

FAIRVIEW TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION

November 3, 2021

CALL TO ORDER

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

ROLL CALL

Present:

Chairman
Member
Member
Member
Codes Director
Township Engineer
Stormwater Engineer

Michael E. Thompson
H. Adam Williams, P.L.S
Michael Mehaffey, P.E.
Mark Koellner
Stephen M. Waller
Drew Bitner, P.E.
Mike Knouse, P.E.

Absent:

Member VACANT

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

October Minutes were not available. Mr. Thompson made a motion to table minutes until the December 07, 2021 meeting. Mr. Mehaffey seconded. Vote on the motion. All Aye. The motion carried.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no Public Comments

DISCUSSION AND CORRESPONDENCE

Mr. Waller announced the resignation of Mrs. Anne K. Anderson, a Planning Commission member, which will leave her position of Vice-Chairman vacant.

Mr. Mehaffey nominated and made a motion for H. Adam Williams to take the seat of the Vice-Chairman of the Planning Commission. Mr. Thompson seconded. Vote on the motion. Mr. Mehaffey – Aye; Mr. Thompson – Aye; Mr. Koellner - Aye. Mr. H. Adam Williams abstained. The motion carried.

SKETCH PLANS

There were no Sketch Plans.

SUBDIVISION PLANS

I. Old York Developers – Old York Road - #21-1018

Mr. Waller presented the revised plans comments, dated October 22, 2021 to the Planning Commission:

Subdivision Ordinance:

- 1. The surveyor/engineer signature and seal are required to be on the plans. SLDO 260.14.A(12).*
- 2. The plans do not have the certification and dedicatory statement signed by the owners. SLDO 260.14.A(13).*
- 3. A copy of an updated approved DEP Planning Module exemption will need to be submitted prior to plan approval. SLDO 260.14.B(2).*
- 4. Due to the site being serviced by public **water**, written approval of servicing ability and of the proposed water delivery system will need to come from PAWC SLDO 260.14.B(6).*
- 5. A copy of the referenced Wetlands Study will need to be submitted. SLDO 260.14.B(7) and 260.32.*
- 6. Due to the site being serviced by public **sewer**, written approval of servicing ability and of the proposed wastewater collection system will need to come from PAWC. SLDO 260.14.B(10).*

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:

None noted on plan.

The following comments, from Mr. Knouse of Rettew Associates, dated October 29, 2021, were read into the record:

- 1. All certificates need to be completed prior to recording the plan. (§ 260-14.A.12, 260-14.A.13).*
- 2. The Township has received a separate application for the development of a portion of this property; the Township should determine if the lot consolidation needs to be approved and recorded before the other application can be approved.*

Stormwater Management:

- 1. The applicant needs to provide additional information related to the condition and purpose of the existing basin located along the east side of the property. The basin appears to be in a sediment control condition while also receiving runoff from the existing CVS lot as well as the two undeveloped lots along Old York Road. The applicant needs to confirm whether the existing basin and/or site is regulated under an existing NPDES Permit (§ 252-21.F.(14)). The*

applicant has responded that the facility is currently in E&S stage and the status of the NPDES permit is unknown; the Township should verify if financial security remains for the basin conversion.

SUBDIVISION PLAN ACTION:

Mr. H. Adam Williams made a motion to recommend approval of the plan, contingent on addressing all staff and consultant comments. Mr. Koellner seconded the motion. Vote on the motion, all yes. The motion carried.

LAND DEVELOPMENT PLANS

There were no Land Development Plans.

OLD BUSINESS

1. Fairview Crossroads – Final Phase I - #21-1013

Mr. Williams made a motion to untable the plan. Mr. Mehaffey seconded the motion. Vote on the motion, all yes. The motion carried.

Mr. Waller presented the revised plan, dated October 4, 2021 to the Planning Commission and read the following comments into the record based on staff review, dated October 18, 2021.

Zoning Ordinance:

No comments.

