

FAIRVIEW TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION

October 5, 2021

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Thompson called the meeting to order at 6:03 PM

ROLL CALL

Present:

Chairman	Michael E. Thompson
Member	Anne K. Anderson, P.E.
Member	H. Adam Williams, P.L.S
Member	Michael Mehaffey, P.E
Member	Mark Koelner,

Codes Director	Stephen M. Waller
Township Engineer	Drew Bitner, P.E.
Stormwater/Consulting Engineer	Mike Knouse, P.E.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Mrs. Anderson made a motion to approve the minutes of the revised **August 3, 2021**, minutes as presented. Mr. Williams seconded the motion. Vote on the motion. All yes, the motion carried.

Mrs. Anderson made a motion to approve the minutes of the **September 7, 2021**, minutes as presented. Mr. Mehaffey seconded the motion. Vote on the motion. All yes, the motion carried.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Matthew Puliti(sp) was present at the meeting seeking an update on the improvements at the Briarcliff development. Mr. Bitner noted that staff had recently conducted a walk-thru meeting with two representatives for the development regarding the streets. As a result of that meeting, temporary improvements to areas of the existing roads would be made this year. He also noted that the developers schedule is to complete all the remaining improvements in the spring of 2022 so that the streets can be dedicated to the Township. Staff emphasized to the representatives that the Board of Supervisors has directed staff to ensure these improvement are made so that the township does not have to seek legal means to complete the streets.

Mr. Waller introduced and welcomed the newest member of the Planning Commission – Mark Koellner.

DISCUSSION AND CORRESPONDENCE

1. Zoning Map Change Request – Wright Properties, S.A.R.A.A. and Merrill Associates – Lewisberry & Old York Road properties - Village Business to Airport Business

Mr. Waller gave a brief introduction of the proposed zoning change to the PC members and provided the following staff comments associated with the request:

WRIGHT/SARAA/MERRIL ASSOCIATES– ZONING MAP CHANGE REQUEST
 LOCATION: OLD YORK ROAD
 DATE: 09/27/21
 CC: DREW BITNER – TOWNSHIP ENGINEER; FILE

FROM: STEPHEN M. WALLER – CODES ADMINISTRATION DIRECTOR

A zoning map change request has been submitted to the Code Office on August 12, 2021. This change request was presented to the BOS at their August 30, 2021 meeting to advise that a public hearing will be required in the future for this request. The Board was notified that once staff, York County Planning Commission and the Fairview Township Planning Commission comments and recommendations were received, the public hearing could be conducted.

BACKGROUND: The parcels are: 27000SF000740 vacant property along Lewisberry Road which is a .91 acre piece of land; 27000SF00075A0 or 6 Lewisberry Road is a 2.68 acre piece of land that currently is occupied by a mobile home park; 27000SF00075C0 or 7 Lewisberry Road is a 1.48 acre in size property that is the current site of a small maintenance contractor shop; and 27000SF0078A0 a vacant piece of land off of Lewisberry Road that is 9.01 acres in size. The existing zoning of the four parcels is Village Business. The current zoning of the properties permits by right the existing businesses at 6 and 7 Lewisberry Road.

The Airport Business zoning district was a new district created with the 2013 update to the Zoning Ordinance and Map. The districts purpose statement reads “This zoning district predominately includes airport, airport service and airport-related uses which includes a mixture of smaller, less intense to larger, more intense industrial and commercial businesses and related uses.” The proposed zoning change would be an extension of the Airport Business (AB) zoning district, which is currently to the south along Old York Road. This area currently encompasses the Airport proper and the military support operations base to the east; several additional businesses to the north, east and west; and the existing EK Services property to the south, which was subject to the early 2021 Zoning Map Change to AB.

