

## FAIRVIEW TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION

February 04, 2020

### **CALL TO ORDER**

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

### **ROLL CALL**

Present:

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

Absent:

Member	Michael Mehaffey, P.E.
Township Engineer	Drew Bitner, P.E.

### **APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES**

Mrs. Anderson made a motion to approve the minutes of the January 07, 2020, meeting as presented. Mr. Williams seconded. Vote on the motion. All Aye. The motion carried.

### **DISCUSSION AND CORRESPONDENCE**

Mr. Waller asked for volunteers for a committee that was being put together to propose language to amend the ordinance regarding small land developments. The purpose of the amendment would be to establish the criteria that would waive small projects from the requirement of submitting a subdivision and/or a land development plan. Mrs. Anderson volunteered. Mr. Thompson asked Mr. Waller to send the Planning Commission agendas for the committee meetings so that if other members wished to go to the meetings, they would have the needed information.

Mr. Waller also asked the Planning Commission for direction on how they would like to receive updates to the plans that had been acted on by the Board of Supervisors. It was agreed that email updates would be provided.

### **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. Fairview Crossroads – 17-1008-LD

Mrs. Anderson made a motion to untable this matter. Mr. Williams seconded. Vote on the motion. All Aye. The motion carried.

Mr. Waller presented this matter to the Planning Commission and read the following revised staff comments from January 31, 2020, into the record:

#### **Zoning Comments:**

All 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. Copies of the proposed/draft language for the ownership and maintenance of the common areas have been submitted to the solicitor for review. Approval of the language will be required prior to Final Plan approval. SLDO 260.14.A(27)
4. The submitted Traffic Impact Study will need to address the Traffic Engineers and PennDOT comments/concerns. SLDO 260.14.A(28) and 260.34.B(1)A
5. A copy of York County Conservation District E & S and DEP NPDES approvals are required prior to Final Plan approval. SLDO 260.14.B(1)
6. PA DEP sewage module approval is required for the site prior to Final Plan approval. SLDO 260.14.B(2)
7. PAWC will need to provide written approval of the proposed public water availability to the site. SLDO 260.29(B)
8. PAWC will need to provide written approval of the proposed sanitary sewer design and availability of sewage to the site. SLDO 260.30

9. Applicant has noted that a fee in lieu of will be made to comply with township recreation requirements. This fee will be \$66,000 (\$1,000/per disturbed acre) and will be due prior to the Final Plan recording. SLDO 260.33.B(2)
10. A Traffic Impact Fee will be required for each new PM vehicle trip in accordance ordinance requirements. This has been evaluated by the Township Traffic Engineer, please see the letter from McMahon & Associates dated December 18, 2017. The BOS has acknowledged that this fee may be offset by the offsite improvements proposed with the site. SLDO 260.61.B

**General Comments:**

1. A plan set was copied to the PA Turnpike Commission for their review. A comment letter from the PA Turnpike has been received which was dated October 23, 2019 (attached). Responses to these concerns should be cc'd to the township, for our files.
2. 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 260.11.B(1) – Plan sheet size 22” X 34” *Staff recommends approval*
2. SLDO 260.22.B – Street Width requirements (street connection to Lewisberry Road) *Staff recommends approval based on PennDOT HOP review and approval*
3. SLDO 260.23.E(1) – Intersections of streets on at arterial road. *Staff recommends approval based on PennDOT HOP review and approval.*
4. SWMO 252.17.C(1)(e)- SWM Basin outlet structure *See SWM Engineer review and recommendation.*
5. SWMO 252.10.E/252.12.A/ SLDO 260.34C(4) – SWM Volume controls *See SWM Engineer review and recommendation.*
6. SWMO 252.10.L – SWM Facilities Setback requirements *Staff supports the request due to the proposed SWM facility being on a controlled access road frontage (Interstate 83).*
7. SWMO 252.17.B(6) – Standards for water carrying facilities *See SWM Engineer review and recommendation.*
8. SWMO 252.17.C(1)(A) – Maximum allowable detention basin depth *See SWM Engineer review and recommendation.*
9. SWMO 252.17.C(1)(c) – SWM Basin side slopes *See SWM Engineer review and recommendation.*