Subdivision Ordinance:

- 1. The surveyor/engineer signature and seal are required to be on the plans. SLDO 260.14.A(12)*
- 2. The plans do not have the certification and dedicatory statement signed by the owners. SLDO 260.14.A(13)*
- 3. PennDOT HOP approval will need to be submitted for the proposed improvements to and along Lewisberry Road. SLDO 260.14.B(3)*
- 4. An improvement guarantee will need to be placed based on the Township Engineers approval of the estimate associated with the proposed public improvements SLDO 260.17.2(b)*
- 5. An engineers escrow will need to be established in the amount of 4% of the approved improvement guarantee amount. SLDO 260.19.C*
- 6. Compliance with township recreation requirements will need to be satisfied prior to final plan action for the proposed 4 lots. SLDO 260.33.B(2)*
- 7. A copy of the proposed covenants and restrictions will need to be submitted so that they can be reviewed and approved by the Township Solicitor. SLDO 260.35.G*
- 8. The BOS will need to finalize action on offsetting the off-site improvement cost from the required Traffic Impact Fees. This traffic impact fee amount has been established by the Township Traffic Engineer. SLDO 260.61.B*

General Comments:

1. *The conditions of the preliminary plan approval noted in the December 10, 2020 approval letter will need to be satisfied PRIOR to final action by the Township on the Phase I plan.*
2. *Any extensions associated with the determination of No Hazard to Air Navigation approval will need to be submitted to the township and noted on the plans.*
3. *All plans have to comply with Resolution 2008-13, which indicates that all accounts with the township must be current and not delinquent.*

Modifications (previously acted on by BOS with preliminary plan):

1. *SLDO 260.11.B(1) – Plan sheet size 22” X 34”*
2. *SLDO 260.22.B – Street Width requirements (street connection to Lemisberry Road)*
3. *SLDO 260.23.E(1) – Intersections of streets on at arterial road.*
4. *SWMO 252.17.C(1)(e)- SWM Basin outlet structure*
5. *SWMO 252.10.E/252.12.A/ SLDO 260.34C(4) – SWM Volume controls*
6. *SWMO 252.10.L – SWM Facilities Setback requirements*
7. *SWMO 252.17.B(6) – Standards for water carrying facilities*
8. *SWMO 252.17.C(1)(A) – Maximum allowable detention basin depth*
9. *SWMO 252.17.C(1)(c) – SWM Basin side slopes*

The following comments, from Mr. Knouse of Rettew Associates, dated October 18, 2021, were also read into the record:

Zoning Ordinance:

1. *Any wall exceeding six (6) feet in height shall comply with Chapter 113 relating to Code Enforcement, Uniform Construction Code. Preliminary wall design, signed and sealed by the responsible professional engineer, shall be submitted for review with the plan (§ 300-37.F). Detailed plans and specifications for the proposed retaining walls shall be submitted (§ 156-10).*
2. *Provide documentation on the form of ownership to be implemented for review by the Township Solicitor (§ 300-44.A.(3)).*

Subdivision and Land Development:

1. *All certificates need to be signed prior to recording the plan (§ 260-14.A.12, 260-14.A.13, 260-35.B.10, 260-35.B.11).*
2. *A Highway Occupancy Permit shall be submitted to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Department of Transportation; Township comments need to be incorporated as applicable (§ 260-14.B.(3)).*

3. *A draft of any protective covenants needs to be provided (§ 260-14.A.27).*
4. *Evidence of design approval for water and sewage facilities needs to be provided (§ 260-14.C.3, 260-14.C.4).*
5. *A cost estimate, financial security, and a financial security agreement need to be provided (§ 260-17). The cost estimate needs to be revised to:*
 - a. *Include an as-built plan submission*
 - b. *Include swale construction and matting*
 - c. *Include the basin spillway matting*
 - d. *Include the bentonite clay liner*
 - e. *Include permanent seeding*
 - f. *Increase the unit cost of RCP pipe*
 - g. *Provide inlet and manhole costs that are representative of the varying box sizes and structure depths.*

The estimate shall be reviewed and approved by the Township Engineer.

6. *A fee in lieu of dedication of park and recreation facilities needs to be provided (§ 260-33.B).*
7. *The developer shall pay all applicable fees and pay all outstanding invoices prior to plan approval (§ 260-41).*

The site may be subject to the Transportation Impact Fee, as determined by the Township (§ 260-50). The value of the proposed improvements has been submitted to the Township for review per the Board of Supervisors' approval for comparison to the required impact fee. The estimate shall be reviewed and approved by the Township Engineer.