As part of this review process, staff conducted a review of the submitted zoning map change request based on the general guidelines outlined in Section 300.98.C(2) of the Zoning Ordinance. Our comments are as follows:

- 1. ZO 300.98.C(2)(c)[2][a] - The proposed map change IS NOT consistent with the 2010 Comprehensive Plan as it relates to the Future Land Uses for this area (see attached future land use plan). The Comprehensive Plan shows this area to be "Community Mixed Use" (CMU). The CMU definition outlined in the Comprehensive Plan supports many different types of commercial and residential uses in this primary growth area.*
- 2. ZO 300.98.C(2)(c)[3][b][vi] - The four properties are all located in a floodprone/floodplain area. There are existing structures on two of these lots located in the floodplain. Any re-development of these areas will have to be in strict conformance with the adopted Floodplain regulations. These regulations may eventually reduce the number of structures permitted on these lots.*

Staff SUPPORTS the request as submitted. This decision was based on:

- The Airport Business Zoning District was created with the Airport and the related businesses surrounding it in mind. Fairview Township felt that this area would be best served by creating the AB district to include industrial uses and restricting residential uses in this area, which is what this district accomplishes;*
- The proposal being an extension of the existing AB zoning district which was expanded earlier this year (March 2021 with a previous zoning change request) and would not be considered “spot zoning” of these tracts of land. As a result of that initial re-zoning, these lots/parcel were specifically mentioned as possible expansion of the AB district;*
- Two of the parcels are vacant lots, which would allow for expanded Airport Business uses in the area. The Merrill Associates property is currently occupied by a Mobile Home Park use. This use would not be permitted in the AB district, however, the existing site presents its own challenges for development/redevelopment in that the property is restricted from a stream that traverses the property; a SARAA flight easement that restricts the height of structures and the floodplain ordinance which requires elevation of structures.;*
- The change in zoning would allow for greater commercial/industrial redevelopment options for any of the properties, while restricting the possibility of adding a residential use (permitted on second and above floors in the VB) in this area. The Airport Authority has expressed concerns in the past of the possibilities of adding residential uses in and around the airport;*
- the tracts are located in a Floodplain and Airport Hazard Overlays as well as partially in aviation flight easements, which limits the amount of development that can take place with these stringent restrictions. The change in zoning would allow for uses that would be more apt to develop in this area.*

Mr. Waller noted the Zoning Change would also be discussed for recommendation at the October 19, 2021, York County Planning Commission meeting and that, if received, both Planning Commission recommendations would

be presented to the Board of Supervisors at the public hearing, which has been scheduled for Monday October 25, 2021.

Proposed Zoning Map amendment action:

Mrs. Anderson made a motion to recommend approval of the proposed map change from Village Business to Airport Business for the noted properties. Mr. Williams seconded the motion. Vote on the motion, all yes. The motion carried.

SKETCH PLANS

There were no sketch plans.

SUBDIVISION PLANS

1. Final Subdivision – 636 Saw Mill Road - #21-1016

Mr. Waller presented the revised plan dated September 24, 2021 to the Planning Commission and read the following staff comments into the record from his memorandum dated 09/27/21:

The REVISED plans dated September 24, 2021 have been reviewed for compliance to Fairview Township Ordinances. Based on that review, staff has compiled the following comments:

Zoning Ordinance:

1. Both of the proposed lots have multiple front yards, as such, they will have the front yard setbacks applied to them. The remaining yards will become side yards therefore the applicable side yard setback should be noted. ZO 300.11 Definitions

Subdivision Ordinance:

1. There is not original property description plan depicted on the drawings. Applicant is requesting a modification of this requirement SLDO 260.14.A(1)

2. The surveyor/engineer signature and seal are required to be on the plans. SLDO 260.14.A(12)

3. The plans do not have the certification and dedicatory statement signed by the owners. SLDO 260.14.A(13)

4. There are two proposed 20 wide drainage easements (outside of the proposed stream easement) that are depicted on the plans. These are required to be identified by metes and bounds since they are not adjacent to property lines. SLDO 260.14.A(17) and 260.35.C(6)(c)

5. PA DEP Planning Module approval will be required SLDO 260.14.B(2)

6. Ordinances require that a proposed subdivision that is located on roads that are not to township standards for CARTWAY width would need to bring that frontage of the property to township standards. This would apply for the frontage along Saw Mill Road. SLDO 260.22.A(7) & 260.22.B(2) Applicant is requesting a modification of this requirement.

General Comments:

1. All plans have to comply with Resolution 2008-13, which indicates that all accounts with the township must be current and not delinquent.

