

# **FAIRVIEW TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION**

September 3, 2019

## **CALL TO ORDER**

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

## **ROLL CALL**

Present:

Chairman

Member

Member

Member

Member

Codes Director

Codes Assistant

Michael E. Thompson

Anne K. Anderson, P.E.

Michael Mehaffey, P.E.

H. Adam Williams, P.L.S.

Jason Stouffer

Stephen M. Waller

Chris H. Strump

Absent:

Township Engineer

Drew Bitner, P.E.

## **APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES**

Mrs. Anderson, seconded by Mr. Mehaffey, made a motion to approve the minutes of the August 06, 2019, meeting as presented. Vote on the motion. All Aye. The motion carried.

## **DISCUSSION AND CORRESPONDENCE**

There was no Discussion and Correspondence.

## **SKETCH PLANS**

There were no Sketch Plans.

## **SUBDIVISION PLANS**

There were no new Subdivision Plans.

## **LAND DEVELOPMENT PLANS**

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. Mehaffey seconded. Vote on the motion. All Aye. The motion carried.

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

#### **Zoning Ordinance Comments:**

1. Lots 10, 13 and 16 will be considered triple frontage lots and will have to show compliance with the buffering requirements of 300.42.B(1 & 2).

#### **Subdivision Ordinance:**

1. The location should clearly show Township lines and County lines. SLDO 260.14.A(12)
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. All existing easements need to be reflected on the plans (gas line that traverses the site to the north east does not show an easement). SLDO 260.14.A(16)
5. Copies of the proposed/ draft language for the ownership and maintenance of the commons areas will need to be submitted for the solicitor's review prior to final plan approval. SLDO 260.14.A(27)
6. The submitted Traffic Impact Study will need to address the Traffic Engineer's and PennDOT's comments/concerns. SLDO 260.14.A(28) and 260.34.B(1)A
7. A copy of York County Conservation District E & S and DEP NPDES approvals are required. SLDO 260.14.B(1)
8. PA DEP sewage module approval is required for the site. SLDO 260.14.B(2)
9. PAWC will need to provide written approval of the proposed public water availability to the site. SLDO 260.29(B)
10. PAWC will need to provide written approval of the proposed sanitary sewer design and availability of sewage to the site. SLDO 260.30

11. Compliance with township recreation requirements are not depicted or shown on the plans. SLDO 260.33.B(2)
12. A Traffic Impact Fee will be required for each new PM vehicle trip in accordance with 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 has been copied to the PA Turnpike Commission per a written request to provide them with ANY development adjacent to their lands. Any comments as a result of their review will come directly from them.
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”
2. SLDO 260.22.B – Street Width requirements (street connection to Lewisberry Road)
3. SLDO 260.23.E(1) – Intersections of streets at arterial road.
4. SWMO 252.17.C(1)€ - SWM Basin outlet structure
5. SWMO 252.10.E / 252.12.A / SLDO 260.34.C(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

**Engineer comments from Mike Knouse at Rettew:**

Mr. Knouse presented the Planning Commission with “Review No. 4”, highlighted some of the following comments, and entered his entire review into the record:

**REQUESTED ALTERATIONS OF REQUIREMENT**

- A. Section 260-11.B.1 – Preliminary Plan Procedures

The applicant has requested a modification of the requirement to provide plans prepared on 22" x 34" sheets. In the alternative, the applicant is proposing to provide plans prepared on 24" x 36" sheets.

We recommend approval of this modification request based upon the justification and alternative provided.

**B. Section 260-22.B – Street Design Requirements - Width**

The applicant has requested modification of the requirement to provide a 30-foot cartway for local roads. In the alternative, the applicant is proposing to transition to PennDOT standard dimensions for the connection to Lewisberry Road (SR 0114).

We recommend approval of this modification request based upon the justification and alternative provided subject to the applicant obtaining a Highway Occupancy Permit from PennDOT.

**C. Section 260-23.E.1 – Intersection on Arterials**

The applicant has requested modification of the requirement to provide 800 feet of separation between the intersection of local and collector streets with arterial streets. In the alternative, the applicant is proposing to provide approximately 450 feet of separation between intersections.