Stormwater Management:

1. *Any stormwater facility located on state highway rights-of-way shall be subject to PennDOT approval (§ 252-16.A). Additionally, a reciprocal maintenance agreement, in a recordable form acceptable to the Township, assigning all maintenance responsibilities and liability to the applicant for any stormwater facilities within the PennDOT rights-of-way, will need to be provided.*
2. *The signature block for the developer's engineer and geologist will need to be completed (§ 252-21.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), 260-35.A.(13)). An operation and maintenance agreement will need to be provided.*
4. *A declaration of adequacy and highway occupancy permit from PennDOT needs to be provided when utilization of a PennDOT storm drainage system is proposed (§ 260-35.B.(12)). The applicant will need to provide evidence of approval to connect to the existing 54-inch pipe under I-83.*
5. *The applicant shall provide for and establish an organization for the ownership and maintenance of drainage facilities that is for the mutual benefit of all lots within the subdivision and/or land development, and such organization shall not be dissolved, nor shall it dispose of drainage facilities owned by it by sale or otherwise (except to an organization conceived and established to own and maintain the drainage facilities) (§ 260-35.G.(1)). Final Condominium Association documents will be provided prior to final plan approval.*

HOP Stormwater Management:

- 1. A reciprocal maintenance agreement, in a recordable form acceptable to the Township, assigning all maintenance responsibilities and liability to the applicant for any stormwater facilities within the PennDOT rights-of-way will need to be provided.*
- 2. The proposed connection to the existing 54-inch pipe under I-83 needs to be part of the HOP plans and profiles. The proposed system on the HOP plans needs to match the subdivision plans.*
- 3. Mr. Mehaffey recommended approval of all previous modifications outlined by Mr. Waller that were noted with the Preliminary Plan. Mr. Williams seconded the vote. Vote on the motion, all yes. The motion carried.*

SUBDIVISION PLAN ACTION

Mr. Michael Mehaffey made a motion to approve contingent on all staff and consultant comments dated October 18, 2021. Mr. H. Adam Williams seconded the motion. Vote of the motion, all yes. The motion carried.

2. SIENNA – 21-1008-SD

Mr. Waller presented the revised plan, dated September 21, 2021 to the Planning Commission and read the following comments into the record based on staff review, dated October 18, 2021.

Zoning Ordinance:

- 1. A lot that is located on a corner has two front yard setbacks and two side yard setbacks. The general application of this requirement to the perimeter of the lot will need to be corrected. ZO 300.11 Definitions (pg 13 of 89 – rear yard setback of 15')*
- 2. The entire tract when used to calculate density will meet the criteria of the Zoning Ordinance, however, when the new lots are created and their areas are used for the final layout, one of the lots appears to exceed allowable dwelling unit per acre density requirement. Discussion with the Township Solicitor needs to take place to make sure the condominium concept is being applied based on the submitted plan. ZO 300.21.B Table 5-4*
- 3. There are several encroachments in the required FRONT YARD setbacks on proposed units 1/61, 1/62, 1/63, 1/64, 1/67, 2/19, 2/20, 2/23, 3/52, and 4/7. ZO 300.21.B Table 5-4*
- 4. Note #4 as it relates to the Airport Hazard Zoning District – Airport Surface Zone notes that no structure will exceed “55 feet in height”. Plans show that that the apartment buildings are proposed to be 63 feet in height. While still exempt, the note should be corrected with the maximum height indicated in the ordinance of “75” feet. ZO 300.25*

Stormwater Management Ordinance:

- 1. SWM facilities are considered structures and are required to meet the applicable district setbacks for a structure. SWMO 252.10.L - Applicant has requested a waiver of these requirements.*

Subdivision Ordinance:

- 1. The plans do not have the seal and signature of the design professionals. SLDO 260.14.A(12)*

