

FAIRVIEW TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION

September 5, 2017

AGENDA

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Thompson called the meeting to order at 7:01 PM

ROLL CALL

Present:

Vice-Chairman

Member

Member

Member

Codes Director

Township Engineer

Codes Assistant

Michael E. Thompson

Michael Mehaffey, P.E.

Anne K. Anderson, P.E.

H. Adam Williams, P.L.S.

Stephen M. Waller

Drew Bitner, P.E.

Chris H. Strump

Absent:

Chairman

Michael A. Powers

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Mrs. Anderson, seconded by Mr. Mehaffey, made a motion to approve the minutes of the August 01, 2017, meeting with the addition of language proposed in an email by Mr. Thompson. Vote on the motion. All Aye. The motion carried.

DISCUSSION AND CORRESPONDENCE

1. Ordinance amendment 2017-3

Mr. Waller presented the proposed Ordinance amendments to the Planning Commission which include a description of flag-lots as well as establishing criteria for flag lots; scale requirements on an original property description which will allow for a scale of up to, rather than explicitly requiring only, 1" = 400'; separating the definition of wholesaling from the warehouse and distribution definitions; an amendment regarding business parks; and an amendment allowing municipal uses as a permitted use in all districts. Mrs. Anderson made a motion to table the matter pending a review and comments from the York County Planning Commission. Mike Mehaffey seconded the motion. Vote on the motion. All Aye. The motion carried

SKETCH PLANS

There were no Sketch Plans.

SUBDIVISION PLANS

There were no new Subdivision Plans.

LAND DEVELOPMENT PLANS

There were no new Land Development Plans.

OLD BUSINESS

1. New View Corporation – 17-1009-SD

Mr. Williams abstained from the discussion and voting because he is an employee of Alpha Consulting Engineers.

Mrs. Anderson made a motion to un-table this matter. Mr. Mehaffey seconded the motion. Vote on the motion. All Aye. Motion carried.

Mr. Waller presented the revised plan to the Planning Commission members and read the following staff comments into the record:

Zoning Ordinance:

There were no comments regarding the Zoning Ordinance.

Subdivision Ordinance:

1. Ordinance required that the Original Property Description plan be depicted at a scale of 1"=400'. SLDO 260.14.A(1). *Applicant has requested a modification of these requirements.*
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. Street lights are not on the plans along the Connector Road (intersection with Old Yorktown Road)? SLDO 260.14.A(20) and 260.25.F.
5. A copy of the draft covenants should be submitted for the solicitors review prior to final plan approval. SLDO 260.14.A(27)
6. A bond estimate will be required for the proposed public improvements on the site along with an executed Developer Agreement. The agreement will be required for the final plan approval SLDO 260.17(A) and 260.17(A)(3).
7. An engineer's escrow will be required in the amount of 4% of the bond total with the final plans.
8. Ordinances state that all land developments that abut a township or state road that are not to township standards for cartway width are required to bring that portion of the properties frontage up to township standards. The plans do not depict any improvements to the Wyndamere Road frontage. Due to this road being a PennDOT Road, the received HOP application will be the basis of PennDOT's requested improvements. Areas outside of PennDOT's scoping would need to meet ordinance requirements unless relief is requested. SLDO 260.22.A(7). *Applicant made a verbal request at the meeting for a modification of these requirements should PennDOT not require any improvements. A written modification request will be made also.*
9. Compliance with township recreation requirements are not depicted or shown on the plans. SLDO 260.33. *Applicant has requested a modification of these requirements.*
10. A Traffic Impact Fee will be required for each new PM vehicle trip in accordance with Ordinance requirements. This fee will be noted as part of the Traffic Consultants' review of the Traffic Impact Study. A Traffic Improvement Agreement has been submitted to staff and the Solicitor for review. SLDO 260.61.B. *Applicant has requested a modification of these requirements.*

General Comments:

1. The portion of Goodman Drive that crosses into Newberry Township will have to be discussed and included into an agreement between the Townships as far as maintenance, repair, and ownership. This has been incorporated into the draft version of the Traffic Improvements Agreement that has been submitted and is under review by staff and the Solicitor.
2. Portions of this plan are outside of Fairview and located in Newberry Township. The plan will have to be reviewed and approved by Newberry prior to Fairview Township approval.

