

East Manchester Township
 PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES
 July 28, 2020

At a regular meeting held at the Township Building, the following members were present: Blaine Rentzel, Robert Nace, Edward Hewitt, Mike McCowan, and Mike Scarborough. Also present: Township Manager Kristie Masemer, Engineer Laymon Mortorff, Zoning Officer Brittany Kohler, Recording Secretary, and six citizens.

Chairman McCowan called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Minutes

Motion by Nace, second by Hewitt, to approve the minutes of the meeting of May 26, 2020. All members voted aye; motion carried.

Plans

Hillwood Enterprises/Garrod property – Subdivision and Land Development Plan
 Josh Hoffman was present on this plan, along with Chris Fencel, Ron Lucas, and John Seitz. This plan involves two parcels, one large, one smaller, for a total of 205 acres. The applicants would like to subdivide those two existing lots into three lots. All have frontage on either Locust Point Road or Canal Road Extended. Two lots are intended for building, one for remote trailer storage. There will be a warehousing/distribution center with access onto Locust Point Road. Sewage planning module approval received from DEP.

Waivers requested:

§208-46.B(1), partial waiver – road widening Canal Road Extended and Locust Point Road for entire road frontage. Mr. Seitz, TRG, elaborated on the reasoning for this waiver. The applicants want to keep Canal Road Extended narrow to discourage truck traffic. It was noted that the emergency access is indeed a bit wider with a larger turning radius to accommodate emergency vehicle access. Mr. Seitz said that the turning radius at the intersection of Canal Road Extended and Locust Point might be slightly enlarged, but details are not available just yet. Discussion was held on that intersection with regard to widening or not widening, improving the curve, facilitating turning for large vehicles (farm equipment, etc.), and the effect of the Canal Road Betterment Project on this intersection/proposal. Mr. McCowan noted that he doesn't want any enlargement of that intersection to send the wrong message to any truck traffic – as in, the intersection is expanded and better, then right after that, the road turns narrow and is more country-like. Mr. Seitz assured the Planning Commission that the Township is the applicant on the HOP, so if the Township doesn't sign the application, it won't go through, so applicant and Township must work together to agree on a design that is satisfactory to everyone. Then PennDOT will review and either approve or suggest revisions.

§208-47, partial waiver – curbs and sidewalks entire road frontage on Locust Point Road.

§208-64, partial waiver to install all electric, telephone, and other utility facilities underground. The applicant would like to install some of the electric service overhead because of the screening that is already in place and the topography. Discussion was held on Met-Ed's service provisions and a possible future substation installation. Mr. Fencel noted that Met-Ed's preference is for the overhead option. Mr. Hewitt feels that if all other applicants are required to place utilities underground, this applicant should be required to do so as well. Mr. Fencel noted

that there are currently electric poles along this roadway. It was also noted that the poles are going to be as high or nearly as high as the buildings themselves, so what is gained by making this applicant put the electrical wires underground? Especially since this is an industrial site, and the land slopes downward. The poles will be visible at the beginning of the site, but then they will fade from view, thanks, in part, to the woods and other screening on the site. From the audience, Mike Grotehouse asked about the berm along the road that is to screen the site from sight. Mr. Hoffman clarified it's not actually a high berm.

Motion by Scarborough, second by Hewitt, to recommend approval of the waiver request for §208-46.B(1), road widening. All members voted aye; motion carried.

Motion by Rentzel, second by Hewitt, to recommend approval of the waiver request for §208-47, curbs/sidewalks. All members voted aye; motion carried.

Motion by Hewitt to recommend *denial* of the waiver request for §208-64, underground utilities. *Motion died for lack of a second.*

Motion by Scarborough, second by Rentzel, to recommend approval of the waiver request for §208-64, underground utilities. Four members voted aye; *Hewitt opposed.* Motion carried.

Discussion was held on the buffering/screening proposals. Mr. Scarborough suggested relocating some of the trees that are proposed for the slope to the top of the berm/flat surface to help function better as some screening. Placed randomly, the trees would have a better look and better serve their function. The applicants are open to that idea.

