

# FAIRVIEW TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION

October 2, 2012

## CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Michael A. Powers called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM. Mr. Powers welcomed H. Adams Williams to the Planning Commission.

## 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

Mrs. Anderson made a motion, seconded by Mr. Thompson, to recommend approval of the minutes of the September 4, 2012, Planning Commission meeting contingent on the correction of the time the meeting was called to order. Vote on the motion: All yes. The motion carried.

## DISCUSSION AND CORRESPONDENCE

There being no Discussion and Correspondence, Mr. Powers moved to Sketch Plans.

## SKETCH PLANS

There being no Sketch Plans, Mr. Powers moved to Subdivision Plans.

## SUBDIVISION PLANS

### 1. Final Subdivision of the Shettel Farm – Michael L. Martin – Lewisberry Road – 6 Lots

Mr. Waller advised the Planning Commission he had received a request from the developers engineer to table the plan. Mr. Thompson made a motion, seconded by Mrs. Anderson, to table the plan per the engineer's request. Vote on motion. All yes. The motion carried.

## SITE AND LAND DEVELOPMENT PLANS

There being no Site and Land Development Plans, Mr. Powers moved to Old Business

## OLD BUSINESS

### 1. Preliminary/Final Subdivision and Land Development Plan – Susquehanna Sports Center

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

Mr. Waller presented the plan to the Planning Commission. Mr. Waller advised the Planning Commission that Martin Lane was changed to Shawnee Drive because there is a Martin Drive in the Township.

Zoning Ordinance:

All comments have been addressed.

Subdivision Ordinance:

1. Adjacent property owner information is not indicated for the property located south of the subject tract easternmost point. There is an errant layer that prohibits this info being recognizable. SLDO 402.1.G
2. The plans do not have the engineer/surveyor signature and seal. SLDO 402.1.L
3. The plans do not have the certification and dedicatory statement signed by the owners. SLDO 402.1.M
4. Sewage Facilities Planning Module approval will be required. SLDO 402.2.B
5. An improvement guarantee estimate prepared by the applicants engineer and subsequent placement will be required. SLDO 502.A.(2)(B)
6. An executed Improvement guarantee security agreement will be required. SLDO 502.A(3) & Appendix 11
7. Compliance with Park and Recreation requirements. SLDO 613

General Comments:

8. How will the old R.O.W. of Shawnee court be conveyed to the West Shore Realty Company as noted on the detail on plan sheet 3-10? If it is this plans intent to have that take place with this submittal, both of those lots would have to also be incorporated into these plans and comply with Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance requirements.
9. Township Solicitor will have to review the plan to verify that the turn-back of the right of way associated with the Old Shawnee Court is acceptable.
10. Is there an easement associated with the portion of the 15" CMP that appears to be leaving the Sunny Krupa Inc. property?
11. Sheet 5 of 10 should show a clean out for the building sewer/sewer lateral at the edge of the dedicated/proposed ROW. A sewer easement will need to be created around the existing sewer that was located in the old ROW. The cleanout will need to be located at the edge of that easement.
12. All plans have to comply with Resolution 2008-13, which indicates that all accounts with the township must be current and not delinquent.

Modifications:

13. Preliminary Plan submittal requirements. SLDO 303
14. Street Cartway Width. SLDO 602.2
15. Street Crown requirements. SLDO 602.8
16. Stormwater Pond Fencing requirements. SLDO 701.3.C.9
17. Stormwater Basin floor 1% slope percentage. SLDO 701.3.C.10

Comments from Michael H. Fleming, Superintendent

Page 3 of 10

1. At the July 24, 2012 Planning Commission Workshop, we discussed vacating Shawnee Court. It now appears that the developer is only proposing to vacate a portion of Shawnee Court. Since it is less than 250' in length, we most likely will lose our PennDOT Liquid Fuels funding for the remaining portion of Shawnee Court. My recommendation would be to vacate the entire Shawnee Court and eliminate General Note #25 on Page 1 of 10 and the need for a cul-de-sac.
2. Signature and approval blocks need to be added to the subdivision portion of the plan for both West Shore Realty Company lots as a result of the vacation of Shawnee Court. Depending on the limits of vacation, it may be necessary to add First Berkshire Properties, LLC.
3. A 30' wide sanitary sewer easement needs to be provided for the existing sanitary sewer main within Shawnee Court.
4. Previous plans dated July 6, 2012 do not indicate wetlands along Shawnee Court. Now the plans indicate wetlands. Was a study completed? Reference who performed the study and when.