3. Note #14 is no longer a valid note, lot #2 does not contain a home and associated utilities.
4. 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. Section 252.10.L – Setbacks stormwater management structures
2. Section 252.12 – Stormwater volume controls
3. Section 252.17.C(1)(c) – Side slopes stormwater basins
4. Section 252.17.C(1)(d) – Bottom slope requirement stormwater basins
5. Section 260.14.A(1) – Original property description
6. Section 260.14.A(3) – Typical driveway detail and profiles requirement – *This modification request was withdrawn during the Planning Commission meeting.*
7. Section 260.14.A(19) – Driveway location requirements – *This modification request was withdrawn during the Planning Commission meeting.*
8. Section 260.14.B(5) – Stormwater management requirements for individual lots
9. Section 260.22.D(6) – Cul-de-sac radius requirement on Yorktown Road
10. Section 260.25.A – Sidewalks requirement
11. Section 260.33.(A) & (B) – Recreation fees
12. Section 260.35.C(3)(i) – Stormwater basin fencing requirement
13. Section 260.35.C(3)(m) – Stormwater basin outlet control structure plate requirement
14. Section 260.50 – Traffic impact fee requirement – *This modification request was withdrawn during the Planning Commission meeting.*
15. Section 260.22.A(7) – Cartway width

Stormwater Comments from Cathy Lee at Rettew:

Mrs. Lee presented the Planning Commission with “Plan Review No. 3” and read the following comments into the record:

5. Provide justification/documentation for Culverts H and L to determine if they need a General Permit or Joint Permit per PADEP Guidelines.

Developer Response: It was previously determined that the drainage area to Culverts H & L are less than one square miles, thereby placing them in the General Permit Category.

RETTEW COMMENT: No documentation was provided. General Permits shall be submitted prior to Final Plan Approval.

6. SLDO Section 260-35.C(3)(m) – Basin outlet control structures. Basin outlet control structures shall consist of stainless steel orifice plates and mounting hardware.

Developer Response: Modification Requested.

RETTEW COMMENT: See separate Modification Request Review Letter dated 9/5/2017.

8. SLDO Section 260-35.C(3)(i) - Fencing. Stormwater detention basins shall be fenced with a six-foot-high fence that meets the following criteria: if the proposed fence is composed of horizontal and vertical members and the distance between the tops of the horizontal members is less than 45 inches, the horizontal members shall be located on the pond side of the fence. Spacing between vertical members shall not exceed 1 3/4 inches in width; maximum mesh size for chain-link fences shall be a one-and-one-fourth-inch square unless the fence is provided with slats fastened at the top or the bottom that reduce the openings to not more than 1 3/4 inches; the maximum vertical clearance between finished ground level and the fence shall be two inches or less, measured on the pond side of the fence; openings in the barrier shall not allow passage of a four-inch-diameter sphere.

Developer Response: Modification Requested.

RETTEW COMMENT: See separate Modification Request Review Letter dated 9/5/2017.

10. Provide an Environmental impact chart showing what environmentally sensitive features (i.e. steep slopes, wetlands and streams) were maintained and include them within the plan view of the existing conditions.

Developer Response: The Environmental Impact Chart/Plan will be provided to the Township under separate cover.

RETTEW COMMENT: Acknowledged. The Chart/Plan shall be submitted prior to final plan approval.

GENERAL COMMENTS

7. NPDES and ESC Plans shall be submitted to the Fairview Township for Review, Including NPDES Worksheets.

Developer Response: NPDES Permit Documentation, including the ESPC Plan and the NPDES worksheets will be provided to the Township under separate cover.

RETTEW COMMENT: Acknowledged. Documentation must be received and reviewed prior to Final plan approval. **ESC Plans have been submitted and will be addressed under separate cover. No ESC Calculations were provided. NPDES calculations and worksheets have still not been submitted.**

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

2. Please review your storm sewer calculation in the Runoff chart on Page C4 and C5. The 100 Year rainfall intensity is listed at 1.92 for the 5 min. TC. The 100 Year Rainfall intensity should be 7.79 in/hr. for the 5-min. travel time. Please review and revise, and review all pipe sizes and capacities.

