FAIRVIEW TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION

October 06, 2020

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Thompson called the meeting to order at 6:00 PM

ROLL CALL

Present:

Chairman	Michael E. Thompson
Member	Anne K. Anderson, P.E.
Member	H. Adam Williams, P.L.S.
Member	Jason Stouffer
Codes Director	Stephen M. Waller
Codes Assistant	Chris H. Strump
Township Engineer	Drew Bitner, P.E.

Absent:

Member	Michael Mehaffey, P.E.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Mrs. Anderson made a motion to approve the minutes of the September 01, 2020, meeting as presented. Mr. Stouffer seconded. Vote on the motion. All Aye. The motion carried.

DISCUSSION AND CORRESPONDENCE

There was no Discussion and Correspondence.

SKETCH PLANS

There were no Sketch Plans.

SUBDIVISION PLANS

There were no new Subdivision Plans.

LAND DEVELOPMENT PLANS

1. Pleasantview, Phase 4 – 20-1007-LD

Mrs. Anderson made a motion to table the matter as there were no representatives of the Plan at the meeting. Mr. Stouffer seconded. Vote on the motion. All Aye. The motion carried.

2. Yellow Breeches (Sports Complex) Parking & Basin Modification – 20-1008-LD

Mr. Waller presented the revised plans to the Planning Commission. Mike Knouse, PE, at Rettew read his comments dated October 02, 2020, into the record:

REQUESTED ALTERATIONS OF REQUIREMENT

- 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.

- 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.

- 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 pervious 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.

- 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.

- Section 252-18.A.1 – Sinkhole bedrock pinnacle and separation distances

  The applicant has requested a modification to allow a stormwater management facility to be constructed in an area of carbonate geology. A Carbonate Geology report recommends repairing the area identified in the report and, once done, recommends the stormwater facility will infiltrate and function as designed.

ZONING

- The existing overflow parking spaces need to be clearly labeled on the plan.

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. Evidence of approval of the Erosion and Sedimentation (E&S) 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)).
3. A cost estimate, financial security, and a financial security agreement need to be provided (§ 260-17). The estimate needs to be revised to include the basin grading, spillway reconstruction, seeding, riprap, E&S controls, and storm sewer removal.
4. 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. All earthmoving activities shall be reviewed and approved by the York County Conservation District (§ 252-16.D, 252-21.F.(5)). Evidence of E&S and NPDES permit approval will be needed. A copy of the E&S/NPDES submission will need to be provided to the Township.
2. The developer shall demonstrate that the post-development hydrograph flows during E&S control phase are less than or equal to the predevelopment hydrograph flows to ensure the rate and volume of runoff leaving the site is controlled for the two-, five-, and ten-year frequency storms. All calculation methodology shall be in accordance with § 252-12 through 252-19 (§ 252-19.D).
3. 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.
4. Supporting calculations need to be provided to show the 2-year volume tributary to the modified basin (§ 260-35.A.16.k). The 2-year volume for the basin drainage area (38,096 CF) appears to be less than the required volume (46,032 CF) noted on page 5 of the report.
5. A schedule of inspections (related to installation of improvements) shall be provided (§ 260-35.J.(1)).
6. Confirmation needs to be provided that a minimum depth of 24 inches will be provided to any limiting zone (§ 260-35.C.(4)(d)[1][a]). The infiltration test results do not indicate that probes were performed in the basin to determine the presence/absence of limiting zones.
7. A geological evaluation and detailed soils/site investigation consistent with Sections 252-18 and 252-21.F.(2) needs to be provided to certify presence/absence of geological features, susceptibility to sinkholes, and suitability of recharge facilities (§ 252-18, 252-21.F.(23), 252-10.I). Furthermore, no stormwater shall be discharged into sinkholes per Section 252-18.A(2). The existing features plan indicates the presence of a sinkhole adjacent to the riprap apron in the basin.
8. The applicant needs to confirm the as-built post-development bypass area and weighted curve number does not exceed the assumptions used in the approved calculations (§ 252-21.G.(3)). The size (3.65 acres) and weighted CN (61.6) of the bypass drainage area exceeds the acreage (3.34) and weighted CN (59.5) from the previous stormwater report. As a result, the post-development bypass flows will need to be calculated for the proposed plan and used in the summary table on page 4 of the report to show compliance with Section 252-13.B.
9. The loading ratios to the modified infiltration basin need to be considered (§ 252-21.F.(2)). We recommend the applicant's geologist weigh in on the proposed loading ratios as part of the site evaluation.
10. The proposed grade shown on the profile for I-3 to Existing Inlet needs to be revised.

Modification Request Action:

1. Mrs. Anderson made a motion to approve the modification of SLDO 260.11.B.1 – Plan size. Mr. Stouffer seconded. Vote on the motion. All Aye. The motion carried.

2. Mrs. Anderson made a motion to approve the modification of SWMO 252.17.C.1.c – Stormwater basin side slopes – from 4:1 to 3:1 with the appropriate remediation within the basin. Mr. Stouffer seconded. Vote on the motion. All Aye. The motion carried.

3. Mrs. Anderson made a motion to approve the modification of SLDO 260.35.C.3.i – Basing fencing – contingent upon the appropriate treatment of the basin slopes to prohibit access to the basin by children. Mr. Stouffer seconded. Vote on the motion. All Aye. The motion carried.

4. Mrs. Anderson made a motion to approve the modification of SLDO 260.35.C.5.a – Minimum Spillway Depth – contingent upon the appropriate operation of the spillway. Mr. Stouffer seconded. Vote on the motion. All Aye. The motion carried.

5. Mrs. Anderson made a motion to approve the modification of SWMO 252.18.A.1 – Sinkhole bedrock pinnacle and separation distances – contingent upon the applicant providing an Indemnification Clause in favor of the Township: that all sinkholes be repaired and remediated in accordance with the Geotechnical Engineer's recommendation from the report dated October 5, 2020; and that the Geotechnical Engineer seals and agrees with the infiltration area shown on the plan. Mr. Stouffer seconded. Vote on the motion. All Aye. The motion carried.

Subdivision Plan Action:

Mrs. Anderson made a motion to table this matter. Mr. Williams seconded. Vote on the motion. Anne Anderson – Aye; Adam Williams – Aye; Jason Stouffer – Aye; Mike Thompson - Nay. The motion carried with 3 Ayes and 1 Nay.

OLD BUSINESS

There was no Old Business.

NEW BUSINESS

There was no New Business.

ZONING HEARING BOARD

There were no new Zoning Hearing Cases.

ADJOURNMENT

Mrs. Anderson made a motion to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Mr. Stouffer. Vote on the motion. All Aye. The motion carried at 6:47 PM.