

FAIRVIEW TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION

January 2, 2018

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Thompson called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM

REORGANIZATION

Mrs. Anderson, seconded by Mr. Mehaffey, nominated and made a motion for Michael Thompson as Chairman of the Planning Commission. Vote on the motion. All Aye. The motion carried.

Mr. Thompson, seconded by Mr. Mehaffey, nominated and made a motion for Anne Anderson as Vice-Chairman. Vote on the motion. All Aye. The motion carried.

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.
Township Engineer	Drew Bitner, P.E.
Codes Assistant	Chris H. Strump

Absent:

Codes Director	Stephen M. Waller
Member	Vacant

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Mrs. Anderson, seconded by Mr. Mehaffey, made a motion to approve the minutes of the December 05, 2017, meeting. Vote on the motion. All Aye. The motion carried.

DISCUSSION AND CORRESPONDENCE

1. Lower Allen Township's 2018 Comprehensive Plan

Mrs. Strump gave the Planning Commission copies of the correspondence received on December 23, 2017. The Planning Commission will review it and all comments will be discussed at the February, 2018, regularly scheduled meeting.

2. New View Corporation request for a special meeting
Mrs. Strump presented the Planning Commission a letter received on December 28, 2017, requesting the Planning Commission requesting a special meeting in January, 2018.

Mrs. Anderson made a motion, seconded by Adam Williams, to have a special meeting on January 25, 2018, should the following conditions be met no later than January 9, 2018, at 3:00 pm:

1. New View will pay all costs associated with having a special meeting;
2. New plans will be delivered addressing all staff comments, all comments by Cathy Lee at Rettew, and all of DEP's comments;
3. Notification by Cathy Lee and Drew Bitner the results of the meeting between New View, Cathy Lee, Drew Bitner, and DEP which clearly show that DEP is satisfied their comments are being met and that they can and will approve the plan prior to the special meeting on January 25, 2018.

Should all of the conditions not be met, a special meeting will not be held. Vote on the motion. All Aye. Motion carried.

SKETCH PLANS

There were no Sketch Plans.

SUBDIVISION PLANS

1. 575 Old York – 17-1012-LD

In Mr. Waller's absence, Mrs. Strump presented to the Planning Commission members the plan and read the following staff comments into the record:

Zoning Ordinance:

All zoning comments have been addressed.

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. The Traffic Impact Study is being reviewed by the Township traffic Consultant. Comments will be forwarded once they are received. SLDO 260.14.A(28) and 260.34.B(1)A
4. A copy of the York County Conservation District E & S and DEP NPDES approval is required. SLDO 260.14.B(1) & 260.15.B(1)
5. PA DEP Sewage Planning Module approval is required for the site. SLDO 260.4.B(2)
6. PennDOT HOP approval will need to be submitted for the proposed improvements along Old York Road and others identified in the TIS. SLDO 260.14.B(3) & 260.15.B(2)
7. All required permits from PA DEP and the Army Corps of Engineers for the proposed access drive crossing the stream and wetlands will need to be copied to the township once approved. SLDO 260.15.B.10
8. A bond estimate will be required for the proposed public improvements on the site along with an executed Developer Agreement. SLDO 260.16(A) and 260.17(A)(3)
9. An engineer's escrow will be required in the amount of 4% of the bond total with the final plans. SLDO 260.19(C)
10. Ordinances require that all land developments that abut a township or state road that are not to township standards for right-of-way width are required to bring that portion of the properties frontage up to township standards. An arterial road (Old York Road) is required to have a right-of-way between 60 – 80 feet in width, dependent on consultation with PennDOT. SLDO 260.22.A(7) & 260.22.B(1)
11. Ordinances require that all land developments that abut a township or state road that are not township standards for cartway width are required to bring that portion of the properties frontage up to township standards. The plans depict improvements to Old York Road in front of the property. Due to this road being a PennDOT Road, consultation and approval will be required from PennDOT to determine any required improvements. SLDO 260.22.A(7)
12. Sidewalks are required along the frontage of the property. SLDO 260.25.A – *Applicant has requested a modification.*
13. PAWC will need to provide written approval of the proposed public water availability to the site. SLDO 260.15.B(9) & 260.29(B)
14. PAWC will need to provide written approval of the proposed sanitary sewer design and availability of sewage to the site. SLDO 260.15.B(12) & 260.30

