



MEETING MINUTES OF THE

**PLANNING COMMISSION OF
LOWER POTTS GROVE TOWNSHIP
MONTGOMERY COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA
September 19, 2016**

The Lower Pottsgrove Township Planning Commission held its regularly scheduled meeting on Monday, September 19, 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	
Scott Fulmer	
Chad Camburn	
Lew Babel	

Mr. Cebular announced the meeting was being recorded.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Scott made the motion to approve the June 20, 2016 minutes and Ron seconded; all in favor

ACCEPTANCE OF NEW APPLICATIONS.

- A. #2016-01 Sanatoga Green, 313 Evergreen Road – Bill made motion to accept; Scott seconded the motion. Application accepted vote 3-0 (Ron abstained)
- B. #2016-02: Flying Horse Farm, 246 Rupert Road – Ron made motion to accept; Bill seconded the motion. Application accepted vote 4-0
- C. #2016-03 Coventry Christian, 699 Pleasantview Road – Bill made motion to accept; Scott seconded the motion. Application accepted vote 4-0

SUBDIVISION & LAND DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW

#2016-01: **Sanatoga Green**, *Land Development Plan*

Frank Bartle spoke on behalf of applicant. Also present are Ted Drauschak and Ken Briar, Paul Callahan and Mike Engle, Engineer both of H&K and Greg Richardson, traffic engineer.

Project consists of three parcels which have been rezoned specifically for this zoning use, a proposed development consisting of 159 townhome units, 342 multi-family units, 17 apartment buildings, one apartment complex clubhouse, 60,000 sq. ft. medical office building and a hotel. The parcels are going to be consolidated as one to take care of some of the issues as mentioned in the review letter by the engineer as well as the planning commission.

Mr. Bartle mentioned the project has come before the township previously with the Zoning Hearing Board and received certain relief and will return to receive additional relief. Plan has not changed since zoning hearing board saw it, but there were a few additional provisions of the Zoning Ordinance from which relief was needed and were made on the drawing. The zoning board has seen the plan and liked the plan to the extent that they gave the relief. So to have the BOC given relief requested in the manner of conditional use application in regard to the steep slope areas. The land development plans were then filed.

Mr. Bartle stated that the owners received a lengthy review letter from Chad Camburn of Bursich Engineering and the Township. A meeting was held with the engineer and Township Staff on September 12th and significant progress was made in seeking answers to all of the various items listed on that review letter.

Mr. Bartle asked the Commission to direct their attention to the minutes from the September 12th meeting. His first comments pertained to the notes from Lew Babel, Fire Marshal. Applicant is essentially a will comply with all of the items the Fire Marshal wants to see. Mr. Bartle believes they have Mr. Babel's concurrence and agreement with respect to that part of the plan that is applicable to his jurisdiction. Mr. Wagner asked Mr. Babel if that was correct; Mr. Babel said that it was.

Mr. Bartle asked that the group now move to the H&K response letter. He mentioned that in the first section, Zoning Ordinance Comments, there were a large number of "Will Comply" items specifically the first twelve items. In regards to item #13, zoning ordinance section 250-38 (250-40) which outlined the Conservation District's floodplain requirements. Owner has requested a variance which will go before the Zoning Hearing Board to permit grading, retaining walls, buildings, outlet structures and associated stormwater management appurtenances. The ordinance has a provision to apply for a conditional use, but as the project must go before Zoning Hearing Board with approximately seven additional Variance items to review the Applicant chose to proceed with a Variance rather than Conditional Use. Mr. Bartle did express that they will comply with the provisions of the ordinance with respect to seeking the Variance request.

Items 14, 15 and 16 all Will Comply.

Item 17 is a provision of zoning code 250-158.9.B.(2); no more than two points of access may be permitted on to each street on which the lots abut. It appears that the applicant is proposing four points however, if Park Road is intended to become a dedicated road there would be three points of access being proposed. Mike Engel, provided additional clarification of the Variance requested using the current plan drawing explaining that the proposed demolition of 313 Evergreen Road reduces the issue to three separate locations where there is access onto Evergreen Road. Part of the Variance request is that the Township accept dedication of Park Road. If that becomes a public street there would then be two accesses to Evergreen Road. In the alternate, they would ask for a Variance to allow three access points, each serving a different portion of the community, on to Evergreen Road, which in the Engineer's opinion would work to the Townships' favor. It is their belief that each entity should have their own entrance/identity off of Evergreen Road. It was asked if each entrance would be phased-in separately to which Mike responded that was the plan.

