varies in width from 24 feet to 42 feet. The varying width is not permitted by Township standards. (§502.3)

Response: The road width has been revised to provide a constant 28' wide cartway.

7. The proposed roadway network shall comply with §502.5 (Street Grades).

Response: Acknowledged.

8. The deflection of street lines should be provided in accordance with §502.8.a.

Response: Acknowledged.

9. The intersections of Road B and Road H with Main Street (S.R. 23) are separated by approximately 750 feet. Intersections with Major Streets shall be no less than 1,000 feet apart in accordance with §502.10.e.

Response: Roads A and B are proposed to be offered for dedication. All other proposed streets are to remain private. As referenced in the materials from Mr. Mountz. Applicant asserts that given the existing constraints, PennDOT will allow the proposed intersections.

10. The Plan does not include available sight distance lines at intersections in accordance with §502.11. Absent of these items, the Plan does not demonstrate sight distance could be compliant. There is concern with, but not limited to, the location of the dwelling units, street trees/landscaping and driveways in relation to the line of sight.

Response: Sight Distances have been added to the plans.

11. The proposed roadway network shall comply with §502.13 (Street Names).

Response: Acknowledged.

12. WAIVER REQUEST: Sidewalks having a minimum width of four feet (4') shall be installed in accordance with municipal requirements along both sides of existing or proposed streets. (§502.15)

Per the request letter, the Applicant is proposing sidewalk on one side of most streets. Sidewalk is excluded from Road A (west of Road B) and Road

H. In consideration of the request, the Applicant is offering an asphalt walk/bike path. It should be noted that the path extends from the intersection of Highcroft Drive and Willow Glen Road to just beyond the intersection of Road A and Road B, all of which is within Stage 1.

The asphalt walk/bike path is only four feet (4') in width. This width is insufficient in accordance



with typical shared bike/pedestrian facilities per PennDOT guidelines and is not complaint with the Township required concrete sidewalk. The width should be increased to better accommodate the intended use.

Response: The Layout Plan has been revised to address this comment, regarding sidewalk and the shared bike/pedestrian walking trail.

13. The proposed roadway network shall comply with §502.16 (Street Signs).

Response: Acknowledged.

14. Street lights will be required for the proposed residential areas as well as the commercial lots. Agreements and a street lighting tax are expected for the development. (§502.17)

Response: Acknowledged.

15. The proposed roadway network shall comply with Section 502.18 (Driveways). Lot 48 and 68 do not appear to comply with the corner lot offset of 40 feet. It should be noted the offset as shown is only 38 feet.

Response: Acknowledged. (NOTE: WE MAY NEED A WAIVER FOR THIS ITEM)

16. The proposed development shall comply with §503.3 for crosswalks. Detail is not provided for any crosswalk. Compliance with ADA standards is required as well.

Response: The Layout Plan addresses the revisions to the crosswalks referenced in this comment.

17. The Applicant must demonstrate the adequate sanitary sewer improvements and submit to the Caernarvon Township Sewer Authority and received approval for the same as required by §505.

### Response:

18. The Applicant must demonstrate adequate water supply and improvements submit to the Caernarvon Township Authority and received approval for the same as required by §508.

Response: Acknowledged.

19. The Plan shall be submitted to the Fire Chief and the Fire Commissioner for comment. (§509)

Response: Acknowledged.

20. The proposed development shall comply with Section 510 (Storm Drainage).

Response: Acknowledged.

21. The Applicant shall forward a copy of the Plan to the appropriate electric utility company for review. A letter from said utility company verifying the receipt of the Plan must be provided to the Township prior to Final Tentative Plan approval per §511.4(a)(1) and (2).

Response: Acknowledged.

22. All review letters and the subsequent approval from the Berks County Conservation District for the Erosion and Sediment Control Plan and NPDES permit shall be provided to the Township per §512.1. A review by the District has not yet been provided at the time of this review.



Response: Acknowledged.

23. The proposed development shall comply with Section 513 (Monuments).

Response: Acknowledged. (NOTE: WE DISCUSSED A WAIVER ON MONUMENTS)

24. The forthcoming Transportation Impact Study shall be submitted to the Township in order to understand if safe and efficient accesses and circulation can be provided to and from the proposed development. (§516)

Response: Acknowledged.

### STORMWATER ORDINANCE

1. At this time, no stormwater design or layout has been submitted. Therefore, a review of stormwater facilities could not be performed. It should be noted that the Tentative Plan outlines potential locations for stormwater facilities but provides no indication of feasibility.

Response: Acknowledged. E&S and stormwater facilities and NPDES permitting will be prepared as part of the Final Plan submission.