15. Compliance with township recreation requirements is not depicted or shown on the plans. If land is not proposed for dedication a fee in lieu can be offered to comply with the with the ordinances. The fee is calculated based on disturbed acreage. SLDO 260.14.B(9) & 260.33
16. A Traffic Impact Fee will be required for each new PM vehicle trip in accordance with ordinance requirements and the Act 209 Traffic Impact Fee Assessment. See McMahon review letter and report dated December 8, 2017. SLDO 260.61.B

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:

1. SLDO Section 260.10 – Preliminary Plan submittal requirements
2. SLDO Section 260.25.A – Sidewalk requirement
3. SLDO Section 260.24.B(2) – Curbing requirements along Old York Road

Stormwater comments from Cathy Lee at Rettew:

(Please note that the comments are not numbered sequentially – the notes were taken directly from Cathy Lee’s emailed and printed correspondence and were left in her format)

1. SWMO Section 252-10.K.- All natural streams, channels, swales, drainage systems and/or areas of surface water concentration shall be maintained in their existing condition unless an alteration is approved by the Township. All encroachment activities shall comply with the requirements of PA DEP 25 Pa. Code Chapter 105 (Water Obstructions and Encroachments), Rules and Regulations of PA DEP. Any approvals or permits issued do not relieve compliance as referenced in § [252-6](#), Compatibility with other permit and ordinance requirements.

Response: All required approvals and permits will be obtained prior to final plan approval.

RETTEW Comment: Acknowledged.

2. SWMO Section 252-16.B. - Any stormwater management facilities regulated by this chapter that would be located in or adjacent to waters of the commonwealth or wetlands shall be subject to approval by PA DEP through the joint permit application process, or, where deemed appropriate by PA DEP, the general permit process. When there is a question whether wetlands may be involved, it is the responsibility of the developer or his agent to show that the land in question

cannot be classified as wetlands; otherwise, approval to work in the area must be obtained from PA DEP.

Response: Approval from PA DEP in order to work within the wetlands will be obtained prior to commencing any work within this area.

RETTEW Comment: Acknowledged.

3. SWMO Section 252-16.D - All earthmoving activities must be reviewed and approved by the York County Conservation District prior to commencing work.

Response: Prior to earthmoving activities an application will be submitted to the York County Conservation District for review and approval. Once a permit is obtained a copy of the approval letter will be forwarded to the township.

RETTEW Comment: Acknowledged.

4. SWMO Section 252-30.A-C - Stormwater O&M Agreements shall be provided and recorded in the recorder of deeds office.

Response: Prior to final plan recording stormwater operations and maintenance agreements will be submitted to the township for review.

RETTEW Comment: Acknowledged.

5. PCSM Plans and NPDES information shall be submitted to the Township for Review. Provide all worksheets associated with the NPDES Permit. Provide the following additional information as per the following Sections:

- a. SWMO Section 252-17.B.(1) - All storm sewer pipes, streets, and inlets (excluding detention and retention basin outfall structures) shall be designed for a twenty-five-year storm event, with the exception of PennDOT, which is a ten-year storm event. Sole access structures (culverts and bridges) shall be designed to convey the twenty-five-year flood without overtopping the roadway.

Response: All storm sewer pipes have been designed to properly convey the 25-year flow. Hydraulic grade line calculations have been included in the PCSM Report on pages 199-205. The included HEC-RAS report demonstrates the conveyance of the stream through the proposed culvert and its effect on the floodplain.

RETTEW Comment: Provide the 25-Year storm flow and water surface elevation for the proposed Culvert. It was not found in the narrative.

Permanent detention and retention basins shall be designed to meet the following standards:

- b. SWMO Section 252-17.C(1)(b) - The minimum top width of all basin embankments shall be eight feet.

Response: Reference the attached Final Plan Sheet C-3 Overall Site Plan. The top widths of all basin embankments have been increased to 8 feet.

RETTEW Comment: Label the top of embankment width on the plan or in the profile.

