BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:	William Patterson, Chairman Richard Kratz, Member Dean Becker, Member Edward Savitsky, Member Gordon MacElhenney, Member
OTHERS PRESENT:	Cecile Daniel, Township Manager Kenneth Picardi, Township Solicitor Pamela Stevens, Township Engineer John Moran, Road Master John Moran Jr., Code Enforcement Officer

PUBLIC HEARING – VERIZON – William Patterson turned the meeting over the Kenneth Picardi to conduct the public hearing on the request of Verizon to provide cable service in Perkiomen Township. Daniel Revy from Verizon was present to discuss with the Board of Supervisors the Cable Franchise Agreement that would allow Verizon a nonexclusive franchise in Perkiomen Township. The approval of the franchise and authorization to enter into this agreement is set forth within the proposed Ordinance No. 197. Mr. Revy indicated that the present schedule is to complete installation of the fiber in the Township's right-of-way by the 4th quarter of 2006. The installation of the fiber will allow the transmission of and provide for cable service in the Township. This would allow Verizon to begin servicing customers by the 1st quarter of 2007. Ordinance No. 197 was an Ordinance allowing the Board to enter into a Cable Franchise Agreement that would grant a nonexclusive franchise to Verizon Pennsylvania, Inc., and to construct, install, maintain, extend, and operate a Cable Communications System in Perkiomen Township. Dean Becker informed his fellow Board members that due to his business dealings with Verizon he cannot vote on the proposed Ordinance and Agreement and will therefore be abstaining. Upon closing the public hearing, Mr. Picardi turned the meeting back to Mr. Patterson. Mr. Patterson then asked for a motion on the proposed Ordinance No. 197. Richard Kratz made a motion, seconded by Gordon MacElhenney to approve Ordinance No, 197 and authorized the chairman to sign the Cable Franchise Agreement between Perkiomen Township and Verizon Pennsylvania Inc. There were no public comments on the motion. The motion was carried by a vote of 4 – Yes to 1 Abstention (Dean Becker).

MINUTES: The minutes of the May 2, 2006 meeting were approved as presented.

POLICE REPORT: The Board reviewed the PA State Police Report for April.

CORRESPONDENCE:

- The Lower Frederick Regional Ambulance Report
- CPVRPC- Minutes of their meeting

- Letter from Trappe Fire Co. #1 Ambulance
- > PSATS Bulletin
- Letter to the Steinbach regarding 2005 Road Project
- Letter to Arthur Feltes of the Montgomery County Waste System Authority regarding Leaf Waste Collection.
- Letter sent to Frank Pizzi of 1100 Cornwallis Way and Georgio Calabretta regarding fences.

SOLICITOR'S REPORT: Kenneth Picardi reported that the Township received approval from the Pennsylvania Department of Economic & Community Development for the \$3,000,000.00 General Obligation Note for Open Space. Settlement for the loan is tentatively scheduled for June 29, 2006. Regarding Verizon, that was taken earlier in the meeting. Regarding the Grass Ordinance, he had made all the necessary changes and the proposed Ordinance will be before the Board for consideration later in this meeting.

EXECUTIVE SESSION – Mr. Picardi requested an Executive Session to discuss the issues presented by the attorneys representing John Meyers and the Manns. This Executive Session was held after the June meeting for the purposes of discussing the matters set forth by legal counsel.

ROAD MASTER'S REPORT: John Moran submitted his report for May to the Board. In addition, Mr. Moran reviewed his memo of June 2, 2006 regarding the Thermo Plastic Bid. At the May meeting the Board awarded the Line Painting Bid to PSX of Kennett Square, PA and the Thermo Plastic Bid to Mid Atlantic, Gaithersburg, MD. Upon notification, Mid Atlantic sent a letter informing the Township that they were withdrawing their bid. In its letter, Mid Atlantic stated that their prices were based upon their being awarded both the line painting and the thermo plastic bid. Kenneth Picardi reviewed the bid documents and indicated that in the future the language should be made clear as to how the Board will determine and decide awarding of this bid. Mr. Moran pointed out that there was not a great deal of difference in the bid price between Mid Atlantic and PSX on the thermo plastic bids. He reviewed this with Mr. Picardi and both he and Mr. Picardi recommended that the Board accept the letter of Mid Atlantic to withdraw their bid and award the thermo plastic work to PSX since PSX was the next lowest bidder. Gordon MacElhenney made a motion, seconded by Dean Becker to accept the letter from Mid Atlantic concerning withdrawal of their bid on the thermo plastic work and award the thermo plastic work to PSX. There were no public comments on the motion. The motion was carried by a unanimous vote of 5-0.

FIRE MARSHALL'S REPORT: John Moran submitted his May report to the Board.

CODE ENFORCEMENT REPORT: John Moran Jr. submitted his May report to the Board. In addition to his report, Mr. Moran reported on two other items. First was the memo regarding the proposed doctor's office in the Iron Bridge Corporate Center. The only comment was Mr.

Savitsky asking about the parking. Mr. Moran indicated that he is waiting for information from Jerry Gorski as to how they proposed to handle the additional parking. Second was the variance application filed by T-Mobile. T-Mobile would like to construct a telecommunications facility at 551 Gravel Pike. Since this is not allowed under the Zoning Ordinance, T-Mobile has filed a variance application to the Perkiomen Township Zoning Hearing Board. The Board discussed the application, but needed more information that Mr. Moran did not have. It was decided that before the Board decided whether to attend the public hearing, they would like someone from T-Mobile to attend the next meeting. The Board directed Kenneth Picardi to contact T-Mobile and ask that someone from the company attend the July 11th Board Meeting to discuss the application to the Zoning Hearing Board.

PLANNING COMMISSION REPORT: The Planning Commission held their meeting on May 16, 2006. The following items were reviewed: (1) Anthony Paone a Preliminary/Final Subdivision Plan for 2 lots. (2) Kriebel – Preliminary Subdivision for property located at Seitz Road, and (3) DiDomenico – Final plan for property located on Trappe Road. All three plans will be discussed later under new business.