2. *The plans do not have the certification and dedicatory statement signed by the owners. SLDO 260.14.A(13)*
3. *A draft version of the protective covenants/ HOA documents for common area ownership, maintenance and responsibilities will need to be submitted for solicitor review. SLDO 260.14.A(27) & 260.35.G*
4. *The traffic impact study will need to be reviewed by our traffic consultant, please refer to any comments generated from that review. SLDO 260.14.A(28) & 260.34(B)(1)(b)*
5. *A copy of the approved York County Conservation District Erosion and Sedimentation Plan as well as NPDES approval will need to be submitted. SLDO 260.14.B(1) & 260.15.B(1)*
6. *A copy of the submittal of the PA DEP Planning Module will need to be supplied. SLDO 260.14.B(2)*
7. *A PennDOT HOP will be required for the proposed street access onto Spangler's Mill Road. SLDO 260.14.B(3)*
8. *Due to the site being serviced by public **sewer**, written approval of servicing ability and of the proposed wastewater collection system will need to come from PAWC SLDO 260.14.B(10)*
9. *All easements that do not follow property lines shall be described by metes and bounds. There are numerous stormwater and drainage easements proposed that are not described. SLDO 260.35.C(6)(c)*
10. *The site will be subject to the Traffic Impact Fee ordinance requirements. The site is located within Traffic Service Area #1, which will be subject to a fee of \$1583 per new PM peak hour trip. This fee will be established off the submitted TIS for the site. SLDO 260.50*

General Comments:

1. *A discussion will have to take place with Township Management regarding the trash collection for this development. Due to the different ownership aspects, access and use types, the possibility exist that to service the entire development, a private collection contract with the Developer and a refuse company may have to be established to service this development.*
2. *While ordinances do not have a requirement, a discussion with PAWC should be made to confirm that basement elevation sewer service is or is not required.*
3. *All plans have to comply with Resolution 2008-13, which indicates that all accounts with the township must be current and not delinquent.*

Modifications:

1. *Stormwater basin setback - SWMO 252.10.L*
2. *Stormwater basin top width – SWMO 252.17.C(1)(b)*
3. *Stormwater basin side slopes – SWMO 252.17.C(1)(c)*
4. *Stormwater Basin Outlet structure perforations – SWMO 252.17.C(1)(e)*
5. *Stormwater rate and volume calcs during E & S Phase- SWMO 252.19.D*
6. *Roadway widening Spanglers Mill and Limekiln Roads – SLDO 260.22.A.7 and SLDO 260.22.B(2)*
7. *Sidewalk locations - SLDO 260.25.A(1)*

8. *Sidewalk construction - SLDO 260.25.A(4)*
9. *Number of access drives - SLDO 260.26.C.2(b)*
10. *Stormwater Rational Method - SLDO 260.35.C.2(b)*
11. *Stormwater – SLDO 260.35.C.3(b)*
12. *Fencing stormwater basins – SLDO 260.35.C.3(i)*
13. *Stormwater Basin Bottom Slope - SLDO 260.35.C.3(j)*
14. *Stormwater basin side slopes – SLDO 260.35.C.3(k)*
15. *Stormwater Basin berm width - SLDO 260.35.C.3(l)*
16. *Emergency Basin spillway depth – SLDO 260.35.C(3)(g)(1)*
17. *Minimum pipe size – SLDO 260.35.D.2(a)4*

The following comments, from Mr. Knouse of Rettew Associates, dated October 19, 2021, were also read into the record:

REQUESTED ALTERATIONS OF REQUIREMENT

A. Section 260-22.A.7 and 260-22.B.2 – Roadway Widening:

The applicant has requested a modification of the requirement to widen the roadway along Spanglers Mill Road and Limekiln Road. In the alternative, the applicant is proposing to widen Limekiln Road on the site frontage to 14 feet from centerline with no curbing. In addition, the applicant is proposing the PennDOT permit dictate the widening and other improvements of Spanglers Mill Road.

B. Section 260-25.A – Sidewalk:

The applicant has requested modification of the requirement provide concrete sidewalks along the frontage of Spanglers Mill Road and Limekiln Road that commences on the right-of-way line and extends toward the curb line. In the alternative, the applicant proposes to place the sidewalk outside of the public street right-of-of way in most areas along the existing streets and within a permanent public path easement that allows for public use.