The letter from Snyder, Secary, and Associates dated July 20, 2020, was reviewed. This letter was in response to the Gordon L. Brown letter dated July 7, 2020. Outstanding items: Zoning 2, the pump station must meet all zoning requirements (§255-4G); SALDO 4A, owners association documents (§208-13); B, street addresses (§208-31.B.26); C, erosion and sedimentation plan approval (§208-31.A.3.a.7); D, recreation fees (§208-49.B); F, Northeastern York County Sewer Authority signature (§208-34.B.21); G, HOP application (§208-34.B.22); H, surety and developer's agreements (§208-67.B); I, appropriate notes from Attorney Miller's memo dated 9/22/11; J, private deed restrictions including private road maintenance agreement (§208-34.C.11); K, owner's signatures (§208-34.B.17); L, Met-Ed approval for improvements on their ROW (§208-31.A.3.a.9); M, USA COE + DEP permit approval (§208-34.C.12); 6, General Notes 41 and 43 detail when building permits and occupancy permits can be requested relative to certain milestones for the road improvements. The completion of these road improvements as provided for in the construction schedule for the road improvements should be evaluated relative to when building permits and occupancy permits are allowed to be issued. A situation in which occupancy permits are requested *prior* to road improvement completion should be avoided if possible. *Discussion was held on this issue, with Mr. Fencel noting that the applicants have worked very closely with the Township/Board of Supervisors for a permit and occupancy schedule that will benefit all parties involved. Discussion was also held on how the improvements associated with the Canal Road Betterment Project will affect this project and that the occupancy permits should be tied to the completion of the Canal Road Betterment Project. To achieve this, Mr. Mortorff feels that these notes must be revised. The schedule, however, was set as a part of the Preliminary Plan, so the applicants must approve any revision. Mr. Mortorff is concerned that the improvements to Canal Road are going to be in the works when this project is completed, so traffic will be snarled if vehicles cannot use Canal Road during the construction phases.*

Also outstanding: 12, Locust Point Road improvements within the proposed HOP should be reflected on this plan (§208-34.B.7); **YCPC** comments 3A, letter from Met-Ed for the 100' Met-Ed easement stating any conditions on the use of the land or a copy of any recorded agreement (§208-31.A.3.9); D, erosion and sedimentation control plan approval (§208-34.C.9); E, DEP and Army Corps of Engineers approval for the proposed wetland mitigation (§208-34.C.12); and F, owners association document (§208-13).

Mike Grothouse had a question on sight distance from the crest of the hill to the driveway. Mr. Seitz and Mr. Hoffman answered his question. Mr. Grothouse also expressed concern for the residents who might be hearing noise and light pollution from the site, as he's experiencing from the DHL project.

Mr. Hewitt asked about shielding on the lighting plan. He'd like to see shields on all the lights facing Canal Road. Discussion was held; plans were checked; the wording says that "shields may be required." Adjust the note to say that shields are indeed required? Mr. Hoffman noted that the lights are actually going to be lower than the building, plus the screening will be in place, so no lights should be visible from Canal Road.

Mr. Fencel noted that Hillwood is approaching this entire project differently from The DHL Experience and will certainly do their best to minimize any unpleasantness during construction.

How about the road closures? Of course, the roadways will need to be shut down and/or flagged, but not for a huge length of time. Mr. Seitz explained how it is envisioned to go.

Mr. Scarborough isn't comfortable recommending approval of this plan with the number of open items and the gravity of some of the issues discussed here tonight. True, several of the outstanding items involve outside agencies, but the items are open nonetheless. The Board of Supervisors simply will not entertain action on a plan with too many open items. Discussion was held on the developers' agreements for this plan and the Canal Road Betterment Project. Mr. Fencel assured the Planning Commission that those documents conform to each other.

Mr. Mortorff noted that the details of the pump station (§255-4G) should be included with this plan. Discussion was held on how exactly this would or should be accomplished. The design information has to be presented by either the applicant or the Sewer Authority. Does the applicant need to wait for the Sewer Authority or can the applicant move ahead?

The applicant verbally requested that the Planning Commission *table* this plan tonight. Agreed.

Additional New Business

JJ Four LP submission for 3-lot subdivision -- an official plan has been submitted, same location as the Dollar General was proposed. Likely will appear before the Planning Commission meeting in August. The next Planning Commission meeting will be on August 25.

Motion by Rentzel, second by Nace, to adjourn. All members voted aye; motion carried. The meeting adjourned at 9:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Julie B. Maher, Recording Secretary

July 28, 2020