

FAIRVIEW TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION

March 5, 2013

CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Michael A. Powers called the meeting to order at 7:05 PM.

ROLL CALL

Present: Michael A. Powers, Chairman
Michael E. Thompson, Vice-Chairman
Anne K. Anderson, Member
Kevin V. Gorman, Member
H. Adam Williams, Member
Stephen M. Waller, Fairview Township Codes Administration Director

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Gorman made a motion, seconded by Mr. Thompson to approve the minutes of the December 4, 2012, Planning Commission Meeting. Vote on the motion. All yes. The motion carried.

Mr. Thompson made a motion, seconded by Mrs. Anderson, to approve the minutes of the January 8, 2013, Planning Commission Meeting. Vote on the motion. All yes. The motion carried.

DISCUSSION AND CORRESPONDENCE

Mr. Waller advised the Planning Commission there will be a public meeting for the proposed Zoning Ordinance on March 20, 2013, at 6:00 PM at the Fairview Township Fire Station at 340 Lewisberry Road, New Cumberland, PA 17070.

Mr. Waller advised the Planning Commission that the York County Planning Commission had recommended denial of the proposed Zoning Ordinance and Zoning Map. Only one item that had any real significance was the front loading garages. The York County Planning Commission felt that the front loading of garages was an architectural review and is not permitted by the Zoning Ordinance.

The definitions portion of the Zoning Ordinance referred to the Municipal Planning Code for definitions. York County Planning Commission indicated the definitions should be part of the Zoning Ordinance.

The Airport Hazard District is further clarified on the Zoning Map, along the stream buffers and the scenic corridors. Mr Waller stated the FEMA spends a large amount of money for the FEMA Flood Plain Maps and does not want to incorporate the Flood Plain maps into the proposed Zoning Maps because something could go wrong trying to show the flood plain overlays on the proposed Zoning Map.

SKETCH PLANS

1. Subdivision Sketch Plan for Richard A. Wildman – 206 Hemlock Road – 2 Lots

Mr. Waller presented the plan to the Planning Commission.

The plan was represented by the property owner, Richard A. Wildman.

Mr. Waller advised the Planning Commission that the Township had a long standing policy of not allowing subdivisions on private roads. Hemlock Road is a private roadway, a “paper street”. Other than the sanitary sewer, the Township has not claim to Hemlock Road. The owners along Hemlock Road have ownership rights along Hemlock Road. Mr. Wildman is going to file a quick claim for a portion of what would have been Hemlock Road going to his existing properties.

Mr. Thompson stated that precedents have been established that no subdivisions will be permitted on private roads because the current Zoning Ordinance requires frontage of a lot on a public street. Mr. Thompson stated he does not want to make an exception for this plan and have a problem develop, and reference to this to something that the Planning Commission did approve.

Mrs. Anderson asked if there were any other subdivisions with private streets in this community. Mr. Waller indicated no. Mr. Waller indicated there are communities with private roads. They are condominiums with private streets that front on public streets. Closest example is the Weatherstone Development at the bottom of Evergreen Road.

Mrs. Anderson asked if the homeowners on Hemlock Road get the cartway dedicated. Hemlock would have to be constructed to the Township’s specifications, inspected by and accepted by the Township’s Engineer.

Mr. Thompson commented that the Zoning Ordinance does not allow for the subdivision of lots on a private road. The Zoning Ordinance requires a minimum of 100 feet of frontage along a public road.

Mrs. Anderson stated she would not be able to support a modification request for the frontage of subdivision of lots along a private roadway.

Mr. Williams stated it would be beneficial if Hemlock Road could meet the specifications for a public street. It would also improve the value of the lots along Hemlock Road.

Mr. Gorman stated that unless some legal loop hole of ownership of the Hemlock Road, a subdivision cannot exist.

SITE AND LAND DEVELOPMENT PLANS

1. Preliminary/Final Land Development Plan for the Holiday Inn Express & Suites

Mr. Waller presented the plan to the Planning Commission.

James Snyder, PE, of Snyder-Secary & Associates, LLC, represented the plan.

Mr. Waller advised the Planning Commission the plan before them was reviewed by Township Staff. Did have the opportunity to meet with the consultants at our Planning Commission workshop meeting. The plans have not been resubmitted at this time. The consultants wanted to introduce the plan to the Planning Commission and get further insight into the project.