C. Section 260-25.A.4 – Sidewalk Construction:

The applicant has requested modification of the requirement to provide sidewalks along the frontage of Spanglers Mill Road and Limekiln Road. In the alternative, the applicant proposes an asphalt walk be permitted along the frontages of existing streets where the path meanders through open areas and that timber bridge construction be permitted for the off right-of-way crossing of two streams.

D. Section 260-26.C.2 – Access Drives:

The applicant has requested modification of the requirement that the maximum number of access drives not exceed two per lot on street frontage. In the alternative, the applicant proposes that four access drives be permitted along Sienna Boulevard for proposed lots 3 and 4.

E. Section 260-35.C.2.b and 260-35.C.3.b – Rational Method:

The applicant has requested modification of the requirement that the Rational Method must be used to determine peak flow for drainage areas up to one-half square mile and less than ten acres. In the alternative, the applicant proposes that the SCS TR-55 Method be permitted in place of the Rational Method.

F. Section 260-35.C.3.i – Fencing:

The applicant has requested modification of the requirement that the height of fencing around the stormwater facilities be a minimum of six feet. In the alternative, the applicant proposes a fence height of four feet.

G. Section 260-35.C.2.j – Basin Slope:

The applicant has requested modification of the requirement that the slope of the basin bottom be a minimum of one percent. In the alternative, the applicant proposes that basins designed as infiltration basins be permitted to have zero percent slope across the bottom.

H. Section 260-35.C.3.k and 252-17.C.1.c – Basin Side Slopes:

The applicant has requested modification of the requirement that the side slopes of the basin be a maximum of 4:1. In the alternative, the applicant proposes 3:1 and 2:1 side slopes if they are fenced.

I. Section 260-35.C.3.l and 252-17.C.1.b – Embankments:

The applicant has requested modification of the requirement that the basin embankment have a minimum top width of eight feet. In the alternative, the applicant proposes an embankment top width of six feet.

J. Section 260-35.C.3.1.2 – Anti-Seep Collars (Removed from Plan):

The applicant has requested modification of the requirement that the basin anti-seep collars need to be constructed of concrete or welded galvanized steel. In the alternative, the applicant proposes to use HDPE anti-seep collars.

This request has been removed from the plan and recent waiver request letter; therefore a formal withdrawal request needs to be submitted.

K. Section 260-35-C.6.c – Easements (Removed from Plan):

The applicant has requested modification of the requirement that the drainage easement shall be identified with metes and bounds. In the alternative, the applicant proposes that metes and bounds be provided on the Final Plan for each phase.

This request has been removed from the plan and recent waiver request letter; therefore, a formal withdrawal request needs to be submitted.

L. Section 260-35.D.2.a.4 – Pipe Size:

The applicant has requested modification of the requirement that the minimum storm drainage pipes must be 18 inches in diameter. In the alternative, the applicant proposes a minimum pipe size of 15 inches for private drainage systems that collect runoff from paving, and a minimum pipe size of 15 inches for major roof drain collection systems.

M. Section 252-10.L – Building Setback:

The applicant has requested modification of the requirement that stormwater facilities must comply with building setback requirements. In the alternative, the applicant proposes that the stormwater management facilities be permitted within the building setbacks as depicted on the plan.

N. Section 252-17.C.1.e – Basin Outlet Control Structure (New Request This Submission):

The applicant has requested modification of the requirement that stormwater facilities must comply with building setback requirements. In the alternative, the applicant proposes that the stormwater management facilities be permitted within the building setbacks as depicted on the plan. The applicant has requested modification of the requirement that outlet control structures utilize perforations arranged vertically with a maximum opening of six inches. In the alternative, the applicant proposes that the stormwater management facilities be permitted to use outlets with a variety of orifices, grates, and spillways.

O. Section 252-19.D – Post-development Flows for E&S Phases (New Request This Submission):

The applicant has requested modification of the requirement that the post-development peak flows during the erosion control phase must be less than or equal to pre-development peak flows for the 2-year, 5-year, and 10-year storm events. In the alternative, the applicant proposes to defer any Chapter 102 requirements to the York County Conservation District.

P. Section 260-35.C.3.g.1 – Basin Spillway (New Request This Submission):

The applicant has requested modification of the requirement that stormwater basin spillway must have a minimum depth of two feet and, in the alternative, proposes the emergency spillway be designed to pass the peak rate of a 100-year storm event with a minimum one foot of freeboard.