It was asked if the applicant was going to present what the ideas are for Phase 1, Phase 2, etc. Mr. Bartle responded that they are seeking approval for the preliminary plan for the entire project at this

time. Then in final plan stage it will be discussed how the project will be phased and will be presented to the Board for their consideration.

Additional comments were made by Mike Engel in regards to Park Road. The concern that the developer who purchased the land adjacent to 422 will more than likely use Park Road to access that project. There will be multiple users utilizing Park Road and feel that the Road must be dedicated. Mr. Wagner struggles with the intersection at High Street and South Park Road and there needs to be a meeting with PennDOT to discuss whether South Park Road be a one-way in to eliminate left movement onto High Street or if a signal could be implemented. Greg Richardson agreed and feels it is something that needs to be addressed. He is not opposed to signalization on High Street, it's a matter of whether it is part of Act 209, and whether cost is shared with other Developers, but in the long run is probably better for all to have a signal. Mr. Bartle mentioned that there would be contact made with PennDOT to discuss this and other issues. Park Road is technically not a road and the nursing home has an easement to use that parcel of land for ingress and egress.

Mr. Bartle discussed the Variance request being made for item #18 250-158.9.B.(4), another zoning provision. Applicant will request variance to permit access way space 40-feet on center. Provision in question states access ways shall be spaced a minimum of 50 feet on center from existing access ways on adjacent properties wherever feasible. Applicant is proposing Road A to intersect Evergreen Road approximately 45 feet on center from the neighboring Marks driveway. Mike Engel explained this in more detail and this is essentially an existing condition with respect to where they are located. Mr. Wagner mentioned that Ted said in the meeting last week he would speak to the Marks to see if they could connect in the future and get rid of that driveway. It was suggested that if an arrangement was made that a letter be secured stating the agreement between the two parties.

Mr. Bartle discussed the Variance being requested against 250-158-9.B.(5); On lots used for nonresidential purposes or only partially for residential purposes, no access way shall be located closer than 25 feet to any lot used exclusively for residential purposes in the GMU District. Variance request due to existing conditions, to permit three access ways to located adjacent lots used for residential purposes. Mr. Engel further detailed this request and stated that without these entrances they are essentially landlocked

Mr. Bartle indicated that applicant will comply with item 20.

Mr. Bartle discussed item 21, another zoning provision, 250.158.10.B stating sidewalks shall be installed along the frontage of all roads. Applicant is requesting Variance to install sidewalks along Evergreen Road frontage, Linfield Road frontage and Park Road extension. Mr. Engel described this request in more detail specifically for relief on installing sidewalk in front of 313 Evergreen and also along Linfield Road due to the nature of the road.

Mr. Bartle stated that applicant will comply with items 22, 23 and 24.

Mr. Bartle stated that a Variance has been requested for 250.158.10.F.(6) which states that shade trees shall be planted on both sides of walkways and trails. Applicant is proposing to utilize existing trees along both sides of walkways and trails in lieu of planting new trees. The Montgomery County Planning Committee recommends the utilization of existing trees and not planting new. Mr. Engel further discussed the Variance request stating that applicant would like to use mature existing trees

for the proposed trail connecting Evergreen Road and Sanatoga Park. Applicant has 500+ trees proposed throughout the site and felt it made sense to utilize existing trees through the trail area.

Mr. Bartle stated that applicant will comply with items 26 thru 32

Mr. Bartle stated that a Variance will be requested for 250.158.19 stating all roads and infrastructure, open space and recreation facilities for GMU developments shall be owned and maintained by a private entity, business or community association. The Variance is requesting that the Board of Commissioners accept dedication of Park Road.

Mr. Bartle stated that the applicant will comply with items 34 thru 40 which ends the zoning comments on the engineer's letter.