Modifications:

SLDO 260.14.A(1) – Original Property Description

SLDO 260.14.A(16) & 260.14.b(7) – Wetlands Investigation

SLDO 260.22.A(7) & 260.22.B(2) – Cartway Widening

Action on Modification request:

Mrs. Anderson made a motion to recommend approval of the modification from SLDO 260.14.A(1) Original Property Description. Mr. Williams seconded the motion. Vote on the motion, All Yes. The motion carried.

Mrs. Anderson made a motion to recommend approval of the modification from SLDO 260.14.b(7) Wetlands Investigation. Mr. Thompson seconded the motion. Vote on the motion - Mr. Thompson, Yes. Mrs. Anderson, Yes. Mr. Williams, No. Mr. Mehaffey, No. Mr. Koellner, No. The motion to recommend approval did not carry.

Mrs. Anderson made a motion to recommend approval of the modification from SLDO 260.22.A(7) and 260.22.B(2)- Cartway Widening along Saw Mill Road. Mr. Koellner seconded the motion. Vote on the motion, All Yes. The motion carried.

Subdivision Plan Action:

Mrs. Anderson made a motion to recommend approval of the plan contingent on the following comments being addressed: Mr. Wallers’ memorandum comments 1-6 and general comment #1 and a note added that the interconnection of the driveways be removed and that the easements be delineated off the existing stormwater channel. Mr. Williams seconded the motion. Vote of the motion, All yes. The motion carried.

LAND DEVELOPMENT PLANS

1. Dollar General – Wyndamere Road – 21-1015- LD

Mr. Waller noted that the applicants representative has requested that the plan be tabled so that the plan could be revised and resubmitted based on staff comments. It would be their intent to attend a future PC workshop meeting to discuss their revised plans.

Land Development Plan Action:

Mrs. Anderson made a motion to table the plan. Mr. Mehaffey seconded the motion. Vote on the motion, All Yes. The motion was carried and the plan was tabled.

OLD BUSINESS

1. Yellow Breeches Parking Basin – Shawnee Ct - #20-1008 – LD

Mrs. Anderson made a motion to un-table the plan. Mr. Williams seconded the motion. Vote on the motion, All yes, the motion carried.

Mr. Waller presented the revised plans dated September 4, 2021 to the Planning Commission. Mr. Waller noted that his comments had been addressed and that the remaining comments are associated with the Rettew Associates review memo dated August 30, 2021. Mr. Knouse read those comments into the record:

REQUESTED ALTERATIONS OF REQUIREMENT

A. Section 260-11.B.1 – Final Plan Size

The applicant has requested a modification of the requirement to provide plans on sheets 22 inches by 34 inches. In the alternative, the applicant is proposing a sheet size of 24 inches by 36 inches.

B. Section 252-17.C.1.c – Stormwater Basin Side Slopes

The applicant has requested a modification of the requirement to construct the stormwater management basin with maximum side slopes of 4:1. In the alternative, the applicant proposes 3:1 slopes with a steep slope seed mix.

C. Section 260-35.C.3.i – Basing Fencing

The applicant has requested a waiver of the requirement to install fencing around the detention basin. The previous LD plans received a waiver. The side slopes will be planted with a native mix which will hinder access to the pond and a vehicular access ramp is provided at a 10:1 slope providing easy access to walk out of the basin.

D. Section 260-35.C.5.a – Minimum Spillway Depth

The applicant has requested a modification of the requirement to install a spillway with a depth less than two feet. The spillway is designed to handle the 100-year storm in the clogged condition and will function, as it should without being two feet deep.

E. Section 252-18.A.(1) – Carbonate Geology Features (New Request This submission)

The applicant has requested a modification of the requirement to allow the stormwater management facility to be constructed in an area of carbonate geology based on the recommendations of the applicant's geologist.

