



MEETING MINUTES OF THE
PLANNING COMMISSION OF
LOWER POTTS GROVE TOWNSHIP
MONTGOMERY COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA
October 17, 2016

The Lower Pottsgrove Township Planning Commission held its regularly scheduled meeting on Monday, October 17, 2016. The meeting was called to order by Chair Frank Cebular at 6:30 p.m. and the following were in attendance:

Frank Cebular, Chair	Edward C. Wagner, Manager
Ronald Dinnocenti, Vice Chair	
William Wolfgang	
Anthony Cherico – Arrived at 6:38 p.m.	
Chad Camburn	
Lew Babel	

Mr. Cebular announced the meeting was being recorded.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

After some minor corrections, Mr. Wolfgang made the motion to approve the September 19, 2016 minutes and Mr. Dinnocenti seconded; all in favor (3-0)

ACCEPTANCE OF NEW APPLICATIONS.

#2015-02 Spring Valley Farms 178 Single Family Homes, 1934 Bleim Road. Mr. Dinnocenti made the motion to accept the application; Mr. Wolfgang seconded the motion. Application accepted (3-0)

Mr. Zlomek from the Post Publications asked what makes this a “new application.” Mr. Wagner stated that it is not a new application, but a new (final) set of plans were submitted which restarts the 90-day approval clock.

SUBDIVISION & LAND DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW

Mr. Cherico arrived 6:38 p.m.

#2016-02: Flying Horse Farm, *Minor Land Development Plan*

Proposal to overall site consists of 9 acres located at 246 Rupert Road within the R-3 Residential District. The site consists of a single family dwelling, barn and accessory uses for a horse riding facility. The site is served by on-lot sewer and water. The applicant is proposing to construct a 90' x 200' pole barn to be used as an indoor riding area. [Plans prepared by Aston Surveyors/Engineers, Inc., 44 South Chestnut Street, Boyertown, PA 19512, dated 07/05/2016 and consisting of four sheets].

Mr. John Aston, Aston Surveyors, presented on behalf of the applicant, Ron Diesinger. Zoning approval has been granted. The intent for the new structure is to provide suitable accommodations to offer year-round riding and lessons without impact due to weather conditions. There are no new or additional events planned for this structure.

Mr. Aston first addressed the comments outlined on the Fire Marshal's letter dated October 1, 2016.

First and foremost was a discussion in regards Mr. Babel's request that the driveway needs to be 20'0" wide. Mr. Babel's primary concern is to get trucks in the driveway to access the property if necessary, but also the ease of entering from and exiting onto Rupert Road with future additional traffic. Mr. Diesinger reminded the Planning Commission that he cannot have more than 20 horses on the property and trailer traffic would not be increasing. It was suggested that the applicant flare the entrance of the driveway to 24'0" in width for the first 20 linear feet then reduce to 13'0" wide for the remainder of the drive. Mr. Babel stated he is okay with this solution.

Mr. Aston reported that the structure will be a steel truss building with a steel truss roof. The only wood in the building will be a 4'0" wall enclosing the riding area.

Mr. Aston asked for clarification regarding Mr. Babel's concern with the location of the pole barn. The concern is there is no way to get around the building to the opposite side with any kind of trucks or equipment to do any kind of fire-fighting. In light of the fact that the proposed structure will be fabricated from steel in lieu of wood, Mr. Babel feels this is no longer a concern and this item may be removed from his list.

Finally, the Applicant addressed the need for the sprinkler system. It was stated that the Planning Commission did not have the authority to deviate from the Code to allow no sprinkler and the Applicant would have to have a separate meeting with the Code Officer Joseph Groff.

Mr. Aston proceeded to the Township Engineer's letter dated October 5, 2016. The submitted Minor Lot Development plan appears to be in general conformity with the exhibit as it relates to the size of the proposed pole barn.

ZONING

There were no waivers requested. Since the time of the letter, a waiver has been requested for the driveway width.

2. Development Regulations

- While the proposed improvements appear to be in conformance with the required setbacks, the ultimate right-of-way and all required yard setbacks must be illustrated on the plan; Mr. Aston agrees
 - The Township should consider if it wishes to require the area within the Ultimate Right-of-Way (30 feet half-width) to be offered for dedication. If the Township requires Ultimate Right-of-Way area to be offered for dedication, the metes and bounds and a legal description will be required. Applicant will ask that Township not take dedication of the Ultimate Right-of-Way.
 - Building Coverage: Will Comply
3. Parking areas. The plans should clarify if the proposed parking lot will simply be a reconfiguration of an existing parking lot or if it will be a new parking lot. Applicant states it

is a gravel parking lot with no striping. They are illustrating how the spaces will be configured but essentially it is the same parking area with the additional two spaces near the residence. Applicant is hoping that the parking area landscaping would not be applicable since they are not really making a new parking area.

