



**UPPER UWCHLAN TOWNSHIP
PLANNING COMMISSION
AGENDA
October 14, 2021
7:00 p.m.**

LOCATION

**Upper Uwchlan Township Building
140 Pottstown Pike, Chester Springs PA 19425**

Masks / face coverings are required.

- I. Call To Order
- II. Approval of Minutes: September 9, 2021 Meeting
- III. Act 537 Plan Update
 - Review the responses to the Planning Commission's comments
 - Following their review of the draft Act 537 Plan Update.
- IV. Township Comprehensive Plan Update
 - Review the 2014 Comprehensive Plan Implementation Matrix and
 - discuss what initiatives have been accomplished, are in progress
 - or are no longer valid.
- V. Next Meeting Date: November 11, 2021 7:00 p.m.
- VI. Open Session
- VII. Adjournment



UPPER UWCHLAN TOWNSHIP

Planning Commission Meeting

September 9, 2021

7:00 p.m.

Minutes

Draft

LOCATION: The meeting was held in person at the Township Building, 140 Pottstown Pike, Chester Springs PA 19425

In attendance:

Members: Joe Stoyack, Vice-Chair; Chad Adams, David Colajezzi, Jim Dewees, Stephen Fean, Jim Shrimp, Jeff Smith

Dave Leh, Township Engineer

Kristin Camp, Esq., Township Solicitor (via phone)

Tony Scheivert, Township Manager

Gwen Jonik, Planning Commission Secretary

Vice-Chair Joe Stoyack called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. A quorum was present. Approximately 40 citizens were in attendance.

Outdoor Storage Tank Ordinance Amendments – August 16, 2021 Draft

The Commission reviewed the August 16, 2021 Draft prepared by the Township Solicitor, reflecting the Planning Commission's August 12 meeting revision recommendations.

Joanne McNaughton, Moore Road resident, made comment that: the terms non-toxic, non-corrosive and non-ignitable are not defined in the Code and should be; safety regulations in Sections 200-80 and 200-90 are for new tanks only, not existing tanks; only outdoor tanks are addressed and suggested addressing indoor aboveground storage tanks. There are multiple areas in the township that allow outdoor tanks and there's no need to expand to the Planned Industrial/Office District (PI/O). That wasn't the intent of Eagleview Corporate Center.

Ms. Camp noted that the terms and text had been reviewed and addressed by the experts; a zoning ordinance cannot be retroactively applied so existing tanks can't be made to comply; this ordinance was to address outdoor tanks; indoor tanks were not a goal of the Board of Supervisors and other requirements cover indoor tanks, which are highly regulated at different levels of government and industries.

Discussion included: define or remove the terms non-toxic, non-corrosive, non-ignitable; the definition of inert includes those terms so it was determined to remove them.

Joe Stoyack commented the Commission could look at the topic of indoor tanks in the future.

Jeff Smith moved to submit to the Board of Supervisors for approval the amended draft with non-toxic, non-corrosive, non-ignitable terms removed. David Colajezzi seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

Joe Stoyack announced the Approval of Minutes would be next and we'd forego Old Business.

Approval of Minutes

Jeff Smith moved, seconded by Chad Adams, to approve as presented the minutes of the Planning Commission's August 12, 2021 Meeting. The motion carried unanimously.

Toll Brothers / 100 Greenridge Road ~ Conditional Use Application

Joe Stoyack explained that the Land Development Plan Approval process is multi-phased, and in this case begins with a Conditional Use Application, proposing 64 homes on a 65-acre parcel. The residential use is allowed on this property in the R2 Residential District (1 dwelling/acre) with the F1 Flexible Development Overlay, allowing a higher density through the conditional use process. The conditional use hearing is tentatively scheduled for October 25. The Application was reviewed by township consultants and the township planning commission and could be reviewed by other commissions or consultants at the Board of Supervisors' preference. The Planning Commission is advisory and provides recommendations to the Board, who has the approval authority. Tonight's discussion of the consultants' comments is in preparation for the conditional use hearing. If the conditional use is approved, Toll Brothers would then submit Land Development Plans that address the conditions outlined in the Conditional Use Decision & Order. They could be preliminary or preliminary/final plans that require further design, reviews, etc. before they are approved. The Commission appreciates and encourages residents to participate at all levels of the approval process and we'll try to hear everyone's comments this evening.

Alyson Zarro presented the Conditional Use Application and Plan submitted August 11, 2021. Also in attendance were Andrew Semon – Toll Brothers, Justin Barnett -- ESE Consultants and Pete Spisszak – Traffic Planning & Design (TPD). The Conditional Use Plan addresses a number of comments from the Sketch Plan review.