ENGINEERS REPORT: Pamela Stevens was present to review the following item:

2006 ROAD PROJECT - Ms. Stevens received her memo of June 2, 2006 regarding the 2006 Road Project. In her memo, Ms. Stevens listed the following items: (1) Betcher Road from realignment to Trappe Road, (2) Iron Bridge Drive from GP Clement Drive to SR 29, (3) GP Clement Drive - full length, (4) Meyers Road from Miller Road to Seitz Road, Kagey Road from Trappe Road to Forge Road, (5) Cranberry Blvd from Kagey Road to Brandywine Road, and (6) Fox Heath Blvd the walkway & Fox Heath Blvd an overlay. The Township will act as the General Contractor and will use the companies whose bids were awarded under the 2006 Materials, Supplies, Contractors Award made earlier this year. P.K. Moyer was the equipment contractor. They will supply the equipment and operator. Highway Materials was the company that was awarded the road material supply contract. The Township will purchase the road materials from this company. The work will include a 1-1/2" scratch course, milling, clean up, tack coat, black top and pavement markings. Based upon the prices awarded under the Materials & Supply Bid, Ms. Stevens estimates that the total cost would be \$275,172.15. Ms. Stevens recommended that the Board award the road project as a local forces contract. With the recommendation of the Township Engineer, Edward Savitsky made a motion, seconded by Richard Kratz to approve the road work to be completed as a local forces contract and as Ms. Stevens listed and presented in her memo of June 2, 2006 at a cost of \$275,172.15. There were no public comments on the motion. The motion was carried by a unanimous vote of 5-0. Regarding the proposed sidewalk installation along Cranberry Boulevard, Ms. Stevens recommended that this work be a standard formal bid. She did receive three quotes. The one quote was received beyond the deadline and was not on the proper forms. The other two bids

were over the \$10,000 level. The Board directed Ms. Stevens to proceed with the standard

bidding format for the installation of additional sidewalk along Cranberry Boulevard.

HERITAGE WOODS LOT #6 - Heritage Woods Lot #6 – Heritage Building Group requested the escrow release for the work the was completed on Lot #6. Under the Use & Occupancy Permit Escrow Agreement, Heritage Building Group posted a check in the amount of \$22,035.75. The work to be completed under this agreement included a retaining wall, grading, seeding, and replanting a cleared area of the Riparian Corridor. Both Pamela Stevens and Nathan Walker (MCPC) inspected the work that was completed and recommended that the escrow be release. The Board discussed the request and questioned the guarantee for the plants/trees that were planted in the Riparian Corridor. The Board discussed holding the ten percent contingency for eighteen months. During that period the contingency would cover any of the trees/plants that were planted in the Riparian Corridor. By holding the ten percent contingency, the amount of the escrow release would be \$20,032.50. Edward Savitsky made a motion seconded by Richard Kratz to release \$20,032.50 and hold the ten percent contingency for eighteen no public comments on the motion. The motion was carried by a unanimous vote of 5-0.

RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES: The treasurer read the receipts and expenditures for the month of May. After review of same, Dean Becker made a motion seconded by Richard Kratz to authorize payment of the May bills. There were no public comments on the motion. The motion was carried unanimously by a vote of 5-0.

NEW BUSINESS:

RESOLUTION 2006-16: Anthony Paone submitted a proposed Preliminary/Final Plan for 130 Betcher Road. Suzanne Creveling was present to discuss this proposal with the Board of Supervisors. The Planning Commission recommended at their May 16, 2006 meeting that the Board consider approval of this Preliminary/Final Plan subject to the following conditions and waivers:

ZONING

1. The zoning data for proposed lot 2 on sheets SP-1, GP-1, and ES-1 shall be changed to show the correct data for an Accessory Structure Front Yard Setback on a Flag Lot. The correct distance is 50 feet.

COMPLIANCE WITH SUBDIVISION AND LAND DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE

- 1. Approval from the Montgomery County Conservation District for Erosion and Sedimentation Pollution Control is required for this project. Evidence of approval will be required prior to recording of the plans, Sections 11.51(f) and 11.60 S.O.
- 2. The approval letter from Aqua PA shall also be submitted upon receipt by the applicant.

- 3. The seal of the professional engineer responsible for the preparation of the plan shall be on the plans, per Section 11.42(a)(3) and 11.43(a) of the Township SALDO, and all certifications shall be completed.
- 4. A performance guarantee shall be executed prior to the signing of the Final Plan, Section 11.29. The items at a minimum to be in the escrow include the stormwater facilities, landscaping, erosion and sedimentation pollution control facilities, and Betcher Road trench restoration.
- 5. The Plan shall be labeled "Final Plan" rather than Preliminary/Final.

STORMWATER MANAGEMENT COMMENTS

- 1. As requested, the applicant has made a reasonable attempt to design the site so that almost all of the runoff from the proposed driveway will be captured and conveyed to the underground detention facility. However, it appears that the design of the "yard drain" and 4" PVC pipe to the facility will not adequately convey the runoff. It needs to be demonstrated that runoff will not "back up" through the system. The Stormwater Management Analysis indicates that for the 2-year storm event, water will reach a peak elevation of 202.90 ft. within the underground facility. The proposed elevation at the grate of the yard drain is 201.75 ft. It is evident that the 2-year storm may "back up" the system. The 5-year, 10-year, 25-year and greater storm events will create even worse conditions. Additionally, adequate capacity of the proposed inlet and drain pipe shall be demonstrated.
- 2. Please note that all ownership and maintenance notes and easement language are subject to the review and approval of the Township Solicitor.
- 3. The proposed stormwater access easement shall include the proposed driveway for proper access to inspect the facilities.
- 4. It has been indicated that the applicant has reviewed Section 703 of the Stormwater Management Ordinance which addresses the required Maintenance Agreement for Privately Owned Stormwater Facilities.
- 5. Per Section 313.C of the Stormwater Management Ordinance, the applicant shall submit evidence of E&SC Plan approval from the Montgomery County Conservation District, prior to the signing of the final plan. It has been indicated that the applicant will submit evidence of the approved plan upon approval by the Montgomery County Conservation District.
- 6. There is a minor typing error located in the "Engineer's Stormwater Certification" block, which shall be corrected. Additionally, irrelevant municipalities are referenced in the "Stormwater Acknowledgement" block and the "Owner Signature" block. These typos and any (if any) similar typos throughout the plans need to be corrected.

