

**RAPHO TOWNSHIP
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES
SEPTEMBER 10, 2018, 7:00 p.m.**

The meeting was called to order at the Rapho Township office by Chairman Jay Gainer at 7:00 p.m., followed by the Pledge of Allegiance. In attendance were Dennis Shellenberger, Howard Boyd, Darwin Nissley, Carrol Ehrhart, Carrol Ehrhart, Jay Gainer, Jim Caldwell, RETTEW, and Sara Gibson.

The minutes of the August 6May 7, 2018 meeting were approved on a motion by Mr. ShellenbergerBoyd, seconded by Mr. Nissley. All in favor.

BRIEFING ITEM:

**Elm Tree Properties, LLC Preliminary Subdivision Plan for Phase 5 (Musser) #18-360
936 Strickler Road**

David Miller/Associates, consultant

Mr. Caldwell presented the plan. The applicants propose to develop the 14.2-acre property identified as Parcel K on the previously recorded Elm Tree Subdivision into 70 single family lots. The development would have two public road access points located along the west side of Strickler Road and include a loop road through the site. Stormwater is proposed to be managed by a bio-retention basin, swales, and a pipe conveyance system. The property is located in the R-2 Residential Zoning District, and would be served by public water and sewer.

Mr. Caldwell noted that one of the challenges of this plan is that the Village Overlay District was not mapped to apply to this parcel. This is being discussed by the Township Solicitor and the applicant's attorney. Mr. Caldwell said staff has discussed with the Mount Joy Borough Authority the need to extend the public sewer line so that it is available for other parties to connect at Strickler Road. He reviewed with the group that the developers of the Rapho Industrial Park (led by Steve Horst) and the developers of this parcel (Elm Tree) were attempting to work out an easement to connect the Industrial Park to public sewer. However, he said, those negotiations had dissolved. He explained that the Board of Supervisors had tabled the Elm Tree request for EDU's for the Musser Tract, because they would like to see a plan that provides for that connection.

Mr. Boyd noted that he felt Steve Horst should be contacted by the Township to let him know that the Musser plan is being considered by the Township.

BRIEFING ITEM:

**Final Lot Add-On and Land Development Plan for Pennstro Leasing, LLC #18-361
1840 Auction Road**

Harbor Engineering, consultant

Mr. Caldwell presented the plan. The applicants, Z Team Limited Partnership, propose to combine two lots and develop the subsequent 12.89+-acre property for an expansion of their business to the adjacent 1976 Auction Road lot. The 1840 Auction Road property had previously been developed for an automotive reconditioning service. The buildings for the automotive reconditioning business will be demolished or renovated as part of this project, and a new 10,940 square foot building would be constructed. The property is located in the Industrial Zoning District, and would be served by on-lot water and sewer.

Mr. Caldwell said that the applicants have been approved to have an internal access drive, which would allow them to jockey trailers between their sites. The drive is outside the floodplain.

Mr. Kent Weaver of Harbor Engineering was in attendance and spoke on behalf of the applicants. Mr. Weaver said that demolition of the existing building is underway. Mr. Caldwell said staff is looking for input from the Commission in order to determine whether the applicants should be issued a zoning permit to continue their excavation work prior to winter weather.

Mr. Caldwell explained that the stormwater plan proposed was unique, and a modification had been requested to have a somewhat longer dewatering time for the basin. Mr. Caldwell said he felt comfortable with their proposal.

The applicants had requested to forgo geological testing on a sinkhole at the property.

Mr. Weaver explained that the stormwater underground detention basin is designed to accommodate a 100-year storm.

Mr. Weaver proposed an additional modification that had not previously been requested. He proposed that curb should be waived along Auction Road and throughout the site, because there is no curbing on Auction Road currently.

Ms. Ehrhart noted several other plans have recently come before the Commission with questions about curbing, and she felt they should be consistent, particularly at the entrance.

Ms. Ehrhart made a motion, seconded by Mr. Shellenberger to move the briefing item to an action item. All in favor.

Ms. Ehrhart made a motion to add the verbally proposed modification request to the application, provided that it be presented in writing subsequent to this meeting. Mr. Shellenberger seconded the motion. All in favor.

Ms. Ehrhart made a motion to recommend approval of the plan, subject to the Rettew September 7 letter, with the additional condition that curbing would be provided at the Auction Road radii, but waived throughout the rest of the site, with final configuration to be determined between the Township and the applicant. Mr. Boyd seconded the motion. All in favor. The conditions are listed in abbreviated form as follows:

MODIFICATIONS:

SUBDIVISION AND LAND DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE

- A. *Section 305 – Preliminary Plan Processing*
The applicant has requested a modification of the requirement to process a preliminary plan and in the alternative, proceed directly to final plan.
We recommend approval of this modification based upon the justification provided with the condition that the applicant satisfy all preliminary and final plan requirements to the satisfaction of the Township.
- B. *Section 403.3 – Existing Features*
The applicant has requested a modification of the requirement to show significant features within 200 feet of the property lines and in the alternative, has shown features directly adjacent to the proposed improvements.
We recommend approval of this modification request based upon the justification provided.
- C. *Section 603.1 – Access Drive General Standards*
The applicant has requested a modification of the requirement to the design standards for access drives including width, construction materials, and separation from the property line, in the alternative, the applicant is proposing an 11-foot wide, stone access drive with a minimum 4-foot separation from the property line.
We recommend approval of this modification request based upon the justification provided.