### **TRAFFIC**

 A Traffic Impact Study will be required by SALDO §516 as well as by PennDOT. The study has not been completed and the impacts by the mixed-use overlay traffic, nor the previously permitted IOP traffic, have not been evaluated. Therefore, the Plan provides no indication of feasibility or improvements.

Response: Acknowledged that a Traffic Impact Study will be required. The parties participated in a scoping meeting with PennDOT on 11/15/2022 and the Applicant has a clear understanding of what will be required for the Traffic Impact Study and for the HOPs required by PennDOT.

2. By email dated February 15, 2022 to the Township Solicitor, attorney Charles Haws, Esq. restated Berks Homes willingness to contribute \$70,000.00 to the Township to help the Township address traffic signal coordination along S.R. 23 in the event PennDOT does not require traffic signal coordination along S.R. 23 as part of the HOP process.

Response: Acknowledged.

3. The Township shall be copied on all correspondence with PennDOT. Additionally, the Township requests to be added as an "Additional Engineer" within EPS to access documents. Kraft Engineering, LLC has the following BPID 016063. Please include the following emails: sanderson@kraftengr.com and zruppert@kraftengr.com.

Response: Acknowledged.

- 4. It appears there are typos in the Trip Generation Comparison at the following locations:
  - A. Table 1 weekday PM total trips and Saturday total trips.
  - B. Table 3 PM exiting trips for the proposed use and Saturday total trips for the proposed use.
  - C. Please verify the total internal capture for the potential by-right plan PM peak hour.

Response: The table has been revised in the information provided by Mr. Mountz.



### **GENERAL COMMENTS**

1. The Declaration of Building Restrictions and Covenants, as well as all other details provided in Exhibit G, shall be reviewed by the Township Solicitor.

Response: Acknowledged.

2. There are numerous "mailbox clusters" located in locations where no pedestrian accommodations are provided to/from the mailbox cluster. Furthermore, no vehicular pull offs are provided for the mailbox clusters. If parking is not permitted in the location of the mailbox cluster this could cause safety issues within the proposed development. The Applicant should consider the location of the clusters to be shifted further from proposed intersections.

Response: The Layout Plan has been revised to address the mailbox cluster locations and access.

3. The sidewalk termination at Highcroft Drive does not align with the existing sidewalk network on the North Side of the Highcroft Drive and Willow Glen Road intersections. Additionally, the Plan should specify that all sidewalks, crosswalks and curb ramps will be ADA compliant.

Response: The Layout Plan has been revised to address this comment, specifically to revise the sidewalk, crosswalks and curb ramps.

4. The requested relief narrative denotes that the Applicant intends to develop 58% of the dwelling units in Stage 1, 19% in Stage 2, and 21% in Stage 3. This is 98% of the dwelling units. Please clarify this discrepancy.

Response: As noted above, 60% of the residential and 100% of the commercial development is proposed in Stage 1, 21% of the residential in Stage 2 and 19% in Stage 3.

5. The information provided did not address storm sewer, signage, lighting, or traffic impacts to the adjacent roadway network. These will need to be reviewed prior to final plan approval.

Response: Acknowledged.

6. Please provide the density for each stage of the development on the plan.

### Response:

Stage 1 - 86 Townhomes, 100% of the townhomes, 39% of the total dwelling units.

Stage 1 – 6 Commercial units, 100% of the commercial development.

Stage 1 - 46 Single family, 34% of the single family, 21% of the total dwelling units.

Stage 2 - 47 Single family, 35% of the single family, 21% of the total dwelling units.

Stage 3 – 42 Single family, 31% of the single family, 19% of the total dwelling units.

7. Detailed calculations and supporting documentation are requested to support the statements made in the Caernarvon Township Impact Evaluation.

Response: Supplemental information has been provided in this submission.

8. The linear footage of street shown in the landscape table does not appear to be reflective of the linear feet provided in the county referral. Please clarify the discrepancy.

Response: Acknowledged.



9. The Planning Commission may consider requesting traffic counts after each stage of the development to confirm the trip generation utilized in the forthcoming Transportation Impact Study.

Response: Acknowledged.

10. The Planning Commission may want to discuss the extension of the proposed trail network along Highcroft Drive. Furthermore, the proposed width of the trail shall be denoted on the plan.

Response: Acknowledged.

11. The Applicant will be subject to the installation of fire hydrants and any other improvement necessary for the proposed water line upon review by the Fire Chief and Commissioner as we as the Township Municipal Authority.

Response: Acknowledged.

12. The termination of the asphalt sidewalk along Road F will create a mid-block crossing. The location of the termination along Road F would only be permitted if a mid-block crosswalk is warranted and all required design parameters provided.

Response: The Layout Plan has been revised to address this comment.