SANITARY SEWER COMMENTS

1. Developer's Engineer is responsible for completing and submitting the necessary forms associated with the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection Sewage Facilities Planning Module Application. Approval by the PADEP of the planning module shall be submitted to the Township prior to signing the Final Plan.

PERKIOMEN TOWNSHIP BOARD OF SUPERVISORS MONTHLY MEETING MINUTES: JUNE 6, 2006 GENERAL COMMENTS

- 1. General Note #10 on Sheets 1-4 shall include Lot One as well.
- 2. Note #7 shall be expanded to state "A copy of the certification of the capped well shall be submitted to the Township prior to the issuance of a building permit for Lot 2.
- 3. Sheet 3 Landscaping A note shall be added that states that "All plant material shall be guaranteed by the applicant for twelve (12) months from the date the Township Engineer certifies the installation of the Landscaping. Any plant material determined by the Township Engineer to be dead shall be replaced.

WAIVERS: The following waivers are hereby approved:

- 1. Section of 11.41(a) of the Subdivision Ordinance requires the plan to be drawn at a scale of 1"=50'. The prepared plan is drawn at 1"=40'. The Planning Commission recommended that the Board approve the waiver request. The use of the scale of 1"=40' makes the plan easier to read and review.
- 2. The Applicant has requested waivers from Sections 11.52(c), 11.72(c), 11.72(d) of the Subdivision Ordinance regarding cartway width, curb and sidewalk requirements. The Planning Commission recommended the Board approve these waiver requests because the area frontage is approximately 230 feet and the proposed subdivision is surrounded by existing homes on Betcher Road.
- 3. The applicant has requested a waiver from providing existing conditions within 150 feet beyond the property line, as per Section 11.42(a)(10) of the Subdivision Ordinance. The Planning Commission recommended the Board approve this waiver request due to negative response from the neighbors granting permission that would have allowed the applicant's surveyors on to their property. Aerial photograph will be substituted in place of the required existing conditions.
- 4. General Landscaping Comments Ordinance 173, Section 1.2 required street tress. The applicant explained that the plan shows there is significant existing vegetation that exists to meet the street tree requirement. There are 4 trees marked for removal due to the site distance issues. The Planning Commission is recommending that the Board approve the waiver request subject to the required evergreen trees shall be 9 feet high and the canopy trees shall be 2.5 inch caliper.

Upon review of the proposed plan, Richard Kratz made a motion seconded by Dean Becker to approve Resolution 2006-16 approval of the 130 Betcher Road Subdivision with conditions and waivers. There were no public comments on the motion. The motion was carried by a unanimous vote of 5-0.

RESOLUTION 2006-17: Violet Kriebel has filed a Preliminary Application for a proposed subdivision located at 215 Seitz Road. This is a proposed 4 lot subdivision. Chad Camburn from Bursich Associates was before the Board to review the proposed Preliminary Subdivision that the Planning Commission recommended that the Board consider granting approval with the following

conditions and waivers:

COMPLIANCE WITH ZONING ORDINANCE

1. The Front Yard setback for lots 2 & 4 on Sheet 1 of 8 shall be provided.

COMPLIANCE WITH SUBDIVISION AND LAND DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE

- 1. Section 11.42(a)(10) of the Subdivision Land Development Ordinance: Existing conditions 150 feet beyond the property line shall be required unless waived under Final Plan review.
- 2. The Plan Note 17 on Sheet 1 shall be revised.
- 3. Section 11.52(c) of the Subdivision Land Development Ordinance: Seitz Road. The applicant requested a partial waiver from the required widening on Seitz Road. At this time, the Planning Commission did not recommend consideration of this waiver until review of the widening by PECO. The request for this partial waiver will be discussed during the review for Final Approval.
- 4. The Township Solicitor shall review and refine the statement on Sheet 1 regarding Harrison Avenue: "Per agreement, road pavement to be installed by others. Curb and sidewalk to be installed by applicant". The pavement cross-section is to be upgraded to Township Standards by Spring Hill Realty, its successors or assigns, or others. Section 11.52(a)(6) of the Subdivision Land Development Ordinance. Mr. Camburn questioned the language regarding Harrison Avenue. Based upon previous discussions Spring Hill Realty and the Township were going to be doing certain upgrades to Harrison Avenue. The second sentence was changed to require the upgrading of Harrison Avenue to Spring Hill Realty its successors or assigns, or others.
- 5. The Township Solicitor shall review Note #10 on Sheet 1 regarding dedication of Harrison Avenue to the Township.
- 6. This project shall be labeled as a 'Preliminary Subdivision', not "Preliminary-Final Subdivision", Section 11.42(a) of the Subdivision Land Development Ordinance.
- 7. Letters from the Perkiomen Township Municipal Authority (PTMA) shall be provided for the proposed connections of the three lots. The plan does not indicate if there are any easements required for the proposed services; the ownership and maintenance of the proposed force main should be clearly discussed with the PTMA, Section 11.42(a)(13)(i) and 11.42(a)(13(vii) of the Subdivision Land Development Ordinance. Mr. Camburn indicated that his client was only going to connect the three new homes to public sewer. The existing home would remain on the on-site septic system. The resolution was changed from four to three.

The Applicant will request a meeting with the Municipal Authority to discuss the sanitary system and required easements. The Plan shall be revised per the meeting conclusions.

- 8. Note 13 on Sheet One shall be revised to properly display the monument symbol within the quotation marks.
- 9. Approval from the Montgomery County Conservation District for Erosion and Sedimentation Pollution Control is required for this project. If the proposed disturbance is to be greater than

1.00 acre, an NPDES Permit may be required. Evidence of approval will be required prior to recording of

the plans, Sections 11.51(f) and 11.60 of the Subdivision Land Development Ordinance.