We recommend approval of this modification request based upon the justification and alternative provided subject to the applicant obtaining a Highway Occupancy Permit from PennDOT.

**D. Section 252-17.C.(1).(e) – Stormwater Detention Basin Outlet**

The applicant has requested modification of the requirement that 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. In the alternative, the applicant is proposing to provide a smaller primary opening and a larger secondary opening in the outlet structure.

We recommend approval of this modification request based upon the justification and alternative provided.

**E. Sections 252-10.E & 252.12.A – Stormwater Volume Control**

The applicant has requested modification of the requirement that for all regulated activities, implementation of volume controls in Section 252-12 is required. In the alternative, the applicant is proposing to provide water quality measures due to the extreme amounts of cut and fill proposed, poor infiltration results, and the underlying geology.

Due to the magnitude and number of comments, we recommend postponing action on this request to allow the applicant the opportunity to address the comments and to meet with DEP and York County Conservation District to discuss the implications of this request. As per Section 252-10.C, the Township may, after consultation with DEP, approve the measure for meeting the state water quality requirements other than those

in this chapter, provided they meet the minimum requirements of, and do not conflict with, state law including, but not limited to, the Clean Streams Law.

F. Section 252-10.L – Setback Requirements for Stormwater Management Facilities

The applicant has requested modification of the requirement for stormwater management facilities to comply with the minimum building setback lines. In the alternative, the applicant is proposing Basin 1 to encroach the setback line along I-83.

Due to the magnitude and number of comments, we recommend postponing action on this request to allow the applicant the opportunity to address the comments.

G. Section 252-17.B.(6) – Design Standards for Water-Carrying Facilities

The applicant has requested modification of the requirement that manholes, inlets, headwalls, and endwalls shall conform to the requirements of PennDOT Pub. 408. In the alternative, the applicant is proposing to provide several double inlets within the streets as a Type D-H box having two Type C tops. PennDOT RC Standards do not provide an option of dual Type C tops as an option for a D-H box.

We recommend approval of this modification request based upon the justification and alternative provided.

H. Section 252-17.C.(1).(a) – Maximum Allowable Detention Basin Storage Depth

The applicant has requested modification of the requirement that the maximum permitted depth for detention basins shall be six feet, measured from the bottom of the spillway to the lowest point in the basin. In the alternative, the applicant is proposing Basin 1 with a depth of 10.7 feet from spillway invert to lowest basin elevation and is proposing to enclose Basin 1 in fencing.

Due to the magnitude and number of comments, we recommend postponing action on this request to allow the applicant the opportunity to address the comments.

I. Section 252-71.C.(1).(c)– Maximum Allowable Detention Basin Side Slopes

The applicant has requested modification of the requirement that the maximum permitted side slopes for detention basins shall be four horizontal to one vertical. In the alternative, the applicant is proposing to provide Basin 1 with 3:1 side slopes and a retaining wall.

Due to the magnitude and number of comments, we recommend postponing action on this request to allow the applicant the opportunity to address the comments.

**ZONING:**

1. All requirements of the Airport Overlay Zoning District shall be clearly addressed on the plan. The plan indicates the approval expires March 10, 2019; therefore, the approval needs to be extended (§ 300-25).

2. Provide buffer yards and screening when abutting the RS – Single Family Residential Zoning District and existing residential use (§ 300-33.A). Requirements for infill plantings within the existing vegetation needs to be provided to meet the required screening level. The proposed improvements in Area C will disturb the buffer.
3. Any wall exceeding six feet in height shall comply with Chapter 113 relating to Code Enforcement, Uniform Construction Code (§ 300-37.H0). 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 need be submitted as they are an integral part of the stormwater management design.
4. 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 percent opacity, and otherwise comply with the regulations in Article VII, relating to buffer and screen regulations.
5. Provide documentation on the form of ownership to be implemented for review by the Township Solicitor (§ 300-44.A.(3)). Ownership for the open space areas needs to be clearly indicated on the plans.