The 2 parcels, totaling 65 acres, are singly owned and contain a non-historic dwelling and driveway. The Plan proposes 64 single detached homes. Base zoning (R2) would allow 65 homes and additional 9 units from the F1 Flexible Development Overlay – clustering the homes. The Plan shows treated wastewater disposal fields, which will exceed the disposal capacity required and could be used for other neighborhoods. The wastewater will be treated at the Route 100 facility via the Font Road extension. The access was initially proposed via Lauren Lane but this Plan shows full access from Greenridge and Lauren Lane as an emergency access. They'll need a waiver for a single access street but could also revert to full access through Lauren Lane. Building separation from the shared property with Stonehedge was increased from 20' to 50' buffer; there may be a trail going through that buffer; trail connection to the existing driveway; sidewalks on one side of street; a tot lot is proposed near Lauren Lane which would be restricted to this Homeowners Association; most other comments they'll be able to comply with and there are a few technical revisions to complete. They have submitted for the jurisdictional determination for scope of wetlands and 150' buffer.

Discussion with Planning Commission members included:

Relocate or add another tot lot; it might be relocated which will be proposed during land development; they continue to analyze the grading of the access road through the precautionary slopes; they may need to seek a Zoning variance; the road would be offered for dedication to the township; they've increased the buffer and there is a tree line along the Stonehedge properties; they won't place the trail within the 50' buffer, they'll relocate it; the buffer will be owned by the Homeowners Association (HOA) who will be responsible for it and property markers will delineate where the open space starts; Aqua has confirmed they'll provide public water service; they've requested a waiver from providing an historic resource impact statement as the nearest historic resource isn't within 250' of the proposed development; the sidewalk width is increased to 5' so 2 people can walk side-by-side, and they're requesting a waiver to provide sidewalk on only 1 side of the street; there are inconsistencies in the Fiscal and Recreational Impact Study that will be updated; the paved trail will be for public use if the road is dedicated to the township; if the road remains private, the trail will be private; the traffic study should be updated with school in session or use figures from 2019; TPD calculated the counts using historical data and increased the

percentages resulting in very conservative counts and agreed to by McMahon; several members are concerned with Greenridge Road's safety due to increased traffic on the narrow road; proposing 32' cartways but it was suggested to reduce to 28' cartways; a Commission member suggested keeping the road wider and having parking on both sides because parking is at a minimum on the Plan; Toll noted perhaps widen within the homesites and reduce width in the open area; the units are proposed with 2-car garages and 2 spaces in the driveway; there will be no connection to neighboring Shea Lane cul-de-sac as there's no land or easement to do so; they'll provide an easement for the potential future connection with the Brandywine Trail; the stormwater management measures may improve the existing stream flooding conditions; sanitary sewer system comments will be addressed during the design of the system; adding Stonehedge properties into the wastewater treatment/disposal hasn't been discussed; bay windows are not offered anymore; depth of the house should accommodate a nice-size deck without encroaching the rear yard setbacks; size and style of house very similar to Chester Springs Crossing; targeted construction would be 12-18 months from now; no recommendation is being sought this evening.

Comments from citizens:

John Mahoney, Esq., is representing residents adjacent to the property who will become parties during the conditional use hearing. Their main concerns are that the tot lot should be relocated or eliminated, Lauren Lane should be a secondary access – limited or for emergency access only and not full pavement. The walking trail adjacent to the Stonehedge neighborhood, as proposed, eliminates the function of the buffer between the two developments so they appreciate Toll's agreement to relocate it, and it will terminate in a better location as well. Moving the entire development toward the east was suggested. Toll noted that would require retaining walls on quite a few lots and would be difficult to meet road grade. They've located the homes in what's currently open space so they won't disturb as many trees and it was already moved a little to the east, increasing the buffer and distance between Stonehedge houses and proposed houses. Mr. Mahoney suggested a lighting consultant provide a lighting plan. Ms. Zarro thinks lights will only be at intersections. Mr. Mahoney also suggested that both sides walk the tree line to determine which trees would stay and which would go and do the same regarding widening Greenridge Road. The developer should provide the residents with the differences between spray disposal and drip disposal facilities.

Steve Egnacyzk, 64 Stonehedge Drive, is concerned with the traffic and safety on Greenridge Road, which needs to be widened or shoulders installed for pedestrians. Try not to disturb the tree line which supports wildlife and there's a stonewall in there that should remain. Sewer disposal and storm water basins are of concern as they're on steep slopes of clay and stone.

Jackie Stees, 12 Greenridge Road, commented traffic is already a mess and asked the construction timeline. Andrew Semon noted most likely 12 months for site preparation and then house construction would begin.

Dave Smith, 32 E. Indian Springs, asked of the road grade and moving the houses to the east. Mr. Semon said this is the third layout and works the best with the slopes and the roadway.