**Engineer Comments from Mike Knouse, P.E., at Rettew:**

Mr. Waller presented the Planning Commission with a letter dated January 31, 2020, and entered the following comments into the record:

**Requested Modifications of Requirement:**

- A. § 260-11.B.1 – Preliminary Plan Procedures
- B. § 260-11.B – Street Design Requirements – Width
- C. § 260-23.E.1 – Intersection on Arterials
- D. § 252-17.C.(1).(e). – Stormwater Detention Basin Outlet
- E. § 252-10.E & 252.12.A – Stormwater Volume Control
- F. § 252-10.L – Setback Requirements for Stormwater Management Facilities
- G. § 252-17.B.(6) – Design Standards for Water-Carrying Facilities
- H. § 252-17.C.(1).(a) – Maximum Allowable Detention Basin Storage Depth
- I. § 252-71.C.(1).(c) – Maximum Allowable Detention Basin Side Slopes

**Zoning:**

1. Triple frontage lots shall be subject to the following criteria (lots 10, 13, and 16):
  - (1) The side lot line coinciding with the lot line abutting the street (frontage) shall have a buffer yard and planting screen easement of at least 20 feet across which there shall be no right of access. The required buffer yard and planting screen easement shall be provided with screening of no less than 70% opacity, and otherwise comply with the regulations in Article VII, relating to buffer and screen regulations.
  - (2) The buffer yards need to be shown on the plan. In addition, Note 13. B, sheet 17 or 57, needs to reference the lots.
2. Provide documentation on the form of ownership to be implemented for review by the Township Solicitor (§ 300-44.A.(3)). Note 26 references the owner as a Developers Association; however, the agreement states the owner is the Condominium Association. Clarification needs to be provided. In addition, the Declaration of Condominium for Fairview Crossroads Condominium needs to be reviewed by the Township solicitor.

**Subdivision and Land Development:**

1. Provide a PA DEP sewage planning module (§ 260-10.A.(2))( § 260-14.B.(2)).
2. 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)).
3. Clearly indicate the location and dimensions of all easements. The PPL transmission line indicates 100 feet is recommended; no easement is indicated for the gas line; no easement is indicated for the existing storm sewer pipe extending from I-83 (§ 260-14.A.(17)). Approval from the appropriate utility needs to be provided for proposed earth disturbance activities within the easement or the vicinity of the existing utility.

4. Provide a plan for proposed street lighting facilities in accordance with Article VI (§ 260-14.A.(20)). The overall lighting plan needs to match the blow-up detail sheets for the intersections of Elysian Ave. and Crossroads Blvd., Crossroads Blvd. and Kope Dr., Kope Dr. and Elysian Ave., Elysian Ave. and Lewisberry Rd., and Lewisberry Rd. and Crossroads Blvd.
5. All earthmoving activities shall be reviewed and approved by York County Conservation District (§ 252-16.D, 252-21.F.(5)), (§ 260-14.B.(1)). 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.
6. A Highway Occupancy Permit shall be submitted to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Department of Transportation; provide a copy to the Township for review and comment (§ 260-14.B.(3)).
7. Provide a certification letter from the public sewer provider demonstrating that there is sufficient capacity available for the proposed land development (§ 260-14.B.(10)).
8. The sanitary sewer layout including collection, conveyance and pump station, as approved by the public sewer provider, shall be shown prior to plan approval (§ 260-14.C.(3), 260-30.C).
9. The water system layout, as approved by the public water provider shall be shown prior to plan approval (§ 260-14.C.(4), 260-29.C).
10. Provide a copy of all certificates of agreement to provide service from applicable utility companies prior to final plan approval (§ 260-15.B.(9)).
11. The plan shall provide continuation of the sidewalk along Lewisberry Road (§ 260-25.A, 260-25.B). The applicant needs to request deferment for the installation of sidewalk to the property line on the western side.
12. All street names shall be approved by the Township (§ 260-25.E).
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 developer shall pay all applicable fees and pay all outstanding invoices prior to plan approval (§ 260-41).
15. Traffic Impact Fees shall be provided in accordance with Article XII. Any relief granted by the Township needs to be indicated on the plans.