Mr. Bartle moved on to Subdivision and Land Development Comments (Waivers not Variances)

Mr. Bartle stated that items 1 thru 4 Will Comply. Item 4 does include a waiver request to have centerline radii for horizontal curves be not less than 37 feet due to the rolling terrain and shallow bedrock. This notation will be made on the plan. Mr. Engel further detailed this Waiver request explaining the unusual layout and terrain of the properties and as a result the requirement for a 150' centerline radius cannot be met and requesting relief from the Ordinance. There was concern that fire trucks would not be able to navigate through, but Mr. Engel explained that there is a maneuverability plan which will be revised to show a larger scale.

The Waiver for Item #5 requests to exceed the 3% but not exceed 8% on the outer perimeter of the cul-de-sac due to the rolling terrain and shallow bedrock. Mr. Engel further explained that there is one cul-de-sac which comes down at about 7-8%. Applicant is asking that the perimeter of the cul-de-sac be 8% as well so it matches. The area is comprised of shallow bedrock and there is not much that can be done to change the terrain. Otherwise all other intersections will meet the 3% grade.

The Waiver for Item #6 requests to have a minimum paved street width of 24 feet for proposed two-way streets to reduce storm water runoff due to the rolling terrain and shallow bedrock. No on-street parking is proposed and the Fire Marshal has approved the street layout and dimensions for emergency vehicle access. Mr. Wagner verified this was acceptable to the Fire Marshal and he agreed. Mr. Engel explained that all of the roads were 24 foot wide which are standard for township subdivisions with one exception; the entrance to the main commercial portion is 30 feet wide along with South Park Road. It was addressed if overflow parking will be provided in the event a resident has a party, celebration etc.

Mr. Engel explained that he did have a newer plan (next submittal) which reflects 50 parking spaces distributed throughout the townhome section for this use. Mr. Wagner asked what happens with the snow in the cul-de-sac containing additional spaces. Mr. Engel replied that it would be pushed over the edge. Mr. Engle stated that there were approximately 50 extra parking spaces in the townhome section; they meet requirements in the apartment section and have 35 extra spaces between the two commercial leases.

Mr. Bartle stated that the Applicant Will Comply to items 7, 8 and 9.

Mr. Bartle stated that a Waiver will be requested for Section 215-16.E.(6) to have approaches to intersections to follow a straight horizontal course for less than 100 feet due to rolling terrain and shallow bedrock. Mr. Engel cited an example of an intersection where there is a curve before you get to the intersection where there is less than 100' of straight-away.

Mr. Bartle stated that a Waiver will be requested for Section 215.16.E.(8) & 215-17.D(10) to allow 15' curblines radii for residential streets due to rolling terrain and shallow bedrock. Will comply by providing proposed curb line radii dimensions on the plan set.

Mr. Bartle stated that a Waiver will be requested for Section 215.17.B.(1) to have driveway slopes not exceed 8%. Most driveways do not exceed 20 feet in length and an 8% driveway slope is necessary (due to rolling terrain and shallow bedrock) to reach the first floor of some residential units. Mr. Engel stated that most driveways are 20 feet and the ordinance states that for 20 feet before you get to the right-away line it has to be 4%. That effectively only allows 4% for driveway slope. Mr. Engel prepared a detail to show it more clearly.

Mr. Wagner addressed Mr. Engel's continued reference to shallow bedrock. He asked where the shallow bedrock is located and if the applicant is blasting for utilities on that site. Mr. Engel replied they will be blasting. Mr. Wagner again asked where the bedrock is shallow. Mr. Engel said that their next submittal would have a test report of 100 borings showing locations. In general there is 5-7 feet up front and 7-9 feet out back. Mr. Camburn asked how deep cuts will be at the deepest location for grading purposes. In general, the proposed grade matches the existing grade. The intention is to the original concept of not disturbing too much of the grade and keeping the existing topography. Per his preliminary calculations, Mr. Engel believes the site will balance.

Mr. Camburn inquired how the applicant anticipates getting grass to grow. He asked if the soil was decent or if soil would be imported. Mr. Engel stated that the borings indicated topsoil is available as a result of years of leaf build up and right under that is rock so it's rich and poor.