Page 4 of 10

5. 20' x 20' Snow Dump Easement: What is the purpose of this? Our policy is not to travel across private property with Township equipment nor do we want to provide snow removal on private property.

Page 5 of 10

6. The previous plans indicated that the 60" CMP was to be replaced with a 60" HDPE. The current proposal is to extend the 60" CMP. Has the Township Engineer evaluated the condition of the existing 60" CMP that is proposed to remain?
7. The existing 60" CMP is bituminous coated. If the proposal is to extend the pipe, will the extension be composed of the same material?

8. The previous plan indicated that the 18" CMP along the North side of Shawnee Court was to be diverted with a manhole and pipe extension. This plan fails to indicate what will happen to the pipe.

Page 7 of 10

9. Plan View indicates 60" CMP while the Profile indicates a 55" CMP.

10. The lateral for West Shore Animal Hospital ties into the main at the same location as the proposed lateral for the Sports Center. Provide a detail of this connection with respect to the Animal Hospital lateral.

Page 9 of 10

11. Shawnee Court Detail doesn't agree with Plan View on Sheet 4 of 10 in regards to how the road is located within the right-of-way.

12. Shawnee Court Section is not consistent with Township specifications. Considering the 3:1 Fill Slopes and the lack of any shoulder, the Township engineer should determine if guiderail is needed as a result of this proposed grading.

Page 10 of 10

13. Sanitary Sewer Manhole Top Extension Detail: This pertains also to manhole P-6A-1 although Profile View on Sheet 7 of 10 doesn't show manhole being extended to the finish grade.

14. Manhole Top Extension Detail refers to a 36" manhole riser. Does this refer to the diameter or the height? Concerning manhole P-6A-1, it may take more than a 36" riser to raise the manhole to the finish grade.

15. Sanitary Sewer Manhole Detail: Add note that 6" is the maximum amount of concrete grade rings to be utilized under frame and cover.

Todd Wilson, PE, Alpha Consulting Engineers represented the plan.

A traffic impact study will be required and it has been submitted. The Public Works comments are technical in nature.

Drew Bitner, PE, Township Engineer stated it appears that a right-of-way has been dedicated to the Township but not accepted by the Township.

Action on Modification Requests

Mrs. Anderson made a motion, seconded by Mr. Thompson, to recommend approval of the modification request from the Preliminary Plan submittal requirements (SLDO 303). Vote on motion. Mr. Powers, Yes; Mr. Thompson, Yes; Mrs. Anderson, Yes; Mr. Gorman, Yes; Mr. Williams, Abstained. The motion carried.

Mr. Thompson made a motion, seconded by Mrs. Anderson, to recommend denial of the modification request from the street cartway width (SLDO 602.2) Vote on the motion. Mr. Powers, Yes; Mr. Thompson, Yes; Mrs. Anderson, Yes; Mr. Gorman, No; Mr. Williams, Abstained. The motion carried

Mrs. Anderson made a motion, seconded by Mr. Gorman, to recommend denial of the modification request from the street crown requirement (SLDO 602.8), and follow the Township’s Engineers recommendations. Vote on the motion. Mr. Powers, Yes; Mr. Thompson, Yes; Mrs. Anderson, Yes; Mr. Gorman, Yes; Mr. Williams, Abstained. The motion carried. The motion carried.

Mr. Thompson made a motion, seconded by Mrs. Anderson, to recommend approval of the modification request from the storm water pond fencing requirement (SLDO 701.3.C.9). Vote on the motion. Mr. Powers, Yes; Mr. Thompson, Yes; Mrs. Anderson, Yes; Mr. Gorman, Yes; Mr. Williams, Abstained. The motion carried.

