

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

**January 11, 2010**

The regular meeting of the Upper Pottsgrove Planning Commission was held on Monday, January 11, 2010, at the Upper Pottsgrove Administrative Office, 1409 Farmington Avenue, with Elwood Taylor, Herb Miller, John Bealer, John Ungerman and Donald Nice present. Also present were County Planner Michael Narcowich, Township Manager Jack Layne and Recording Secretary Michelle Reddick. The meeting was called to order by Chairman Taylor at 6:05 p.m. There were 5 people in the audience.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES** – A motion by Ungerman, seconded by Bealer, to approve the minutes of December 14, 2009, as written. All aye votes.

**#4-09 COMMERCE CORNER LAND DEVELOPMENT** – **sewage planning module** - Michelle explained that the Planning Commission needs to review the sewage planning module and authorize staff to complete and Chairman Taylor to execute Component 4A. Mr. Bealer noted that there is a discrepancy between the number of EDU's listed in the project narrative as opposed to number of EDU's listed in Component 3, page 3. He also noted that in the resolution, the word "Supervisors" should be "Commissioners" and in the project narrative, it should read "Upper" Pottsgrove not "West" Pottsgrove. Mr. Miller noted the word "nursery" in the project narrative should be "orchard" and that "wetland" should be "wetlands". Mr. Taylor advised that the sewer system should be designed to accommodate existing businesses along Commerce Drive should those businesses desire to connect to public sewer. A motion by Ungerman, seconded by Miller, to authorize staff to complete Component 4A and Chairman Taylor to execute Component 4A. All aye votes.

**#1-02 WOODBROOK COMMERCIAL** – Mr. Minge was present to discuss final plans for the Woodbrook Commercial development. He explained that he has now received the necessary zoning relief required as part of preliminary plan approval for the parking setbacks so the plan is now ready for final plan approval. In response to a question from Mr. Miller, Mr. Minge explained there will be eight (8) offices in the proposed two-story office building. Mr. Minge further explained that he may be moving his office to this location and then there will be other professional offices. Mr. Taylor explained there are no other zoning issues other than setbacks for parking which zoning relief has been granted and there are no dimensional issues so the plan is ready for final approval. In response to another question from Mr. Miller, Mr. Minge advised that the tenants usually obtain the permit for a sign. Mr. Miller suggested that appropriate landscaping (i.e., Douglas fir, Fraser fir, cherry and skip laurels, American and Japanese holly, etc.) be installed as opposed to less expensive white pines. In other words, Mr. Miller was emphasizing the landscaping should personify professionalism since there will be professional offices. In response to a question from **Diana Updegrave, 1404 Farmington Avenue**, Mr. Minge advised that there is a buffer from the residential properties. A motion by Miller, seconded by Nice, to recommend to the Board of Commissioners final plan approval subject to review by the Township Engineer. All aye votes.

**DIGITAL/LED SIGN REGULATIONS** – County Planner Mike Narcowich briefly reviewed some of the changes to the proposed regulations and advised that there are limits on signs over eight (8) square feet. **Donald Taylor, Hopewell Community Church**, noted that he is interested in the change rate and limits on foot candles in the proposed regulations since they will be installing a digital sign. Mr. Narcowich advised there is a .3 foot candle limit in the proposed

**DIGITAL/LED SIGN REGULATIONS (con't.)** - regulations. Mr. Taylor suggested that there should be no transitional changes as we do not want the sign changing while people are looking at it, and the sign should not be distracting. In response to a question from **Donald Taylor, Hopewell Community Church**, Mr. Narcowich advised that the proposed regulations that limit the times illuminated signs can be lit would apply to the church. Mr. Ungerman suggested that Mr. Donald Taylor check out the digital sign at Coventry Christian School on Pleasantview Road in Lower Pottsgrove and make sure his sign is not like that one, because that sign is very difficult to read. Mr. Narcowich suggested that these types of signs should only be permitted in the Retail Office and Limited Industrial Districts. Mr. Taylor noted that it is probably not a bad idea to limit these types of signs to these zoning districts. Mr. Narcowich also suggested that the Planning Commission consider limits on how close signs over eight (8) square feet can be to each other and also where you want to allow these types of signs. In response to a question from **Donald Young, 46 Harding Street**, Mr. Narcowich advised that Fujiyama would be able to erect a freestanding sign of 50 square feet and a 30 square foot digital sign. Mr. Narcowich provided additional information on illumination levels, spillover and height of lighting fixtures. Mr. Taylor noted that he would like to obtain feedback from someone who deals with these types of signs. Mr. Narcowich noted that he could provide samples of these types of signs for the Planning Commission to look at. The Planning Commission decided to table any action on these proposed regulations until further information is obtained.

**PROJECTED/MURAL SIGN REGULATIONS** – Mr. Narcowich provided proposed regulations for projected/mural signs. In response to a question from Mr. Taylor, Mr. Narcowich advised that a 100 square foot sign of this type would be permitted in the Retail Office District and a 50 square foot sign of this type would be permitted in the Limited Industrial District. Mr. Narcowich noted that projected signs may not be projected onto freestanding signs or billboards. Mr. Narcowich briefly reviewed the proposed regulations. The Planning Commission decided to table any action on these proposed regulations.

**Donald Taylor, Hopewell Community Church**, expressed concern that with the proposed Commerce Corner project, they would no longer have direct access to Commerce Drive. He also indicated that the church may be interested in connecting to the public sewer within the proposed land development depending upon the costs.

**Diana Updegrave, 1404 Farmington Avenue**, noted that the owners of the storage facility on Commerce Drive are listed on the plans for Commerce Corner as the McIlvees and there are new owners. She also questioned whether the developer is going to own the roads in the Commerce Corner development. She expressed concern that once a property owner does not own the entrance to the road, they no longer have public access to the road. Therefore, those businesses located along Commerce Corner may become existing non-conforming interior lots.

**ADJOURNMENT** – A motion by Nice, seconded by Ungerman, to adjourn the meeting at 8:00 p.m. All aye votes.

Respectfully submitted,

Michelle L. Reddick  
Recording Secretary