Mr. Bartle stated that applicant will comply with item 13.

Mr. Bartle stated a Waiver will be requested for 215-17.D.(2) to have parking adjacent to streets, roads and driveways due to the need to provide convenience to townhome residents and apartment dwellers. The measure also reduces impervious cover, and thus, storm water runoff because the drive aisles that service the parking spaces double as roads. Mr. Engel explained that the whole project based upon the road system meandering through the development with parking spaces adjacent to the road preferably near where people live. 100% of the parking is perpendicular to the roadways in the residential sections; the two commercial uses have dedicated parking lots.

Mr. Bartle stated a Waiver will be requested for 215.17.D.(4) to have less than 20 feet of open space between the curb line of any parking area to the outside wall of dwelling unit in residential areas due to the need to provide convenience to townhome residents and apartment dwellers. Mr. Engel stated that for convenience, applicant is looking for parking as close as 10 feet to a building. Mr. Camburn asked how cars would be prevented from running into the building in an area where there is a depressed curb. Mr. Engel replied that per the recommendation of the township engineer, a bollard would be placed to protect any pedestrian from a car that would enter the sidewalk. In addition, applicant is proposing head-in parking with a five foot sidewalk perpendicular to that parking in lieu of four foot sidewalk to provide additional buffer. Sidewalk will have a 6" high curb.

Mr. Bartle stated that applicant will comply with items 16 and 17.

Mr. Bartle stated a Waiver for 215.18.A.(2) will be requested to have all sidewalks four feet wide in all areas except where sidewalk is located adjacent to head in (90 degree) parking, where sidewalks will be five feet wide. (see previous discussion)

Mr. Bartle stated a Waiver for 215.18.A.(3) will be requested to have sidewalks adjacent to curb lines, to forgo the installation of a 2 foot wide grass strip because it becomes a maintenance problem. Mr. Engel stated applicant feels that due the maintenance required for the two-foot section of grass, that typically does not support grass life, a sidewalk directly adjacent to the concrete curb would be more suited for the application. It was recommended that possibly wider sidewalks are installed however, as a buffer to prevent children, etc. walking or falling into the street. Mr. Camburn felt in his opinion that this was a community that advocates walking within the facilities and there would be an awareness to walkers in the street and did not see this as a concern.

Mr. Bartle stated that the applicant will comply with items 20 and 21.

Mr. Bartle stated that a Waiver for 215-18.B.(1) will be requested to substitute Belgium Block Curb for concrete curb and a waiver to not have curbing along Evergreen or Linfield Road. Mr. Engel stated PennDOT permits will be acquired for access to Evergreen Road and applicant will abide to whatever requirements they mandate, but if PennDOT does not require concrete on Evergreen Road, it is asked that the Township not require it. Secondly as there is no development on Linfield Road, applicant is asking for relief to provide curbing along Linfield Road. It is the applicant's feeling that the Belgium Block Curb sets a quality standard for the community that they like and want to project to the buyers.

Mr. Bartle stated that the applicant will comply with item 23.

Mr. Bartle stated that a Waiver for 215-20.C.(3) will be requested to stabilize banks exceeding 25% with seed and mulch rather than riprap due to the residential nature of the development and the high proportion of proposed slopes exceeding 25%. Mr. Wolfgang addressed his concerns pertaining to heavy rains prior to grass growing and how was applicant planning to handle that. Mr. Engle stated that all areas will be topsoiled, conditioned and seeded. There will be straw at the very least. Mr. Wagner stated that at the staff meeting, applicant agreed that anything under 33% would be seeded and mulched and anything over 33% would use erosion blankets.

Mr. Bartle stated that applicant will comply with items 25 and 26.

Mr. Bartle stated that a Waiver for 215-23 will be requested to show all contours and spot grades in vertical datum NAVD 1988, but to provide a conversion factor from HAVD 1988 to NGVD 1929 so that elevations are consistent with USGS and FEMA mapping.

Mr. Bartle stated that the applicant will comply with items 28 thru 33.