**Stormwater Management:**

1. All stream encroachment activities, stream piping, and stream removal shall comply with the requirements of PA DEP 25 Pa. Code Chapter 105 (§ 252-10.K). Evidence of permit approvals will be needed. Evidence of approval for stream grading on adjoining properties will be needed.
2. The condition of the existing 54-inch CMP needs to be considered since it will be connected to manhole 400 (§ 252-15.C). The condition of the pipe needs to be verified as part of this plan.
3. 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.
4. Where a development site is traversed by watercourses, drainage easement shall be provided conforming to the line of such watercourses. If diffused flow is proposed to be concentrated and discharged onto adjacent property, the developer must document that adequate downstream conveyance facilities exist to safely transport the concentrated discharge, or otherwise prove that no

erosion, sedimentation, flooding or other harm will result from the concentrated discharge (§ 252-16.H, 260-35.C.(6)(b)). The existing watercourses need to be reserved in easements.

5. 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)). The detail for a sumped inlet at a low point could not be found on sheet 30.
6. 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). The geologist needs to certify all items outlined in Section 252-18.A.(1) and evaluate whether the stormwater facilities will need to be equipped with impermeable liners per Section 252-18.A.(5).
7. The developer shall demonstrate that the post-development hydrograph flows during erosion and sedimentation 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). The post-development information provided in Appendix B of the E&S report for the 2- and 5-year storms shows all peak outflows at zero cfs and needs to be revised.
8. The signature block for the developer's engineer and geologist will need to be completed (§ 252-21.D).
9. The effect of the project in terms of runoff volumes and water quality needs to be provided (§ 252-21.F.(6)). If infiltration should not be considered as a feasible option, it is unclear how PA DEP Worksheet 5 will be applicable. Furthermore, the applicant is proposing a Managed Release Concept for the basin as a post-construction BMP. As design standards for this strategy were only recently released by PA DEP, the applicant will need to consult with York County Conservation District and PA DEP on the use of the Managed Release Concept in conjunction with NPDES permitting. The applicant will need to show that Basin 1 meets the Managed Release Concept design standards.
10. 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.
11. Where feasible, stormwater runoff shall be pretreated for water quality prior to discharge to surface water or groundwater in accordance with accepted stormwater quality BMPs and as required by Subsection 260-35.C.(5) (§ 260-35.A.(10), 260-35.A.(13)). The applicant is proposing street sweeping, water quality units, and soil amendments. If the streets will be dedicated to the Township, then the plan needs to clearly state that the applicant/owner will be responsible for street sweeping and not the Township.
12. 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 CMP under I-83.
13. 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)).