Developer Response: *The SWM Report has been revised to correct the IDF Curve within the storm-sewer model. The appropriate intensities are now reflected, but it will not result in any changes to the pipe sizes or materials.*

RETTEW COMMENT: The Rainfall intensities have been updated. The outfall pipe from Basin A – OCS - A1 to I-16 is undersized. The flow is 10.15 CFS, the pipe full capacity of the 18” pipe at 0.5% slope is 8.09 CFS. Revise the pipe size or slope.

ROADWAY DRAINAGE REPORT FROM TRAFFIC, PLANNING AND DESIGN DATED JUNE 30, 2017 COMMENTS

1. In the Roadway Drainage Report from TPD, Appendix B, Time of concentration calcs for I-20, I-36, I-B5 and I-B7, the Precipitation amount appears to be incorrect. The 2-year storm precipitation amount is 2.89 not 0.13, thus significantly lowering the Time of concentration for these inlets. Please revise, or explain the where the 0.13 in/hr was generated from. This will revise the Post Development Weighted Runoff Factor and Peak Discharge Computation Table.

TPD Response: *The time of concentration and precipitation calculations haven been reviewed and updated as necessary. A Revised Roadway Drainage Report will be provided to the Township in Conjunction with the next submission of the Highway Occupancy Permit (HOP) and signal plan package to PennDOT. At this stage, TPD does not anticipate that any of the resultant modifications to the Roadway Drainage Report or Highway Occupancy Permit Plans will impact the detention basin/site stormwater management design identified on Evans Engineering’s current Subdivision Plans.*

RETTEW COMMENT: The plans have not been submitted therefore cannot be reviewed against Evans Engineering’s current Subdivision Plans. A few additional comments are listed below based on the TPD stormwater Calculations from 6/30/17.

- a. The Area and Wetted Perimeter calculations in the four-individual time of concentration calculations are not correct.
 - b. As per SLDO Section 260.35.C(2)(^e), The maximum length of the Overland Flow is 100 feet. Time of Concentration Calculations for I-20 and I-B7 are 300’ and 202’ respectively, and should be corrected. The maximum shallow concentrated flow is 1000’. I-20 lists 2225’ and should be corrected. This will affect the swale flow calculations also.
 - c. TPD’s Storm Sewer Summary Report and Storm Sewer Tabulations lists the flow rate for OS-A to I-16 as 0.01 CFS. The flow rate should be should be 1.025 CFS for the 10-year storm event. This will adjust the flow in the downstream pipes.
 - d. TPD’s Storm Sewer Summary Report lists the flow rate for OS-B to MH-44 as 0.01 CFS. The flow rate should be should be 0.687 CFS for the 10-year storm event. This will adjust the flow in the downstream pipes.
2. Most the PennDOT inlet and pipe calculations have not been reviewed yet. This will be completed when Peak Discharge Computation Tables and plans are corrected.

TPD Response: *Noted. The revised Roadway Drainage Report will be modified to address both RETTEW’s comments noted in this letter, and PennDOT’s 8/8/17 HOP Review Letter.*

RETTEW COMMENT: RETTEW will review the calculations when the revised plans are submitted.

3. Change the name of Yorktown Road to Industrial Drive.

TPD Response: *As requested, the HOP plans, Traffic Plans and Drainage report will be modified to identify “proposed Industrial Drive” in Lieu of realigned Yorktown Road.*

RETTEW COMMENT: RETTEW will acknowledge the above response after submission and review of the plans.

The following information is missing from the submission and therefore cannot be reviewed:

1. NPDES Calculations and Worksheets for Volume and Water Quality Treatment.
2. Erosion and Sedimentation Control Features calculations have not been provided to provide backup data for the Detail Computation Tables.
3. Traffic Drainage Design and Roadway Reports have not been resubmitted with updated information.
4. SLDO 260-35.B(1) Stormwater effects on downstream pipes and properties is a required part of the stormwater report and NPDES NOI.

Coordination between the different companies designing each entity should take place before the next submission so all design components of the project are submitted. A stormwater consistency letter will not be issued until all stormwater Volume, Peak Rate Management, Water Quality, collection and conveyance calculations are submitted, reviewed and approved by the Township.