13. The Planning Commission may want to consider sidewalk along the property frontage of Main Street (S.R 0023) as well as sidewalk along Road H to Main Street (S.R. 0023).

Response: Acknowledged.

14. Street trees exist within the street right-of-way (ROW) on the side of the street where sidewalk is provided. It may be the preference of the Township to move these trees outside of the ROW for consistency and less conflict with infrastructure.

Response: Acknowledged.

15. The Plan shall include a note in reference to the HOA Agreement, covenants or other document including the appropriate recording information. The note on the Plan regarding maintenance by the HOA should be revised accordingly.

Response: Acknowledged.

### BERKS COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSIONS COMMENTS

- The Berks County Planning Commission recommends that you call ahead for subdivision/land development plan endorsements. Please review the Plan Endorsement Checklist at <a href="http://www.co.berks.pa.us/dept/Planning/Pages/default.aspx">http://www.co.berks.pa.us/dept/Planning/Pages/default.aspx</a> prior to coming to the office. If you have any questions, please contact the office at (610) 478-6300 Response: Understood.
- 2. The township should consider requesting a tentative layout of the proposed commercial space for planning purposes. The BCPC application indicated 8 commercial units, will there be 8 individual lots, 1 building with 8 units, 8 leased buildings, etc.? This is particularly important for determining reservation for vehicular access based on site conditions.

Response:



3. The project will need a PennDOT highway occupancy permit to terminate the Willow Glen Road connection at SR 23.

Response: Acknowledged.

4. The township should ensure that the proper procedure(s) are followed for the vacating of land(s) associated with the elimination of the section of Willow Glen Road within the project site.

Response: Acknowledged.

5. The township should coordinate with the Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission regarding the bridge replacement on SR 23.

Response: Acknowledged.

6. 6.The plan identifies Roads B and H as new access streets on to SR 23, PennDOT HOP's are needed for both access streets prior to final plan approval.

Response: Acknowledged.

7. Due to road size, staff recommends no on-street parking. If on-street parking is prohibited the project should provide for adequate visitor parking.

Response: See previous comment responses.

8. The plan is missing internal traffic controls, staff recommends having the traffic controls added to the plan prior to final approval.

Response: Acknowledged.

9. Will the one mailbox in the townhouse section be adequate for the number of units being proposed?

Response: Mailbox clusters are sized to accommodate the number of proposed units.

10. 10. The plan identifies mailboxes are proposed on the opposite side of the sidewalk, staff recommends having each mailbox placed on the curbed side.

Response: Will review.

11. 11. The plan identifies having a trail ending opposite of the middle of a resident's driveway on (Road F), staff recommends relocating the ending of the trail, to a point with access to the sidewalk system.

Response: Acknowledged.

12. 12.Staff recommends that sidewalks be extended from both the townhouses and single family lots along Road A, if trail is not ADA compliant. Please provide for future connections across Road A to the proposed Commercial parcel.

Response: Acknowledged.

13. The plan notes "Active Recreation", staff recommends identifying what type of recreation will be placed on the plan prior to final approval.

Response: Plans have been revised with notes.



14. If there is a homeowner's association that will be created with the townhouse portion of the subdivision, the Township should review the by-laws and covenants of the proposed association to ensure for the appropriateness and adequacy of all provisions. The Township should make sure that these documents adequately discuss maintenance issues, operational/ management process, long-term capital maintenance, how police coverage will be handled, enforcement of speed limits on private roads, etc.

Response: Acknowledged.

15. The plan should contain complete erosion and sediment control provisions.

Response: Acknowledged.

16. The project site is in the Caernarvon Township Authority's ground water protection area. With any future development on the site, the developer should contact the Caernarvon Township Authority for additional Information.

Response: Acknowledged. Coordination with Township Authorities.

17. According to our assessment information, this property has been enrolled in the Clean & Green Program since 2003. We recommend that the owner contact the Berks County Assessment Office (610) 478-6262 for clarification of the Clean & Green requirements for the proposed subdivision.

Response: Acknowledged. The Assessment Office will be contacted.

18. Erosion and sediment control measures where required under Title 25, Pennsylvania Code, Chapter 102, Rules and Regulations of the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection, shall meet standards and specifications of the Berks County Conservation District. The Berks County Conservation District should approve the erosion and sediment control plan prior to final plan approval.

Response: Acknowledged, a NPDES permit is required.

19. The local fire official(s) and EMS should review the plan relative to fire protection and emergency issues.

Response: Acknowledged.

20. The developer should be sure that applicable Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements are met including trail crossings of streets.

Response: Acknowledged.

21. The township should be satisfied with the proposed stormwater management design prior to plan approval. The proposal should meet applicable regulations of the township's Stormwater Management Ordinance.