- c. SWMO Section 252-17.C(1)(g) - Any stormwater management facility (i.e., detention basin) designed to store runoff and requiring a berm or earthen embankment required or regulated by this chapter shall be designed to provide an emergency spillway to handle flow up to and including the one-hundred-year, twenty-four-hour design storm at post development conditions, assuming the principal outlet structure to be clogged. The height of embankment must be set as to provide a minimum one foot of freeboard above the maximum elevation computed for the clogged orifice condition. Should any stormwater management facility require a dam safety permit under PA DEP 25 Pa. Code Chapter 105, the facility shall be designed in accordance with PA DEP 25 Pa. Code Chapter 105 and meet the regulations of PA DEP 25 Pa. Code Chapter 105 concerning dam safety which may be required to pass storms larger than one-hundred-year event.

Response: Reference the attached revised PCSM Report Appendix J. The proposed basins have been designed to handle a 100 yr., 24 hr. storm with the clogged orifice condition and have a minimum of 1 ft. of freeboard.

RETTEW Comment: Sheet C-18: Profile PE. OS 1 to PR LS 1 – PR OS-1 is labeled incorrectly. According to Pond calcs. it should be 504.40 not 504.50. If the pond embankment elevation is 500 as labeled in the pond report, 1' of freeboard is not met. The top of embankment contour on the grading plan appears to be 506.00. PCSM-5 Basin 1 cross-section detail lists the top of embankment as 505.00. Please verify and coordinate elevations.

- d. SWMO Section 252-17.C(h) - A cutoff trench of impervious material shall be provided within all basin embankments.

Response: Reference the attached revised Final Plan Sheet PCSM-5. Cutoff trenches of impervious material have been provided within the proposed basin embankments, see cross sections for Basins 1 and 3.

RETTEW Comment: Sheet PCSM-5 Basin 1 cross-section detail does not show a cut-off trench, emergency spillway or embankment top elevation and width. The 25-year water surface elevation is 504.44 in Basin 1. Both curb cuts are 404.22, allowing the 25- thru 100-year stormwater to flow into the parking area.

7. SWMO Section 252-21.C. - Provisions for permanent access or maintenance easements for all physical SWM BMPs, such as ponds and infiltration structures, as necessary to implement the operation and maintenance (O&M) plan.

Response: Reference the attached revised Final Plan Sheet C-24 Easement Plan. Access and maintenance easements have been indicated per your comment.

RETTEW Comment: Along the back-property line, include the riprap stilling basin and end of existing pipe in the easement.

9. SWMO Section 252-21.F.(7) - Plan and profile drawings of all SWM BMPs, including drainage structures, Bridges/Pipe Culverts.
Response: Reference the attached revised Final Plan. A profile of the culvert has been provided on PCSM-5 and additional details for the proposed culvert are on PCSM-6. Final Culvert specifications for the culvert will be provided once approval from DEP has been received.
RETTEW Comment: Plan Sheet PCSM 6 is missing from the Plan Set.
11. SWMO Section 252-21.G.(1)(b) - Basins. A cross-section of the basin showing the relationship between the existing topography and the proposed bottom, spillway, top of embankment, and the outlet structure and the corresponding proposed finished grade elevations. A detail of the outlet structure shall be provided, including all pertinent construction requirements.
Response: Reference the attached revised Final Plan Sheet PCSM-4 and PCSM-5. Cross-sections for proposed basins 1 and 3 have been provided on PCSM-5. Details for the outlet structures in Basins 1 and 3 are provided on PCSM-4.
RETTEW Comment: PCSM-4: Basin 3 OS Detail – The inlet top and bottom elevations do not match the pond calculations in the narrative, or profile on Sheet C-18.
15. SLDO Section 260-35.C(2)(e) - Time of concentration. The methods found in Chapter 3 of the latest edition of Urban Hydrology for Small Watersheds, Technical Release TR-55, available from the U.S. Department of Agriculture, NRCS, shall be used to compute times of concentration. The length of flow path for sheet flow shall not exceed 100 feet and the length of flow path for shallow concentrated flow shall not exceed 1,000 feet.
Response: Reference the attached revised PCSM Report pages 30, 32, 34, and 36. The length of flow path for sheet flow has been revised to be 100 ft. for time of concentration calculations per your comment.
RETTEW Comment: Where does the manning's n value of 0.60 come from in the TC Calculation for the Southwest Corner on page 30 of the PCSM Narrative? It appears to me that this should be grass or light woods since the path is following the edge of the woods.
18. SLDO Section 260-35.C(3)(g)[2] - Emergency spillway. Any stormwater management facility (i.e., detention basin) designed to store runoff and requiring a berm or earthen embankment shall be designed to provide an emergency spillway able to safely pass the peak rate of runoff from the post-development one-hundred-year storm with a minimum one foot of freeboard between the maximum (one-hundred-year) water surface elevation and the top of the berm/embankment. The use of inlets and pipes is prohibited for the emergency spillway. Provide Cross-sections of the stormwater basins and sediment trap.
Response: Reference the attached revised Final Plan Sheet PCSM-5. Cross-sections of the proposed stormwater basins and sediment trap have been provided per your comment.
RETTEW Comment: See Comment 5.d. above.