Zoning Ordinance

1. A 5 foot landscape buffer is required around the parking lots adjacent to Beacon Hill Boulevard and the Lower Allen Sewer Authority property as well as the private ROW. DZO 706.H & 804.B.7.A (1).
2. The proposed height/clearance of the porte crochere is not indicated on the plans. DZO 809.B
3. Proof that trucks will be able to maneuver through the site is required. DZO 809.C.

Subdivision Ordinance

4. Township Line should be depicted on Sheet 2 of 13. SLDO 402.1.D.
5. The plans do not have the engineer/surveyor signature and seal. SLDO 402.1.L
6. The plans do not have the certification and dedicatory statement signed by the owners. SLDO 402.1.M.
7. Soil types should be depicted on the plans. SLDO 402.1.P
8. Is there an existing easement associated with the Lower Allen interceptor sewer line? I should be depicted on the plans. SLDO 402.1.Q
9. drainage easements should be noted on the plan from the existing culverts along Beacon Hill Boulevard as well as the existing culverts from the Hari Ohm Hospitality property and the Lower Allen Township Authority property. SLDO 402.1.Q
10. Sewage Facilities Planning Module approval will be required. SLDO 402.2.B
11. Has a detailed Wetland Analysis been Submitted? SLDO 402.2.G
12. A improvement guarantee estimate prepared by the applicants engineer and subsequent placement will required. SLDO 502.A(2)(B)
13. An executed Improvement Guarantee security agreement will be required. SLDO 502.A(3) & Appendix 11.
14. A certified asbuilt will be required for the propose sewer line expansion. SLDO 610.2.C
15. Compliance with the Part and Recreation requirements. SLDO 613
16. A Traffic Impact Study may be required, please consult the Township Engineer. SLDO 614

General Comments

17. The plans show that a proposed sewer connection point will be to the existing sewer located on the west side of Beacon Hill Boulevard. Plan No. 1458 shows this existing sewer mains are located on the property, without contiguous or overlapping easements. This would mean that a redesign will be required to connect in a different location or attaining an easement from the land owner.
18. A Sewage Pre-Treatment Application will be required in accordance with the Lower Allen Treatment facility standard. In the past, an oil separator and grease interceptor have been required.
19. The proposed segmented wall design should be submitted with the land development plan due to the fact that the wall is integral to the functioning of parking and access to the hotel.
20. The plans indicate that the maximum employees on the largest shift will be 3. This number seems relatively low. Are there industry standards that support such a low number? (desk clerk, manager, and a housekeeper)
21. There is a portion of the proposed retaining wall that appears to be directly on the limits of the wetlands. How can this portion of the wall be constructed without some type of disturbance?
22. The plan depicts grading taking place in the private ROW associated with the Lower Allen Authority property. The authorizing document should be submitted which grants this grading to take place.
23. All plans have to comply with Resolution 2008-13, which indicates that accounts with the Township must be current and not delinquent.

Mrs. Anderson questioned what permit will allow the developer to place fill in a flood plain. Mr. Snyder explained that the fill will be placed in the flood plain and not the flood way. The flood way is regulated, the flood plain is not.

Mr. Williams asked what the difference is between the flood plain and flood way. Mr. Snyder explained the difference between the floodway and flood plain.

Mrs. Anderson had concerns about the wall being at the edge of the wetlands. Is there sufficient space for the wall and any leeway for installation of the wall, guiderail and the pedestrian handrail?

Mr. Gorman stated the developer needs to be clear on the wall detail, the footer detail in relation to the limits of the wetlands.

Motion on the Plan

Mrs. Anderson made a motion, seconded by Mr. Thompson, to table the plan pending revisions to the plan. Vote on the motion. All yes. The motion carried.

OLD BUSINESS

There being no Old Business, Mr. Powers moved to New Business.

ZONING HEARING BOARD

Case No. 2013-01: Thomas and Carol Ann Stezar, 318 Braddock Drive, Etters, PA 17319. The Applicant is requesting variances pursuant to the Fairview Township Zoning Ordinance, Section 1302, Accessory Building and Structures on Conforming Lots;.. Section 1303, Accessory Building and structures on Corner Lots; Section 1304, Fences and Walls and Sections 1305, Satellite Dishes. The Applicants wish to erect a fifty four (54) inch high fence, for a swimming pool barrier, in the side yard of a corner lot which abuts a side street. The property is owned by the Applicants and is located in the Residential Single District.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Thompson made a motion, seconded by Mrs. Anderson, to adjourn the meeting at 7:57 PM. Vote on the motion. All yes. The motion carried.