ZONING

1. *A corner lot shall be provided with two front setbacks and two side setbacks (§ 300-11).*
2. *The proposed zoning data per lot needs to be provided (§ 300-21.B).*
3. *The plan depicts encroachments into the required building setback line (§ 300-21.B). Principal structures need to be adjusted accordingly and accessory structures need to be reviewed for conformance with the allowable encroachment.*
4. *The development needs to comply with the Airport Overlay Zoning District; the building height noted needs to be adjusted to correspond to the plan (§ 300-25).*
5. *Lighting needs to be provided for the portion of unlit 5-foot walking trail shown on Plan Sheet 32 (§ 300-46.B.9).*
6. *The plan needs to address the required number of ADA parking space requirements. The Parking Compliance Diagram states five ADA parking spaces are provided at the main/elevator entrance of the building; however, this plan does not depict this. Clarification needs to be provided (§ 300-56.B).*
7. *The parking data for Lot 1A, located on Plan Sheet 2, states 25 garage parking spaces are provided; however, 33 are shown. Clarification needs to be provided.*
8. *The unit counts provided on Plan Sheet 2, Zoning Data, and the Phasing Schedule states that a total of 655 units are provided; however, 653 units are shown. Clarification needs to be provided.*

SUBDIVISION AND LAND DEVELOPMENT

1. *All certificates need to be completed prior to plan approval (§ 260-14.A.12, 260-14.A.13).*
2. *Provide a draft of any protective covenants, if any (§ 260-14.A.27).*
3. *A Traffic Impact Study needs to be provided (§ 260-14.A.28). The Traffic Impact Study needs to be reviewed by the Township's traffic consultant.*
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).*
5. *Planning module approval needs to be obtained from PA DEP (§ 260-14.B.2).*
6. *A PennDOT Highway Occupancy Permit and Township Road Occupancy Permit will be required (§ 260-14.B.3, 260-15.B.3).*

7. *Vertical curb needs to be provided (§ 260-24.B). The Township should determine if a waiver is required for the use of slant curb on the internal sections and six inch reveal curb. The plans need to clearly indicate a transition to vertical curb at the access onto township and state roads.*
8. *All street names shall be approved by the Township (§ 260-25.E).*
9. *An intersection clear sight triangle needs to be provided at all driveway intersections (§ 260-23.D).*
10. *Street signpost details need to be provided (§ 260-25.C).*
11. *A guarantee for the perpetual maintenance of the boulevard needs to be provided (§ 260-25.D).*
12. *Lighting details need to be provided (§ 260-25.F).*
13. *A fee in lieu of dedication of park and recreation facilities shall be required at the time of Final Plan approval (§ 260-33.B).*
14. *The site may be subject to the Transportation Impact Fee, as determined by the Township (§ 260-50).*
15. *Evidence of design approval and capacity for water and sewage facilities needs to be provided.*
16. *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.*
17. *ADA Curb ramps need to be provided on the eastern side of the Sienna Boulevard and Modena Drive intersection.*
18. *An easement agreement for the Lot 1A parking spaces located on Lot 1B needs to be provided.*
19. *A detail for the proposed vinyl fence needs to be provided.*
20. *The internal circulation turning movement analysis Exhibit 3 shows a fire truck will hit the curb when entering the site and Exhibit 5 shows the fire truck may hit a vehicle in the Building 4B parking lot. Clarification needs to be provided.*
21. *The proposed improvements along Limekiln Road need to be reviewed by the Township Engineer.*

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. The applicant has indicated that the E&S plan will be submitted with the Final Plan for each phase but it is unclear whether the NPDES Permit will be processed with the Preliminary Plan. It is our opinion that the NPDES Permit will need to be submitted in conjunction with the Preliminary Plan in order to approve the overall stormwater management design for the site.*
2. *All certificates need completed (§ 252-21.D, 252-21.F.(11)).*
3. *The carbonate geology certification needs to be completed (§ 252-18.A.(4)).*
4. *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)). The agreement will need to be modeled after the Long Form sample provided in the ordinance.

