

**EAST MANCHESTER TOWNSHIP
PLANNING COMMISSION
JULY 27, 2010**

At a regular meeting held at the township building, the following members were in attendance: Blaine Rentzel, Robert Nace, Edward Hewitt, Mike McCowan, and Mike Scarborough. Also in attendance were Engineer Laymon Mortorff of Gordon L. Brown & Associates and Zoning & Codes Enforcement Officer Katrina Rife.

Call to order at 7:00pm by Chairman Rentzel.

The minutes of 6/22/10 were approved as distributed.

Orchard Business Park lot 10/11 land development revision

David Koratich and Dan Creep of LSC Design and Mike Jeffers of Kinsley were present to represent revision 7 dated 7/16/10 to the previously recorded land development plan 2009.247.047-00 dated 11/25/09.

Changes to Sheet 5 were discussed. The area that was not to be graded has been filled. They are moving the fence an additional 10' off pavement; originally it was shown 2' off.

Adjoining property owner, Mr. Gladfelter was invited to look at plan. Discussion on mound, trees, and light poles was held.

Lights are to be shielded directing light toward building.

The elevation for the second mound is to be at least 10' high.

Steven H. Gross, Jr. mentioned the steepness of bank next to their property isn't what the Board of Supervisors approved and on the empty lot behind GEA water does not flow any longer in the swale.

Mike acknowledged the slope failure; layer not stable, undercut and recompact to reconstruct slope with matting.

Steve reiterated that the bank is extremely straight up and down.

Mike commented that it is 1:1 slope cut to plan; waiver was granted. In some areas, it is 1 ½ :1 Steve also expressed that he is very concerned. The buffer is not what the Board thought was going to be. The Board expected it to be similar to the Willow Springs Lane/Board Road project. It is an insult and disgraceful. There is not enough topsoil to support trees. He stated that he can assure the next plan brought before the Supervisors will be closely questioned.

Mike mentioned that YCCD approved amended plan.

Bob questioned the height of buffers. Now the filled in areas are higher than buffers.

Laymon commented what is shown on plan is as required of from ordinance. The fill is now higher than buffer, and the screening requirements need met. He believes more than 1 row of trees is needed – should be doubled. Also extend the berm past the line of truck parking to prevent seeing into the parking spaces.

Mike mentioned that the swale gets restored; it is not intact now. The elevation behind Gladfelter will increase and enlarge and have more trees.

Gordon L. Brown & Associates should keep an eye on bank adjoining Gross property. If problem, it will need to be corrected.

Discussion continued on the elevations, buffering and trees, and slope of bank.

Dave also mentioned the concrete island was amended to become 4' wider than initial design to accommodate the guard shack.

Per York County Planning Commission letter dated 7/19/10:

The staff of the York County Planning Commission recently received a revised set of plans for the above-mentioned final land development plan. Based on the changes from the original submission (YCPC File #26-09-11-30-269), the staff has determined that no additional review is necessary.

per Gordon L. Brown & Associates, Inc. letter of 7/9/10:

The purpose of this plan is to provide for a revision to the site grading just off of the northwest corner of the proposed building that is under construction. The changes in grading will cause relocation of proposed fence and guide rail and some additional tree planting. The configuration of a traffic island with a guard house is also being modified with this plan. It is noted on the plan that this plan does not stand alone. The only drawings modified from the previously approved plan are included in this set. Those remaining drawings, notes, details and conditions of approval remain in effect unless modified by this plan.

The following comments relate to the Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance:

1. The proposed plan modifications also affect Sheets LD-4, LD-6, LD-7 and LD-12 from the originally approved plan set. These sheets should be modified and added to this revised plan set. -ok
2. A sheet index should be provided on LD-1 and the sheets that are to be recorded should be noted. -ok
3. The following information should be provided on or with the plans:
 - A. Signatures (s.6.1.1/B(1)q&r). -ok
 - B. Updated approval of erosion and sediment control plan, if necessary (s.6.1.1.C(1)i). - OPEN
4. Since the fence location is being modified, is the guide rail also being relocated? Show more explicit labeling
5. Although the buffer yards are shown as required, because of the grading behind the buffer yards, it may be necessary to add another row of trees at the top of the slopes to achieve the necessary screening. - OPEN
6. If additional stormwater management comments are necessary, they will be provided by separate letter (s.6.1.1.(C)j). -OPEN

Bob commented that too much is open with the discussion and concerns about the elevations and buffering. He could not recommend approval.

Mike agreed and expressed similar concerns as to what is shown as compared to real world.

Blaine asked if they would like to work out the details and bring back their plan.

The Planning Commission suggested they revise based upon the discussions and show more clearly what is proposed.

REQUEST To TABLE to 8/24/10

PPL oil storage building and warehouse land development plan

Doug Gamber of Raudenbush Engineering and Barry Acker of PPL presented a 3-page plan #D376446 dated 6/30/10 revised dated 7/19/10.

Per Gordon L. Brown & Associates comment letter dated 7/9/10:

The purpose of this plan is to provide for the development of two new buildings on the Brunner Island power generating facility site. One building is a 40' x 80' structure intended to be used for an oil storage building and the second building is a 75.5' x 100.5', 7,587.75 square foot building

that is to be used for a warehouse. Waivers are being requested from the requirement to prepare a Preliminary Plan and for groundwater recharge as required by the Township Stormwater Management Ordinance.

The following comments relate to the Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance:

1. It should be indicated on the List of Drawings on the Cover Sheet which drawings are to be recorded.-ok
2. The date of approval of the Erosion and Sediment Control Plan by the York County Conservation District should be provided in the General Notes (s.6.1.1.C(1)i). A copy of the approved plan should be provided to the Township.- OPEN
3. It should be determined if a fire lane should be provided between the existing building and the proposed oil storage building (s.6.1.1.C(1)l).-ok, Katrina Rife met with Chief Brenneman of Eagle to review and he is ok with due to the two access lanes on either side.
4. The location of doors and access to them should be shown on the plan (s.5.1.1.B(1)v).-ok
5. A note should be provided on the plan that no outdoor storage will occur in relationship to these structures (s.6.1.1.C(1)l).-ok

Per York County Planning Commission letter dated 7/19/10:

These comments refer to the East Manchester Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance:

1. The following information should be shown on or provided with the plan:
 - A. A completed notarized statement of ownership (s.6.1.1.B.1q).-ok
 - B. A copy of any deed restrictions associated with the tract (s.6.1.1.C.1.k). -ok
 - C. The dated signature and seal of the engineer responsible for preparing the plan (s.6.1.1.C.1.r).-ok
 - D. Any required erosion and sediment control plan (s.6.1.1.C.1.i). -OPEN

Waiver requests:

SALDO 3.5 preliminary plan

SWMO 2006-1 groundwater recharge

Northeastern York County Sewer Authority is requesting the effluent line and right-of-way shown on drawing in relationship to proposed buildings. Doug stated they will include this page.

After review and discussion of waiver requests:

Mike M. motioned to recommend granting of SALDO 3.5, seconded by Mike S. and carried unanimously.

Mike M. motioned to recommend granting of SWMO 2001-6, seconded by Ed and carried unanimously.

After discussion and deliberation with consideration of prior comments and recommendations from township staff, Planning Commission, Township Engineer, York County Planning Commission, Sewer Authority, and public as well as applicant and/or applicant's representatives, a motion by Mike S. to recommend to Board of Supervisors for approval upon satisfaction of OPEN items and comments was seconded by Ed and carried unanimously.

Updated copies of the Code of the Township of East Manchester, Subdivision and Land Development were distributed.

At 8:26pm, a motion to adjourn was made by Mike M.