

East Manchester Township
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES
June 26, 2012

At a regular meeting held at the Township Building, the following members were present: Blaine Rentzel, Robert Nace, Edward Hewitt, and Mike Scarborough. Absent with prior notice: Mike McCowan. Also present: Engineer Laymon Mortorff, Zoning Officer Jon Beck, Recording Secretary, and four citizens.

Chairman Rentzel called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. The minutes of the meeting of April 24, 2012, were approved as presented without a formal motion/second.

Plans

A. Kinsley Equities II, L.P., Orchard Business Park, Lot 1, 1500 Bartlett Drive
Kathy Connelly, LSC Design, was present on this final land development plan, LD1-LD25, Original submission May 30, 2012; Revision 1, dated 6/18/12.

Outstanding comments from Gordon L. Brown's letter dated June 15, 2012:

3, Buffer Strip Set-Back of 15' off property line bordering the residential zone boundary, Section 255-50-A

8b, sewer authority signature

8c, surety

8d, soil erosion plan approval

8f, date and permit number in Note 47 on sheet LD-2 after NPDES permit approval is obtained

9, stormwater plan approval; Mr. Mortorff suggested fencing the small pond (stormwater basin), which is more restrictive than what's required by the Zoning Ordinance.

RE: 13, sidewalks from Bartlett Drive to the building. These have been added for convenience to a plan that has not been submitted for review as of yet. Keep open until added to the final plan.

RE: fencing around the facility. The area will not be enclosed. Mr. Mortorff discussed the fencing issue, mentioning the 20' cut on the embankment. The berm will be "dressed up a little bit" to make the area look better. There's a 4' high berm along the majority of the length. Mr. Mortorff is concerned with the embankment having a 3:1 slope along some of it. The evergreens in this area are quite large and thick. Mr. Nace looked to the future, when those trees die and are removed or fall over. What then? There's a 4' berm and a 20' drop. How about if the trees weren't there? Since this is a required buffer, if a tree dies, the applicant must replace it. Ms. Conley reminded the Planning Commission that the applicant is supplementing the existing trees. An audience member, Tim Kinsley, confirmed why there was a cut in the berm a number of years ago (water drainage problem). This will be addressed in the storm water management plan. If there's a drainage issue on the other side of the berm (again), a pipe could be installed through the berm to relieve the problem.

RE: the final comment, the intersection at Bartlett and Espresso. The Township staff asked the applicant to address the situation that occurs when traffic turns right from Espresso onto Bartlett. The applicant has agreed to pull the curbing back to alleviate turning problems. The Township feels it's warranted with the increased truck traffic that is planned with this project.

YCPC comments have all been addressed or are the same outstanding ones as the ones from Gordon L. Brown.

Waiver requested: preliminary plan requirement.

How about lighting? Building lights will be 30' off the ground and will have shields on them. The lights will likely be 10'-15' above the berm; lights will be visible but not the light bulbs. All lights will shine in toward the building. There have been some complaints about lights at other business locations (shining in residents' windows at night), so the Planning Commission wants to be sure that this issue will be fully addressed and satisfactory. The applicants are prepared to make the situation acceptable for the neighbors.

Jim Younker, 215 Fig Tree Way, commented on the removal of the berm; he contends that the berm has always been the way it is and was not changed/removed. He has a few easements in the back of his yard. He says that there's no berm in his area. Why is that? Ms. Conley noted that the applicant is planning to add to the berm along this property. How is the berm affected by the easements? If the utilities permit the berm to be over their easements, the applicant will put the berm there. The applicant is willing to meet with Mr. Younker to figure out a way to get a berm between his property and the proposed construction. Mr. Younker had some other concerns: length of construction time, 9/12—5/13, if all goes well. Would he be permitted to view the plan? Maybe not, since it's a commercial endeavor and is not recorded yet. Mr. Beck will let him know. Another concern: noise of truck trailers, and worse, dust and dirt. Apparently, the neighborhood suffered a good deal of dust and dirt from the construction of the GSK project. Loading docks on both sides of the building? Yes, and that concerns him because of the noise. Mr. Rentzel advised Mr. Younker that no one can assure him that there won't be any dust from this project. There is also the possibility of noise here and there, but the berm will alleviate some of the noise. Mr. Younker suggested a fence.

Mr. Scarborough noted that the NPDES permit is to address the dust issue among other things. If there's a problem, Mr. Younker should feel free to speak up, and he was commended for voicing his opinion tonight.

Motion by Hewitt, second by Scarborough, to recommend approval of the waiver request by Kinsley Equities, Orchard Business Park, for preliminary plan approval, Section 208-21. All members voted aye; motion carried.

Motion by Scarborough, second by Nace, to recommend approval of the Final Land Development Plan of Kinsley Equities, II, for the Orchard Business Park, upon satisfactory resolution of the following outstanding items from the Gordon L. Brown comment letter referred to above: 3, 8b, 8c, 8d, 8f, 9, AND 13. All members voted aye; motion carried.

Zoning Cases

None this month.

Motion by Hewitt, second by Nace, to adjourn. All members voted aye; motion carried. The meeting adjourned at 7:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Julie B. Maher,
Recording Secretary