- 10. The radii at the driveways shall be labeled, Section 11.52(m)(2) of the Subdivision Land Development Ordinance.
- 11. The applicant shall submit a copy of the letter from the water company who will be providing service, Section 11.57 of the Subdivision Land Development Ordinance. The applicant shall also submit a letter from the PTMA concerning their approval for the proposed sewer extension and connections, Section 11.55 of the Subdivision Land Development Ordinance.
- 12. A performance guarantee will need to be executed prior to the signing of the Final Plan, Section 11.29 of the Subdivision Land Development Ordinance. The items at a minimum to be in the escrow include the road improvements, seepage beds, sanitary force main, road restoration, erosion and sedimentation pollution control facilities, curb, sidewalk, landscaping, and utility relocations(if applicable). Mr. Camburn questioned adding the utility relocation to the escrow if PECO's opinion would be that they would prefer that the existing telephone poles not be relocated. It was agreed to add the words, if applicable, after utility relocations.
- 13. Section 11.59(c) of the Subdivision Land Development Ordinance. Our office is forwarding the Plan to the appropriate utility company (PECO) for review.
- 14. Submission and compliance with the Final Plan requirements of the Subdivision Land Development Ordinance, Sections 11.26, 11.27, 11.28, and 11.29.

STORM SEWER COMMENTS

- 1. The applicant must perform a detailed soils investigation to determine the feasibility of stormwater infiltration within this project, per Section 304.B of the Stormwater Management Ordinance. The evaluation shall be performed by a qualified professional, and at a minimum, address soil permeability, depth to bedrock, and subgrade stability. The investigation shall address the existence of any limestone areas within the project area. If the evaluation concludes that stormwater infiltration is feasible, then the proposed drainage design shall incorporate infiltration BMPs. Percs and probes shall be conducted (by a qualified individual) in the areas of the proposed infiltration facilities to ensure that their intended function is physically feasible. This investigation shall be completed prior to submission of the Final Plans.
- 2. The applicant shall demonstrate that the proposed design complies with the applicable Nonstructural Project Design (Sequencing to Minimize Stormwater Impacts) requirements outlined in Section 302 of the Stormwater Management Ordinance.
- 3. A cursory review of the proposed design was performed assuming that infiltration will be feasible. If the conclusion is indeed that infiltration is feasible on the project site, then the proposed design, consisting of individual seepage beds (with level spreaders at the overflow outlets) for each proposed home, and a small infiltration basin will be acceptable. In review of the information submitted the following comments for the applicant to shall be considered when resubmission of the Final Plans:
 - a. The Stormwater Report indicates an assumed time of concentration (t_c) of 5 minutes (the

minimum) for both pre- and post-developed site conditions. While this practice is conservative while analyzing post-developed conditions, it is not conservative when

analyzing pre-developed conditions, unless calculations are shown to demonstrate that the pre-developed t_c does not exceed 5 minutes. The drainage area maps shall identify t_c flow paths, and the TR-55 method shall be utilized to determine the appropriate t_c 's to be used to analyze the pre-developed conditions of the site.

- b. The plan shall demonstrate that runoff will not be increased or directed into the intersections of the proposed driveways with the existing roads, specifically at the intersection of the proposed Lot 2 driveway with Seitz Road.
- c. The bottom elevation of each individual seepage bed shall be provided in the construction detail for the seepage beds.
- d. A construction detail for the proposed infiltration basin needs to be provided on the plans.
- e. Hydrograph No. 6 (Basin B1), which routes the proposed infiltration basin is referred to in the Stormwater Report, but has not been provided in the report.
- f. It appears that the sizing of each of the proposed seepage beds has been based off of the proposed conditions on Lot 3. Lot 3 proposes the largest area of roof cover, so this concept is conservative. The Stormwater Report shall clearly indicate how each facility has been designed. Additionally, the report refers to Hydrograph No. 7 (Roof Runoff Lot 3), but the hydrograph is not included in the report.
- 4. The drainage plan shall consist of all applicable calculations, maps, and plans, per Section 403 of the Stormwater Management Ordinance.
- 5. Per Section 313.C, of the Stormwater Management Ordinance the applicant shall submit evidence of E&SC Plan approval from the Montgomery County Conservation District for any project in which the earth disturbance will exceed one (1.0) acre of disturbance, prior to final plan approval. The applicant shall be aware of the additional E&SC design standards and criteria that must be applied where infiltration BMPs are proposed, per Section 313.B of the Stormwater Management Ordinance.
- 6. There shall be a drainage easement around the seepage beds to provide for their access for maintenance or repair. Easements shall be provided around all proposed stormwater management facilities. Mr. Camburn felt that the correct word at the beginning of the second sentence should be easements. Ms. Stevens agreed and the word was changed to easements.
- 7. The ownership and maintenance notes for the proposed stormwater management facilities will be subject to the approval of the Township Solicitor.

GENERAL LANDSCAPING COMMENTS

- 1. The clear sight triangle shall be reflected on the grading and utility plan to ensure that the street trees are proposed outside of the triangle.
- 2. A partial waiver was recommended by the Planning Commission under Ordinance No.173, Section 1.2 to provide eighteen (18) street trees in lieu of the required twenty-seven (27)

trees. Three of the eighteen trees are to be supplemented on Lot 1. The reason why the Planning Commission

recommended the partial waiver was due to sight distance problems at driveways and road intersection.

GENERAL COMMENTS

- 1. On Sheet #3, it appears that the force main will be obstructed by the existing utility pole. The plans shall be revised to eliminate the conflict.
- 2. In the layout of Lot 2, the applicant and the applicant's engineer shall be cautioned that the vertical curve of Seitz Road may not be conducive to the placement of a safe driveway access onto Seitz Road. The applicant shall provide sight distance information on the plans.
- 3. The details on sheet 4 for the trench and backfill restoration shall be amended to reflect 2A not 2A modified, ID-2 not ID-2A, and the choice of 8 inches of stone with binder and wearing shall be eliminated. The note shall be expanded to include installation within the right-of-way areas. The superpave material equivalents shall be placed in the details.
- 4. The plans shall be revised to note "2A Stone" anywhere on the plans that "2A Modified Stone" is noted.