#### **SUBDIVISION AND LAND DEVELOPMENT:**

1. Provide a PA DEP sewage planning module (§ 260-10.A.(2))( § 260-14.B.(2)).
2. Provide a notification signed by the Codes Enforcement Officer indicating that the plan proposal is generally in conformance with the applicable zoning requirement (§ 260-10.A.(5)).
3. Certificates of accuracy shall be signed by the responsible professional prior to plan approval (§ 260-14.A.(12)).
4. The certificate of ownership and dedication shall be signed prior to plan approval (§ 260-14.A.(13)).
5. 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)). All easements shall be described by metes and bounds. Approval from the appropriate utility needs to be provided for proposed earth disturbance activities within the easement or the vicinity of the existing utility.
6. Provide a plan for proposed street lighting facilities in accordance with Article VI (§ 260-14.A.(20)). Details for the proposed lighting fixtures need to be provided. A streetlight,

meeting Township specifications, shall be installed at one corner of every intersection including the intersections with Lewisberry Road (§ 260-65.F).

7. Provide a draft of any proposed protective covenants running with the land, if any (§ 260-14.A.(27)).
8. Provide a preliminary erosion and sedimentation control plan (§ 260-14.B.(1)).
9. 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)).
10. 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)).
11. 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). Sanitary sewer force main shall be provided with a minimum four-foot cover and five-foot cover within existing and proposed roadways. A sanitary sewer force main is indicated to extend from lot 6 without a connection; clarification needs to be provided.
12. 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).
13. Provide a copy of all certificates of agreement to provide service from applicable utility companies prior to final plan approval (§ 260-15.B.(9)).
14. Public improvement financial security shall be posted prior to final plan approval (§ 260-16).
15. The plan shall provide continuation of the sidewalk along Lewisberry Road (§ 260-25.A, 260-25.B).
16. The PennDOT vertical curb detail needs to reflect an eight-inch reveal.
17. Street signs shall be provided at all intersections in accordance with Section 260-25.C.
18. All street names shall be approved by the Township (§ 260-25.E).
19. A fee in lieu of dedication of park and recreation facilities shall be required at the time of Final Plan approval (§ 260-33.B).

20. The developer shall pay all applicable fees and pay all outstanding invoices prior to plan approval (§ 260-41).
21. Traffic Impact Fees shall be provided in accordance with Article XII.

### **STORMWATER MANAGEMENT:**

1. The overall pre-development versus post-development analysis needs to account for offsite improvements including but not limited to SR 0114 and the ramp from I-83 (§ 252-13.B). The extent of these improvements will be subject to PennDOT approval.
2. 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.
3. The hydraulic capacity of the existing 54-inch CMP needs to be considered, as well as the condition of the pipe since it will be connected to manhole 400 (§ 252-15.C). The hydraulic calculations used in the Hydraflow analysis need to be revised to reflect a Manning's coefficient that matches the pipe material .
4. 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.
5. All earthmoving activities shall be reviewed and approved by 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.
6. 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.
7. The applicant needs to document that the concentrated flow from Basin 1 will be adequately diffused by the level spreader prior to discharging to the stream (§ 252-16.G). The level spreader depth needs to extend below the riprap bottom and below the front line to prevent heaving.

8. 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 base drain needs to be labeled on the plan and a detail for a sumped inlet at a low point needs to be provided.
9. All detention basins shall have a minimum bottom slope of two percent unless infiltration facilities are provided (§ 252-17.C.(1).(d)). For Basin 1, the applicant is proposing a flat bottom basin with underdrain and expecting little to no infiltration to occur.
10. 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). The extent of testing appears to be limited to four locations over the entire site and does not appear to be in the area of Basin 1.
11. 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).
12. The signature block for the developer's engineer and geologist will need to be completed (§ 252-21.D).
13. The expected project time schedule needs to be provided (§ 252-21.F.(4)).
14. 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.
15. 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 agreement will need to be provided.
16. The plan shall include a notarized signature of the owner of the parcel for which the stormwater management site plan is proposed indicating that they are aware of, and will

be responsible for, operation and maintenance of the facilities. The statement shall also acknowledge the stormwater management system to be a permanent fixture that can be altered or removed only after approval of a revised plan by the Township (§ 252-21.F.(11)). The statement provided references “landowners”, but it is unclear if this refers to the current owner or future individual lot owners.