14. A schedule of inspections during construction (related to installation of improvements) shall be provided (§ 260-35.J.(1)). At a minimum, the following ordinance language needs to be noted on the plans: “Schedule of inspections. (a) The Township Engineer or Township's designee shall be permitted to inspect all phases of the installation of the permanent stormwater management facilities and BMPs. (b) The Township Engineer or Township's designee shall be permitted to inspect all phases of the site development work in progress to ensure compliance with erosion and sediment control requirements. Inspection functions under this section may be delegated by the Township to another entity if such agreement is entered into by the Township. (c) During any of the work, if the Township Engineer or the Township's designee determines that the permanent stormwater management facilities of BMPs are not being installed in accordance with the approved drainage plan, the Township shall revoke any existing Township permits and/or issue a stop-work order until a revised drainage plan is submitted and approved as specified in this section.”
15. The plans need to specify the type of permanent matting to be installed on all slopes 3:1 and steeper.
16. Unless a waiver is requested, the minimum depth of the spillway shall be two feet (§ 260-35.C.(3)(g)[1]).
17. The comments dated July 22, 2019 on the Joint Permit Application Stormwater Consistency Review need to be addressed.
18. If the pad sites are to be maintained in a meadow condition until further development, the PCSM and E&S plans need to note this requirement and identify what areas of the site get the meadow seed mix versus the turf grass mix.
19. The applicant needs to clarify General note #15 on sheet 2 of 57 which indicates the development association will be responsible for operation and maintenance of the stormwater conveyance facilities within the street right-of-way. This appears to conflict with O & M note # 3 on PCSM sheet 1 which states the owner shall be responsible for maintenance of stormwater facilities located outside of public rights-of-way.
20. Note # 8 of the Basin 1 section detail on sheet 30 states the underdrain valve will only be opened if the basin has not dewatered within 72 hours. If this will be the case, the Basin 1 routings and dewatering time calculations need to be revised to discount the use of the 1-inch orifice associated with the underdrain (§ 252-10.M). If Basin 1 is intended to primarily function as an infiltration facility, then infiltration testing will need to be performed during construction to confirm suitability.
21. Unless a waiver is requested, the discharge from the proposed stormwater management facility shall be provided with a concrete level spreader (§ 252-17.C.(1)(f)). The applicant has eliminated the level spreader at the Basin 1 outlet as previously shown on the plans.
22. The applicant needs to locate the existing gas line in the vicinity of Basin 1, show the utility crossing in the basin outfall pipe profile, and provide evidence of approval from the gas company (§ 252-21.F.(15)).
23. The depth and side slopes listed for each swale in the vegetated channel detail on sheet 30 need to match the supporting calculations. Channel 2 needs to include a permanent lining. Additionally, the applicant needs to clarify notes # 2 and # 3 regarding the use of impervious liners and amended soils in the channels.

**General Comments:**

1. The plan shall address compaction and testing requirements for all fill operations as a note on the plan.

2. The plan shall be submitted to the Township Emergency Services for review and comment.
3. Consideration to include a 19mm binder course in the pavement design needs to be made. This course (2" depth) should be in addition to the 25 mm course (3" depth).
4. The applicant needs to evaluate access to lot 6 based upon the updated plan due to potential conflicts with proposed fixtures, easements, and plantings.

**Traffic Engineer Comments from Jodi Evan, PTOE, at McMahon Associates, Inc.:**

Mr. Waller presented the Planning Commission with a letter dated December 11, 2019, and entered the following comments into the record on behalf of Ms. Evans:

**General comments:**

Based on our review of the HOP site access design submission from October 2019 also submitted to PennDOT under EPS 199784 Cycle 1, we offer the following comments for consideration by the Township:

1. Comments for this review are only associated with the plans and documents for this submission. Additional comments may follow upon review of the updated plans and documents of the resubmission.
2. A copy of the Approval Letter for the Erosion and Sediment Pollution Control Plan from the County Conservation District is required for all local road, high volume driveway, and any other permit application that includes major earthwork.
3. Provide at least minimal lighting in accordance with NCHRP Report 672 Chapter 8.
4. Provide a signature and seal of a Pennsylvania licensed Professional Land Surveyor to the plans to ensure geometric alignments, property lines, right-of-way lines, and topographic features are accurate and shown in accordance with industry standards.
5. Some sheets label I-83 with the incorrect SR number. Please make sure mainline I-83 is labeled as S.R. 0083 on all applicable sheets. The ramps appear to be correctly labeled as S.R. 8033.

**Roadway Geometrics:**

6. The roadway geometry plan appears to callout most horizontal break locations; however, only a few of the labels note what the break is (PC, PT, MP, Break, etc.). Please ensure all callouts are clearly marked due to the complex geometry of a roundabout which includes small curve and tangent segments mixed throughout.
7. Ensure all curves larger than a five-foot radius include a midpoint geometry callout to allow the curve to be staked out by at least three points. Additional points may be beneficial for larger radii such as the outer curbs for the exiting movements.