Mr. Bartle stated that a Waiver for 215-35.C.(1) will be requested to substitute an aerial photograph to show existing features within 400 feet of the site.

Mr. Bartle stated that applicant will comply with items 35 thru 48 wrapping up the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance Comments and moved to Landscaping Comments.

In regards to Landscaping Item 1, Mr. Bartle stated that a Waiver for 215.20.C.(2) would be requested to permit the removal of trees six (6) inches or more in caliper DBA as necessary for development. Mr. Engel stated that the applicant is seeking clarification on the Ordinance which states that large trees should not be removed except where retention is not practical. Applicant wants to save as many trees as possible and in two weeks will begin to mark individual trees that are high quality enough to preserve.

It was suggested that the applicant consult a professional having forestry knowledge regarding the trees to be removed to prevent future potential fall hazards. Mr. Engel stated that all trees preserved will have specific tree protection, fencing, installed around the base to preserve the root structure. It was also noted that there are areas where trees can be preserved and areas where trees can't be preserved. The applicant explained that from a screening standpoint it is in their best interest to save trees as possible, in addition to the beautification standpoint of the site.

Mr. Bartle stated that a Waver will be requested for item 215.20.C.(5) requesting to utilize existing suitable tree line as landscape buffer.

Mr. Bartle explained that applicant will comply with items 3, 4 and 5.

Mr. Bartle stated that a Waiver is requested for 215-51.B.(5) to provide only ground cover on planting islands with subsurface storm water management features. Mr. Engle clarified this request stating plantings such as pachysandra, ivy or similar on islands where there is a subsurface detention basin under that island so there is no interference with the roots and the basin. Mr. Camburn suggested that the applicant expand the request to include islands which may have utilities or other features which may conflict with tree roots in the island. Mr. Engle agreed that was a good idea and something that could be worked on together.

Mr. Bartle stated that the applicant will comply with items 7, 8, 9 and 10.

Mr. Bartle stated that a Waiver is being requested for 215-54.C.(4)(a) to provide a buffer area of not less than 15 feet in width along all property lines because the building setback lines were reduced to 15 feet by zoning variance.

Mr. Bartle stated that a Waiver is being requested for 215-54.C.(6)(d) to allow substitution of evergreen trees for shrubs at the rate of one evergreen tree for five shrubs. Mr. Engle explained that they are having a difficult time infiltrating the required volume of storm water into the ground as the existing soils are very tight. NPDES permit provides the opportunity for volume credits for evergreen trees (10 cu. ft. credit/tree). Applicant is looking for ways to meet that requirement. Evergreen trees will soak up water from the ground and disperse the moisture into the air.

Mr. Bartle stated that the applicant will comply with the remaining issues under the Landscaping Section.

Moving to the Storm Water Comments, Mr. Bartle stated the applicant will comply with items 1 thru 7.

Mr. Bartle stated that a Waiver is being requested for 203-15.C.(1)(a) to have storm water detention facilities within ten (10) feet of proposed structures. Mr. Engel explained there are some shallow underground basins close to buildings. He explained that Mr. Camburn was generally on board with this as long as certification was provided that the foundation will not be adversely affected by the basin in question. The basins in question would be detention basins which would fill up and drain within hours of the storm; no infiltration systems would be used that close to a building. It was asked if these basins would have any type of protective fencing around them. Mr. Engel replied that the basins are normally dry. Mr. Bartle raised the question of whether installing fence was a safer option and applicant was up for further discussion in regards to the Board's preference. It was stated that all of the detention basins within the actual courtyards created by house are buried so there were no safety issues. The only large basins are exterior on the park side and at the clubhouse area.

Mr. Bartle stated applicant will comply with item 9.

Mr. Bartle stated that a Waiver is being requested for 203-15.D.(6) to comply with PennDOT DM2 requirements for 50 year life span pipe, and including HDPE corrugated pipe up to 60" in diameter. Mr. Engle stated that it was discussed at the staff meeting with the Engineer and Manager and that PennDOT requires 100 year span pipe for very deep installations and limited access highways where maintenance is difficult and they require higher standards. For secondary roads and relatively shallow installations they are fine with 50-year pipe. Mr. Wolfgang asked if Mr. Camburn was okay with this request. Chad responded HDPE is fine and commonly used in private areas but require concrete in public right-aways which there are practically none so ok.