SUBDIVISION AND LAND DEVELOPMENT

- 1. All certificates need to be completed prior to recording the plan (§ 260-14.A.12, 260-14.A.13).*
- 2. Financial security, in the amount approved by the Township Engineer, and a financial security agreement need to be provided (§ 260-17).*
- 3. The date, final action, and conditions of approval by the Board of Supervisors on any approved modification requests need to be included on the plan.*

STORMWATER MANAGEMENT

- 1. The plan shall include an operation and maintenance plan for all existing and proposed physical stormwater management facilities, as required by Subsection 260-35.G. This plan shall address long-term ownership and responsibilities for operation and maintenance in an executable agreement, as well as schedules and costs for operation and maintenance activities (§ 252-21.F.(9)). An agreement will need to be provided.*
- 2. A schedule of inspections (related to installation of improvements) shall be provided (§ 260-35.J.(1)).*
- 3. A note needs to be added to the land development plan indicating the existing sinkhole in the basin shall be evaluated by a geologist and remediated prior to making improvements to the basin (§ 252-18, 252-21.F.(23), 252-10.I).*

Action of Modification request:

Mrs. Anderson made a motion to recommend approval of the NEW modification from SWMO 252.18.A(1) – Carbonate Geology Features with a condition that a geologist must be present during construction of the alterations to the basin to provide guidance, testing and a report of the findings must be provided to the township. Mr. Mehaffey seconded the motion. Vote on the motion, All Yes. The motion carried.

Subdivision Plan Action:

Mrs. Anderson made a motion to recommend approval of the plan contingent on compliance with Mike Knouse of Rettew Memo - general items 1 through 3 and Stormwater management items 1-3. Mr. Koelner seconded the motion. Vote on the motion, All Yes. The motion carried.

2. Green Lane Meadows – 21-1006-SD

Mr. Waller addressed the Planning Commission at this time as it relates to the proposed Green Lane Meadows Plan. He reminded the PC members that a formal recommended denial of the overall plan at the September 7, 2021 meeting as well as recommended denial of the modification request for cartway widening along Green Lane Drive and

Limekiln Road. Mr. Waller indicated that as a direct result of the meeting, the developer and his representatives reached out to staff to try to address some of the concerns expressed by the PC that lead to the recommended denial of the plan and modification. He advised the PC that there was a meeting where those aforementioned PC concerns were openly discussed, proposed remedies to those concerns were presented and copies of the finalized Traffic Impact Study comments were received from the Townships traffic consultant – Jodie Evans of McMahon Engineering.

Mr. Waller relayed to the PC members that Drew Bitner – Township Engineer as well as himself, felt those discussions were productive and the proposed changes were significant enough that staff (Bitner and Waller) felt it would be beneficial to re-visit those earlier discussions with the PC members at the October meeting. The Township Solicitor – Dave Jones was contacted as it relates to protocol and to advise if these new revisions and information could be presented to the PC again and, if warranted, have the PC revisit their recommendation on the plan and modification based on the new information and design. Mr Jones confirmed that this could take place and it would be in everyone’s best interest to have the PC recommendations based on a complete picture of the project.

At this time, it was agreed by the PC members that they would hear the new information with the understanding that it may not change their formal recommendation on the modification or plan.

Mr. Knouse read into the record the following comments from his October 1, 2021 review:

REQUESTED ALTERATIONS OF REQUIREMENT

A. Section 260-22.A.7 – Roadway Widening

The applicant has requested a modification of the requirement to widen the roadway along Green Lane Drive and Limekiln Road. In the alternative, the applicant is proposing to widen the cartway along Green Lane Drive to 15 feet from the centerline where feasible between the existing guiderail at the south end of the roadway to the northern boundary of the property along approximately 2,740 feet of frontage. Also, the applicant is proposing to widen the cartway along Limekiln Road by approximately three feet to 15 feet from the centerline between Green Lane Drive and the existing residential driveway at approximately 885 feet east of Green Lane Drive.

B. Section 260-24.B.1 – Curb

The applicant has requested a waiver from the requirement to provide curbs along Green Lane Drive and Limekiln Road.

C. Section 260-25.A - Sidewalk

The applicant has requested a modification of the requirement to provide sidewalks along the frontage of Green Lane Drive and Limekiln Road. In the alternative, the applicant is proposing a six-foot-wide bituminous walkway adjacent to the Green Lane Drive right-of-way within a common space area with a roadside swale constructed between. In addition, the applicant is not proposing sidewalk along the frontage of Limekiln Road.

D. Section 252-17.C.1.c–Basin Side Slopes

The applicant has requested a modification of the requirement to provide basin side slopes of 4:1. In the alternative, the applicant proposes basin side slopes of 3:1.