8. In addition, the following locations need geometry callouts to ensure proper stakeout and construction:
  - a. Media island taper point near Sta. 111+40L
  - b. End of Crossroads right-turn splitter island around Sta. 112+60L
9. Fast path plans and sight line plans were provided without a fastest path summary or speed calculations. Either provide a summary showing all speeds match the last reviewed speeds, or new completed calculations for any adjustments in fastest paths.
10. Several utility easement call outs are not pointing to anything. Additionally, the utility, right-of-way, and easement lines and callouts appear to be intermittently on and off on the geometry sheets. Please revise to be consistent.
11. Provide additional guiderail details and labels for all transitions, connections, post lengths, attenuators, and all associated notes and grading for each guiderail installation location. Also provide length of need calculations and plotted nmout paths for all hazards being protected by guiderail.
12. Please extend the proposed sidewalk to a logical terminus, such as a connection to the end of Crescent Drive.

**Pavement Markings:**

13. Label all critical points. Label all line breaks, PC, PT, etc. These labels should reference a station and offset to the construction baseline.
14. Label all pavement marking transitions, tapers, and shifts and show/label where the proposed pavement markings tie in to the existing pavement markings.
15. Verify the widths shown at each yield bar. Most of them appear to vary substantially from the actual width provided between painted lines.
16. Replace one-way arrow legend on the I-83 off ramp, or provide correspondence that PennDOT does not want this pavement marking.

**Signs:**

17. Exit guide wayfinding signs should be placed perpendicular to the approaching or circulating traffic for each leg.
18. Space advance wayfinding and warning signs further apart where possible to reduce sign clutter and to help provide enough time to see and process each sign's message. Some signs only have 25ft between signs.
19. Consider using roundabout arrows with the I-83 advance directional signs. Especially for the westbound S.R. 0114 approach, where a left arrow could be confusing since traffic first needs to circulate the roundabout. Additionally, a right arrow is shown for this sign, but a left arrow appears to be specified from the label.
20. Add "I-83 South" markers on the splitter island exit wayfinding sign to reinforce the

appropriate exit for the interstate.

21. Add "To I-83 North" markers on the splitter island exit wayfinding sign to reinforce the appropriate exit for the interstate.
22. Add a yield ahead sign to the I-83 off ramp, or provide correspondence that PennDOT does not want these signs.
23. Replace wrong way signs along the I-83 off ramp, or provide correspondence that PennDOT does not want these signs.
24. Replace adopt a highway signs along the I-83 on ramp, or provide correspondence that PennDOT does not want these signs.

#### **Cross Sections:**

25. Several proposed sections are missing connections to tie into existing surface (e.g. 105+50 to 108+50).
26. Show existing pavement box or label existing edges of pavement.

#### **Median/Islands:**

27. Indicate proposed central island and splitter island/approach landscaping on the plans, consistent with the recommendations in NCHRP 672 Chapter 9.
28. Reference to the standard details are acceptable; however, where the standard detail deviates from the proposed design, additional notes and guidance is required to ensure that the design is appropriate and the contractor can properly apply the standard. Ensure the reference to the RC's includes how to address any variations from the standard.
29. Some splitter islands call out Type A Mountable curb while others call out Truck Apron Curb. Provide consistent splitter island design or explain the reasoning for different types of curb. Splitter islands typically should not be easily mountable to help calm traffic.
30. Provide special island grading details for the non-typical splitter islands that have low point inlets installed in the concrete island and the concrete is pitched into the center.
31. Provide references on the grading plan to tie the grading points to critical points and/or project stationing.
32. The design proposes a single type M inlet at the low point near 112+60R. This is undesirable for potential clogging issues. Provide flanking inlets or another treatment to minimize ponding issues at the low point.
33. The end of the splitter island around station 112+70 proposes a low point inlet, but the elevations do not seem to correspond. Verify the 171.94 elevation and ensure the grading positive drainage to the inlet.

