

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION
UPPER POTTS GROVE TOWNSHIP**

May 12, 2008

The regular meeting of the Upper Pottsgrove Planning Commission was held on Monday, May 12, 2008, at the Upper Pottsgrove Administrative Office, 1409 Farmington Avenue, with Elwood Taylor, John Bealer, Herb Miller, John Ungerman and Donald Nice present. Also present were Township Engineer John Theisen, Township Manager Jack Layne and Recording Secretary Michelle Reddick. The meeting was called to order by Chairman Taylor at 6:03 p.m. There were 5 people in the audience.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES – A motion by Miller, seconded by Bealer, to approve the minutes of April 14, 2008, as written. All aye votes.

LEVENGOOD SKETCH PLAN – Doug Kramer of Applied Surveying Technologies, Inc. and property owner Bob Levengood were present to discuss the proposed subdivision. Mr. Kramer explained that Lot 1 contains an existing house and this lot will be split off, and Lot 2 will be retained by Mr. Levengood to construct a new dwelling. He further explained the driveway profile needs to be reviewed to see if it complies with the ordinance. He noted that USGS contours were used in preparing the plan. In response to questions and concerns raised by Mr. Nice, Mr. Levengood explained there is a common access easement off of Orlando Road, and the width of the driveway is 12 feet. Mr. Levengood further explained that there is a 50 foot pull-off to the right of the driveway, a 50 foot pull-off to the left of the driveway and another pull-off further up the driveway. In response to another question from Mr. Nice, Mr. Levengood explained that two families will be utilizing the access. Mr. Levengood noted that his property is part of the Clean and Green Act (Act 319) with Montgomery County, and he has gotten an okay from the County for this proposal. In response to a question from Mr. Ungerman, Mr. Kramer advised that Lot 1 is big enough and does comply with Township ordinances. Mr. Kramer advised one of the issues with the plan is that the scale is one inch equals 60 feet, and noted this does not comply with the ordinance requirements. Mr. Theisen noted this would not be a problem. Another issue expressed by Mr. Kramer is that they used parcel topography which also does not comply with ordinance requirements. Mr. Theisen advised this would be acceptable since they have USGS information for the entire site. One last concern expressed by Mr. Kramer was the requirement in the ordinance to show all existing features within 200 feet. Mr. Taylor noted this requirement is important in order to see how the proposed development affects off-site drainage. Mr. Miller noted the land that abuts Mr. Levengood's property is owned by the Maynards and is all open. It was agreed that existing features within 200 feet need to be included on the plan. Mr. Kramer also questioned whether wetland delineation would also be required. Mr. Taylor explained this information is necessary for determining developable acreage. In response to a question from Mr. Theisen, Mr. Kramer advised there are no wetlands on Lot 1. Mr. Kramer explained they can have an expert state that there are no wetlands within the improved area. He noted the USGS show "hydric" soil, but there is none there. Mr. Theisen agreed to visit the site in order to determine if wetland delineation is necessary. Mr. Kramer also suggested that Mr. Theisen also check to see if the proposed storm sewer pipe shown on the profile is warranted. In response to a question from Mr. Ungerman, Mr. Levengood advised There will be a formal agreement for the shared driveway, and he will provide a copy of the

LEVENGGOOD SKETCH PLAN (cont'd.) - easement agreement to the Township Solicitor for review. In response to a question from Mr. Taylor, Mr. Levengood advised there is a 50 foot access. In response to another question from Mr. Taylor, Mr. Levengood advised there are no deed restrictions currently on the property. He further advised that he would not be willing to say that it will never be subdivided in the future. **Diana Updegrove, 1404 Farmington Avenue**, expressed concern that the proposal is starting to look like development without the proper benefit of a street and stormwater management. Mrs. Updegrove suggested including deed restrictions, and including the maintenance agreement for the shared access a part of the deed. It was noted Mr. Levengood will proceed with a formal minor subdivision plan submission.

#4-07 PASCAL ANNEXATION – revised plan review – Jana Eppihimer from Bursich Associates was present to discuss revised plans dated March 31, 2008. In response to a question from Ms. Eppihimer, Mr. Taylor advised the Township is in the process of working on purchasing additional sewer capacity. Ms. Eppihimer advised she would like to discuss the waiver requests as outlined in her letter dated May 12, 2008. The first waiver is from Section 310-21.A(1) which requires the installation of sidewalks along roads in residential districts. The Planning Commission did not see a problem with waiving this requirement since there are no sidewalks in the vicinity of the site along Gilbertsville Road. The second waiver is from Section 310-21.B(1) which requires the installation of curbs along roads. The Planning Commission did not see a problem with waiving this requirement since there are no curbs in the vicinity of the site along Gilbertsville Road. The third waiver is from Section 310-317.B and 310.37.C(4) which requires a landscaping plan be submitted that identifies tree replacement. The Planning Commission did not see a problem with waiving this requirement since trees outside the limit of disturbance required for construction of the house, drives and stormwater facilities will be protected. The fourth waiver is from Section 410.A.2 which requires post-development peak discharge rates reduced to certain pre-development peak discharge rates described in Standard 2. Ms. Eppihimer explained that the stormwater management design provides the necessary recharge volume and water quality for the proposed impervious surfaces and at no time does the post-development peak rate exceed the pre-development peak rate for the same storm event. He further explained that providing additional detention capacity would require removal of more trees. Mr. Theisen explained that he cannot see taking down more trees to get handle additional flows so long as they meet existing flows. In response to a question from Mr. Miller, Ms. Eppihimer explained that the driveway will be its own collector of water and the swale up further from the driveway will handle runoff from the existing lot. Mr. Nice expressed concern regarding the width of the driveway and roadway in regard to handling emergency equipment. Mr. Taylor explained that the ordinance allows ten feet. Mr. Bealer suggested a larger radius where the two driveways meet. **Diana Updegrove, 1404 Farmington Avenue**, expressed concern that cars are not going to have enough room to pass each other on the roadway especially when it snows. She suggested the applicant consider allow for some pull-off areas. Ms. Eppihimer asked whether the Planning Commission would consider giving a recommendation on the waiver requests. Mr. Taylor noted he would like to see some other issues worked out on the plan before any recommendation is given on waiver requests. Ms. Eppihimer agreed to move forward with revising the plans accordingly.

In response to a question from **Herb Miller**, Mr. Taylor noted the delay in the construction of the Bachman tract is probably due to the current status of the housing market. Michelle advised that there were also some issues with the PennDOT permit for this subdivision. In response to another question from Mr. Miller, Mr. Taylor advised that Code Enforcement Officer Errol Kring is working on issues concerning the Victory Baptist Church.

ADJOURNMENT – A motion by Miller, seconded by Nice, to adjourn the meeting at 7:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Michelle L. Reddick
Recording Secretary