E. Section 252-10.L – Building Setback Requirements

The applicant has requested a waiver of the requirement that all stormwater management facilities must comply with building setback requirements.

F. Section 260-35.C.3.g.1 – Emergency Spillway

The applicant has requested a modification of the requirement that the emergency spillway be a minimum depth of two feet.

SUBDIVISION AND LAND DEVELOPMENT

- 1. All certificates need to be completed prior to recording the plan (§ 260-14.A.12, 260-14.A.13, 252-21.D, 252-21.F.(11)).*
- 2. Provide a draft of any protective covenants, if any (§ 260-14.A.27).*
- 3. The Traffic Impact Study needs to be reviewed by the Township traffic consultant (§ 260-14.A.28).*

4. Evidence of approval of the Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan and NPDES Permit, if applicable, by the York County Conservation District needs to be provided (§ 260-14.B.1, 260-15.B.1, 252-16.D, 252-21.F.5). A copy of the E&S/NPDES submission will need to be provided to the Township.
5. Evidence of an approved planning module, exemption request, or notice that a planning module is not required, needs to be provided (§ 260-14.B.2).
6. Evidence of design approval and capacity for water and sewage facilities needs to be provided (§ 260-14.C.3, 260-14.C.4).
7. All street names shall be approved by the Township (§ 260-25.E). The applicant states the street names have been provided for review.
8. The Township Engineer needs to review and approve the proposed improvements along Green Lane Meadow and Limekiln Road.
9. The date, final action, and conditions of approval by the Board of Supervisors on any approved modification requests need to be included on the plan.
10. Access through the existing fence needs to be addressed for the proposed parking area at the end of Tall Tree Drive. The plan needs to clearly identify a portion of the fence to be removed. Operation and maintenance requirements and responsibility need to be addressed for the proposed parking area. These items need to be incorporated should the Township determine that the area is to be accepted for dedication and the area remains on the plan.

STORMWATER MANAGEMENT

1. The plan shall include an operation and maintenance plan for all existing and proposed physical stormwater management facilities as required by Subsection 260-35.G. This plan shall address long-term ownership and responsibilities for operation and maintenance in an executable agreement, as well as schedules and costs for operation and maintenance activities (§ 252-21.F.(9)). An agreement will need to be provided.
2. The applicant has submitted an alternative design for Basin 2A; the alternate is not reflected in the plan set. The alternate design complies with the Township Stormwater Management Ordinance. The proposed fence needs to be adjusted for the Alternate Basin 2A layout, if selected. The erosion and sedimentation plan will also need to be revised for consistency if this alternate is selected.

Mr. Waller advised the PC members that Jodie Evans of McMahan Associates – Traffic Consulting Engineer, had completed their review and offered the following comments:

Based on our review of the Green Lane Meadows Development TIS dated July 21, 2021, we provide the following comments for consideration by the Township:

1. The TIS must be signed and sealed by a PE licensed in Pennsylvania.
2. Please verify the base critical and follow-up headways used in the analysis. Base headways should be consistent with Pub 46, Chapter 10 parameters. Use values for two-lane roadways throughout the study area.
3. Please verify that the detectors located at the signalized intersection of Limekiln Road and the I-83 northbound ramps are coded correctly in the analyses.
4. Please provide the applicable turn lane warrant figures with the plotted data for this development shown along with the turn lane warrant calculation sheets.
5. Please label Green Lane Drive on all traffic volume figures.
6. Please include all proposed storage on all queue tables as appropriate. The additional storage proposed on the eastbound approach at the intersection of Limekiln Road the I-83 northbound ramps is not consistently shown on the tables. Furthermore, where with development queues are greater than without development queues and exceed existing/proposed storage lengths, provide mitigating measures.
7. Please include all lane group LOS in the LOS tables for unsignalized, in addition to signalized, intersections. Also, clearly include both build without and with improvements in the LOS tables. Additional improvements may be necessary upon further review of the updated LOS tables. Provide recommended improvements to mitigate any LOS that does not meet the Township requirement of LOS D or better.
8. The study must document the land use context of the subject property, and along key area roadways. The applicant should identify the land use context that seems most representative of a roadway segment as a whole. Land use contexts should not be defined in too fine a manner; avoid segments less than 600 feet in length. There are seven different land use contexts, in order of intensity: rural, suburban neighborhood, suburban corridor, suburban center, town/village neighborhood, town center, and urban core. For more information on land use context, see PennDOT Design Manual, Part 1X, Appendix B.
9. Provide traffic crash data and analyses for the study area intersections and key corridors for the most recent five years, summarizing any trends in the crash data. Include mitigation options if crash trends are present at an intersection or along a

