

# McCloskey & Faber, P.C.

## Landscape Architecture • Land Planning

831 DeKalb Pike, Blue Bell, PA 19422-1271

(610)-277-9200 FAX (610) 277-9203

EMAIL: Staff@McFPC.com

# MEMO

**Date:** November 6, 2015

**To:** E. Van Rieker, AICP

**From:** Kimberli J. Flanders, RLA, LEED Green Associate

**Reference:** General Landscape and Lighting Review for Centre Square Commons  
DeKalb Pike & Skippack Pike, Whitpain Township, PA

**Project No.:** 1226

Land Development Plan Submission includes thirty-six sheets:

Maser Consulting, P.A.- Sheets 1 to 26 of 36, dated 10/9/15

Aqua Mist Irrigation - Sheets 27 - 34 of 36, dated 9/29/15

Maser Consulting, P.A. - Sheets 35 and 36 of 36, dated 10/12/15, plus:

Hardscape Plans for Centre Square Commons, 13 sheets, prepared by Bernardon, dated 10/14/15

This is a follow up to the review issued September 2, 2015. We did not make a quantitative review of plant material. Numbered items from the previous review not included herein have been satisfactorily addressed. Current responses are included below in **bold**.

### Landscaping Review Comments:

- 1) We recommend that tree clearing limits as indicated on the Landscape Plan be included on the Grading and Drainage PCSM Plan, and the Erosion Control plans, so the appropriate contractor is aware of the limits. (General comment)
- 2) A Tree Protection Fence installation detail has been provided and Tree Protection Fence is indicated in the Erosion Control Legend. However, the limits of Tree Protection Fence does not appear to be indicated in plan view. We recommend that Tree Protection Fence limits are indicated in plan view. In addition, for further clarification, we recommend that the linetype for Tree Protection Fence, which is similar to the linetype for Existing Contours, is revised to be more contrasting. (General comment)

**Tree Protection Fence limits and tree clearing limits have been indicated in plan view on the Erosion Control and Grading plans. The Tree Protection Fence installation detail on Sheet 18 of 36 indicates that the fencing is to be installed at the dripline of the tree canopy. Location of fencing is to be adjusted in plan view accordingly. (General comment)**

- 9) We offer the following comments relative to Zoning Code Section 160-108, which is referenced within the Community Shopping Center Development requirements of Section 160-261.
  - b) The proposed grading is to be reviewed and adjusted in order to meet the minimum requirements of Section 160-108. E., which states, "*All landscaping planting areas shall be raised in order to prevent road salts*

# McCloskey & Faber, P.C.

Centre Square Commons  
DeKalb Pike and Skippack Pike  
Landscape and Lighting Review  
November 6, 2015  
Page 2

*from seeping into the planting area."* **Plan submission does not appear to address this comment.**

10) We offer the following comments relative to the "Centre Square Commons - Preliminary Land Development Submission - Architectural Design Guidelines," last revised June 4, 2015:

- a) The Site Plan, Sheet 4 of 36 of the land development submission, depicts areas of enhanced hardscape treatment such as concrete paver sidewalk and paving which appears to be generally consistent, in terms of general location, with the design guidelines. Details for installation, including color selection and proposed paving patterns, should be provided. (Reference Sheets 22 and 23 of 23 of the design guidelines.) **Review of the Hardscape Plans is included under separate cover.**
- b) The Landscape Plan appears to include requirements to meet Township Code, but does not fully include landscape upgrades as indicated in the perspective renderings, and as outlined on Sheet 21 of 23, of the design guidelines. A note on Sheet 20 of 23 of the design guidelines reads, "Landscaping shall be in accordance with the exhibits." **The revised Landscape Plan indicates several landscape bed areas for seasonal annual plantings. In addition, the Hardscape Plans provide for above ground planters.**
- c) The design guidelines for landscaping as outlined on Sheet 2 of 23 of the design guidelines indicate that plantings are to be utilized to, in part, to define and reinforce outdoor spaces, create a sense of human scale, provide visual interest and to achieve a functional and aesthetic landscape. While these guidelines may be geared more toward *pedestrian* scale areas, we offer the following recommendations that will help define *vehicular* spaces, as well as provide a more pleasing aesthetic:
  - i) Two trees, approximately 75 feet on center on each side, flank the main access drive southeast of Bldg. No. 6. One additional tree along either side, along with the proposed hardscape treatment and shrub hedge, would help to define the main access drive while creating a more prominent vehicular aisle, as well as create a more pleasing environment for pedestrian use of the space. **The landscape and hardscape design for this space was revised since the previous submission, though not necessarily as a result of our comments. We note that one tree has been added on one side, and the two trees and shrub row previously shown on the opposite side have been eliminated. Annual planting beds are shown where the shrubs were eliminated. Two pedestrian access points have been added on both sides of the drive, with bollards. The curb is flush along the driveway, and there does not appear to be adequate delineation between the driveway and adjacent landscape spaces, to prevent vehicles from traveling beyond the drive lane.**
  - ii) Berms at 3:1 slopes with evergreen trees are proposed along the southwestern and southeastern side of the proposed development. The berm height is approximately 10 to 12 feet to the southwest, and reaches above 30 feet to the southeast. Meadow seeding is proposed on the back side of the berms, opposite the development, which seems appropriate as a transition adjacent to the preserved trees. Large expanses of lawn is proposed along the berm slopes adjacent to the development. We recommend that shade and/or ornamental deciduous trees are incorporated into the design along the development side of the berms to help define and soften the edge of this space. **The revised Landscape Plans provide for trees along the slopes. However, we do not feel the layout provides**

## McCloskey & Faber, P.C.

Centre Square Commons  
DeKalb Pike and Skippack Pike  
Landscape and Lighting Review  
November 6, 2015  
Page 3

### **the intended softening of the berms, and definition of the space.**

- d) Complete construction details for the Trash Enclosure included on Sheet 16 of 23 of the design guidelines should be included. In addition, we recommend these areas are labeled on the Site Plan, Sheet 4 of 36 of the land development submission. **Details provided for the Conditional Use hearing should be incorporated in the land development plan submission.**
- e) Location and installation details have not been provided for the site furnishings included in the design guidelines, including but not limited to, benches, waste receptacles, bike racks, bollards, and fencing. **Review of the Hardscape Plans is included under separate cover. We note that fencing details have not yet been provided.**
- f) Notes on Sheet 17 of 23 of the design guidelines indicate that a minimum of fifteen (15) waste receptacles and a minimum of fifteen (15) benches will be provided, and that final locations will be mutually determined by the applicant and the township. A quantity of bike racks was not included in the design guidelines. We believe placement of bike racks should also be reviewed and mutually determined by the applicant and the township. As noted above, locations and details for these site furnishings were not included on the land development submission. **We note that the Hardscape Plans indicate more than the above noted minimum benches and waste receptacles. Additional comments of the Hardscape Plans are included under separate cover.**
- g) The location of cart corrals (reference Sheet 19 of 23 of the design guidelines) has been included on the Site Plan, Sheet 4 of 36 of the land development submission. Details for construction should be provided. **Not addressed in this submission.**
- h) Relative to Pedestrian Plazas and Pavilions on Sheet 20 of 23 of the design guidelines, we note that locations of pavilions, pergolas, canopies and/or other structures have not been indicated in the land development plan submission. It is understood that detailed drawings of proposed structures will be submitted at the building permit stage. However, we recommend that, at least conceptually, the locations and types of structures are provided for review as part of the land development stage. **Not addressed in this submission.**

### **General Lighting Review Comment:**

- 1) Other than the pedestrian scale lighting fixtures proposed within the plaza area adjacent to Building No. 6, the proposed lighting fixtures, in particular the "Executive RT Series" parking area (shoebox) light fixtures do not provide the character implied in the "Centre Square Commons - Preliminary Land Development Submission - Architectural Design Guidelines." **No change from previous submission.**
- 2) **New comment - We recommend that the locations of proposed lights (two total) in the first parking islands in front of Building 1 be reviewed with the relationship to the proposed trees in these islands. Will the trees be in conflict with the effectiveness of the light?**