Kristine Podvia, 47 E. Indian Springs, commented fewer houses would resolve a lot of these issues.

Lee Ann Smith, 32 E. Indian Springs, would like to see fewer houses.

In answer to questions regarding approving, or limiting, the number of proposed houses, Joe Stoyack advised that the property's zoning is what controls the use and density for development. A property owner has the right to develop their property to its highest legal potential. Zoning ordinances would have to be changed in order to limit development. Chad Adams added that what is being proposed is by-right for the most part and the township tries to make it as palatable to the neighbors as possible.

Dave Smith, 32 E. Indian Springs, commented they don't need sidewalks in their development at this time but would if Lauren Lane is an access.

Carl Broege, 136 Devon Circle, the road is already dangerous without adding 64 new households.

Pat Adams, 128 W. Indian Springs, don't disturb the existing vegetation as it supports wildlife that has been enjoyed for generations.

Elizabeth Woodward, 38 E. Indian Springs, commented that the majority of the parcel is wooded, not open land and a 50' buffer isn't much throughout the seasons, especially if mature trees are removed. They'll lose their privacy.

Bonnie Crockett, 23 Stonehedge, commented that the intersection of Font and Greenridge Roads floods regularly. How can that be improved?

Greg Amicon, 301 Deerhaven, asked about public water service through Aqua.

Marianne Krug, 418 Hilltop, suggested fewer houses and increase the buffer.

Joe Stoyack restated the process for this project: a conditional use hearing will be held by the Board of Supervisors to hear testimony from the developer and the residents and if approved, the plan would go through the land development approval process, which provides greater detail and is reviewed by the consultants, the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors prior to consideration for approval by the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Stoyack announced at 9:25 p.m. that a short recess would be taken. He reconvened the meeting at 9:30 p.m.

The Commission asked if an attorney can attend their next meeting to answer legal questions that may arise regarding this conditional use application. Tony Scheivert will look into that request.

Open Session

Joe Stoyack noted the Commission will begin to update the Comprehensive Plan adopted in 2014 and he'll be speaking with the other Township Boards and Commissions for their assistance. He also proposes the Commission look at several ordinances: outdoor dining in the Village, to make approvals easier; make shared parking approval easier; redevelopment.

Mr. Stoyack announced the next meeting is scheduled for October 14, 2021, 7:00 p.m.

Adjournment

Jeff Smith moved, seconded by Chad Adams, to adjourn the meeting 9:41 p.m. All were in favor.

Respectfully submitted,

Gwen A. Jonik,
Planning Commission Secretary



Birdsboro Office

321 North Furnace Street, Ste. 200

Birdsboro, PA 19508

T 610.374.5285

F 717.560.2778

September 9, 2021

Upper Uwchlan Township Planning Commission
140 Pottstown Pike
Chester Springs, PA 19425

RE: Act 537 Plan Review;
ARRO #10270.71

Dear Planning Commission Members:

Thank you for taking time to review this Act 537 Plan and provide us with your comments and observations. These have been very helpful for us and will certainly help make this planning document a clearer and more understandable narrative for future sewage facilities planning.

Please be aware that ARRO has received a response from the Chester County Planning Commission and this response has indicated that this draft Plan is consistent with the County's Landscapes (Comprehensive) Plan. We are still waiting for a response from the Chester County Health Department. Once we have their response, we will have a better understanding of their concerns and questions.

The following are comments received in a memo from August 18, 2021. The Authorities comments are in bold and our responses follow.

- 1. General Note: All Acronyms should be spelled out on the first usage acronym parenthetically included.**

Response: Acknowledged. Acronyms will be spelled out at the first usage.

- 2. General statement: should state up front somewhere the time horizon this covers. Is it 2022 – 2027 -2030?.**

Response: Acknowledged. This will be corrected.

- 3. Pages i – iii: Include the page numbers for the Appendices in the Table of Contents. List the Tables and Figures, also with page numbers.**

Response: Acknowledged. Since the documents in the Appendices are a variety of documents, tabs will be incorporated that allow for easy reference for specific appendices.

- 4. Pages 2 and 3. General comment. Capacity planning Appendix should probably be referenced directly?**

Response: Acknowledged. The 'capacity planning Appendix' will be referenced directly.

5. Page 2, #3 regarding the extension of Byers Road sewer main to SennDrive and south along Senn Drive towards Township Line Road. Question – What about Byers Road east of Senn Drive where there are already failing systems? Question – why south on Senn Drive? This is an industrial, commercial area where there are only daytime/minimal uses.

Response: PA DEP requested the Township consider providing public sewer on Senn Drive. Clearly, in time, others areas along Byers Road will need public sewer, public sewer can be extended depending upon funding availability.