5. *The emergency spillway needs to be provided with a minimum two-foot depth (§ 260-35.C.(3)(g)[1]). Although not included in the waiver request letter, the applicant has indicated they will pursue a waiver of this requirement.*
6. *All inlets at low points along the roadway shall have a ten-inch curb reveal and shall be equipped with pavement base drain extending 50 feet in either direction, parallel to the center line of the roadway (§ 252-17.B.(3)). This is not limited to the connection points of Sienna Boulevard to existing streets; all roadway low points shall meet this requirement.*
7. *Several storm facilities have been modeled with a discharge pipe and outlet structure and will need details provided on the plans; this includes but is not limited to facilities #3, #4, #18, #19, and #36.*
8. *Gutter spread and depth calculations need to be provided (§ 260-35.C.(2)(g)[1-3]). These calculations need to be provided for both public and private streets.*
9. *The infiltration test locations need to be shown on a plan or map which also depicts the infiltration facility locations (§ 260-35.C.(4)(e)).*
10. *The BMPs have been designed to rely solely on infiltration to dewater for both rate and volume control. We recommend that the applicant perform post-construction infiltration testing as part of the as-built plan process to confirm the rates meet or exceed the approved design.*
11. *Infiltration BMPs shall include pretreatment BMPs (§ 252-10.J). A typical detail needs to be provided for the water quality inlets.*
12. *The discharge from the facility spillways needs to be safely conveyed to the watercourse without damage to the site (§ 252-17.C.(1)(k)). There are stormwater basins located within the interior of the site with spillways that discharge onto roads, parking areas, rear yard, and side yards.*
13. *Evidence of permit approval from DEP needs to be provided for all stream culverts and proposed outfalls to streams (§ 252-10.K, 252-16.B).*
14. *Any stormwater facility located on state highway rights-of-way shall be subject to PennDOT approval (§ 252-16.A). Additionally, a reciprocal maintenance agreement, in a recordable form acceptable to the Township, assigning all maintenance responsibilities and liability to the applicant for any stormwater facilities within the PennDOT rights-of-way, will need to be provided.*
15. *Post-construction water quality protection shall be addressed as required by Subsection 260-35.C.(5) (§ 260-35.A.(13)). The applicant will need to confirm the NPDES design meets or exceeds these standards.*
16. *Provide pavement base drain at all low points in the road. This is not limited to the connection points of Sienna Boulevard to existing streets; all roadway low points shall meet this requirement.*
17. *Although the waiver request indicates the minimum pipe size will be 15 inches, there are several proposed pipe runs with diameters less than 15 inches. These include but are not limited to the pipes between inlets 26-13 and 26-4 are to be six and eight inches; and the pipes from inlet 30-5 to 30-1 are 12 inches.*
18. *The proposed inlet top details need to comply with PennDOT Publication 72M – RC Standards.*

H&H

1. *In the West Tributary proposed geometry, the road fill at sections 2421, 2133, and 1690 does not appear to be input correctly when shown in the section views*
2. *In the West Tributary proposed geometry, the applicant needs to model the basin berm with levees on the right side of sections 2421, 2400, and 2350. The current model shows divided flow through the proposed basin.*
3. *In the East Tributary proposed geometry, the applicant needs to model the basin berm with levees on the left side of sections 2515, 2500, 2400, 2200, and 2000. The current model shows divided flow through the proposed basin.*

ACTION OF MODIFICATION REQUEST:

