

East Manchester Township
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES
April 22, 2025

At a regular meeting held at the Township Building, the following members were present: Edward Hewitt, Mike McCowan, Mike Scarborough, Herb Nix, and Troy Rentzel. Also present: Engineer Laymon Mortorff, Zoning Officer Kate Snyder, Township Manager Kristie Masemer, Recording Secretary, and two citizens.

Chairman McCowan called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

Minutes

Motion by Nix, second by Scarborough, to approve the minutes of the meeting of March 25, 2025. All members voted aye; motion carried.

Plans

- A. Orchard Business Park, Phase II, Lot 2; Canal Road Extended, final land development plan

Josh Hoffman, with Pennoni, and Brian Johnson with Kinsley, were present on this plan. This preliminary plan was approved about a year ago. This plan involves two development tracts and one parcel to be dedicated to the township. All wetlands will be avoided during the development. Mr. Hoffman gave the history of this plan, including a parcel to be dedicated to the Township and right-of-way along Route 83 based on the possibility of the completion of Exit 26. No additional waivers are requested. The application for the NPDES permit is being reviewed.

Gordon L. Brown's letter dated April 7, 2025, was reviewed. Outstanding comments: 1, stormwater management plan comments shall be provided by separate letter (Section 208-34.C.10); 2a, owners association documents (Section 208-13); from Pennoni's response (letter dated April 14, 2025). "No owners association is planned for the two lots. To the extent that any portion of either lot is utilized for the benefit of the other lot for access, stormwater management, or another purpose, easements would be granted which would include obligations to share costs between the owners of the affected lots. If requested by the Township, the developer will provide a draft of the easement document for the Township Solicitor's review"; the easement documents should be provided. 2b, signatures (208-34.B.17); 4, the dedicated ROWs along Canal Road should reflect the latest Highway Occupancy Permit drawings for the Canal Road Betterment Program; 5, Comment 1b of the MPL memorandum dated April 2, 2025, requires review of EXB 3.0, and our only comment at this time is that an emergency access should be provided if only one exit/entrance remains (*discussion below*); 6, add note for comment 6 as follows: on the E&S plans, sheet CS8102, add note "not available until constructed by the Canal Road Betterment Project and accepted by PennDOT."; All MPL comments shall be satisfied.

GLB Comment 5 corresponds with MPL memo's comment 1b – see Pennoni's response #5 which reads as follows: "The subject driveway entrance into the project site is proposed at the location required by the Canal Road Betterment Project as it aligns with what will be a four-way intersection. Further, the driveway entrance is being constructed as a wider boulevard-style entrance which would allow for traffic flow on either side of the concrete median in the event that an accident occurs near its entrance onto Canal Road. If the entrance remained as a public cul-de-sac road, the configuration would still remain the same with only one access point into the

project site. Further, there are no other alternative entrances into this project site as it is surrounded by the Little Conewago Creek, Interstate 83, and a stream that runs parallel to Canal Road. As such, the applicant acknowledges the possible scenario of the driveway entrance being temporarily closed off due to an accident.”

Per Mr. Mortorff, if the Exit 26 ramp is constructed, access to the rear of the property will be cut off, leaving only one access, as that area of the ramp will be dedicated to PennDOT. Exhibit 3 was referred to; Mr. Hoffman explained what will happen in the future with the access. Mr. Mortorff was satisfied with that explanation. Should Exhibit 3 be made as a part of this final plan? Mr. Mortorff isn't sure that's a good idea. Mr. Scarborough would like to be assured that this concept can actually be done. Mr. Johnson noted that the applicant has done all the calculations to ensure that yes, it can be accomplished.

YCPC comment letter dated April 7, 2025, was reviewed. Outstanding: 1A, signatures (same as GLB comment 1).

Motion by Scarborough, second by Nix, to recommend approval of the final subdivision plan for Orchard Business Park, Phase II, Lot 2, subject to the satisfactory resolution of the following open items from the letters/memoranda referred to above: GLB 1, 2a, 2b, 4, 5, 6 (add note) YCPC 1; satisfy all of MPL Law Firm's comments; AND add Exhibit 3 to the developer's agreement. All members voted aye; motion carried.

New Business

Becky Gross will be submitting a subdivision plan for Jerusalem School Road, perhaps before the PC in May or June.

Motion by Scarborough, second by Rentzel, to adjourn. All members voted aye; motion carried. The meeting adjourned at 6:56 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Julie B. Maher, Recording Secretary