6. Page 2, #6 Township's Septage Management Ordinance – continued implementation and enforcement of OLDS. If we're not providing sewers, what kind of enforcement is being used? If a lot is too small for any alternate system if the present one fails, is pump and haul an option, and if so, why are we not addressing specifics on pump and haul situations?

Response: Ordinance implementation begins in 2022. Failed OLDS will be reviewed on a case by case basis by the Township and the Chester County Sewage Enforcement Officer

7. Page 3 Infrastructure improvements proposed to be primarily funded through "general obligation bonds". For clarification for the general public, are any of these payments to satisfy these bonds paid out of the General Fund of the Township?

Response: Revenue from user rates will pay the debt service for the bonds. User rates are reviewed annually to ensure adequate revenue for operations, maintenance, and debt service.

8. Page 4, Table. Schedule needs to be updated.

Response: Acknowledged. The schedule will be updated.

9. Page 9 Section under Geological features states 71% of the Township has Pickering Gneiss which is relatively impervious and well yields are limited. Is there data to substantiate this assumption?

Response: The source for this information is the Township's Act 537 Plan dated August 1999 as approved by PA DEP.

10. Pages 15 – 19: Monitoring well results. Would be nice if the regulatory limits are stated. As it is, "below", "well below", "does not exceed" are subjective. How much margin is there? Especially when "spikes" occur. How big of a spike? 10%, 50%.

Response: The text for the monitoring well results will be adjusted to reflect the regulatory limits. PA DEP accepts 10 mg/liter as the maximum allowable level for nitrates and there should be no detectable amount for fecal coliform per 100 milliliters for drinking water.

- 11. Page 26 paragraph 1, include the map from the Comprehensive plan: Rural/Site Responsive, etc? Are these the areas that are not “environmentally and economically feasible” per Page 34 paragraph 5? If so, state.**

Response: The map from the Township's Comprehensive Plan shall be included as requested. The areas that are referenced as not “environmentally or economically” feasible are those areas that are represented by the rural/site responsive designation. This will be adjusted in the text as noted.

- 12. Page 27 b.1: Is this meant to identify that the entire subdivision is served by the respective WWTP? St. Andrews Brae WWTP does not serve the whole subdivision for example.**

Response: It is not meant to identify that the entire subdivision is served by the respective satellite wastewater treatment plants. This will be clarified in the Plan's text in this section.

- 13. Page 30 Population Growth chart. Would it be nice to put a “Current Population (2020)” point on the chart, if possible, otherwise its way out of date.**

Response: The US Census states that the Upper Uwchlan Township Population for 2020 is 12,275. This text on page 30 will be modified to reflect the latest Census numbers.

- 14. Page 34, paragraph 4. Appendix X does not exist.**

Response: This will be removed from the Appendix listing in the contents section of the Plan and the reference will be removed from the text.

- 15. Page 34, paragraph 5 statement about connecting those served by OLDS is not fully consistent with Page 26, paragraph 1 statement that some will not be connected.**

Response: It is the Township's intent to look toward the extension of public sewer service to properties in the “Suburban/Site Responsive”, “Village”, and “Suburban Employment” areas as it is feasible. Those areas in the “Rural/Site Responsive” designation shall continue with on-lot disposal.

- 16. Page 35, paragraph 4. Appendix X does not exist.**

Response: This will be removed from the Appendix listing in the contents section of the Plan and the reference will be removed from the text.

- 17. Page 36, Section 4. This is not well written. Is the first sentence needed?**

Response: This Section shall be rewritten as follows: The Route 100 WWTP will remain as the Township's central treatment facility. Wastewater needs areas and new development shall be

served by this treatment plant . There are no plans to construct new wastewater treatment facilities.

18. Page 36, Section 5, paragraph 3 and page 41 Section 2 paragraph 1. Is this correct for the next 5 years? (Capacity planning document?)

Response: This statement is correct per the Township's Chapter 94 Wasteload Management Report that is submitted to PA DEP annually.

19. Page 39, Section G. The Planning Commission has started the process for updating the Comprehensive Plan, due in two years (2024). Need to rewrite this section to state that.

Response: This Section shall be rewritten to recognize that the Township Planning Commission has started the process of updating the Comprehensive Plan (due in 2024).

20. Page 42, paragraph 2. Should state when Phase 3 is scheduled to come on-line.

Response: This paragraph will be changed to reflect that it is planned for Phase III of the Route 100 wastewater treatment plant to begin construction in 2022 and come on-line in 2023.

