

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

FEBRUARY 8, 2016

The regular meeting of the Upper Pottsgrove Planning Commission was held on Monday, February 8, 2016, at the Upper Pottsgrove Administrative Office, 1409 Farmington Avenue, with Elwood Taylor, John Bealer, John Ungerman, William Hewitt and Greg Churach present. Also present were Township Manager Carol R. Lewis, Recording Secretary Michelle Reddick and County Planner Donna Fabry. The meeting was called to order by Chairman Taylor at 7:00 p.m.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES – Motion by J. Bealer, seconded by W. Hewitt to approve the minutes of January 11, 2016, as presented.

UPLAND SQUARE TRAFFIC STUDY - E. Taylor advised that we have received a preliminary traffic study for possible development of the parcel directly across from Upland Square shopping center next to Citadel. He explained that the project is located in West Pottsgrove Township, and that no official plans have been submitted yet. He further explained that we need to have a traffic engineer review the study to make sure it is adequate. He noted he is concerned with the connection of State Street into this development and advised that all traffic should be routed to the signalized intersection that already exists along Upland Square Drive. Motion by J. Ungerman, seconded by W. Hewitt and unanimously carried to recommend to the Board of Commissioners that they authorize a contract with a traffic engineer to review and approve or make recommendations on the traffic study. G. Churach suggested contacting Pottstown to see if we could coordinate the costs for review of the traffic study.

RICHARD MINGEY – W. MOYER ROAD PROPERTY DISCUSSION – Rosemary Whitlock from Rich Minge’s office was present to discuss the proposed sketch. She advised that there were some changes made to the proposal based upon the discussion at last month’s meeting. She explained the proposal plan consists of residential and commercial with 8.078 acres of open space. She further explained there are 79 proposed units within six (6) buildings; four (4) two-story buildings in the front of the property and two (2) one-story buildings in the rear of the property. She noted the proposal is for 46 two-bedroom units and 18 one-bedroom units and each unit will have two (2) parking spaces. W. Hewitt expressed concern regarding the access to Route 100. E. Taylor noted that the proposed access to the site may be too close to Route 100 which would be a PennDOT issue. G. Churach expressed concern regarding the location of one of the proposed buildings and its proximity to the pond on the Stewart property. He noted we need to make sure we do not affect the view of the pond. E. Taylor noted that the proposed project is a low impact to residents, and a benefit is that the project has direct access to Route 100. W. Hewitt expressed concern as to whether W. Moyer Road can handle the additional traffic. He also expressed concern regarding senior living and whether the management company can rent to others and suggested a restriction on senior living. E. Taylor noted that the current age restricted ordinance may be able to be revised to accommodate the proposed project. J. Bealer noted that Mr. Minge originally said the project would include a community center and questioned what is actually being proposed. R. Whitlock advised the community center would be a designated area in a building and not a separate building. M. Schreiber expressed concern that the original proposal was for two (2) buildings and now we have six (6) buildings. E. Taylor advised that the buildings were reduced to two-story instead of three-story as recommended at the last meeting; however, the developer needed to maintain the density. W. Hewitt questioned the relative costs (revenue) generated from this project versus the impact, and was advised that this information is not available. W. Hewitt expressed concern that the proposal is for apartments versus single family dwellings which may generate a different

RICHARD MINGEY – W. MOYER ROAD PROPERTY DISCUSSION – amount of tax revenue. G. Churach advised that he would like information on the height of the proposed buildings. J. Bealer noted there is a difference between age-restricted versus age-targeted. He further noted that the township was very specific when the age restricted ordinance was created, and there are a lot of restrictions contained in that ordinance. J. Bealer noted that he would like to see a community center rather than just a room within a building for residents to use. E. Taylor advised that the age restricted ordinance probably did follow federal guidelines. The Planning Commission agreed that a memo outlining their concerns should be forwarded to the Board of Commissioners for their consideration when they review the proposed sketch plan.

OFFICIAL MAP – D. Fabry was present to review her first draft of an official map. She reviewed the different categories she is recommending as well as the items included on the proposed map under those categories. Members provided feedback regarding information they believe should be included and information they believe should not be included. In reviewing the proposed map, it was also discovered some information that was not accurate and additional information that was missing from the map. D. Fabry agreed to further revise the proposed map and provided an updated copy for review at the next meeting.

ADJOURNMENT – Motion by J. Ungerman, seconded by W. Hewitt and unanimously carried to adjourn the meeting at 8:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Michelle L. Reddick
Planning & Zoning Administrator