25. Provide a letter from PPL stating that grading may occur in their R.O.W.
Response: Coordination with PPL is ongoing and a letter will be provided once obtained.
RETTEW Comment: Acknowledged.
26. The storm sewer pipes from I-12 to DMH-6, Inlet 11 to DMH5 and OS-1 to DMH-4 have very steep slopes. Provide pipe anchors and/or drop the inlets to decrease the slope.
Response: Reference the attached revised Final Plan Sheet PCSM-5. Anchors have been added in order to decrease the slope in the storm sewer pipes from 1-12 to DMH-6, Inlet 11 to DMH5 and OS-1 to DMH-4 per your comment.
RETTEW Comment: Check the table for the pipe anchors distances. The 36' between anchors for >50% slopes do not appear to be correct.
28. Provide Hydrologic Study cross-section locations in a legible plan view. Provide a cross-section at the beginning and end of the proposed culvert.
Response: Reference the attached revised Final Plan Sheet PCSM-6. Cross-sections at the beginning and end of the proposed culvert have been provided per you comment.
RETTEW Comment: Sheet PCSM-6 is missing from the plan sheet.
35. Provide Plans to Pa American water for Review of Water and Sanitary sewer lines.
Response: The design of water and sanitary sewer service will be coordinated with PA American water and documentation of their approval will be provided once obtained.
RETTEW Comment: Acknowledged.
37. Provide calculations to show how you determined the infiltration rates at each infiltration BMP. Were the infiltration rates averaged?
Response: Reference the attached revised PCSM report page 190. The infiltration rates for each BMP was determined using the rates obtained from the infiltration tests. The infiltration rates were averaged for BMPs with multiple tests within the vicinity of the BMP.
RETTEW Comment: The PABMP Manual recommends a factor of safety of 2 when using infiltration rates. This does not appear to have been used.
43. Level Spreader detail is lacking overall length and unites, measures more than 1 foot in plan view. Length of the level spreader should be 10 x width of the discharge pipe.
Response: Reference the attached revised Final Plan Sheet PCSM-4. The total length for the level spreader has been added to the detail. The pipes for both level spreaders are 18" in diameter so the total length is 15'.

RETTEW Comment: Detail is not revised, still says level spreader is 1' long.

45. Outlet structures need to be detailed to provide specific information about weir outlets sizing and elevations.

Response: Details for outlet structures are provided on Final Plan Sheet PCSM-4.

RETTEW Comment: Basin 3 outlet structure elevations do not match the pond calcs. in the narrative or the profile on sheet C-18.

50. A profile of the proposed bridge/culvert showing 100 year WSE (existing and proposed) and other details in order for construction should be added to the plan. An analysis of the proposed structure should be provided for review as well. The detail on sheet.

Response: Reference the attached revised Final Plan Sheets C-17, PCSM-5, and PCSM-6. A profile of the proposed culvert has been provided on PCSM-5 along with additional details for construction of the proposed structure on PCSM-6. The driveway profile on sheet C-17 shows the existing and proposed 100-year WSE. A HEC-RAS analysis showing in 100-year flood elevation based on the removal of the existing driveway and the installation of the proposed culvert has been provided.