Mr. Bartle stated that applicant will comply with the remainder of the storm water comments.

Traffic comments will be addressed later.

Mr. Bartle moved into the General Comments stating that the Applicant will comply with items 1 thru 20.

Mr. Bartle stated a Waiver is being requested to have all sidewalks 4 feet wide in all areas except where sidewalk is located adjacent to head in (90 degree) parking, where sidewalks will be 5 feet wide which is a restatement of provision discussed earlier.

Mr. Bartle stated the Applicant will comply with the remainder of the General Comments including the approvals required.

Mr. Bartle stated that if there were no further questions in regards to the above, he would proceed to the Caruolo Associates report and asked Greg Richardson to address that.

Mr. Wagner asked if County letter would be addressed. Mr. Bartle feels the letter is a restatement of what we have gone through previously and if there is anything specific that needs to be reviewed he would.

Mr. Richardson mentioned there have been two submissions to PennDOT as well as to the Township in regards to the traffic study. The original response from PennDOT was that no work will be done until the interchange gets resolved. Mr. Richardson mentioned that a grant was

awarded to Limerick and Lower Pottsgrove to expand the interchange and improve the capacity. As background Mr. Richardson stated that the original submission to PennDOT was in August of last year; preliminary comments were received in September and resubmission of traffic impact study was made in August 2016 and are waiting from comment letter.

Mr. Richardson addressed the four comments pertaining to the Traffic Impact Study and stated that comments will be addressed to Mr. Caruolo's satisfaction.

In regards to the Land Development Site Plans, all comments, except for one the Applicant Will Comply. The item in question is item #1 requesting a three-lane cross section. As there is very little frontage on Evergreen Road, it would require the acquisition of right-away along the roadway. Applicant does not see it as needed since the majority of the vehicles will be coming from interchange area. Applicant is asking for reconsideration to that comment. Along with that is the provision of deceleration lanes to facilitate right turn movements into the driveways; again with limited frontage applicant is requesting consideration on that issue. An alternative would be to seek larger radii but similar limitation apply.

Mr. Richardson addressed comment 4 pertaining to pedestrian access to the development which also ties in with SEPTA and the long range plan on how pedestrian needs are met. Pedestrian access is encouraged. Mr. Wolfgang asked if public transportation would be coming into the development either commercial or residential and what details/processes are planned. Early conversations indicate that SEPTA will not come into the residential areas, but the commercial buildings may be considered. Mr. Richardson thought this might be something that happens with future development.

Mr. Wagner asked if a public school bus shelter at the Evergreen Road would be considered. Applicant had not considered this, but Mr. Wagner asked that they please look into one for the area at Driveway 313 and Evergreen Road.

Mr. Bartle announced that the last review was the Bursich sewer letter review. Mr. Bartle stated that the applicant will comply with all the requirements outlined on the letter.

Mr. Bartle summarized by stating that the applicant is essentially a will comply with the Fire Marshal letter; will comply to everything except for the Variance requests and Waiver requests on Bursich's plan review letter; will comply with respect to the Caruolo letter as outlined by Greg and will comply with respect to the Bursich sewer letter. These were all of the things reviewed. In addition, applicant is further down the road with respect to Zoning Hearing Board decisions as favorable decisions were received on seven Variances already. Applicant also received a favorable decision on Conditional Use with respect to the steep slope provisions. Mr. Bartle opened the floor to questions and requested recommendation of preliminary approval.

Mr. Zlomek from The Post Publications asked what happens if more than 58 kids reside in the new development, and how are those impacts accommodated. This prompted a discussion about the impact study and the resources used to determine those numbers that were reviewed by Commissioners in regards to rezoning of the property. Obviously a guarantee cannot be made as to the specific number of children but applicant feels that they have the best answer they can find at the current time.