Mrs. Lee then presented the Planning Commission with “Plan Review No. 1” for Erosion and Sedimentation Control and read the following comments into the record:

EROSION AND SEDIMENTATION CONTROL PLAN

7. Submit a written Narrative that includes, at a minimum, the following:
 - a. Design Calculations for Erosion Control Facilities.
 - b. 8.5x11 USGS location Map
 - c. Analysis of the impact that runoff from the project site will have on existing downstream watercourses resistant to erosion.
 - d. Person Responsible for Design of ESC BMP's
8. ESC Manual Chapter 1 page 1 – Site Characteristics including steep slopes, sensitive and special value features such as riparian areas should be mapped on the plan.
9. Sheet ES 3.1
 - a. Label the Topsoil Stockpile.
 - b. Filter sock around the topsoil stockpile shall be a minimum of 18”.
 - c. Show proposed rip-rap outlet protection at end-walls.
 - d. Provide Maximum Drainage areas, on the plan, to Hydraulic BMPs during construction.
 - e. Soils boundaries and Identification symbol are not shown in plan view.
10. Sheet ES 4.1
 - a. Provide note explaining the responsibilities for materials including environmental Due Diligence and Clean Fill.
11. Sheet ES 4.3
 - a. Add filter sock table with slope length and sock size requirements or provide calculations in narrative
 - b. Provide Channel details and calculations.

Mrs. Lee then presented the Planning Commission with “Modification Request Review (Revised)” and read the following comments into the record:

RETTEW concurs with the following Stormwater Modifications.

- 3) SWMO Section 252.17.C(1)c) - Side slope stormwater basin requirement – using 3:1 in Basins which is allowed if vegetation is provided to stabilize the embankment slopes.
 - **Rettew Concurs with this modification due to ordinance allowance for Vegetative stabilization of 3:1 slopes.**
- 4) SWMO Section 252.17.C(1)(d) – Bottom Slope stormwater basin requirement
 - **Rettew Concurs with this modification. All basins have amended soils and a pipe underdrain system to allow the water to drain thru the amended soil and to the perforated pipes. Per the PABMP Manual Biorientation Basins should have flat bottoms to allow for infiltration.**
- 8) SLDO Section 260.14.B(5) – Stormwater Requirement for individual lots. The proposed stormwater management facilities are proposed as part of the subdivision and SWM Site Plan in order to address the improvements associated with this plan and not the individual Lots.
 - **Rettew Concurs with this modification. The individual Lot owners will be required to provide stormwater Volume Control, Rate Control and Water Quality Treatment for their individual lots based on what is being constructed on those individual lots.**
- 13) SLDO Section 260.35.C(3)(m) – Stormwater basin outlet control structure stainless steel plate requirement.
 - **Rettew concurs with this modification, as all pond outlet structures are sized with a 6” diameter orifice which is the Maximum diameter allowed by SLDO Section 252.17.C(1)(e) Outlet control structures. Outlet control shall be accomplished utilizing (six-inch diameter or six-inch width maximum) perforations arranged vertically to provide for positive control of stormwater runoff. Outlet controls shall also provide for modification of the orifice to a smaller diameter through the use of removable plates. Removable plates are not necessary since there are no smaller orifice sizes proposed.**

See the following comments Stormwater Modification requests for concurrence on some portion of the request and non-concurrence on others.

- 1) SWMO Section 252.10.L – Setbacks stormwater management structure requirement. The proposed stormwater management facilities were designed to minimize disturbed area and thus have been located as close as reasonably possible to the right-of-way and in a few cases, slightly encroaching on the front yard setback. Additionally, in the cases of Basin B, C, and D, the primary purpose of these areas is for stormwater management and thus the basins were maximized encroaching upon all setbacks. The design provides more storage for the stormwater runoff and thus a more conservative design. Also, these areas have limited development value and will be utilized to help reduce runoff within the state right-of-way.
 - **Basins A & E - Rettew DOES NOT concurs with this modification for Basin A and E, as they have enough room on their respective lots to be designed outside of the setback. The outside toe of the embankment should be located outside of the setback line.**
 - **Basin B - Rettew DOES Concur with Basin B being in the setback. This area will not contain any buildings. Basins are limited by the inverts of the PennDOT Pipes coming into the ponds.**

- Basin C - Rettew DOES Concur with Basin C being in the setback. This area will not contain any buildings. Basins are limited by the inverts of the PennDOT Pipes coming into the ponds.
- Basin D - Rettew DOES Concur with Basin D being in the setback. But Rettew DOES NOT concur with the embankment of Basin D being in the Right-of-way of Goodman Drive connector. This Basin will need to be adjusted to pull it out of the right-of way. This area will not contain any buildings.