RETTEW Comment: PCSM-6 is missing from the plan set.

Erosion and sedimentation control plans:

54. Submit an Erosion and sedimentation (ESC) plan and Narrative to the York County Conservation District (YCCD) for review and approval. Provide an ESC Approval letter upon receipt for YCCD.

Response: An application will be submitted to the York County Conservation District for review and approval. Once a permit is obtained a copy of the approval letter will be forwarded to the township.

RETTEW Comment: Acknowledged.

57. Provide additional filter sock below swale 1 above the corner property.

Response: Reference the attached revised E&S Plan Sheet ES-2. Additional filter sock has been provided above the property in the northeast corner.

RETTEW Comment: The filter sock should be shown parallel to the contours, as per the ESC Manual.

60. SWMO Section 252-13.B. – Post-development discharge rates shall not exceed the predevelopment discharge rates for the one-, two-, five-, ten-, twenty-five-, fifty-, and one-hundred-year twenty-four-hour storms.; The Post Development Area to The Northern POI, Southeast Corner POUI and Southwest Corner POI, all have Peak Rates that are higher than the Pre-development Peak Rates.

61. Sheets C-9 and C-10 – Turn on Inlet and Outlet Structure labels. Sheet C-8 has them shown, but the layer is turned off on the other two grading plans.

62. Basin #1 – review proposed contours and verify that they are tied into the correct existing grade contour.
63. Hydraulic Report: The proposed cross-section for station 19-44.83 is missing.
64. The proposed gas line as shown on the culvert profile appears to be approx. 1' below the stream bed. Check DEP regulations and Gas line regulations for proper separation of the gas line and all other utilities crossing the stream bed.
65. Provide Channels Calculations and Channel lining for the swales being directed to proposed Inlets 1, 2, 3 and 4 at the rear of the building. Make sure off-site flow to the channels is included. Add swale dimensions and lining to the vegetated swale detail on sheet ES-5, or add a separate detail for V-shaped channels.
66. Sheet C-17, Sanitary Sewer Profile
 - a. Approximate Station 1+55, an 18" SLCPP storm sewer pipe is called out, but the pipe is not shown.
 - b. The waterline and gas line appear to go through the culvert and not under the stream bed. Please correct.
 - c. Label the gas line on the profile.

Township Engineer comments:

1. Need signature block for Township Engineer.
2. Identify control point for survey / it should be one of the two concrete monuments.
3. Lighting --- Plan is still missing T2M-25 along Old York Road.
4. Heavy Duty Bituminous Paving Section --- 12.5 mm Superpave Wearing Course is a minimum of 2 (two) inches.
5. Under-drain on both sides of Old York Road is required by the Township due to frequent flooding at this location.
6. TIS Revision for Old York / Wyndamere Roads was not submitted.

Modification Request action:

Mrs. Anderson made a motion to approve the modification of SLDO 260.10 – Preliminary Plan submittal requirements. Mr. Williams seconded the motion. Vote on the motion. All Aye. The motion carried.

Mrs. Anderson made a motion to deny the modification of SLDO 260.25.A – Sidewalk requirement. Mr. Williams seconded the motion. Vote on the motion. All Aye. The motion carried.

Mr. Mehaffey made a motion to table the modification of SLDO 260.24.B(2) – Curbing requirements along Old York Road. Mrs. Anderson seconded the motion. All Aye. The motion carried.

Subdivision Plan Action:

Mrs. Anderson made motion to table the plan. Mr. Mehaffey seconded the motion. Vote on the motion. All Aye. The motion carried.

LAND DEVELOPMENT PLANS

There were no new Land Development Plans.

OLD BUSINESS

1. New View Corporation (Final) – 17-1011-SD
2. (NO REVISIONS) – Fairview Summit – 17-1003-LD
3. Fairview Township Yard Waste/Recycling Center

NEW BUSINESS

There was no New Business.

ZONING HEARING BOARD

There were no new hearings.

ADJOURNMENT

Mrs. Anderson made a motion to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Mr. Mehaffey. Vote on the motion. All Aye. The motion carried at 8:04 PM.