#### **ADA Compliance:**

34. It appears that TIFs may be required for some ramps. Please verify and provide, as applicable.

35. Show detail for transitioning Truck Apron Curb to standard Depressed Curb. Also provide a detail for the depressed curb in a median splitter island where Type A Mountable Curb will end and standard Depressed Curb will extend along the face of the ramp.
36. Provide completed CS-4401 forms for each curb ramp, including ramps in center islands.
37. Show all critical elevations for each ADA curb ramp design. Include all corners and break points.
38. For Ramp 03, it appears that the ramp cross slope transitions from 1.5% to 1.1% without any variation in the longitudinal ramp slopes or ramp length (the ramp appears to have no angle). Please revise as needed to ensure the DWS is not twisted.
39. Verify roadway cross slopes between ramps 36 and 07. They are pointed in opposite directions, even though the land should be consistent.

**Typical Section:**

40. Ensure the roundabout pavement section is acceptable for the extra forces of heavy circular traffic.
41. Confirm that PennDOT does not want more of the I-83 on/off ramps to be replaced with concrete pavement to match the existing pavement section. Provide correspondence with PennDOT to support the design.

**Access Configuration/Profile:**

42. The Crescent Drive cul-de-sac shall be designed to accommodate the largest local fire truck. Provide turning templates for the cul-de-sac, which were not included with this submission.
43. Label the existing driveway slope at the tie in location for all adjusted driveways to ensure it is less than the allowable 8% grade break.
44. Provide a profile for Armstrong Driveway. It does not appear that the proposed edge of pavement aligns with the existing driveway for the Armstrong Driveway. Please confirm the design and provide a profile of this driveway.
45. Label the Spertzel Driveway Centerline and station equation.

**Maintenance and Protection of Traffic:**

46. Provide a project specific MPT narrative on a Traffic Control Plan with any required notes, details, and an overview plan of the project stages included in the narrative. Include a sequence of construction and identify specific Publication 213 PATA figures for each work area or phase. As standard PATA figures are not anticipated to be sufficient for all stages, a site-specific detailed Traffic Control Plan will be required for each stage. PA Code, Title 67, Chapter 441.3(f). The Township has indicated that traffic must be maintained on S.R. 0114 at all times with flaggers during construction and staging construction.

**Sight Distance:**

47. Sight line plans were provided without speed calculations. Either provide a summary showing all

speeds match the last reviewed speeds and sight distances, or new complete calculations for any adjustments .

48. Show allowable sight distance based on landscaping and physical features.
49. Prepare a composite exhibit with all the proposed required sight lines listed in NCHRP 672. This must show the proposed landscaping and define the required low growth areas. Ensure this exhibit corresponds with the overall landscaping plan.
50. Provide sight distance information for all modified driveways along S.R. 0114.

**Right-Of-Way:**

51. The required ROW line appears to split the proposed sidewalk on northwest corner of site frontage. For maintenance purposes, the sidewalk should be located outside the S.R. 0114 right-of-way.
52. Confirm that the proposed utility easement running along the proposed drainage system is the correct easement type and label who the easement is intended to be dedicated to.

**Drainage:**

53. Please label all existing and proposed pipe sizes and types on the plan view.
54. Provide standard storm water maintenance HOP notes on the plan and due to the complexity of this drainage system, provide an exhibit showing which drainage facilities are proposed to become the responsibility of the Township. All inlets and pipes that are required by PennDOT to be the responsibility of the Township and covered by the storm water maintenance HOP need to be shown on this plan and included in the roadway drainage reports. The applicant must coordinate with Township Solicitor and staff to establish a storm water maintenance agreement, where the developer is financially responsible for all proposed improvements included on the HOP plans, including those in the name of the Township under the associated storm water maintenance HOP.
55. Provide pre- and post-development drainage areas for all inlets shown in the limits of work.
56. Provide swale calculations for all roadside swales and concrete islands with swales.
57. Provide spread calculations for the centerline of each driveway within the limits of work.
58. Provide a summary of spread at each inlet, critical point, driveway centerline, and swales. The summary shall compare the proposed design with the allowable spread for each location and provide justification for any that do not meet the spread requirements.
59. Several pipe runs along the site side of S.R. 0114 appear to exceed the maximum fill heights of 2ft-8ft for the specified pipe material. Extend the profile to begin at the headwall and continue to the point crossing under I-83.