Response: Acknowledged.

22. The plan references the PIN (12-digit number). The County will solely use the UPI/PROPID (14-18 digit number) in all internal land record systems and use of any other identifiers will no longer occur. Map PIN numbers and Account numbers will no longer be created or maintained. The County encourages any public or private entity currently using any legacy property identifiers to make efforts to convert any existing documentation to the UPI/PROPID.

Please contact Brad Shirey bshirey@countyofberks.com with any questions/concerns.

Response: Acknowledged.



We plan to attend the next Township Meeting to review and discuss this revised Tentative Plan with the Township.

Sincerely,

Aristides I. Otero Senior Project Manager

cc: Gary McEwen, Berks Homes (via email)

# Twin Valley School District Student Enrollment and Building Capacity Information

Building	Building Capacity	22-23 Enrollment	Unused Capacity	*Average Class Size
Twin Valley High School	1,339	1,022	317	19
Twin Valley Middle School	1,415	915	500	27
Honey Brook Elementary Center	550	296	254	18
Robeson Elementary Center	450	349	101	19
Twin Valley Elementary Center	525	416	109	20
	4,279	2,998	1,281	21

<sup>\*</sup>Average class size was calculated on actual classrooms and teachers. Excluded from the calculation were professional support personnel, including but not limited to: Learning Support Teachers, Guidance Counselors, Librarians, Reading Specialists, Reading Support Teachers, Behavioral Support Teachers, Speech Pathologists, and Psychologists.

- The district has availability for an additional 1,311 students K-12
- District school buildings are underutilized by over 30% (30.6%)
- Declining enrollment impacts extra-curricular participation rates and the ability to be competitive in athletics, band competitions, clubs (FFA, TSA, etc.)
- Elective courses and Advanced Placement course offerings may be eliminated without sufficient class sizes

***************************************		HONEY	BROOK	ONEY BROOK ELEMENTARY CENTER	TARY CE	NTER					
			2022-203	2022-2023 ENROLLMENT	MENT						
TEACHER	GRADE	Sep. 2	Oct. 3	Nov. 3	Dec. 3	Jan. 3	Feb. 3	Mar. 3	Apr. 3	May 3	Last Day
Armpriester	All-day	4	13	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bonds	All-day	15	15	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Goldberg	All-day	15	4-	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kretchmer	***	17	20	21	0	0	0	0,	0	0	0
Lerch	*	19	19	19	0	0	0	0	O	Ö	0
Lewis	~	19	19	20	0	0	0	0	0	Ö	0
Cola	2	24	24	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Jamison	2	24	23	23	0	0	0	O	0	0	0
Meyer	2	22	22	22	0	0	0	0	C	0	0
Hughes	ຕົ	20	21	21	0	0	0	0	O	Ö	0
Proska	m	20	21	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Witman	ю	20	20	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Huntsinger	4	20	20	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Moyer	4	20	21	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sutu	4	21	21	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
		0	0	0.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL		290	293	296	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

		1									
			2022-202	2022-2023 ENROLLMENT	MENT						
TEACHER	GRADE	Sep. 2	Oct. 3	Nov. 3	Dec. 3	Jan. 3	Feb. 3	Mar. 3	Apr. 3	May 2	Last Day
Burrows	All-day	21	21	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Davis	All-day.	21	21	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Knapp	All-day	22	22	22	0	0	0,	0	0	0	0
Anderson	~	19	19	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hubert	<b>\</b>	19	19	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kline	~	18	₩	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Passerini	<b>T</b>	19	19	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Balash	2	22	22	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Fronina	7	22	21	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Herbine	73	23	23	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Eisenhard	ຕ	24	24	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Koch	ື ຕ	24	24	24	0		0	0	0	Ö	0
Russell	က	23	23	23	0	0	Ö	0	0	0	0
Brennan	4	19	19	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Burns	4	18	18	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Deren	4	19	19	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Smith	4	18	18	8	0	0.	0	0	0	0	0
	Life Skills	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Whitelev	Life Skills!	6	<u></u> ه	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	
14101		351	350	349	0	0 0	0	0	0	0	0