21. Page 46, Section B. Why aren't these searches completed? Seems like a potentially big hole.

Response: This Section shall be reworded. The Pennsylvania Historic and Museum Commission (PHMC) searches have been completed for those areas planned for construction of infrastructure. The results have indicated searches have been completed and there are no conflicts with historical artifacts or structures. The Pennsylvania Natural Diversity Inventory (PNDI) searches are complete as well. Avoidance measures are in place to address impacts in the areas of planned infrastructure. In areas where specific species were identified as being impacted, specific measures are being reviewed with the appropriate agencies relative to mitigation of impacts during design and construction.

22. Pages 46 and 59: Cost estimates. While bonds will pay the upfront costs, will the bonds be paid off by the specific property owners or is it spread across all users? What is the estimated yearly cost, including operation and maintenance, to the property owner? What are the assumptions used?

- **Ex. Bordeaux Estates: $\$90,000,000/218 \text{ units} = \$41,284 \text{ per unit}/20 \text{ years} = \$2064 \text{ per year per unit}$. That doesn't include bond interest or operation and maintenance costs. So \$3,000 per year? With OLDS, the cost is \$25,000 - \$40,000 for 20/30/40 years which is cheaper than public sewerage.**
- **What is the incremental cost to those already on community sewers, but being upgraded? At what point is the trade cost prohibitive?**

Response: Typically costs for capital improvements are spread over the entire user base, subject to Authority exemption. Also, Public sewer in this area will not only serve the properties within the Bordeaux Estates communities, the proposed sewer mains will facilitate additional properties, beyond Bordeaux Estates (within the Township) to connect to public sewer.

23. Page 47 Section 1a. Is it 3 or 5 methods of funding? Five are listed.

Response: This will be corrected to reflect that 5 funding methods are discussed in the plan.

24. Page 55 VII A2. The Township has 3 Supervisors not 5.

Response: Acknowledged. This will be corrected in the Plan's text.

25. Page 56 B2. Doesn't the Authority also have responsibilities regarding OLDS?

Response: Upper Uwchlan Township Supervisors enacted an Ordinance amending the Township Code governing the regulations for Individual On-Lot Disposal Systems.

26. Page 56 B and C entire sections. Mixes use of Upper Uwchlan Township Municipal Authority, Authority and UUTMA. Should stick with one. Suggest Authority?

Response: This Section describes that both the Township and the Authority have the structure in place to ensure the implementation of the identified technical alternatives.

27. Page 58: A Planning Commission member agrees with what the Plan states, that “the selected alternative that best meets the wastewater treatment needs of proposed and existing development is a blend of options that can be considered in conjunction with Phase 3 upgrade to the Route 100 WWTP.”

Response: Acknowledged.

28. Page 59 Section 2 After completion of Phase 3? If so, should state.

Response: Acknowledged. The text shall state that there will be available capacity at the Route 100 WWTP for the selected alternatives after the completion of Phase III.

29. Page 59 Section 4. Is this consistent with prior statements of not connecting OLDS in some cases due to environmental and economic reasons?

Response: Yes. That is correct. Environmental and economic reasons as well as location ("Rural Site Responsive") will be given consideration relative to not connecting OLDS to public sewer, in some instances.

30. Page 60: A Planning Commission member finds that the selected financing alternative of general obligation bonds seems to make sense.

Response: Acknowledged.

31. Appendix M. Well, Spring, and Public Water Users Map. Why don't we know what properties have what type of service?

Response: This map will be revised to provide a clearer representation of those properties served by public water and those served by private water sources.

32. Appendix M. Spreadsheet. It is not appropriate to list names and addresses in the Table. They need to be removed.

Response: Names and addresses shall be removed from the table.

33. General Question: Might have missed this in the plan, but is there any sewage disposal area and how much is reserved for the Township's future use for connecting areas with OLDS above the requirements to connect the Village of Eagle properties and those of the Village of Byers?

Response: The Township/Authority is planning to acquire additional disoposal area.

Thank you again for your thorough review and comments on the 537 Planning Document. The revisions noted above will be incorporated and included as part of the public comment document. Your formal comment letter and this response letter will be included in the Appendix of the Plan for reference by the public and by the PA DEP.

Sincerely,



William L. Bohner, Jr., P.E.
Project Engineer

Cc Upper Uwchlan Township
 G. Matthew Brown, P.E., DEE – Authority Administrator
 David M. Schlott, Jr., P.E. - ARRO

Chapter 7

Implementation Matrix

The following implementation matrix summarizes all the Implementation Steps that have been presented and discussed in each of the prior five chapters (Chapters 2 through 6). They are organized as above: first by chapter, then by section, and finally by tier.