SANITARY SEWER COMMENTS

- 1. A note shall be added to the plans stating that the sanitary sewers will be constructed in accordance with the Perkiomen Township Municipal Authority (PTMA) Standard. Specifications and Requirements for the Construction of Sanitary Sewers, dated June 2002.
- 2. Harrison Avenue is to be offered to the Township for dedication. The engineer shall consider moving the Harrison Avenue force main, currently shown in the ultimate right-of-way for Harrison Avenue, into the street. The engineer shall respond in writing if the force main can not be relocated to the street. If the force main can not be located in the road, a 20 foot permanent easement and 30 foot temporary construction easement for the force main must be established. An easement description and exhibit shall be submitted for review. The easement shall be shown on the plans and should state "Sanitary Sewer Easement offered for Dedication to the Perkiomen Township Municipal Authority."
- 3. The water main and sanitary sewer force main crossing appear to be closer than the DEP recommended standard practices. The sanitary sewer shall be located a minimum of 18 inches vertically from other utilities and 10 feet horizontally. A note pertaining to this shall be added to the plans. Mr. Camburn pointed out that the use of the words vertically and horizontally are in the wrong place, the words need to be switched so that it is 18 inches vertically and 10 feet horizontally. Ms. Stevens agreed and the words were switched.
- 4. The engineer shall consider placing 45 degree bends on the force main for Lot 4 rather than a 90 degree elbow.

- 5. The cap shown at the end of the force main on Lot 1 shall be noted on the plans.
- 6. A typical flushing connection for low pressure force mains shall be shown close to the termination of the force main at Lot 1 and Lot 4.
- 7. The following PTMA details shall be added to the Plans
 - a. S-S-18 Bedding and Backfill
 - b. S-S-21 Typical Flushing Connection for Force Main
 - c. S-S-22 Typical Drop Connection Force Main Discharge into Manhole.
 - d. S-S-23 Thrust Block Installation
 - e. S-S-24 Thrust Block Installation
 - f. S-S-25 Pressure Lateral to Low Pressure Main
- 8. The grinder pump that is specified is in the PTMA Standards is a Hydromatic TRST-HPG200. The engineer shall note this on the plans and shall revise the Engineer's Report and calculations submitted to reflect this model pump.
- 9. A note shall be added to the plans stating that the grinder pump will be installed in accordance with the PTMA standards Section 11306 and other applicable sections. The grinder design and installation shall also be in accordance with the recommended practices outlined in the PADEP "Domestic Wastewater Facilities Manual."
- 10. Approval of the planning module by the PADEP shall be submitted to the Township prior to the signing of the Record Plan. If the applicant intends to utilize the existing on-site septic system for the existing home, approval of the on-site system by the Montgomery County Heath Department shall be submitted to the Township prior to the signing of the Record Plan.
- 11. The stationing shown on the sanitary sewer profiles shall also be shown on Grading/Utility and Landscaping Plan (Sheet 3).
- 12. The profile on Sheet 6 shall be adjusted as the 210 elevation line is missing.
- 13. The engineer shall evaluate the profiles; the connection to Harrison Avenue shown on the Seitz Road profile has an elevation of approximately 211 feet. Whereas the connection shown on the Harrison Avenue/RainTree Circle Profile shows this connection at an elevation of 207 feet.
- 14. The engineer shall clarify the note shown on Sheet 6 on the profiles that states Lot 2 shall be capped and stubbed. Sheet 3 shows Lot 2 as having a grinder pump, not a capped connection for future use.
- 15. The size and material of the force main and other appurtenances shall be shown on the plans.

- 16. Although this is not depicted on the plans, a note shall be added to the plans stating that laterals are not to be located within the driveways. This note may eliminate potential of this happening during construction.
- 17. The material of the force main shall be shown as Schedule 80 as required in the PTMA standards.
- 18. Also, a developer agreement with the PTMA and establishment of a tapping fee and escrow will need to be established prior to starting construction.

WAIVERS: The following waivers are hereby approved:

- 1. <u>Seitz Road</u>, The Applicant has requested waivers from Sections 11.72(c) and 11.72(d) of the Subdivision Land Development Ordinance regarding curb and sidewalk requirements. The Planning Commission recommended the Board consider approval of this waiver request.
- 2. Lot 4 is not generally in conformance with the requirement that the lot depth should not be more than 2-1/2 times the width. The lot width is 150 feet and the lot depth is approximately 425 feet. The proposed lot depth is greater than 2-1/2 times. The Applicant has requested a waiver of Section 11.54(a)(3) of the Subdivision Land Development Ordinance due to no other option than the current lot configuration. The Planning Commission recommended the Board consider approval of this waiver conditioned upon the applicant placing a note on the Record Plan that there shall be no further subdivision of lot 4. Mr. Camburn pointed out the restriction of no further subdivision was tied to lot 4 only, not all the lots. The resolution was corrected to indicate only lot 4.

Upon review of the plan and resolution, Dean Becker made a motion, seconded by Edward Savitsky to approve Resolution 2006-17 as amended and approve the Preliminary Plan of the Violet Kriebel Subdivision subject to the conditions and waivers. There were no public comments on the motion. The motion was carried by a unanimous vote of 5-0.

RESOLUTION 2006-18: Louis DiDomenico was present along with Tom Ludgate, his engineer, and Sean Cullen, his attorney, to review the final plans of the subdivision being proposed at 182 Trappe Road. The Planning Commission recommended at their May 16, 2006 meeting that the Board consider approval of the final plans with the following conditions and waivers:

COMPLIANCE WITH ZONING ORDINANCE

1. A conditional use decision has been placed on the first page of the drawings. Note #11 on Sheet 3 states that all dead trees and vegetation should be cut down and removed from the site. This note shall be placed on Sheet #1.

COMPLIANCE WITH SUBDIVISION AND LAND DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE

1. The Plan contains a statement on Sheet #7 addressing the issues of the house and retaining wall. This statement shall be placed on Sheet #1.

- 2. Section 11.43(a)(3): the suggested street name of the private road should be provided for the Township's approval.
- 3. A Performance Guarantee shall be required and executed prior to the signing of the Record Plan, Section 11.29 of the Subdivision Land Development Ordinance.
- 4. All prior approved waivers shall be listed on the Record Plan.