		V NIWT	ALLEY E	WIN VALLEY ELEMENTARY CENTER	ARY CE	NTER						
			2022-202	2022-2023 ENROLLMENT	MENT							
TEACHER	GRADE	Sep. 2	Oct. 3	Nov. 3	Dec. 3	Jan,	က	Feb. 3	Mar. 3	Apr. 3	May 2	Last Day
Acinapura	All-day	23	22	22			0	0	0	0	0	0
Hacker	All-day	21	21	22		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Havens	All-day	22	22	20		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
DeWolf (Schneck)	All-day	20	20	20		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Burns	_	23	23	23		. 0	٥	0	0	0	0	0
Cresswell	~	23	23	24		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Gruin	τ.	24	24	24		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
King	<b>~</b>	23	23	23		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Abbadusky	23	19	20	20		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Chirlin	2	18	20	20			Ö	0	0	0	0	0
McCaughan	2	21	20	20		0	0	0,	0	0	0	0
Weaver	8	20	20	20		0	0	o`	0	0	0	0
Lonsdale	ຕ	24	23	23		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Rotoloni	ຕ໌	24	24	24		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Thees	æ	23	23	23		0	0	0	0	o`	0	0
Troffo	ဂ	24	23	22		0	0	0	Ö	0	0	0
Burger	4	21	20	19		0	0	0	ō	0	0	0
Cola	4	21	21	21		0	0	0	o	0	0	0
Sanger	4	20	20	20		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cumens - EST		7	O	9			* Name				Ja 1 10	
TOTAL		414	418	416		0	0	0	0	0	0	0

		IWT	N VALLE 2022-202	TWIN VALLEY MIDDLE SCHOOL 2022-2023 ENROLLMENT	IOOL						unionimini de la contractiva del la contractiva del la contractiva de la contractiva de la contractiva del
TEACHER	GRADE	Sep. 2	Oct. 3	Nov. 3 Dec. 3		Jan. 3	Feb. 3	Mar. 3 Apr. 3	Apr. 3	May 2	Last Day
	Ď.	222	223	225	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	9	217	217	215		0	0	0	0	0	0
,	7	223	227	225	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	<b>©</b>	256	254	250	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	æ	918	921	915	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

			Ā	/IN VALL 2022-202	N VALLEY HIGH SCHO 2022-2023 ENROLLMENT	TWIN VALLEY HIGH SCHOOL 2022-2023 ENROLLMENT						
reacher		GRADE	Sep. 2	Oct. 4	Nov. 3	Dec. 3	Jan. 4	Feb. 3	Mar. 3	Apr. 3	May 2 Last Day	ast Day
		O	242	240	239	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
		9	283	284	281	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
		7	249	245	243	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	(e	12	260	260	259	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
rotal			1034	1029	1022	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

\*the significant drop in 12th gr. is result of inactivating the early grads

				DISTRICT								
			2022-203	2022-2023 ENROLLMENT	MENT							
TEACHER	GRADE	Sept. 3	Oct. 3	Nov. 3	Dec. 3	Jan. 4	Feb. 1	Mar. 3	Apr. 3	May 2	Last Day	
	All-day Kdg	194	191	190	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
v 1	_	223	226	229	0	0	0	0	0	Ō	****	
	8	215	215	214	0	0	0	0	0	0	_	0
	R	226	226	225	0	0	0	ō	0	0		0
	4	197	197	197	0	0	0	0	0	0		ò
	2	222	223	225	0	0	0	0	0	0	_ ^	0
	ဖ	217	217	215	0	0	<b>O</b> .	0	0	0		0-
TOTAL ELEMENTARY	RY	1494	1495	1495	0	0	0	0	0	0		_
	7	223	227	225	0	0	0	0,	0	0		0
	8	256	254	250	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
	O.	242	240	239	0	0	0	0	0	0	<u>.</u>	
	0	283	284	281	0	0	0	0	0	0	,	0
		249	245	243	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
	12	260	260	259	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
TOTAL SECONDARY	<b>&gt;</b>	1513	1510	1497	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
				******								
TOTAL DISTRICT		3007	3005	2992	0	0	0	0	0	0		0



WWW.TRAFFICPD.COM

### MEETING SUMMARY

Project:

Magnolia Greene (aka Morgantown Airport Redevelopment)

Caernarvon Township, Berks County, PA

Date:

Tuesday, November 15, 2022 (1:00 PM)

Subject:

Transportation Impact Study (TIS) Scoping Application Meeting

Place:

Virtual Meeting

Attendees:

Melissa Maupin, PennDOT 5-0

Brian Boyer, PennDOT 5-0

Kristen Kostick, Pennoni (Consultant Reviewer for PennDOT 5-0)

Scott Anderson, Kraft Engineering (Township Engineer)

Zakary Ruppert, Kraft Engineering Gary McEwen, Berks Homes

dary McEweri, berks Homes

Justin Moceri, Wilkinson & Associates

Eric Mountz, Traffic Planning and Design, Inc. (TPD)

Jason Zheng, TPD

TPD Job #:

BEHO.00007

Preparers:

Jason Zheng & Eric Mountz

### MEETING MATERIALS

- 1. TPD submitted the TIS Scoping Application on August 2, 2022. The application included three (3) attachments: (1) Location Map and Radius Maps (1-mile, 2-mile, and 5-mile); (2) Site Plan; and (3) Trip Generation Calculations.
- 2. Kraft Engineering (Township Engineer) provided comments regarding the TIS Scoping Application via e-mail on September 15, 2022. A copy of the comments is attached.
- 3. PennDOT provided comments regarding the TIS Scoping Application via email on September 19, 2022. A copy of the comments is attached.