**Utilities:**

60. Add the Municipal Authority and any other missing companies to the list of utility contacts on Sheet 2, Note 31.

61. Mailboxes are being set on the opposite side of the road from the driveways to match existing conditions, however, the proposed wider roadway is a concern for the safety of crossing to get mail. Coordinate with the local postmaster and provide concurrence that this configuration is still desirable, or if the mailboxes should be relocated to the driveway side of the road. Additionally, add a note that requires all mailboxes to be reset to current postal standards, to replace mailboxes in-kind if they are damaged during construction, and to coordinate all mailbox work with the property owners.

### **Transportation Impact Fee:**

In accordance with the Fairview Township Impact Fee Ordinance (ord. No. 201-04), the new weekday afternoon peak hour trip generation of the proposed development within Fairview Township will be subject to the Township's transportation impact fee. The proposed Fairview Crossroads Development is located in Fairview Township Transportation Service Area #1 (TSA-1), which has a transportation impact fee of \$1,583 per new weekday afternoon peak hour trip. According to the *Transportation Impact Study*, the proposed Fairview Crossroads Development will generate approximately 771 total new trips during weekday afternoon peak hour. Therefore, the corresponding transportation impact fee is **\$1,220,493**. The final determination of the impact fee and any potential credits, in accordance with the Act 209 law, will occur as the project moves through the Township land development process.

### **To be Addressed During Land Development/HOP Plan Submissions:**

- Additional signage needed due to the proposed cul-de-sac of Crescent Drive.
- Design the proposed cul-de-sac per Township roadway standards.
- Provide detailed cost estimates clearly separating any proposed improvements requested for consideration for traffic impact fee credit.
- Provide appropriate signage for trucks within the site to restrict the use of the proposed western access and provide a truck route within the site. Signage has been added to the ingress of the proposed western access to restrict truck traffic into the site; however, additional signage needs to be installed along the truck route internal to the site to ensure trucks do not try to exit through this access.

### **Turnpike Commission Comments:**

Mr. Waller presented the Planning Commission with a letter dated October 23, 2019, and entered the following comments into the record:

At this time, the PTC does not object to the plans that we initially received for review. The PTC will keep those drawings on file as our record set. We do provide the following comments for your information:

- Please be advised that the PTC has two (2) intake headwalls (cross pipe culverts) between the eastbound lanes of the turnpike and the adjacent common property line. These pipes are located approximately at Milepost 241.66 and Milepost 214.38 of the turnpike. From the existing contours presented on the plans provided it appears that the existing natural pattern of surface water in this locale is being modified to the existing point of interests as the drainage exits this property. It is the PTC's position that it is the developer's responsibilities to maintain the current drainage pattern and discharge points.
- At this time, we are unable to verify the impact of this modification at both upstream (intake) and downstream (discharge) points. When available, we request that the stormwater management and

drainage calculations are provided to us for our files and to allow us to review the pre and post development drainage calculations at the points of interest as the drainage exits this property.

- Please be advised that there is a grading encroachment shown in the overall grading plan within the PTC's Legal Right-of-Way. This is an unauthorized encroachment and the plans should be either modified to eliminate this encroachment or the discussion of a Temporary Construction Easement for Grading would need to commence with the PTC to allow this proposed grading.
- The PTC would request that when future development plans are submitted to Fairview Township, that we receive the same submissions for this proposed site development. This would provide us with the opportunity to review these plan submissions. Providing the PTC the opportunity to review this site development enables us to verify that the approved site development will not adversely affect our facility. Future coordinate between Fairview Township, the Site Developer and the PTC may be necessary to avoid conflicts between this proposed site development and future projects that could be undertaken by the PTC in the future such as the Total Reconstruction/Widening of the Pennsylvania Turnpike or Replacement of Overhead Bridges.