corridor. The applicant should also contact the municipality again for input regarding non-reportable crashes. Note that the crash history provided by PennDOT is confidential under 75 PA Code Section 3754. This material is only provided to official agencies that have responsibility in the highway transportation system and can only be used by those agencies for traffic safety-related planning or research. Publication, reproduction, release or discussion of these materials, as well as use of or reliance upon these materials for any purpose other than stated above, is expressly prohibited without the specific written consent of the Pennsylvania Department of Transportation. Do not include copies of crash data in the TIS. Provide copies of the crash data analysis in a separately bound appendix, under separate cover.

10. Please correct the noted discrepancy by which 100% of site traffic is included in all analysis years. Only include the development traffic under that designated phase in the analyses for that Phase year being evaluated. Update the recommendations, as applicable.

11. The applicant appears to have submitted a request to limit roadway widening. It should be noted that the land development plans appear to show separate left and right turn lane on Green Lane Drive approaching Limekiln Road, which implies that the applicant intends to widen Green Lane Drive in the vicinity of the guiderail, which may be inconsistent with the request. That being said, the Township ordinances dictate the roadway widths required for improvements on Township roads when development is proposed adjacent to the Township road, and a formal waiver request must be submitted to the Township for their consideration for any relief request.

12. Please revise the trip distribution. As previously commented and discussed at the TIS Scoping meeting, the Limekiln Road East trip distribution assumption should be decreased (i.e. ~5%) and the Spanglers Mill Road trip distribution should be increased by the difference and split similar to the previously provided Cordon Line split North/South. Also, clarify in the resubmission any revisions based on Sienna's trip distribution regarding the analyses, particularly with regards to Limekiln Road/Spangler's Mill Road.

13. Please verify the COVID adjustment factor and traffic volumes growth calculations. The projected daily traffic volumes using TIRe data along Limekiln Road appear to have been grown incorrectly, and has resulted in an incorrect daily COVID-19 adjustment factor. Furthermore, where hourly volumes are available for comparison between pre-COVID TIRe data and post-COVID traffic counts, data from each peak period (6-9 AM, 3-6 PM, etc.) must be compared for peak period specific COVID adjustments, which appear to be higher than the assumptions as they may have been impacted more by changes in commuting routines and thereby are more appropriate for adjusting manual turning movement traffic counts at the study intersections. Please verify and revise accordingly.

14. At locations where traffic signal warrant analysis is anticipated, 12-hour manual turning movement counts are recommended in accordance with PennDOT Publication 46. PennDOT TIRe data should not be used as a substitute for manual turning movement counts for traffic signal evaluation. Also, where signal warrants are evaluated, all warrants must be evaluated. For example, it is unclear why peak hour warrants were noted as N/A, as the peak hour warrants should also be considered in addition to the other warrants. The signal warrants for Limekiln Road with both Green Lane and Spangler's Mill Road appear to have been omitted from the appendix and must be included with the next submission. Please verify the County noted in the forms. Please revise the signal warrants and update your report and recommendations accordingly.

15. If the applicant continues to propose an all-way stop control for an intersection, please provide TE-102 to document the multway stop control evaluation to be completed in accordance with Section 2B.07 of the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) and Section 212.106(c) of Title 67 (PennDOT Publication 212). Where AWSC is considered, a signal warrant evaluation, including all warrants, must be provided, and if warranted the traffic signal may be required. It should be noted that the Township's long-term mitigation for the intersection of Limekiln Road/I-83 SB ramps is the installation of a traffic signal under the future development scenario in the Township CIP, and if warranted, should be installed in lieu of the AWSC recommended by the developer. If the developer installs a traffic signal included in the Township CIP, a traffic impact fee would be applicable.