17. Lots 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8, when developed, will be required to manage discharges to more than one drainage area and will need to honor the drainage divides established with the subdivision plan. A note to this effect needs to be added to the plan (§ 252-21.F.(16), 252-21.F.(20)).
18. 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 and soil amendments. If the streets will be dedicated to the Township, then it's unclear if the responsibility for street sweeping will fall to the Township. The soil amendment areas need to be clearly delineated on the PCSM plans and protected through an easement.
19. The statement will need to be completed by the applicant (§ 260-35.B.(10)).
20. The certification statement must be signed, sealed, and dated by the responsible professional(s) after the last plan revision (§ 260-35.B.(11)).
21. 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.
22. The depth of flow across a street intersection for the 25-year storm shall not exceed one inch (§ 260-35.C.(2).(g).[3]). Calculations need to be provided.
23. Groundwater recharge needs to be considered and evaluated (§ 260-35.C.(4)). If infiltration will be limited at best, it's unclear how groundwater recharge will be achieved.
24. Drainage easements shall be provided for all stormwater facilities (§ 260-35.C.(6)). The easement for Basin 1 needs to extend to the toe of slope.
25. Upon completion of all required improvements and prior to release of the performance bond, the applicant shall submit as-built plans showing the actual location, dimension, and elevation of all drainage and stormwater management facilities included in the approved drainage/stormwater plan. In addition, the plans shall include a note certifying that the resultant grading, drainage and stormwater management facilities, and erosion and sediment control measures, including vegetative stabilization, are in conformance with the approved drainage/stormwater plan and specifications. Deviations from the approved

drainage/stormwater plan and specification must be requested, along with justification for the request, and approved by the Township prior to construction. The applicant's design professional shall certify that the construction of the drainage and stormwater management facilities was completed in accordance with the drainage/stormwater plans and specifications approved by the Township. The plans shall note all deviations from the approved drainage/stormwater plan and specifications. The as-built plans and an explanation of any discrepancies with the approved plan shall be submitted to the Township for final approval. Along with the required as-builts, stormwater facility routings and post-construction infiltration testing that compare the as-built outflows and infiltration rates to the design outflows and infiltration rates must be provided prior to the final release of the financial security for all stormwater management and conveyance facilities. In no case shall as-built plans be submitted until the Township receives a copy of an approved declaration of adequacy and/or highway occupancy permit from PennDOT, NPDES permit, and any other applicable permits or approvals. The above permits and approvals must be based on the as-built plans (§ 260-35.F). A note to this effect needs to be added.

26. 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)).
27. A schedule of inspections (related to installation of improvements) shall be provided (§ 260-35.J.(1)).
28. Notes regarding right of entry for inspections shall be added to the plan (§ 260-35.J.(2)).
29. Design information will need to be provided to show stability for all cut and fill slopes that exceed three to one.
30. Although Channel 3 has been eliminated, the post-development drainage area map still references Channel 3.
31. Any aboveground stormwater management facility designed to store at least a four-foot depth of runoff shall be subject to the fencing requirements of § 252-17.C.(1)(j). All gates or doors through such enclosure shall be equipped with self-closing and self-latching device for keeping the gate or door securely closed at all times, when not in actual use.
32. Additional information needs to be provided on the material to be used for the vehicular access proposed for Basin 1 (§ 260-35.C.(3)(p)).
33. The minimum depth of the spillway shall be two feet (§ 260-35.C.(3)(g)[1]).