Mr. Wolfgang expressed his feeling that he is not ready for preliminary approval. Mr. Cebular and Mr. Fulmer both agreed. Although much work has been done there are still too many outstanding items. Mr. Fulmer has concerns with the retaining basins 10' within structures. Mr. Fulmer stated that it does not appear ready to go preliminary but appreciates all of the work done and thinks the applicant went through the Waivers well. He asked Mr. Camburn if he was satisfied with Waivers.

Mr. Bartle brought up time constraints with respect to some of the matters and expressed the urgency of getting their approvals. Applicant understands there are outside Agency issues and are resigned to that but would like to get moving as soon as possible so building permit process can begin the beginning of 2017. Mr. Bartle expressed that if recommendation could not be granted for preliminary approval at this time, it was understood, but asked that it be done ASAP so Preliminary Approval from the Township is secured soon as well.

Mr. Wolfgang asked Mr. Wagner about the status of the water. Mr. Wagner said applicant had to speak to Pottstown. Mr. Engle said they spoke to Pottstown. There is a main in the Park Road Section which will service the entire community.

Ted Drauschak said he received the PennDOT letter, which no one else had seen. Mr. Cebular would like to see all PennDOT comments addressed on the next plan submittal and as a result said he felt preliminary would have to be pushed to next month. Mr. Bartle said they hoped that the entire concept discussed tonight would be enough for preliminary approval so the Applicant can utilize the time to make changes and have it done in time for the Commissioners.

Mr. Ken Brier addressed Mr. Wolfgang's comments; and while he acknowledged Mr. Wolfgang's ideas were good, he reminded the Board that they have seen the Applicant say yes to 95% of the items raised by Bursich. He asked that they get Preliminary Approval Condition on whatever needs to be conditioned as they have obligations to the people who are making giant investments to Lower Pottsgrove and will give Lower Pottsgrove approximately \$2.8 million/year for which the school district will benefit. It was requested that the Board take a break to discuss awarding Preliminary Approval with Conditions.

The PennDOT letter came to the table. The most substantial comment made was the alignment of Park Road with Evergreen Road. Mr. Wagner argued that Mr. Richardson is presenting the letter tonight and asking for a decision. Mr. Wagner respectfully argued the Township wants the project, but Zoning has not yet been approved and there have been no Variances granted. Mr. Bartle stated they are asking for recommendation for Preliminary Approval and would go in front of the Board as soon as Variance was received. Mr. Wagner feels this request is unrealistic; this is the first time this Commission is seeing the plans. The Township is working with Applicant and trying to address issues to reach May deadline imposed by the developer, but this is not realistic.

Mr. Wagner suggested that the Applicant resubmit plans for the October 17th Planning Commission Meeting, get on the Zoning Hearing agenda for the 18th then the BOC the 20th. Mr. Bartle suggests Applicant will try to meet this timeline to keep the project moving and appreciates the representation of the Township to work with Applicant. Mr. Wagner said he wanted to keep the project moving forward, but this was just a suggestion.

A recess was taken at 8:27 p.m. and Board was back in session at 8:46 p.m.

Mr. Cebular stated the Commission would like to see the plans revised to incorporate all the Will Comply issues. In addition, Mr. Camburn shared some concern about the Storm Water Plan that needed to be more robust and he would need time to review that as well. For the most part once those items are received, there should be less comments in the next review letters. The overall feeling is it needs to be pushed until the next meeting. This still allows enough time to hit zoning and BOC.

Mr. Bartle asked Mr. Wagner if this was acceptable. Plans would get revised and submitted to Bursich for review and stormwater plan will be discussed and revised. Mr. Engle requested a list of conditions be provided in regards to the Waivers so they could be added to the drawings. Mr. Camburn said he and Mr. Engle could discuss it and accommodate. Mr. Cebular also requested that the PennDOT letter be distributed to all.

Mr. Camburn made mention that he needs the drawings in his office ASAP (Friday, September 23rd) in order to accommodate the future meeting dates (10/17, 10/18 and 10/20) the Applicant is seeking.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, Mr. Dinnocenti made a motion to adjourn at 8:52 p.m. Mr. Wolfgang seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved. Vote was 4-0 in favor.

Respectfully submitted,

Edward C. Wagner, Township Manager