16. Please note that an Intersection Control Evaluation (ICE) will be required for this project, since this project appears to include a change in traffic control or lane configurations at an existing intersection with a state route. Refer to Appendix AI of Publication 10X (DM-1X) for guidance on when an ICE is required. This will be further considered with the additional information to be provided in the TIS and/or HOP submission.

Transportation Impact Fee

In accordance with the Fairview Township Impact Fee Ordinance (Ord. No. 2015-4), the weekday afternoon peak hour trip generation of this proposed development within Fairview Township will be subject to the Township's transportation impact fee. The proposed Green Lane Meadows development is located in Fairview Township Transportation Service Area #1 (TSA-1), which has a Transportation Impact fee of \$1,583 per new weekday afternoon peak hour trip. The proposed Green Lane Meadows development is anticipated to generate approximately 202 new trips during the weekday afternoon peak hour of adjacent street based on the assumed trip generation, for a total estimated transportation impact fee of \$319,766. The final

determination of the impact fee and any potential credits, in accordance with the Act 209 law, will occur as the project moves through the Township approval process.

Mr. Waller updated the PC members on the meeting that was conducted in-house after the September 7th regarding possible improvements to Limekiln Road. Mr. Bitner updated the PC members on the site discussion as it related to the roadway improvements along Limekiln Road.

Based on both of these meetings, it was agreed by staff that there were extenuating limitations along the western portion of the subject tracts Limekiln Road frontage, both to the North side (small creek) and to the south side (Limestone rock face), that would limit widening of the roadway in these areas. Mr. Bitner and Mr. Knouse – Rettew, felt that what developer was proposing (widening as much as possible on both sides without removal of the rock face or a DEP stream enclosure) would be an alternative that staff could support. This would include the developer extending/adding approximately 150 +/- feet of guiderail to the north side of Limekiln Road along the stream. The developer also proposed widening along west bound Limekiln Road at the intersection of Green Lane Drive and installing a right turn lane for turning movements onto northbound Green Lane Drive.

The developer and their representatives were in attendance to discuss the revised plan, the proposed improvements and to address any concerns the Planning Commission had with them or staff recommendations.

Action of Modification request:

After discussions, Mrs. Anderson made a motion to recommend approval of the modification from SLDO 260.22.A(7) and 260.22.B(2) – Cartway widening along Green Lane Drive and Limekiln Road contingent on the commitment of the developer to present the best configuration and widening of Limekiln Road as directed by Township Staff and the addition/extension of 150 +/- feet of guiderail along Limekiln Road. Mr. Mehaffey seconded the motion. Vote on the motion, Mrs. Anderson – Aye; Mr. Williams – Nay; Chairman Thompson – Aye, Mr. Mehaffey – Aye; Mr. Koelner – abstained (due to new PC membership). The motion carried.

Subdivision Plan Action:

Mrs. Anderson made a motion to approve the plan contingent satisfactorily addressing the review from M. Knouse, Rettew dated October 1, 2021 - general comments 1 through 10 with specific note to #10 in that the PC would recommend dedication of land along the Yellow Breeches Creek in lieu of a fee if the dedication would meet ordinance requirements for dedication; SWM comments 1 & 2; and all the Traffic review comments from Jodie Evans, McMahon Associates dated September 9, 2021. Under discussion Mr. Williams noted that any proposed improvements should be depicted on the plans. Mr. Mehaffey seconded the motion. Vote of the motion, Mrs. Anderson, Aye; Mr. Mehaffey, Aye; Chairman Thompson, Aye; Mr. Williams, Nay; Mr. Koelner; abstained (due to new PC membership). The motion carried.

NEW BUSINESS

There was no New Business.

ZONING HEARING BOARD

Docket No. 2021-11: Flurie Irrevocable Trust, 665 Old Quaker Road, Lewisberry, PA 17339. The applicant is requesting a variance to the Fairview Township Zoning Ordinance, §300-16A “Area and design requirements”. The applicant is proposing to subdivide the property along Old Quaker Road. One of the tracts will have a substandard lot width of 200 ft of frontage. The property is located at 698 Old Quaker Road, Lewisberry, PA 17339, and is located in the Rural Living Zoning District.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:15 PM.