4. Utility Lines serving the new building shall be placed underground. Applicant will comply and will add that note to the plan.
5. Township staff should determine whether a traffic study and analysis of police, fire and recreation impacts will be required. The Township Fire Marshal has issued a review letter. Since there is no new use of the property, only a new building intended to continue with the existing use, Applicant asks that additional studies not be required.
6. Parking lot, walkway and building entrance lighting shall be provided in accordance with this section. Applicant indicated that he would put some lights on the face of the building, but as the facility will primarily be a daytime operation they do not feel the need for street lights in the parking area. Mr. Camburn stated that the zoning ordinance does not specify what type of lights are required; simply that lights are required for safety. A spotlight would be acceptable as long as it provides adequate lighting. In addition, the accessible parking spots must be lit. It must be shown that there is enough light in the parking lot to safely maneuver in the area. This must be shown on the plans. Clarification was made that the driveway does not need to be lit.
7. Plans should clarify how the required number of spaces was determined. Applicant has previously reviewed this with the Zoning Officer. A letter was issued by the Zoning Officer in regards to the parking and Applicant is okay to proceed with the number of spaces as shown on the plans.
8. Handicap accessible parking space must be paved and shall contain appropriate signs and markings. Applicant will comply.

SUBDIVISION AND LAND DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE COMMENTS

1. The plans shall be revised to more clearly distinguish existing versus proposed features and the limits of the gravel versus macadam surfaces. Applicant will comply.
2. Existing Contours shall be included. Applicant will comply.
3. Driveway widths are to be 24'0". Waiver is requested to SALDO Section 215-17.B.(3) to not require widening the driveway to the 24 ft. standard of commercial driveways.

STORMWATER COMMENTS

- Applicant will comply with all.

GENERAL COMMENTS

- Applicant will comply with all.

Mr. Babel had one final question for Mr. Diesinger. He asked if there would be any hay stored in the new barn at any time. Mr. Diesinger replied that there is no second floor in the new barn and no hay would be stored there. Mr. Babel was satisfied with this response.

Mr. Wolfgang made the motion to approve the Waiver to widen the driveway entrance to a minimum of 20'0" in width for a distance no less than 20 ft at which time it may be reduced to 13'0" in width for the remainder of the drive. Mr. Dinnocenti seconded the motion. All in favor (4-0)

Mr. Dinnocenti made the motion to grant preliminary/final approval with the following conditions:

1. The sprinkler issue must be worked out with the Zoning Officer;
2. Compliance to all items as outlined in the Engineer's review letter.

Mr. Wolfgang seconded the motion. All in favor (4-0)

#2016-03: Coventry Christian Schools, Inc., *Preliminary Land Development Plan*

Proposal to overall site consists of 12.143 acres located at 699 N. Pleasantview Road within the R-2 Residential District. The site is served by public sewer and water. The Applicant is proposing to construct a 12,160 sq. ft. addition to the rear of the existing building [Plans prepared by Site Design Services, LLC., 1210 Mt. Pleasant Road, Lebanon, PA 17042, dated 08/25/2016 and consisting of six sheets].

Alan Love, SDS (Site Design Services), the Engineer for Coventry Christian School presented on behalf of the Applicant, John Niehls.

Mr. Love began with the Engineer's review letter and stated he felt that most of the comments are fairly minor and technical in nature and that they could be worked out directly with Mr. Camburn. Mr. Love stated that there were some global issues he wanted to run by the Planning Commission to determine if Waivers would be necessary. Those items are as follows:

ZONING ISSUES

2. Township staff should determine whether a traffic study and analysis of police, fire and recreation impacts will be required. Applicant feels since the school has less enrollment than it did during its original use (500 students), the impact of the use as it is today is less intensive than it was previously as a full-blown school. If it functioned properly with 500 students, it should function properly with less students and additional traffic studies are not warranted for this application. The total capacity of the school with the new addition would be approximately in the low 400's.

Mr. Cebular brought up his concern of the missing flashing signal on the south side and feels that is more important than a traffic study. Several others stated their concerns. A flashing signal is not required by PennDOT if the school has no walkers. Even though there are "no walkers" currently, there could potentially be walkers in the future.