34. Inlets I-106 and I-214 do not appear to be labeled on the PCSM plan.
35. Inlet boxes with 24-inch diameter pipes or larger shown to connect to the short side need to be designed as modified boxes according to PennDOT RC standards.
36. Based on the location of OS-1, the six-inch orifice invert will be buried below the proposed embankment.
37. The profile for MH-400 needs to show the connection to the existing 54-inch CMP under I-83.
38. The applicant needs to clarify who will own the open space lots since Basin 1 will be located within open space Lot 18.
39. The shallow concentrated flow slope (0.02 percent) used in the calculations for post-development drainage area 5 does not appear to be correct (§ 252-21.G.(3).(a)).
40. Clarification needs to be provided for the sheet flow path of pre-development drainage area 3. If the flow path starts on an impervious surface then the impervious surface (driveway) needs to be shown on the drainage map (§ 252-21.G.(3).(a)).
41. The time of concentration listed on the post-development drainage area map table for 3B needs to match the report.
42. The comments dated July 22, 2019 on the Joint Permit Application Stormwater Consistency Review need to be addressed.
43. If the pad sites are to be maintained in a meadow condition until further development, the PCSM and landscaping plans need to note this and identify the meadow seed mix to be used. We point this out since the post-development times of concentration assume travel time through a meadow cover.

**GENERAL COMMENTS:**

1. Clearly identify the ownership, purpose, and maintenance responsibilities for the remaining lands of the parent tract. Provide a non-building declaration for the remaining lands.
2. The proposed grading at the southeast corner of Lot 1 exceeds the allowable 2:1 slope to tie into existing grades; the applicant shall demonstrate proper means for stabilization.
3. The plan shall address compaction and testing requirements for all fill operations as a note on the plan.

4. The plan shall be submitted to the Township Emergency Services for review and comment.
5. Consideration to include a 19mm binder course in the pavement design needs to be made.
6. 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 Evans at McMahon Associates, Inc.:**

Mr. Waller presented the Planning Commission with a letter dated July 26, 2019, and entered the following comments into the record on behalf of Ms. Evans:

#### **General Comments:**

1. As previously noted, these plans are only a preliminary Line and Grade submission. Additional may follow once full plans are provided. The full plan set must have a signed and sealed cover sheet, locations map, general notes, typical sections, grading plans, cross sections, special details, ADA plan sheets and Traffic Control/Staging plans at a minimum. Additionally, lighting, landscaping, sight distance, and truck turning template plans should be provided with the submissions as the design is modified. Most of the following comments are listing the full design requirements to make sure these items are identified early. It is understood that this Line & Grade Plan represents a preliminary submission and most of these items have been purposely excluded until the general design concept is agreed upon. The applicant has acknowledged this comment.
2. As previously noted, 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. The applicant has acknowledged this comment.
3. As previously noted, provide at least minimal lighting in accordance with NCHRP Report 672 Chapter 8. The applicant has acknowledged this comment.

#### **Roadway Geometrics:**

4. AS previously noted, label points of transition along the proposed edge of pavement / driveway radius returns, including PC, PT and PI locations on the plan by station/offset along the centerline and the distance from the centerline to the point of transition. These points should include all curb (PC, PT, etc.), islands, edge of pavement and any other break or critical points that will need to be staked out during construction. The applicant has acknowledged this comment.

5. Advance curvature should always be applied where possible to slow approaching vehicles before the yield point as good design practice. Advance curvature is an important design principle to incorporate as much as possible to help gradually slow approaching speeds and improve safety of the approaches. While NCHRP Section 6.8.5.4 and Exhibit 6-70 lays out specific requirements for advanced curvature when above 50 mph, it does not state that advance curvature is only needed when speeds are above 50 mph. Section 6.8.5.4 discusses the specific requirements needed for high speeds, but it also notes, "Good design encourages drivers to slow down before reaching the roundabout, and this can be more effectively achieved through a combination of geometric and other design treatments." The southern leg (Lewisberry Rd) is approaching down a significant grade and the proposed design is creating a large tangent section with an open cross section leading up to the roundabout. If advance curvature cannot be added anywhere else, it should at least be added to this leg to help encourage speed reduction before the intersection.
6. The revised fastest path exhibits provide all necessary critical labels and the colors make the paths much more legible. The fastest path speeds generally appear to be reduced due to the additional outer truck aprons. The speeds presented are acceptable, however, please submit revised speeds based on any geometric changes made during subsequent submissions.