### PROJECT OVERVIEW

- 4. Eric Mountz provided the following project overview:
  - a. The project site is located on the northern side of Main Street (SR 0023), just east of Willow Glen Road, on the site of the Morgantown Airport.

- b. In March 2022, the Caernarvon Township Board of Supervisors approved a zoning change that established an overlay district within the Industrial Office Park (I-O-P) zoning that allows residential development on a portion of the project site.
- c. Based on the submitted the TIS Scoping Application, the residential portion of the site was assumed to consist of 135 single-family dwellings and 86 townhomes. Additionally, although not depicted on the Conceptual Site Plan included with the application, the I-O-P Parcel was assumed to consist of a 6,900 s.f. automobile parts store; a 20,000 s.f. tractor supply store; two (2) 7,500 s.f. high turnover sit down restaurants; a 10,000 s.f. general office building.
- d. Access to the project site is proposed via three (3) driveway locations as follows: one (1) full-movement driveway to Main Street (SR 0023) that will form the 4th leg of the signalized intersection with Crossings Boulevard; one (1) left-in/right-out driveway to Main Street (SR 0023) to the east of the signalized intersection; and one (1) left-in/right-out driveway to Main Street (SR 0023) to the west of the signalized intersection (for the I-O-P Parcel).
- e. In conjunction with proposed development, Willow Glen Road will be vacated at its existing intersection with Main Street (SR 0023) and will be relocated through the proposed development to provide access to the signalized intersection of Main Street (SR 0023)/Crossing Boulevard. A connection will also be provided to Hunter's Hill Road toward the rear of the property.
- f. With respect to the proposed relocation of Willow Glen Road, coordination is ongoing with the engineers for the Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission for the portion of their programmed project that will reconstruct and widen the mainline of the Turnpike from Milepost 298-302.

### DISCUSSIONS REGARDING PENNDOT TIS SCOPING APPLICATION COMMENTS

- 5. The meeting attendees discussed the proposed access configuration, as follows:
  - a. Brian Boyer discussed PennDOT concerns regarding restricted driveway designs with channelization islands not effectively restricting non-permitted left-turn movements. Therefore, he recommended that the proposed driveway to Main Street (SR 0023) to the east of the signalized intersection be revised to assume full-movement access; and he recommended eliminating the proposed driveway to Main Street (SR 0023) to the west of the signalized intersection. However, he noted PennDOT would consider one additional restricted access driveway for the commercial properties.
  - b. Eric Mountz expressed the applicant's desire to provide access to Main Street (SR 0023) to the west of the signalized intersection due to the proposed commercial uses and need for convenient access. He questioned if the Department would consider some form of restricted access. Brian Boyer indicated the Department would be comfortable with an enter-only driveway since a center left-turn lane exists along Main Street (SR 0023).
  - c. Brian Boyer stated that a revised site plan should be provided showing the general layout of the buildings and the internal circulation for the commercial portion of the development (i.e. I-O-P Parcel) to review potential vehicular conflicts between site circulation and any additional proposed access driveways. Eric Mountz and Gary McEwen replied that general building sizes can be shown, but the precise site layout for the commercial uses have not yet been determined since end users have not yet been identified. Gary McEwen noted that an additional connection to the commercial uses will likely be provided to the rear along the relocated Willow Glen Road. He also noted the enter-only driveway from Main Street (SR 0023) would not have a direct connection to the relocated Willow Glen Road to discourage cut-through traffic.
  - d. Brian Boyer noted that based on the site plan included with the TIS Scoping Application, the first internal driveway along the signalized site access must be located at least 150 feet from the proposed stop bar approaching the signal. Eric Mountz responded that the proposed driveway throat length is