GENERAL COMMENTS

- 1. General note no. 9 on plan sheet no.1 indicates that the owners of Lot Nos. 1 through 8 are to share in the maintenance of the access drives and easement. This includes the proposed private road (Road 'A'). The Developer shall submit ownership information and the maintenance agreement for review by the Township and Township Solicitor. The developer shall also submit the maintenance agreement for the proposed common drive to Lots 6 and 7.
- 2. To ensure a safe access for both the road and the driveway, a warning sign shall be installed where the curb taper comes into where the existing driveway meets the private road.
- 3. A detail of the proposed retaining wall with a sealed design shall be provided before any wall construction begins, as per Sheet 1 notes 23 and 24.
- 4. The appropriate portions of the steps along the Gall property shall be labeled to be removed and to remain. If the steps that are to remain do not meet UCC regulations, they shall be replaced.
- 5. The paving materials for the private road shall include the equivalent Superpave mixes.
- 6. A complete copy of the erosion and sedimentation control plan, report, application, NPDES permit application, post construction storm water management plan and pertinent correspondence with PA DEP or the Montgomery County Conservation District shall be submitted to the Township. Whereas the storm water management system may be influenced by these agencies and the applications made to them, the Township requires that copies of all of this information be submitted in order to properly coordinate implementation of the storm water plan. In addition, the applicant shall submit evidence to the Township that they have received approval of the erosion and sedimentation control plan and an NPDES Phase II permit from the Montgomery County Conservation District prior to the signing of the Record Plan.
- 7. The wetland report, referred to on Note #14 on Sheet 1 shall be submitted to the Township.
- 8. The two parking spaces on Lot #1 shall be 8 x 24 ½ for each of the two parking spaces. There shall be a total of 49 feet in length with striping to delineate the spaces. It appears that this issue has not been addressed on the revised plan.

LANDSCAPING (PER ORDINANCE NO. 173)

- 1. The required plantings given for the filtering buffer in Sheet 3 exceed the provided planting, therefore, the proposed plantings are inadequate.
- 2. According to the symbols provided in the legend, five (5) proposed shrubs are shown south of the property line, in Upper Providence Township. If these are existing shrubs, they should be labeled as such.

PERKIOMEN TOWNSHIP BOARD OF SUPERVISORS MONTHLY MEETING MINUTES: JUNE 6, 2006 SANITARY SEWER

1. The laterals shown on the plans shall also show cleanouts on every bend greater than 45-degrees.

- 2. Sanitary sewer laterals shall be shown on the landscaping plans to ensure trees are not in conflict with the proposed sanitary sewer.
- 3. Separate easement descriptions and details (8 ½ x 11) shall be submitted for review and approval by the Perkiomen Township Municipal Authority. The description and details will be used as part of the recording process. A separate plan shall be made for the easements as it is hard to follow on Sheet 1. Also, it appears that only the easement for the street is described on the plan. It is recommended that the easement for the street be relabeled as a combination 30 foot wide Private Road Easement/Utility Easement. Note #21 on Sheet 1 and Note #20 on Sheet 2 needs to be clarified. Is it the intention of the applicant to dedicate the sanitary sewer system, excluding laterals, to the Perkiomen Township Municipal Authority?
- 4. The 25 foot wide access and utility easement shall also be shown on sheet 2 as it appears that the lateral for Lot 7 is not properly situated within this easement. Showing the easements on Sheet 2 will help eliminate potential errors or conflicts during construction.
- 5. The sewer lateral for Lot 6 appears to be situated on the property line between Lot 6 and 5. This lateral shall be moved so that it is entirely on Lot 6 property.
- 6. Detail S-S-12 Typical House Connection with Trap and S-S-14 Service Lateral Riser Detail Single Service shall be added to the plans.
- 7. The pipe bedding detail shown on Sheet 9 does not appear to be the most recent detail used by the PTMA. The detail shall be deleted and detail S-S-18 Bedding and Backfill for Pipe be used in its place. The grade ring detail shall also be deleted and replaced with the more up to date S-S-08 Grade Ring detail.

STORM DRAINAGE

- 1. The narrative provided in the Stormwater Management Report needs to be revised. All information shall be clear, concise, accurate, updated, and applicable when describing the pre- and post-development conditions of the site and when outlining the methodology used throughout the design of the proposed drainage facilities.
- 2. The pre- vs. post- development peak flow summary table provided in the Stormwater Management Report shall also compare the peak flows accumulated for the entire site.
- 3. There is no drainage area map included with the submittal. The Stormwater Management Report refers to this map, and the map is critical to our review. The applicant shall include their drainage area map within all future report revisions. The map shall clearly delineate all drainage areas, points of interest, and time of concentration flow paths associated with the pre-development and post-development site conditions. If multiple maps are needed for clarity, more than one map shall be submitted.
- 4. Erosion and Sedimentation Pollution Control Plan approval is required. Because the design of the storm sewer facilities is subject to approval from the Montgomery County Conservation District /

DEP, the Applicant must submit a copy of the approval letter from the Montgomery County Conservation District upon receipt. The applicant shall submit evidence to the Township that they have received approval of the NPDES Phase II and the PA DEP General Permits before the signing of the Record Plan. Per SALDO Section 11.43(b), approval of the NPDES Phase II Permit and PA DEP permits must be

provided prior to recording of the plans. If in meeting the requirements of the PA DEP, and subsequent approvals require revisions to the final plans, the final plans shall be resubmitted to the Township for review and approval before signing of the Record Plan.

- 5. A complete copy of the erosion and sedimentation control plan, report, application, NPDES permit application, post construction storm water management plan and pertinent correspondence with PA DEP or the Montgomery County Conservation District shall be submitted to the Township. The storm water management system may be influenced by these agencies and the applications made to them, the Applicant shall submit copies of all of this information to the Township in order to properly coordinate implementation of the storm water plan. In addition, the applicant shall submit evidence to the Township that they have received approval of the erosion and sedimentation control plan and an NPDES Phase II permit from the Montgomery County Conservation District prior to the signing of the Record Plan.
- 6. The applicant has performed percolation tests in the vicinity of several of the proposed facilities. Test locations shall be clearly labeled (i.e.: numbered, lettered, etc.), and test results shall clearly correlate with test locations. The applicant has also performed a soils investigation for depths to bedrock and to the seasonal water table within the approximate areas of several of the proposed facilities. The probe locations shall be clearly labeled in plan view, and the results shall clearly correlate to their locations. Infiltration facilities shall be designed using data obtained from percs and probes within a reasonable vicinity of the location of the proposed facility. The probes shall extend 3 ft. to 4 ft. below the bottoms of the proposed facilities.