Key

- BoS Board of Supervisors
- PC Planning Commission
- TM Township Manager

Implementation Strategy

Chapter 2. Land-Use, Housing, and Economic Development		
2.1 Land-Use		Lead
Tier 1*		
2-1	Review and amend the Zoning Ordinance Map to be generally consistent with the Future Land Use Map.	PC
2-2	Utilize the "Concept Committee" approach to the township's technical review of proposed land use applications (zoning ordinance amendments, conditional use, tentative plan, preliminary plan, and final plan).	TM
2-3	Institute ordinance amendments that encourage developers to help establish village greens, pocket parks, and other civic spaces within the township's more densely settled areas, such as the Village of Eagle/Byers.	PC
2-4	Better use the Historical Commission, to make recommendations to the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors, regarding the impacts of development on the township's remaining historic resources, and to ensure the preservation and re-use of historic structures.	TM
Tier 2		
2-5	Promote redevelopment of underutilized properties with more intensive site development and, ideally, a compatible mix of residential and non-residential uses.	PC

2-6	Coordinate with neighboring municipalities, Chester County, other regional organizations, and public and quasi-public agencies and commissions, as needed relative to infrastructure improvement planning, development of regional trail and open space networks, watershed-based resource protection issues, major utility and natural gas lines, and review of development plans with potential multi-municipal impacts.	TM
Tier 3		Lead
2-7	Develop building checklists for construction, rehabilitation, renovation and urban infill projects with a focus on energy conservation.	PC
2-8	Encourage, where feasible and appropriate, use of the Zoning Ordinance's F-1 and F-2 Flexible Development Overlays and Flexible/Open Space Design Option where residential development is proposed for properties planned for rural/site responsive or suburban/site responsive land uses on the Future Land Use Plan (Map 3).	PC

* Note: for an explanation of the Tier system, see pages 1 & 2 of Chapter 1, Introduction, Organization of the Plan.

2.2 Housing

Tier 1		Lead
2-9	Ensure that any amendments to the zoning ordinance made in support of the Village of Eagle/Byers Concept Plan promote a wide variety of residential housing options within the village.	PC
2-10	Ensure that Homeowner Association (HOA) by-laws and restrictive covenants are fully reviewed by the Planning Commission before final development approval is given.	TM
2-11	Work with developers during the planning process to ensure that restrictive covenants that discourage energy conservation, such as the prohibition on hanging laundry, creating backyard gardens, or against seasonal mowing, are not instituted with final subdivision or land development approvals.	PC
Tier 2		Lead
2-12	Enact standards within our Zoning Ordinance to specifically allow accessory dwelling units, as well as upper-story residential uses over commercial uses.	PC
Tier 3		Lead
2-13	Update the zoning ordinance and subdivision and land development ordinance to promote the construction of energy- and water-efficient buildings and neighborhoods.	PC

2-14 Work with existing HOAs to remove restrictive covenants that discourage or prevent energy or resource conservation, such as the prohibition on hanging laundry, creating backyard gardens, or against seasonal mowing. TM

2.3 Economic Development

Tier 1

Lead

2-15 Initiate appropriate zoning ordinance map changes consistent with the Future Land Use Map's (Map 3) Suburban Employment designation in the Fellowship Road North planning area. PC

2-16 Review the zoning ordinance's PI District and Light Industrial District provisions for office, research and development, medical institutions, and light industrial uses, and amend where needed to allow for accessory retail sales for principal uses, and include appropriate sites and architectural design standards. PC

2-17 Permit small-scale food-product manufacturing in appropriate districts and in home businesses. PC

Chapter 3. Eagle Village (Village of Eagle/Byers Concept Plan)

Issue 1: Are there sufficient provisions and landowner incentives in the township's zoning or subdivision and land development ordinances to guide future development in ways that will help to achieve the village planning objectives?

Lead

3-1 Obtain greater historic resource protection within the village by adding appropriate provisions to the zoning ordinance that will provide landowners and developers with incentives for adaptive reuse of historic buildings, and discourage historic resource demolition. This is also a recommendation in the OSRER Plan. PC

3-2 Amend the Township's Historic District to establish a Historic Architecture Review Board (HARB) that can make objective recommendations to the Township Supervisors regarding the impacts of new development on the district's historic resources. Provide for more consistent architectural building and site design guidelines between the Historic District and underlying zoning districts. BoS

3-3 If available, consider applying for Chester County grant funding for continued planning and implementation of the Concept Plan recommendations for village of Eagle/Byers. Reinforce the village cores (as noted above, the core of Eagle has traditionally centered around the Eagle Tavern and the cluster of buildings at the intersection of Pottstown Pike and Little Conestoga Road) and create a greater sense of place. TM

3-4 Update the C-1 and C-3 Districts to incorporate more detailed design guidelines including streetscape improvements, pedestrian facilities, and civic spaces.