- approximately 300 feet long and the first internal driveway is shown at approximately 150 feet from the signal. Brian Boyer sought clarification on the configuration of the first internal driveway, and noted that the results of the traffic study will dictate whether if it is full-movement or restricted access, and if separate turn lanes are required.
- e. Brian Boyer indicated that right-turn lanes must be provided for the Main Street (SR 00233) approach to each of the proposed site driveways. Eric Mountz sought clarification on whether a right-turn lane will be required if it is not warranted. Brian Boyer replied that PennDOT will require right-turn lanes regardless of the warrant results.
- f. Eric Mountz discussed the driveway to Main Street (SR 0023) that will form the 4th leg of the signalized intersection with Crossings Boulevard and suggested providing a shared left/thru lane and a separate right-turn lane were anticipated for the exiting approach to avoid impacts/modifications to Crossings Boulevard. Brian Boyer responded that similar to other development projects in the area, the department will require separate left-turn lanes for the proposed site driveway and Crossings Boulevard approaches.
- g. Meeting attendees discussed the potential impacts/modifications to Crossing Boulevard associated with providing separate left-turn lanes for the proposed site driveway and Crossings Boulevard approaches to the signalized intersection with Main Street (SR 00203). Brian Boyer, Kristen Kostick, and Melissa Maupin discussed other recent development projects in the District, and they noted the Department will consider removal of the existing driveway median, removal of the dual ingress lanes, and/or reduction in size of the islands for the Crossings Boulevard approach to accommodate the separate left-turn lanes. They noted their main concern is providing the separate left-turn lanes and proper alignment for the proposed site driveway and Crossings Boulevard approaches.
- 6. The meeting attendees discussed the trip generation, as follows:
  - a. Brian Boyer noted that PennDOT will accept a 10% internal capture reduction for time periods with no available internal capture data (e.g. Saturday midday or daily). Eric Mountz responded that the TIS Scoping Application will be revised accordingly.
- 7. The meeting attendees discussed the study area intersections, as follows:
  - a. Meeting attendees agreed on the study area intersections as presented in the TIS Scoping Application. Eric Mountz sought clarification from Kraft Engineering regarding their request to include the intersection of Oxford Drive and Hunters Hill Road. Zakary Ruppert responded that the requested the intersection should be included in volume development figures to show the anticipated traffic diversions from the relocation of Willow Glen Road. He noted that traffic counts and capacity analysis are not required.
- 8. The meeting attendees discussed nearby planned developments, as follows:
  - a. Scott Anderson noted three (3) nearby planned developments:
    - Morgantown Crossing Outparcels two proposed fast-food restaurants (Wendy's and Popeye's) totaling approximately 4,978 s.f. within the existing Shopping Center located on the southwest corner of Main Street (SR 0023) and Heritage Drive.
    - » Kim Dental a proposed 5,100 s.f. medical office building and 5,536 s.f. dental office building located south of the existing Starbucks along Heritage Drive.
    - » Kidjoy Heritage Drive a proposed 22,923 s.f. testing lab located along the horizontal curve of Heritage Drive.
  - b. Eric Mountz sought clarification on the status of the nearby developments. Scott Anderson responded that the dental office building is in operation and the Kidjoy testing lab is constructed but not yet occupied. Meeting attendees agreed that traffic counts will already include the dental office trips since

it is in operation. Eric Mountz replied that he will coordinate with the Township Engineer to obtain trip generation information for the remaining nearby developments, as necessary.

### 9. Additional discussions:

- a. Eric Mountz noted that many of the signalized study area intersections along the Main Street (SR 0023) corridor have not had equipment upgrades or timing optimization in a number of years. Gary McEwen noted the applicant made a commitment to Caernarvon Township in conjunction with the zoning approval to provide a financial contribution for traffic signal upgrades. Brian Boyer requested that left-turn advance phase warrants are evaluated as part of the TIS for the eastbound Main Street (SR 0023) approach to the signalized site driveway, and noted that if advance phasing is warranted, Flashing Yellow Arrows should be installed.
- b. Eric Mountz stated meeting minutes would be prepared and provided for review, and that the TIS Scoping Application will be revised based on the discussions during the meeting and resubmitted for review/approval.

These comments reflect our understanding of the issues discussed at the meeting. If any attendee does not agree with these minutes or would like to add to them, please respond within five (5) working days of the transmittal date. Otherwise, this summary will be considered final as written.

Distribution:

Meeting Attendees

Caernarvon Township

Attachments:

PennDOT Comments

Caernarvon Township Comments

From:

ePermitting Help <penndotepermittinghelp@pa.gov>

Sent:

Monday, September 19, 2022 9:35 AM

To:

gmcewen@berkshomes.com; Mountz, Eric; Zheng, Jason; mmaupin@pa.gov; bklingel@pa.gov; mshankweil@pa.gov; mhaddad@pa.gov; hcero@pa.gov;

EArmitage@Pennoni.com; KKostick@Pennoni.com;

jdimmerling@dimmerlingconsulting.com; BRIBOYER@pa.gov;

Planning@countyofberks.com; jbair@caernarvon.org;

sanderson@kraftengr.com

Cc:

RA-PDEPSPROD@pa.gov

Subject:

:: Scoping Meeting Application - Returned - Application Number is :

50520220069

(Sent on: 09/19/2022 09:34:44 AM)

**CAUTION:** External email - do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

PennDOT has completed its review of the TIS Determination and Scoping Meeting Application.