Additionally, the applicant refers to percolation rates provided within the **Berks** County Soil Survey, and states that the soil should be appropriate for infiltration based on this information. This information and conclusion is invalid.

The design shall be tied into the test data by providing approximate dewatering times for the proposed infiltration facilities. Dewatering times for infiltration facilities shall not exceed 48 hours. Until all percs and probes have been satisfactorily completed and satisfactorily documented, the validity of the design/analysis cannot be verified.

7. Design, construction, and maintenance of infiltration facilities shall follow the new PA DEP requirements and guidelines set forth in the PA DEP's Draft Stormwater Best Management Practices Manual, which can be found at: http://www.dep.state.pa.us/dep/subject/advcoun/stormwater/stormwatercomm.htm.

The applicant states that the manual has been used in the design of the infiltration facilities.

Construction details need to be provided which direct the contractor how each facility shall be

constructed. Currently, the details that are provided do not indicate bottom elevations for the proposed facilities or exact elevations of incoming pipes. All pertinent elevations and construction information shall be provided on the details.

The construction details shall show that the geotextile filter fabric shall be wrapped entirely around the stone for all proposed infiltrators. Each provided detail contains a note regarding a "temporary impervious plastic liner." It is unclear the intended function of this liner. The notes also refer to restoring pipe penetrations into the geotextile fabric with "glue." The appropriate adhesive shall be specified.

The roof infiltrator details only refer to Lots 2 and 8, while roof infiltrators are shown on the plans for other lots as well. Additionally, the roof infiltrators shall be provided with an overflow structure.

The design of all stormwater facilities shall be documented in the Stormwater Management Report.

Finally, the dimensions of the proposed infiltrators as determined through the design process (as shown in the Stormwater Management Report) shall correspond with the dimensions shown on the plans.

- 8. <u>Easements and access easements</u> shall be provided around and to all proposed Stormwater management facilities (i.e., swales, roof infiltrators, "large" infiltrators, level spreader, etc). The easements shall extend beyond the limits of the facilities to allow for reconstruction of those facilities if needed. Additionally, easements will be required for the leaders which connect to the infiltrators and cross property lines.
- 9. The plans and report are not clear as to why there is not an increase in runoff to the PECO property. As the report is presented, it is unclear that the conclusion states that there is no increase. As mentioned above, a drainage area map has not been provided. Additionally, the roof leaders for all of the proposed dwellings shall be clearly shown on the plans from the dwelling to the drainage facility or discharge point. Presently, the roof leaders for Lots 5, 6 and 7 are shown only at the dwelling. The report and plans must agree and shall clearly show where each roof leader terminates, and whether it discharges to grade or is connected directly to an infiltrator.

Perkiomen Township issues individual building permit plans with lot grading and all utilities. The grading, dwelling, driveway and utilities, etc., will be inspected to ensure that they are constructed according to what is shown on the approved plans.

10. A note shall be added to the plans clearly specifying what the ownership and maintenance responsibilities and limits will be for the shared private access road/strip. A similar note stating the stormwater ownership and maintenance issues for the shared Stormwater management facilities shall be provided on the plans prior to signing the final plan, as well as the non-shared facilities.

When provided, these notes and easement documents will need to be review and approved by the Township Solicitor.

11. The plan shall include construction details for all stormwater facilities including but not limited to infiltration devices, pipe bedding, endwalls, stormwater basins, and swales.

Again, adequate construction details need to be provided for all proposed facilities so that they may be properly constructed.

The proposed level spreader appears to be an earthen berm expected to cause the discharge to make a 90 degree turn. It is unclear how this is physically possible. The level spreader shall consist of some more permanent/hard (i.e.: concrete) device.

- 12. Calculations for the proposed swales shall be included in the Stormwater Report.
- 13. Regarding the proposed "large" infiltrator on Lot 2, it is assumed that the proposed bottom elevation is 181 ft. This assumption is based on the data provided in the Stormwater Management Report. The plans indicate a proposed invert-out elevation of 179.23 ft. from CB-5A, and then a pipe leading to the infiltrator. The provided construction details for the infiltrators indicate that the invert-in elevation of the incoming pipe to the facility should be at a minimum of 2 ft. above the bottom elevation. This means that runoff needs to flow against the grade of the pipe, up nearly 4 ft. through approximately 35 linear feet of pipe to get to the infiltrator. The applicant shall identify proposed invert-in elevations for each proposed infiltration facility and demonstrate that the plan is physically feasible.
- 14. The entire storm sewer system needs to be re-analyzed. The data input into the Hydroflow Storm S Sewers program simply does not match the proposed storm sewer system as shown on the plans.

The entire proposed storm sewer system shall be shown accurately on the profile view plans, with all information pertinent to the proper construction of the system.

- 15. As previously mentioned, gutter flow spread shall be limited to $\frac{1}{2}$ of the travel lane width (in this case 6 feet).
- 16. The applicant shall address how roof runoff will be conveyed from the proposed garage on Lot 1.
- 17. Note 14 (regarding the existence of wetlands on the site) on Sheet 1 of the plans, shall be completed. Currently, there is a blank space reserved for the date when the wetlands investigation was performed.
- 18. All inlets shall be specified as to the specific type of inlet top (Type C, Type M, etc.) to be constructed, especially in the case proposed CB#10. Additionally, the plan shall indicate how runoff is expected to be directed to the inlet. The plan indicates that this inlet is not proposed to be against any curbing.

- 19. For all future plan revisions, a response letter from the applicant's engineer/surveyor, which clearly addresses all comments included in our latest review, shall be submitted.
- 20. Additional comments may be forth coming due to the amount and nature of the aforementioned comments on the Stormwater Management Plan. Revised plans and a revised Stormwater

Management Report shall be submitted which adequately addresses the above comments. If it is determined that the designed stormwater management system needs to be revised such that it affects the approved plan, the plan shall be returned to the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors for review and approval.

