

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

FEBRUARY 12, 2018

The regular meeting of the Upper Pottsgrove Planning Commission was held on Monday, February 12, 2018, 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 Recording Secretary Michelle Reddick and County Planner Lauren VanDyk. The meeting was called to order by Chairman Taylor at 7:00 p.m.

REORGANIZATION – Motion by J. Bealer, seconded by J. Ungerman and unanimously carried to nominate E. Taylor as Chairman. A motion by G. Churach, seconded by J. Bealer and unanimously carried to nominate J. Ungerman as Vice Chairman. A motion by J. Ungerman, seconded by G. Churach and unanimously carried to nominate J. Bealer as Secretary.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES – Motion by J. Bealer, seconded by G. Churach and unanimously carried to approve the minutes of August 14, 2017, as presented.

DISCUSSION ON PROPOSED USES ON WASTE MANAGEMENT PROPERTY – County Planner Lauren VanDyk reviewed the recommendations for proposed uses on the property. She indicated that they would recommend low to moderate residential or recreational uses only. W. Hewitt expressed concern regarding traffic, lights at night and pollution with recreational uses on the property. G. Churach suggested that the township send a letter to owner advising them of the recommended uses and let them know to contact us if they need further assistance in marketing the property. J. Bealer suggested allowing them to request a zoning change or submit a master plan for the property. **Herbert Miller, 184 Mangers Mill Road**, suggested that the township consider the possibility of a recreational complex or an easement to connect the trail into West Pottsgrove Township.

SIGN ORDINANCE – The Planning Commission reviewed the proposed ordinance along with the comments from the Montgomery County Planning Commission. County Planner Lauren VanDyk explained that she was not involved when the initial ordinance changes were being reviewed but was asked to review the proposed ordinance. She further explained that in the course of the County's final review, they have identified suggested revisions that they feel would strengthen the ordinance should the Township choose to incorporate their comments. She noted that comment concerning removing any specific language related to content of a sign is of most important to the proposed ordinance. However, the other recommendations could be considered at a future time to further improve the ordinance. She also noted that there are typographical errors that could be changed at this time as well as changes for the numbering in the proposed ordinance. The other changes include revising the off-premises sign dimensions, revising the height for a ground sign, and clarifying information listed on the summary tables for limited duration signs and temporary signs to be consistent with the written language concerning the tables. J. Bealer advised that there are typos in Section F.1.c, there is a definition needed for a temporary sign on page 8 and there is extra language in 5c on page 15 (signs incorporating should be removed). In response to a question from G. Churach concerning snipe signs, it was noted that these type of signs are prohibited. However, he suggested taking out the language after snipe signs in Section 350-135.B on page 8. During the discussion concerning a recommendation to change the height of a ground sign, Commissioner Krazalkovich referenced the sign at Citadel Federal Credit Union to use in determining the allowable height for ground signs. **Herbert Miller, 184 Mangers Mill Road**, noted over 200 illegal signs which were located in the right-of-way that were thrown away last year. Motion by J. Ungerman, seconded by W. Hewitt and unanimously carried to recommend adoption of the proposed sign ordinance with the following changes: (1) move the definition for sandwich board sign from page 3 to

SIGN ORDINANCE (cont'd.) - page 7 so that it is in the right location; (2) include a definition for a temporary sign on page 8; (3) delete all the language in Section 350-135.B on page 8 except for “snipe signs”; (4) delete the language “signs incorporating” in 5c on page 15; (5) revise language in the summary tables for limited duration signs and temporary signs so that it is consistent with the written language that references the tables; (6) increase the maximum permitted height for a ground sign to 5 feet in Section 350-138.A.6.e; (7) change the maximum length requirement for an off-premises sign to 40 feet in Section 350-138.F.2; (8) revise Section 350-139.B.10.a.i and Section 350-139.B.10.a.ii to remove the references to specific advertising content; (9) revise the language in Section 350-139.A.3 to read “on properties where lawful home occupations are present, the following sign types are permitted”; (10) revise the language in Section 350-139.A.4 to read “on properties where residential development, including apartment buildings, are present, the following sign types are permitted”; (11) revise Sections 350-139.5 and 350-139.12 to include reference to the correct section of 350-139.C; (12) revise Sections 350-139.6 and 350-139.13 to include reference to the correct section of 350-139.D; (13) correct all typographical errors; and (14) correct numbering.

RICHARD MINGEY ~ W. MOYER RD. & RTE. 100 PROPOERTY DISCUSSION - Ro Whitlock, Richard Mingey’s assistant, was present to discuss the proposal for this property. She explained that the proposed plan includes both residential and commercial. She further explained that there will be a total of 70 residential units which would include one (1) and two (2) bedroom units. She also noted that there is a proposed walking trail within the development. G. Churach questioned whether the proposed bridge would carry utilities across Route 100 and noted it appears that the retail portion would be invisible to traffic. R. Whitlock could not answer the question or provide any information concerning the visibility of the retail portion of the project. J. Bealer expressed concern regarding the steep slopes on the property being greater than 15 percent and noted that it would not meet the ordinance requirements for steep slopes. J. Bealer questioned whether the age qualified overlay district would apply to this project. He noted that if it would apply, several waivers would be needed in order to develop the property as proposed. He explained that waivers would be needed for the unit mix, minimum lot sizes and general requirements regarding the size of the community center and the requirement for two other active recreation uses. He also explained that the single office structure would have to comply with all the standards in the Retail Office District. J. Bealer questioned whether the project would be age restricted or age targeted. R. Whitlock was unsure, but indicated if age targeted, the age would be 45 to 65 years. E. Taylor explained his conversations with R. Mingey always indicated that it would be age restricted. The Planning Commission expressed concern that any additional residential development be age restricted. They also indicated they would consider reviewing such a plan when it was presented but noted that it may not necessarily be in favor of all waivers which would be needed in order to develop the property as proposed.

ADJOURNMENT – Motion by J. Ungerman, seconded by W. Hewitt and unanimously carried to adjourn the meeting at 8:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Michelle L. Reddick
Planning & Zoning Administrator