Please address the following comments below, and resubmit the application to PennDOT for review.

### PennDOT Review Comments:

- 1. Please do not reply all to this review. If you have any questions regarding these comments your review team is: Melissa Maupin <a href="maupin@pa.gov">mmaupin@pa.gov</a>; Earl Armitage <a href="mailto:EArmitage@Pennoni.com">EArmitage@Pennoni.com</a>; Kristen Kostick KKostick@Pennoni.com.
- 2. For time periods with no available internal capture data, e.g., Saturday midday or daily, the Department will accept a 10% internal capture reduction. Alternatively, the analyst must collect additional data in accordance with ITE Trip Generation Handbook, 3rd Edition, Section 6.7, to determine a different internal capture rate.
- 3. Provide an updated site plan depicting all proposed uses and internal circulation. The first internal driveway along the main access must be located at least 150 feet from the signal to ensure smooth driveway ingress and egress, so the first driveway conceptually depicted on the plan serving the IOP parcel must be relocated.
- 4. Include left turn advance phase warrant calculations for eastbound SR 23 at the signal. If an advance phase is warranted, Flashing Yellow Arrows should be installed for both SR 23 approaches.
- 5. Due to the connection to the existing development via Hunter Hill Road, the proposed access will be considered a local road rather than a driveway. Be sure to account for redistribution of existing traffic to the proposed signalized access given the interconnection.
- 6. In accordance with the Department's access management principles, the proposed left-in/right-in/right-out driveway for the I-O-P Parcel west of the main signalized access must be eliminated, and access to the retail/office portion of the site must be obtained via the proposed fourth leg of the signalized intersection of SR 23 and Crossings Boulevard.
- 7. Revise the proposed left-in/right-in/right-out residential access east of the signalized intersection to be full access due to the inability to physically restrict left turns out.
- 8. A more detailed site plan and access concept must be provided in order for the Department to provide more specific comments. The site access will be discussed further at the scoping meeting.
- 9. Separate left and through lanes will be required on the proposed driveway approach to the signal. Therefore, the Crossings Boulevard approach must also be revised to provide separate left and through lanes so the opposing lanes align.
- 10. Right turn lanes will be required along westbound SR 23 at the proposed driveways.

11. Provide Township comments on the scoping submission. Identify any planned developments that should be included in background traffic.

Click here to access the Scoping Application

PENNDOT EPERMIT - PLEASE DO NOT REPLY TO THIS EMAIL



September 15, 2022

Eric Mountz, P.E., PTOE Traffic, Planning and Design, Inc. 4000 Crums Mill Road, Suite 102 Harrisburg, PA 17112

Re:

Morgantown Airport Redevelopment

TIS Scoping Meeting Application

Received: August 9, 2022

KE File - Z206

### Dear Eric:

We have reviewed the Transportation Impact Study (TIS) Scoping Meeting Application for the Morgantown Airport Redevelopment. The proposed development consists of 135 single-family dwellings, 86 Townhomes, a 6,900 square foot automobile parts store, a 20,000 square foot tractor supply store, two 7,500 square foot high turnover sit down restaurants, and 10,000 square feet of general office space.

## Traffic Scoping Comments

1. The following nearby developments should be included in the Transportation Impact Study:

a. Morgantown Crossing Outparcels – two proposed fast-food restaurants (Wendy's and Popeye's) totaling approximately 4,978 square feet within the existing Morgantown Crossings Shopping Center located on the southwest

corner of Main Street (S.R. 0023) and Heritage Drive.

b. Kim Dental – The development includes a 5,100 square foot proposed medical office building, a 5,536 square foot proposed dental office building, and a 5,036 square foot proposed office building located just south of the existing Starbucks along Heritage Drive. Additionally, access to the site will be via the existing Starbucks access along Heritage Drive.

c. Kidjoy Heritage Drive - The development includes a 22,923 square foot

testing lab located along the horizontal curve of Heritage Drive.

2. The proposed intersection of Oxford Drive and Hunters Hill Road should be included in the study area.

This review letter presented herein should be considered preliminary. Caernarvon Township has not received an official Land Development Plan for this property. Therefore, Caernarvon Township and Kraft Engineering reserve the right to retract the above comments and/or provide additional comments at such time a Plan is received. If you have any questions about this review, please contact me.

Sincerely,

SCOTT C. ANDERSON Senior Project Engineer

cc: Board of Supervisors, c/o Joan Bair (via email) Eric Brown, Esquire (via email)