2) SWMO Section 252.12 – Stormwater volume controls requirement.

RETTEW COMMENT: Section § 252-14 deals with Stormwater management facilities for Pennsylvania Department of Transportation and Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission roadways and associated facilities. 252-14.B states that *“Where standards in the Act 167 elements of the IWRP and this chapter are impractical, PennDOT or the PTC may request assistance from DEP, in consultation with the County, to develop an alternative strategy for meeting state water quality requirements and the goals and objectives of the Act 167 elements within the IWRP.”*

- Rettew DOES NOT concur with this modification request. PennDOT Design Manual 2, Chapter 13.7 The Antidegradation and Post Construction Stormwater Management Policy requires that projects should meet the Townships Act 167 plan. Per this chapter, a PCSM Level 3 Design Criteria should be used for this Project. See Table 13.9, page 13-29. Volume Controls can be managed by using dry extended detention basins when infiltration is not available. This project does have dry extended detention basins. Provide Calculations for Water Quality Volume and adjust the basin orifices, if necessary to account for the water quality volumes. If the developer decides to consult the York County Conservation District or PADEP, then RETTEW will concur with the York County Conservation District and PADEP for Stormwater Volume control requirements.
- The NPDES Information and Calculations should be submitted to Fairview Township for Review and Approval.

12) SLDO Section 260.35.C(3)(i) – Stormwater Basin Fencing Requirement. Change Section to 252-17.C(1)j – Fencing required for pond with water deeper than 4’.

- RETTEW DOES concur with the modification of no fence for Basins C & E, as the 25-year peak rate storm water surface elevations are under 4 feet.
- RETTEW suggests that the modifications for Basins B and D, be DEFERRED until individual Lots are designed and the nature of the business on those lots are known (i.e. Day Care, or Sports Center, where children would be present). Basins B and D are 4.08 and 4.16 feet deep at the 100-year peak rate storm event which is very close to the 4’.
- RETTEW DOES NOT concur with a modification for Basin A as the 25-year Peak Rate Elevation is 4.28 feet deep and the 100-year peak rate elevation is 5.37 feet deep.

Modification Request action:

Mrs. Anderson made a motion to approve the modification of SLDO 252.10.L – Setbacks stormwater management structures. Mr. Mehaffey seconded the motion. Vote on the motion. All Aye. The motion carried.

Mrs. Anderson made a motion to deny the modification of SLDO 252.12 – Stormwater volume controls. Mr. Mehaffey seconded the motion. Vote on the motion. All Aye. The motion carried.

Mrs. Anderson made a motion to approve the modification of SLDO 252.17.C(1)(c) – Side slopes stormwater basins. Mr. Mehaffey seconded the motion. Vote on the motion. All Aye. The motion carried.

Mrs. Anderson made a motion to approve the modification of SLDO 252.17.C(1)(d) – Bottom slope requirement stormwater basins. Mr. Mehaffey seconded the motion. Vote on the motion. All Aye. The motion carried.

Mrs. Anderson made a motion to approve the modification of SLDO 260.14.A(1) – Original property description. Mr. Mehaffey seconded the motion. Vote on the motion. All Aye. The motion carried.

Mrs. Anderson made a motion to approve the modification of SLDO 260.14.B(5) – Stormwater management requirements for individual lots. Mr. Mehaffey seconded the motion. Vote on the motion. All Aye. The motion carried.

Mrs. Anderson made a motion to approve, contingent on the Township Engineer's comments, the modification of SLDO 260.22.D(6) - Cul-de-sac radius requirement on Yorktown Road. Mr. Mehaffey seconded the motion. Vote on the motion. All Aye. The motion carried.

Mrs. Anderson made a motion to approve the modification request of SLDO 260.25.A – Sidewalk requirement. This motion pertains to requiring sidewalks along Industrial Drive, New View Road, and Goodman Road and to defer the sidewalk requirement for Wyndamere Road pending the type of development that gets proposed for Lot 3. Mr. Mehaffey seconded the motion. Vote on the motion. All Aye. The motion carried.

Mrs. Anderson made a motion to defer, pending the submittal of the Land Development Plan, the modification of SLDO 260.33.(A) & (B) – Recreation fees. Mr. Mehaffey seconded the motion. Vote on the motion. All Aye. The motion carried.