1. Mr. Michael Mehaffey made a motion to recommend approval of the modification request for Stormwater basin setback - SWMO 252.10.L. Mr. H. Adam Williams seconded the motion. Vote on the motion, All Yes. The motion carried.
2. Mr. Michael Mehaffey made a motion to recommend approval of the modification request for Stormwater basin top width – SWMO 252.17.C(1)(b). Mr. Mark Koellner seconded the motion. Vote on the motion, All Yes. The motion carried.
3. Mr. Michael Mehaffey made a motion to recommend approval of the modification request for Stormwater basin side slopes – SWMO 252.17.C(1)(c) contingent on using a 6 foot fence along 2 to 1 basin with mesh on outside. Mr. Mark Koellner seconded the motion. Vote on the motion, All Yes. The motion carried.
4. Mr. Michael Mehaffey made a motion to recommend approval of the modification request for Stormwater Basin Outlet structure perforations – SWMO 252.17.C(1)(e) contingent on using 2 year storm events. H. Adam Williams seconded the motion. Vote on the motion, All Yes. The motion carried.
5. Mr. Michael Mehaffey made a motion to recommend approval of the modification request for Stormwater rate and volume calcs during E& S Phase- SWMO 252.19.D. Mr. Mark Koellner seconded the motion. Vote on the motion, All Yes. The motion carried.
6. Roadway widening Spanglers Mill and Limekiln Roads – SLDO 260.22.A.7 and SLDO 260.22.B(2) – The developer withdrew modification request at November 3, 2021 Planning Commission meeting.
7. Mr. Michael Mehaffey made a motion to recommend approval of the modification request for Sidewalk locations - SLDO 260.25.A(1) contingent on the Development Maintenance Liability Agreement. Mr. Mark Koeller seconded the motion. Vote on the motion, All Yes. The motion carried.
8. Mr. Michael Mehaffey made a motion to recommend approval of the modification request for Sidewalk construction - SLDO 260.25.A(4) to use Asphalt material rather than concrete outside the Rights of Way for Limekiln Road and Spanglers Mill Road. Mr. Mark Koellner seconded the motion. Vote on the motion, All Yes. The motion carried.

9. Mr. Michael Mehaffey made a motion to recommend approval of the modification request for Number of access drives - SLDO 260.26.C.2(b). Mr. H. Adam Williams seconded the motion. Vote on the motion, All Yes. The motion carried.
10. Mr. Michael Mehaffey made a motion to recommend approval of the modification request for Stormwater Rational Method - SLDO 260.35.C.2(b). Mr. Mark Koellner seconded the motion. Vote on the motion, All Yes. The motion carried.
11. Mr. Michael Mehaffey made a motion to recommend approval of the modification request for Stormwater – SLDO 260.35.C.3(b). Mr. Mark Koellner seconded the motion. Vote on the motion, All Yes. The motion carried.
12. Mr. Michael Mehaffey made a motion to recommend approval of the modification request for Fencing stormwater basins – SLDO 260.35.C.3(i). Mr. Mark Koellner seconded the motion. Vote on the motion, All Yes. The motion carried.
13. Mr. Michael Mehaffey made a motion to recommend approval of the modification request for Stormwater Basin Bottom Slope - SLDO 260.35.C.3(j). Mr. Mark Koellner seconded the motion. Vote on the motion, All Yes. The motion carried.
14. Mr. Michael Mehaffey made a motion to recommend approval of the modification request for Stormwater basin side slopes – SLDO 260.35.C.3(k). Mr. Mark Koellner seconded the motion. Vote on the motion, All Yes. The motion carried.
15. Mr. Michael Mehaffey made a motion to recommend approval of the modification request for Stormwater Basin berm width - SLDO 260.35.C.3(l). Mr. ??? seconded the motion. Vote on the motion, 3 to 1. Mr. Michael Mehaffey voted Aye. Mr. Michael Thompson voted Aye. Mr. Mark Koellner voted Aye. Mr. H. Adam William voted Nay. The motion carried.
16. Mr. Michael Mehaffey made a motion to recommend approval of the modification request for Emergency Basin spillway depth – SLDO 260.35.C(3)(g)(1). Mr. H. Adam William seconded the motion. Vote on the motion, All Yes. The motion carried.
17. Mr. Mark Koellner made a motion to recommend approval of the modification request for Minimum pipe size – SLDO 260.35.D.2(a)4 to use less than 18 inch pipe outside of Rights-of-way, contingent to the Developers Maintenance Liability Agreement approved by Township Solicitor. Mr. H. Adam Williams seconded the motion. Vote on the motion, All Yes. The motion carried.
18. Mr. Michael Mehaffey made a motion to recommend approval of the modification request for Curbing 260.24(B)(1) contingent on Penn Dot approval to waive curbing requirements. Mr. Mark Koellner seconded the motion. Vote on the motion, All Yes. The motion carried.

NEW BUSINESS

There was no New Business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Thompson made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Vote on the motion. All Aye. The motion carried and the meeting adjourned at 7:44 PM.