#### **Pavement Markings:**

7. As previously noted, label all critical points. Label all line breaks, PC, PT, etc. These labels should reference a station and offset to the construction baseline. The applicant has acknowledged this comment.
8. As previously noted, label all pavement marking transitions/shifts and show/label where the proposed pavement markings tie in to the existing pavement markings. The applicant has acknowledged this comment.
9. As previously noted, label and dimension the size and type of pavement marking for the proposed crosswalks and yield bars. Show details for all proposed pavement markings called out on the plan. The applicant has acknowledged this comment.
10. Please extend the proposed sidewalk to a logical terminus, such as a connection to the end of Crescent Drive.

#### **Signs:**

11. As previously noted, provide advance and exit guide wayfinding signs perpendicular to the approaching or circulating traffic for each leg. All special signs shall have special details in the final plan set. The applicant has acknowledged this comment.

### **Curb:**

12. Additional curb labels have been added. Make sure the final labels are consistent with PennDOT curb types. Specifically label the type of mountable curb used. The applicant has acknowledged this comment.

### **Cross Sections:**

13. As previously noted, provide 5 scale cross sections for all legs and roadways including all labels in accordance with PennDOT's Design Manual 3. The applicant has acknowledged this comment.

### **Median/Islands:**

14. As previously noted, indicate proposed central island and splitter island/approach landscaping on the plans, consistent with the recommendations in NCHRP 672 Chapter 9. The applicant has acknowledged this comments.

15. As previously noted, 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. The applicant has acknowledged this comment.

### **ADA Compliance:**

16. As previously noted, separate intersection details at 20 scale minimum must be added to the plans for the intersection of Lewisberry Road (SR 0114) and I-83 SB ramps to better show the proposed ADA curb ramp design. Details must include all dimensions for construction including widths, lengths, and all slopes pertaining to the curb ramp design. Additionally, although RC-67M indicates an 8.33% maximum slope for most ramps, the applicant should utilize a slope of 7.14% for design purposes to help ensure that the ramp is constructible regardless of potential survey discrepancies and construction methods. Pub 72 (RC-67M). The applicant has acknowledged this comment.

### **Typical Section:**

17. As previously noted, provide typical sections for each unique section of all roadways, the roundabout, and all proposed driveways. Provide pavement history and proposed pavement sections. The applicant has acknowledged this comment.
18. As previously noted, ensure roundabout pavement section is acceptable for the extra forces of heavy circular traffic. The applicant has acknowledged this comment.

### **Access Configuration/Profile:**

19. 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.

### **Maintenance and Protection of Traffic:**

20. As previously noted, 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. The applicant has acknowledged this comment, but noted that limited short-term, off-peak lane closures may be required.

### **Sight Distance:**

21. As previously noted, provide additional combined sight distance diagram similar to NCHRP Exhibit 6-60 showing all required low landscaping areas. This should correspond with the landscaping plan as well. The applicant has acknowledged this comment.

### **Drainage:**

22. As previously noted, provide a full drainage report that is signed and sealed by a Pennsylvania licensed Professional Engineer including pre- and post-construction drainage area maps, changes in peak discharges for each POI, pipe and swale capacity analysis, and spread calculations for all inlets, proposed driveways, and critical points. Additionally, the plan shall show all existing and proposed drainage facilities along with type, size, slopes, inverts, and profiles. The applicant has acknowledged this comment.

As a reminder, please note the developer has agreed to address the following 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.
- Design the proposed roundabout to provide the recommended maximum entry speed of 25 mph and verify adequate sight distance will be provided on all approaches considering potential queuing based on final roundabout design.
- Provide detailed cost estimates clearly separating any proposed improvements requested 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.

### ***Transportation Impact Fee***

In accordance with the Fairview Township Impact Fee Ordinance (ord. 2015-4), 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 the 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.

### **Modification Request Action:**

The Planning Commission discussed the requests. No action was taken on any of the Modification Requests.

### **Subdivision Plan Action:**

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

### **NEW BUSINESS**

There was no new business.

### **ZONING HEARING BOARD**

There were no new Zoning Hearing Board applications.

### **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.