PC

3-5

As an alternative to 3-4, consider:

a. adding a Traditional Neighborhood Development (TND) zoning overlay district that conforms to the village boundaries and only applies when landowners/developers seek greater use options and development flexibility. Consistent architectural and other site design guidelines would apply to these new uses reflecting the village planning objectives; or

b. replacing the C-1 and C-3 Districts with a new zoning district that conforms to the village boundaries and provides landowners/developers with greater development potential as well as zoning flexibility. Requires consistent architectural and other site design guidelines reflecting the village planning objectives (and could “exempt” smaller, mom-and-pop type uses)

PC

Issue 2: Is there a need for additional supporting infrastructure?

Lead

3-6 Update the township's Official Map to add planned (new) roads and other changes intended for existing roads. Showing these roads does not mean that the township can merely take the needed right-of-way when needed. However, showing these roads informs landowners of the township's desired village street network, and allows for appropriate township/developer negotiations at the time of land development application. (Note: affected landowners should be provided with proportionate development incentives so that the township's mapped infrastructure needs can be satisfied without burdening existing township residents and businesses.)

TM

3-7 Conduct a village walk-ability study to document the locations and connections of existing sidewalks and their condition. Consider preparing a sidewalk master plan based on this study for enhancing sidewalk connectivity and sidewalk condition within the village.

TM

3-8 If available, consider applying for Chester County planning grant funding to be used for continued planning and implementation of the Concept Plan recommendations for the village of Eagle/Byers. Identify and examine future infrastructure needs such as roads, sewer, water and other public utilities and develop/refine standards for signage, streetscapes, paving details, crosswalks, etc.

TM

3-9 Adopt a street tree ordinance.

BoS

3-10 Adopt a sidewalk ordinance that provides design guidelines for sidewalks and civic spaces in the village.

BoS

Issue 3: Transportation-related Items

3-11 Implement the adopted Access Management Ordinance tailored to the village, and implement the recommendations of the village transportation plan, now underway by the township. Further study the feasibility of a frontage or service road to provide safe long-term access to the commercial lands east of Graphite Mine Road and north of the PA Turnpike. BoS

3-12 Consider the feasibility of adjusting/reducing the township zoning ordinance's parking requirements in the village; encourage greater pedestrian movement in and around the village; and insure that the zoning ordinance allows the use of structured parking. PC

3-13 Review area and bulk requirements in the C-1 and C-3 Districts. Consider ordinance amendments that encourage shared uses, such as residential uses above retail/office use. PC

3-14 Encourage alternative modes of travel to and from the village by pursuing a SEPTA public bus transportation extension north of Eagleview in Uwchlan Township. TM

Issue 4: Architectural Standards Lead

3-15 Consider increasing the maximum building height in the village, where appropriate. PC

3-16 Enhance the architectural design guidelines contained within the C-1 and C-3 Districts. PC

3-17 Develop an expanded set of village design guidelines (booklet) similar to those already prepared for the village, and refer to these guidelines by amending existing zoning and subdivision and land development ordinance language. For example, refer to the village design guidelines in the township's subdivision and land development ordinance where a historic resource impact study is required. PC

3-18 As an alternative to 3-17, consider:

- adding a TND zoning overlay district that conforms to the village boundaries and only applies when landowners/developers seek greater use options and development flexibility. Consistent village architectural and other site design guidelines would apply to these new uses reflecting the village planning objectives; or
- replacing the C-1 and C-3 Districts with a new zoning district that conforms to the village boundaries and provides landowners/developers with greater development potential as well as zoning flexibility. Requires consistent village architectural and other site design guidelines reflecting the village planning objectives (and could exempt smaller, mom-and-pop type uses). PC

3-19 Amend the township's Historic District to establish a Historic Architecture Review Board (HARB) that can make objective recommendations to the Township Supervisors regarding the impacts of new development on the District's historic resources. Provide for more consistent architectural building and site design guidelines between the Historic District and underlying zoning districts.

BoS

3-20 Review the sign ordinance for its suitability for a mix of desired village uses.

PC

Issue 5: Zoning Provisions

3-21 Update the C-1 and C-3 Districts to provide density bonus and other incentives for applicants to construct residential dwellings above commercial/retail/office space, or establish free-standing residential dwellings.

PC

3-22 As an alternative to 3-21, consider:

a. adding a TND zoning overlay district that conforms to the village boundaries and only applies when landowners/developers seek greater use options and development flexibility. Consistent village architectural and other site design guidelines would apply to these new uses reflecting the village planning objectives; or

PC

b. replacing the C-1 and C-3 Districts with a new zoning district that conforms to the village boundaries and provides landowners/developers with greater development potential as well as zoning flexibility. Requires consistent village architectural and other site design guidelines reflecting the village planning objectives (and could "exempt" smaller, mom-and-pop type uses)

Chapter 4. Community Infrastructure & Services

4.1 Wastewater Treatment and Disposal

Tier 1

Lead

4-1 Develop process for routine pumping and repair of existing on-lot septic systems that are not already covered by operations & maintenance agreements.