Mrs. Anderson made a motion, seconded by Mr. Thompson, to recommend approval of the modification request from the storm water basin floor 1% slope percentage (701.3.C.10). Vote on the motion. Mr. Powers, Yes; Mr. Thompson, Yes; Mrs. Anderson, Yes; Mr. Gorman, Yes; Mr. Williams, Abstained. The motion carried.

Motion on the Plan

Mr. Thompson made a motion, seconded by Mrs. Anderson, to recommend approval of the plan contingent on Subdivision comments 1 thru 7, General comment number 8 to be reviewed by the Township’s Solicitor, comments 9 thru 12, the Superintendent of Public Works of October 2, 2012, comments 3 and 5. Vote on the motion. Mr. Powers, Yes; Mr. Thompson, Yes; Mrs. Anderson, Yes; Mr. Gorman, Yes; Mr. Williams, Abstained. The motion carried

2. Minor Subdivision Plan of John B. Hoffert Estate – 1103 Siddonsburg Road – 2 Lots

Mrs. Anderson made a motion, seconded by Mr. Gorman, to untable the plan. Vote on the motion. All yes. The motion carried.

Mr. Waller advised the Applicants engineer, John Murphy, PE, Alpha Consulting Engineers, wanted an open discussion with the Planning Commission about the PennDOT’s roadway improvement letter relating to the Hoffert Estate Subdivision. Drew Bitner, PE, Township Engineer stated that PennDOT refused to comment on the cartway widening for Siddonsburg Road (SR 4022).

Mr. Murphy, PE, he is before the Planning Commission for a vote on the Modification Request on the cartway improvement requirement (SLDO 22-602.2.C).

Mr. Murphy indicated that he had spoken to Drew Bitner, Township Engineer, several times and was advised that Siddonsburg Road should have a cartway width of twenty-eight (28) feet.

Mr. Bitner advised that Siddonsburg Road was measured from Lewisberry Road to Allens on Pinetown Road. The average width of Siddonsburg Road was twenty-two (22) feet, except for the hill in front of the Hoffert property. The cartway width is twenty-six (26) feet.

Mr. Bitner stated that PennDOT is not going to widen Siddonburg Road to twenty-eight (28) feet from one end to the other.

Mr. Bitner stated that John Murphy, PE, if he wants, he could put a note on the subdivision plan if PennDot would require widening of the rest of the subdivision, that the portion in front of Lot 1 will also be widened.

#### Motion on the Modification Request

Mr. Gorman made a motion, seconded by Mrs. Anderson, to recommend approval based on existing roadway width in the area of twenty-six and a half (26.5) feet to accept the modification request from SLDO 22-602.2.C, the cartway improvement requirements. Vote on motion. Mr. Powers, Yes; Mr. Thompson, No; Mrs. Anderson, Yes; Mr. Gorman, Yes; Mr. Williams, Abstained. The motion carried.

Mr. Powers indicated a note should be added to the plan to explain the special circumstances and why the modification request was approved.

#### Action on the plan

Mrs. Anderson made a motion, seconded by Mr. Gorman, to recommend approval of the plan to the Board of Supervisors. Vote on the motion. Mr. Powers, Yes; Mr. Thompson, No; Mrs. Anderson, Yes; Mr. Gorman, Yes; Mr. Williams, Abstained. The motion carried

### **NEW BUSINESS**

Having no New Business, Mr. Powers moved to the Zoning Hearing Board.

### **ZONING HEARING BOARD**

Case No. 2012-09: William and Linda Mowrey, 315 Hillcrest Drive, New Cumberland, PA 17070. The Applicants are requesting a variance to the Fairview Township Zoning Ordinance, Section 505.6, Area Regulations, Rear Yard Setback. The Applicants constructed a deck addition to the dwelling unit which intrudes 14 feet into the rear yard setback area. The property is owned by the Applicants and is in the Residential Single Zoning District.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

Mr. Thompson made a motion, seconded by Mrs. Anderson, to adjourn the meeting at 7:55 PM. Vote on the motion: All yes. The motion carried.