Upon review of the proposed plan and resolution, Dean Becker made a motion, seconded by Gordon MacElhenney to approve Resolution 2006-18 the Final Plan of the proposed 182 Trappe Road Subdivision. There were no public comments on the motion. The motion was carried by a unanimous vote of 5-0.

BUXMONT: Cecile Daniel reviewed with the Board a meeting that was held on May 25, 2006 with representatives of Community Services Foundation. This is the organization that we know as Buxmont. Ms. Daniel informed the Board of the number of e-mails she received regarding the situation at 2 Wynnewood Drive. These incidents have accelerated to a point where the PA State Police have been to the home a number of times in the last couple of months. In addition, the impact on the neighbors that live within this community has them very concerned about what is happening at this Buxmont Home. Ms. Daniel informed the Board that Buxmont is licensed by the PA Department of Welfare. In the last 60 days the Department of Public Welfare has renewed Buxmont's license. Ms. Daniel recommended that the Board authorize the Township Solicitor to write a letter to the state informing them of what has been happening at this home. Ms. Daniel explained that the e-mail information was sent to her from Abbe DeMaio. Mrs. DeMaio lives next door to the Buxmont Home. Dean Becker, of which the other Board members agreed, thanked Mrs. DeMaio for her thoroughness in the information that she has sent to the Township and in keeping the Township informed of the situation. Mr. Picardi informed the Board that he made the representatives of Community Service Foundation aware of the Disorderly Conduct Ordinance in this Township. At this time Reverdy Rhodes of Community Service Foundation informed Ms. Daniel that they are going to replace the houseparents. There may be some other community items they may have the girls do. Regardless, the Board felt that they should send a message to the PA Department of Public Welfare and make the agency aware that the Board is concerned with what is taken place in this home and that the agency should take a closer look into how Buxmont is performing. The Board authorized the Township Solicitor to send the letter.

OPEN SPACE PLAN: As required by Montgomery County, under their Green Fields/Green Towns Program, Perkiomen Township prepared an update to its Open Space Plan. This work was conducted during 2005/2006. This draft plan was sent to the adjacent municipalities, Montgomery County, and the Perkiomen Valley School District on April 12, 2006 for their

comments. The Board held two public hearing – one on May 4, 2006 and one on May 23, 2005 on the proposed Perkiomen Township Open Space Plan. This plan was recently approved by the Montgomery County Open Space Board. Resolution 2006-19 is adoption of that plan. Edward Savitsky made a motion seconded by Dean Becker to approve Resolution 2006-19. There were no public comments on the motion. The motion was carried by a unanimous vote of 5-0

GRASS ORDINANCE: The Board has been working on updating the old Grass Ordinance. This work has been on going for the past few months. All changes and corrections were made to the draft Ordinance by the Township Solicitor and it was advertised for the Board's consideration at this meeting. The proposed Ordinance is Ordinance No. 194 – A Grass Ordinance regulating the height, providing for abatement as a nuisance, and procedures of enforcement and penalties for violation. Upon review of the proposed Ordinance, Richard Kratz made a motion seconded by Dean Becker to adopt Ordinance No. 194 - An Ordinance restricting the height of brush, grass, weeds and other vegetation, providing for abatement as a nuisance, establishing procedures for enforcement, and prescribing penalties for violations. There were no public comments on the motion. The motion was carried by a unanimous vote of 5-0.

FIREWORKS: The Central Perkiomen Rotary is holding their annual carnival June 6 through June 10th. The fireworks are scheduled for June 9th. Before they can have the fireworks, the Board needs to grant their permission. The Rotary has submitted a Certificate of Insurance and everything is in order. Richard Kratz made a motion seconded by Gordon MacElhenney to approve the request of the Central Perkiomen Rotary and allow them to hold their annual fireworks on June 9th. There were no public comments on the motion. The motion was carried by a unanimous vote of 5-0.

BETCHER ROAD: There is an existing Agreement between Perkiomen Township and Trappe Borough regarding Betcher Road. This agreement goes back to 1976. Within the agreement, there is a section that lays out what area of Betcher Road that Perkiomen Township will be responsible for and what areas Trappe Borough will be responsible for. Since that Agreement, the metes and bounds of Betcher Road has changed. Trappe Borough sent a letter indicating a desire to revise this existing agreement in terms of the new metes and bounds and in trying to provide better clarification in terms of the responsibility for construction, reconstruction, and maintenance. The Board indicated they are interested in renegotiating this agreement and authorized Kenneth Picardi to work out a revision to this agreement.

CRANBERRY PHASE 4B: The original Maintenance Bond for Phase 4B was in the name of the Perkiomen Township Municipal Authority. It should have been in the name of Perkiomen Township. The bond was corrected and a new Maintenance Bond was submitted to the Township. Mr. Picardi recommended that the Board accept the new bond. Upon the recommendation of the Township Solicitor, Edward Savitsky made a motion, seconded by Dean Becker to accept the new Maintenance Bond for Phase 4B of the Cranberry Development. There

were no public comments on the motion. The motion was carried by a unanimous vote of 5-0.

FEDERAL CABLE LEGISLATION: There is both Federal and State Legislation being proposed that would affect the municipalities' role in negotiating terms with those companies that provide cable television service within the municipal boundaries. This proposed legislation would

not affect companies like Comcast, but would affect companies like Verizon. The present legislative proposals would allow companies like Verizon to negotiate franchises with the state or federal government. The local governments would no longer be able to negotiate franchise agreements with these companies. Resolution 2006-20 is a resolution in opposition of such proposed legislation be it state or federal. Upon review of the proposed Resolution, Richard Kratz made a motion seconded by Gordon MacElhenney to approve Resolution 2006-20 and authorize that it be forwarded to the Township's legislative representatives. There were no public comments on the motion. The motion was carried by a unanimous vote of 5-0.

EXECUTIVE SESSION: William Patterson informed the public that the Board held a Personnel Session prior to the start of this meeting.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned upon a motion made by Gordon MacElhenney and seconded by Dean Becker.