Mrs. Anderson made a motion to approve the modification of SLDO 260.35.C(3)(i) – Stormwater basin fencing requirement - for Basins C, D, and E, but deny the request for Basin A and B. Mr. Mehaffey seconded the motion. Vote on the motion. All Aye. The motion carried.

Mrs. Anderson made a motion to approve the modification of SLDO 260.35.C(3)(m) – Stormwater basin outlet control structure plate requirement. Mr. Mehaffey seconded the motion. Vote on the motion. All Aye. The motion carried.

Mrs. Anderson made a motion to defer, pending PennDOT's review, the modification request of SLDO 260.22.A(7) – Cartway width. Mike Mehaffey seconded the motion. Vote on the motion. All Aye. The motion carried.

Subdivision Plan Action:

Mrs. Anderson made a motion to approve the plan contingent upon a Developer's Agreement being formalized between the developer, Fairview, and Newberry for the proposed roadway improvements, the comments in the Memorandum by Codes Director Stephen Waller, dated August 24, 2017, TPD's comments, Rettew's comments in Plan Review No. 3 dated September 5, 2017, Rettew's comments in Plan Review No. 1 dated September 5, 2017, and Rettew's comments in the Modification Request Review (Revised) dated September 5, 2017, and there is no construction until final plan approval and concurrence with all staff reviews and requirements. Mr. Mehaffey seconded the motion. Vote on the motion. All yes. The motion carried.

2. 674 Gaumer Rd. – 16-1011-LD (Modification Request)

Mr. Waller presented to the Planning Commission members a Modification Request for requirements to the Subdivision and Land Development ordinance. He then further explained that although this Plan had already been heard and approved by the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors, the applicants were now making a request for a modification to § 260.33.B(2) – Recreation Fee and § 260.34 – Traffic Studies and ACT 209 Impact Fee.

Mr. Mehaffey made a motion to deny waiving § 260.33.B(2) – Recreation Fee. Anne Anderson seconded the motion. Vote on the motion. All Aye. The motion carried.

Mr. Mehaffey made a motion to deny waiving § 260.34 – Traffic Studies and ACT 209 Impact Fee. Anne Anderson seconded the motion. Vote on the motion. All Aye. The motion carried.

3. Postupak – 16-1007-LD (Modification Request)

Mr. Waller presented to the Planning Commission members a Modification Request for requirements to the Subdivision and Land Development ordinance. He then further explained that although this Plan had already been heard and approved by the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors, the applicants were now making a request for a modification to § 260.33.B(2) – Recreation Fee and § 260.34 – Traffic Studies and ACT 209 Impact Fee.

Mr. Williams made a motion to deny waiving the Recreation Fee. Anne Anderson seconded the motion. Vote on the motion. All Aye. The motion carried.

Mrs. Anderson made a motion to deny waiving the Traffic Impact Fee. Mike Mehaffey seconded the motion. Vote on the motion. All Aye. The motion carried.

4. (NO REVISIONS) - Westhafer Subdivision – 3 Lots – Heck Hill Rd.
5. (NO REVISIONS) – Fairview Summit – 17-1003-LD
6. Fairview Township Yard Waste/Recycling Center

NEW BUSINESS

There was no New Business.

ZONING HEARING BOARD

Docket No. 2017-04: Charles E. Westhafer, Jr. and Brenda L. Westhafer, 781 Heck Hill Road, Lewisberry, PA 17339. The Applicants are requesting variances to the Fairview Township Zoning Ordinance §300-16, “Area and design requirements”; §300-41 “Lot frontage onto public streets”; and §300-44 “Number of principal uses and/or principal structures per lot”. The Applicants wish to subdivide a currently nonconforming lot into two lots which would both be nonconforming under §§ 300-16, 300-41 and 300-44. The property is owned by the Applicants and is in the Rural Living (RL) Zoning District.

Mr. Thompson and Mrs. Anderson commented, on behalf of the Planning Commission, that they felt to allow this would allow the applicants to create two nonconformities and they expressed their desire to have Codes Director Mr. Waller relay their message to the Zoning Hearing Board.

ADJOURNMENT

Mrs. Anderson made a motion to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Mr. Mehaffey. Vote on the motion. All Aye. The motion carried at 9:15 PM.