Christina Crawford, 2385 Southview Drive, stated her children attend the school along with several other children who live in that neighborhood. Ms. Crawford stated that they are offered a bus, but the bus picks up on Welsh Drive, drives by the school and stops at other developments on the way to the Middle School where they exchange buses to come back to Coventry Christian. Some choose to drive their children to school; some, especially the older children, take the opportunity to walk to school. As the children get older there may be additional walkers who attend the school and the biggest fear is crossing Pleasantview Road. Ms. Crawford's hope is that the Township will fund putting the light back in to get the traffic to slow down and also extend the timeframe for the speed restrictions. Mr. Wagner stated that we cannot remove the existing flasher as long as there are walkers and the other flasher sign needs to go up. Ms. Crawford asked who would pay for the new flashing sign to which Mr. Wagner stated the school would be responsible - just like the High School had to pay for the ones on Kauffman Road. Mr. Niehls of Coventry Christian

asked if they took care of replacing the sign if the traffic study issue goes away. Mr. Niehls stated he would pay for the replacement flasher for the south side.

3. A lighting plan shall be submitted. Applicant asked if they only needed a lighting plan for the expansion area. Mr. Camburn replied yes. Applicant expressed their concern for the neighbors and for the addition of too much lighting. He stated that they want to keep the neighbors happy. Mr. Camburn stated that we don't want too much lighting – we want the right amount of lighting. The Zoning Ordinance is very specific about the minimum amount of lighting required and the fact that you can't bleed over into residential properties. Mr. Love stated he can do a photometric study fairly easily and he would bring it to the staff meeting where it could be resolved.
4. It appears there are less than the required 125 parking spaces indicated on the plans; the number of proposed parking spaces should be clarified. The Applicant feels that the 100 proposed spaces is sufficient and currently, on a daily basis, only 25-40% of the spaces are used. There has never been an auditorium or school function where every parking space has been utilized.

SUBDIVISION AND LAND DEVELOPMENT COMMENTS

1. A waiver should be requested in order for this application to be processed as a minor land development. Applicant believes this was a waiver granted previously and they are being asked to ask for it again. Mr. Camburn stated that was correct. This is a new application so a new waiver must also be requested.
5. The cartway and right-of-way widths for Pleasantview Road should be shown on the plans. Applicant stated this too was a waiver acquired previously, but will ask for it again.
7. The Township may wish to grant concurrent preliminary/final approval for the project. Applicant asks that this be something that is considered.
8. The property shall be posted in accordance with this section. Applicant asks who posts the property and what it is posted with. Mr. Wagner stated it should read that "this property is up for a possible subdivision." Mr. Love asked if there was a particular sign to use and could he get a copy so they could post. Mr. Wagner stated he would e-mail a sample sign.
9. The required ultimate right-of-way for Pleasantview Road is eighty (80) feet and the minimum paved width is forty (40) feet. Applicant asked if Township is looking for the ROW to be increased from 55 to 80, 40-feet from centerline. Mr. Wagner stated that the Township is looking for ultimate dedication. Mr. Camburn stated the Applicant will need to prepare a legal description and offer dedication. Applicant stated a separate plot plan will be submitted.
12. Buffer planting requirements shall be applicable to parking lot facilities along all property lines. The Applicant is proposing to install additional parking spaces without buffer plantings. Applicant states there currently is no buffer landscaping and that there are no new parking spaces other than one; the Applicant is asking for a Waiver

LANDSCAPING COMMENTS

2. A buffer area of not less than 25 feet in width shall be established along all property lines unless waived by the Board of Commissioners. From a global perspective the interconnection between the Township area and this area seem to get some combined use, and Applicant did not see the 25 foot landscaping strip as something that either side would be looking for and would like to request a Waiver.

STORMWATER MANAGEMENT AND EROSION & SEDIMENTATION CONTROL COMMENTS

2. A BMP Operations and Maintenance Plan suitable for recording incorporating the requirements of this section shall be provided. The Grading/Utility Plan could constitute this plan if the required information is added. Applicant asked exactly what the Engineer is looking for. Mr. Camburn stated that they will need an Operation & Maintenance Agreement (can get a copy standard agreement from Township Solicitor) and provide Operation & Maintenance notes which can be added to the Plan.
3. General Note 14 on Sheet 1 indicates that a blanket easement is granted to the Township for access to all stormwater management facilities. Documentation for the blanket easement should be provided to the satisfaction of the Township Solicitor. Applicant states they will comply and Mr. Camburn stated that a Plan Note may suffice.