TM

4-2 Follow through on plans to create a township-wide sewerage (537) plan that is consistent with the township's future land-use plan.

TM

4.2 Energy		
Tier 1		Lead
4-3	Make use of the township newsletter and website to focus on public education regarding energy issues.	TM
Tier 2		Lead
4-4	Institute policy that the design of new and renovated municipal facilities will consider energy conservation and energy efficiency.	BoS
Tier 3		Lead
4-5	Consider fuel efficiency when procuring township vehicles (when appropriate), and consider the use of hybrids and alternative-fuel vehicles.	TM
4-6	Investigate feasibility of purchasing township energy from renewable sources, as well as feasibility of installing solar, wind or geothermal systems on township property.	TM
4.3 Infrastructure and Stormwater Management		
Tier 2		Lead
4-7	Amend the stormwater management ordinance (Ch. 152) to require BMPs, and establish an inspection program for stormwater management systems and structures.	TM
Tier 3		Lead
4-8	Consider incorporating "green streets" design concepts in street design standards to minimize runoff and create healthier environment.	PC
4-9	Ensure relevant portions of Township Code allow use of green roofs and other environmentally-friendly materials and structures.	TM

Chapter 5. Transportation

Tier 1

Lead

5-1 Continue to advance the design and construction of transportation capital improvement projects in Upper Uwchlan Township that enhance safety, mobility, access for all users of the transportation system. BoS

5-2 Designate Graphite Mine Road as PA Route 100. TM

5-3 Support maintenance of township-owned transportation infrastructure including roadways, bridges, traffic signals, trails, and signage and striping. BoS

5-4 Seek funding from traditional and non-traditional sources for transportation capital improvement projects. Submit identified transportation projects to the Chester County Planning Commission for inclusion on the Transportation Improvement Inventory (TII). TM

5-5 Continue to coordinate with surrounding municipalities, Chester County, PennDOT and DVRPC on regional transportation issues, particularly traffic circulation, trail connections, and opportunities for future public transit services. TM

Tier 2

Lead

5-6 Consider developing a new policy or updating township ordinances to further promote vehicular, bicycle, and pedestrian connectivity within the township. BoS

5-7 Consider adoption of an updated Official Map to delineate the desired locations of roadway and trail improvements to ensure that the future transportation and circulation network is consistent with township goals and objectives. TM

5-8 Consider updating the township's Act 209 Transportation Impact Fee Ordinance based on an updated Land Use Assumptions Report. TM

5-9 Consider the use of more sustainable materials for transportation infrastructure, including recycled or reused pavement materials and porous paving materials, particularly for parking areas. TM

Tier 3

Lead

5-10 Periodically review the zoning ordinance, subdivision and land development ordinance, and other township policies to ensure roadway, sidewalk, and trail standards are current and aligned with the township's goals and objectives, as well as other standards. PC

5-11 Plan and implement transit and ride-share supportive facilities. TM

Chapter 6. Open Space, Recreation, & Environmental Resources (In addition to those implementation steps recommended in the township's 2009 OSRER)

Tier 1

Lead

- 6-1 Amend zoning provisions to require protection of historic resources, including delay of demolition and provisions to prohibit "demolition by neglect," based on the classification of the resource. PC
- 6-2 Establish township-wide standards for native plant use (e.g., eliminate invasive species from street tree and ground cover lists; allow removal of existing invasive wooded vegetation and require replacement of wooded areas with native species (allowing limited use of horticultural varieties of non-native plants for developed areas); add native fruit and nut trees to list(s) of allowed species). PC

Tier 2

Lead

- 6-3 Classify woodlands based on ecological value, and correlate overlay or woodland/resource protection ordinance standards to each identified class (e.g., 1, 2, or 3), ensuring that this doesn't place an undue burden on commercial development. PC
- 6-4 Encourage developers to plant trees and improve protections for existing woodlands. PC
- 6-5 Use open space management plan review to recommend reforestation. PC
- 6-6 Amend ordinances to reflect state requirements for establishment of 150-foot undisturbed buffers along the township's HQ (high quality) streams at the time of development. BoS

Tier 3

Lead

- 6-7 Provide support to homeowner's associations seeking to encourage and revise/update common open space maintenance plans consistent with township-wide natural resource priority planning (such as GIS mapping of common open space, trails, etc.). TM
- 6-8 Consider a tiered approach to riparian buffer protection; i.e., in addition to required 75-foot buffer, establish a 75- to 100-foot wide buffer where some modification is allowed, and a 100- to 300-foot wide buffer along first order streams. PC
- 6-9 Further limit expansion of structures in Flood Hazard District, and consider limiting type of development permitted by variance. BoS