### **Modification Request Action:**

Mr. Stouffer abstained from voting due to a possible business conflict.

1. Mrs. Anderson made a motion to approve the modification of SLDO 260.11.B(1) – Plan Sheet Size 22" X 34". Mr. Williams seconded. Vote on the motion. 3 Ayes, 0 Nays. The motion carried.
2. Mrs. Anderson made a motion to approve the modification of SLDO 260.22.B – Street Width requirements. Mr. Williams seconded. Vote on the motion. 3 Ayes, 0 Nays. The motion carried.
3. Mrs. Anderson made a motion to approve the modification of SLDO 260.23.E(1) – Intersections of streets on at arterial road. Mr. Williams seconded. Vote on the motion. 3 Ayes, 0 Nays. The motion carried.
4. Mrs. Anderson made a motion to approve the modification of SWMO 252.17.C(1)(e) – SWM Basin outlet structure. Mr. Williams seconded. Vote on the motion. 3 Ayes, 0 Nays. The motion carried.
5. Mrs. Anderson made a motion to deny the modification of SWMO 252.10.E/252.12.A/SLDO 260.34.C(4) – SWM Volume controls. Mr. Williams seconded. Vote on the motion. 1 Nay, 2 Ayes; Mr. Thompson – Nay, Mrs. Anderson – Aye, Mr. Williams – Aye. The motion carried.
6. Mrs. Anderson made a motion to approve the modification of SWMO 252.10.L – SWM Facilities Setback requirements. Mr. Williams seconded. Vote on the motion. 3 Ayes, 0 Nays. The motion carried.
7. Mrs. Anderson made a motion to approve the modification of SWMO 252.17.B(6) – Standards for water carrying facilities. Mr. Williams seconded. Vote on the motion. 3 Ayes, 0 Nays. The motion carried.
8. Mrs. Anderson made a motion to approve the modification of SWMO 252.17.C(1)(A) – Maximum allowable detention basin depths. Mr. Williams seconded. Vote on the motion. 3 Ayes, 0 Nays. The motion carried.

9. Mrs. Anderson made a motion to approve the modification of SWMO 252.17.C(1)(c) – SWM Basin side slopes. Mr. Williams seconded. Vote on the motion. 3 Ayes, 0 Nays. The motion carried.

**Subdivision Plan Action:**

Mrs. Anderson made a motion to approve the plan subject to all comments in the January 31, 2020, Memorandum by Codes Director Steve Waller; all comments in the January 31, 2020, letter from Mike Knouse, P.E., at Rettew; all comments in the December 11, 2019, letter from Jodi Evans, P.E., PTOE, at McMahon Associates, Inc.; and all comments in the October 23, 2019, letter from Charles Buchanan, P.E., at the Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission. Mr. Williams seconded. Vote on the motion. 3 Ayes, 0 Nays. The motion carried.

**NEW BUSINESS**

There was no New Business.

**ZONING HEARING BOARD**

**Docket No. 2020-01:** Craig, Howard, & Janet DeTraglia, 454 Brenneman Drive, Mechanicsburg, PA 17055. The Applicants are requesting an interpretation of the proposed “excavation” use portion of their business being permitted as an agricultural support service or landscaping service at the property. In the alternative, the applicants request that the “excavation” use be considered as a use not provided for and to be permitted in the RL district by special exception pursuant to § 300-4 of the Fairview Township Zoning Ordinance. The property is located at 454 Brenneman Drive, Mechanicsburg, PA 17055, and is located in the Rural Living Zoning District.

**ADJOURNMENT**

Mrs. Anderson made a motion to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Mr. Williams. Vote on the motion. All Aye. The motion carried at 6:59 PM.