GENERAL COMMENTS

4. Engineer recommends a protected pedestrian area be provided around the building to separate vehicular traffic from pedestrians. Applicant requested clarification regarding this comment. Mr. Camburn stated his concern is the vehicular traffic through the parking lot passes right by the building. He would like to see some type of pedestrian area, not necessarily a sidewalk, which would protect the people standing right outside the building. Applicant states that they will stripe out two spaces closest to the building, which would also allow for fire truck access. They will install bollards along the building and will also make the spot closest to the door an Accessible parking spot. After review of the plans by the Engineer and the Commission, it was determined that the parking area in question is for staff parking only. Therefore, the need for pedestrian protection along the building will not be required.

Mr. Love stated he next wanted to address the comments outlined in the Fire Marshal review letter of September 30, 2016.

Mr. Love requested clarification from Mr. Babel in regards to the driveway he is requesting for the back of the building. Mr. Babel stated that he is looking for some sort of paved access along the back of the building that would allow fire truck access to the south side of the building if it became necessary. Mr. Love asked if a path consisting of two tracks of pavers was installed along the building leading to a stabilized area near the center of the building for the trucks to park if that would be acceptable. Mr. Babel stated that would be okay and said that they would discuss how far away from the building it needed to be.

Mr. Love stated that the Applicant was planning to sprinkle the new building and that there is a 4" dedicated line for the site which should be more than enough capacity to sprinkle that section of the building.

Mr. Love stated that the interconnection between the old and new buildings is not enclosed; it only has a roof so the kids don't get wet. There are no walls so no fire door should be required.

Mr. Cebular suggested that since a lot of discussion that took place at tonight's meeting the Applicant clean up the plans, supply a written request of Waivers along with a written statement in

regards to funding the flasher light and bring them to a staff meeting with the Engineer and Manager to review prior to the next Planning Commission meeting on November 21st.

AUTHORITY BUSINESS

None

PLANNING & ZONING

None

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Ted Drauschak & Paul Callahan, Sanatoga Green. Mr. Drauschak stated that he spoke to Mr. Wagner on Thursday, October 13th to discuss the possibility of rescheduling the November 21st meeting to November 16th in order to have the Planning Commission's input prior to the Board of Commissioners meeting on the 17th. Mr. Drauschak acknowledged the engineers (both H&K and Bursich) for the time they have been spending on the project and that revised drawings will be submitted to the Township Tuesday, October 18th addressing the notes on the previous comment letter.

Mr. Drauschak wanted to express his concern about the Township's (mis)conception that they were trying to "push the project through the Township." He stated that nothing could be further from the truth and that this is a complicated project; it's a large project and he understands that it takes multiple meetings to get through this type of project. He is asking that the Township give a fair addressing of the project. Applicant will provide the data, the information and the studies as necessary to meet all of the codes and requirements. Mr. Drauschak stated that his family has resided in the Township for many years. He is proud of the project and wants the Township to be proud of this project. He asked if there were any questions from the Planning Commission and again asked if there is some way possible that the meeting could be moved.

Mr. Wolfgang stated that he did not know whether the Zoning Hearing Board would be able to address the issues at the November meeting or not, but he didn't feel that 24-hours (or less) after their review would be enough for the Planning Commission to adequately digest the Zoning Board's comments in time for a meeting the next night. Secondly, Mr. Wolfgang mentioned that he would like to see some sort of phasing plan proposed so there is a schedule in place. In addition, the Variances are of concern. Depending on how the Zoning Hearing Board rules, changes to the plans could not possibly be facilitated in time for a meeting the following night. Mr. Drauschak stated that the majority of the Variances requested would not have bearing on the plans so he did not see that as an issue.

Mr. Cebular stated that he is unable to change the meeting date due to his schedule and Mr. Cherico was not able to make that date either. As Mr. Dinnocenti must abstain from comments relating to this project, there would not be a Quorum on the 16th and the meeting could not be rescheduled from its originally scheduled date of the 21st.

Additionally, Mr. Wolfgang asked for a letter from the Marks stating they granted permission for the use of their driveway.

There is a meeting with PennDOT set up for November 1, 2016 at 10:00 a.m. Mr. Wagner invited any of the Commission members to attend. Mr. Cebular said he would attend and Mr. Wolfgang said he would let Mr. Wagner know.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, Mr. Dinnocenti made a motion to adjourn at 7:59 p.m. Mr. Cherico seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved. Vote was 4-0 in favor.

Respectfully submitted,



Edward C. Wagner, Township Manager