- D. *Section 605.H – Vehicular Parking Facilities*
The applicant has requested a modification of the requirement to provide lighting at parking areas, main entrances and exits, in the alternative, the applicant is proposing to utilize the existing pole light and building exterior lighting. We recommend approval of this modification request based upon the justification provided.
- E. *Section 609.1.C – Commercial Landscaping*
The applicant has requested a modification of the requirement to provide landscaping and screening around the perimeter of all commercial parking areas and mechanical equipment, in the alternative, the applicant is proposing natural grade separation, existing vegetative screen and adjacent use of similar nature. We recommend approval of this modification request based upon the justification provided.
- F. *Section 609.4 – Existing Wooded Areas*
The applicant has requested a modification of the requirement to protect existing wooded areas and replace a minimum fifty percent of disturbed trees, in the alternative, the applicant is proposing to evaluate at the time of construction. We recommend the Township deny this modification request and require the replacement to be identified on the plan.
- G. *Section 609.6 – Refuse Collection Stations*
The applicant has requested a modification of the requirement to provide a refuse collection station, in the alternative, the applicant is proposing shared use of the facilities at 1976 Auction Road. We recommend approval of this modification request based upon the justification provided with the condition that an agreement for shared facilities be provided and the future location be depicted on the plans in the case of sale of the adjoining property.

STORMWATER MANAGEMENT ORDINANCE

- H. *Section 402.11 – Dewatering Time*
The applicant has requested a modification of the requirement to completely drain the volume control storage in not more than 72 hours from the end of the design storm. In the alternative, the applicant proposes to dewater Infiltration Beds #1 and #2 in approximately 85.7 hours for the 100-year storm. We recommend postponing action on this modification request to allow the applicant to confirm the rate control storage will dewater to the 2-year water surface elevation within 24 hours, and to indicate how long the volume control storage for the 2-year storm will drain down.
- I. *Section 501.14.E – Infiltration Testing Notification*
The applicant has requested a modification of the requirement to notify the Township 24 hours prior to conducting infiltration testing so that the Township has the opportunity to witness the tests. In the alternative, the applicant acknowledges that the testing was done in 2016 prior to their knowledge of the requirement and proposes all required retesting to include the notification. We recommend approval of this modification request based upon the justification provided and with the condition that post-construction infiltration testing shall be performed and that the Township shall be notified at least 24 hours in advance of the testing.
- J. *Section 501.16 – Stormwater Facilities Placed in or over Sinkholes*
The applicant has requested a modification of the requirements that: unless an alternate design is submitted to the Township for review and is prepared by a licensed geologist or geotechnical engineer, no stormwater facilities shall be placed in, over, or within a distance that will impact a sinkhole; and, the minimum isolation distance from a stormwater facility to a sinkhole shall be 100 feet. In the alternative, the applicant proposes the location of the infiltration bed to be in the same area as a sinkhole. We recommend disapproval of this modification request. The applicant needs to satisfy the requirements of the Section 501.16 by submitting an alternate design for a stormwater facility over a sinkhole that is prepared by a licensed geologist or geotechnical engineer. The location of the sinkhole needs to be identified on the existing conditions plan.

CONDITIONS:

ZONING

1. *A copy of the August 2018 Zoning Hearing Board decision needs to be submitted.*
2. *The applicant needs to verify that the correct section number is provided for variance to allow the shared internal access drive within the side and rear setbacks (§ 304.C.6.b).*
3. *Clear sight triangles need to be clear of any permanent obstructions and plant materials over thirty (30) inches high and below ten (10) feet. In addition, easements will be required for those portions of the clear sight triangles that encroach upon adjoining properties (§ 504.B).*

4. *An access and maintenance agreement, in a recordable form acceptable to the Township, needs to be provided for the shared access drive (§ 507).*
5. *The applicant needs to provide a trip generation study documenting that less than 100 new vehicle trips are generated (§ 533).*
6. *An Hours of operation and maintenance plan needs to be submitted in accordance with Article 9 (§ 604.R.8).*

SUBDIVISION AND LAND DEVELOPMENT

1. *A graphic scale and north arrow need to be provided on the plan view on sheets 7 and 11 (§ 403.1.C)*
2. *The applicant needs to verify that filed run topography has been provided for all areas of proposed earth disturbance (§ 403.3.A.3).*
3. *The location and size of existing on-lot sewage system and well need to be clearly indicated on the plan (§ 403.3.B.3, 403.3.C.2, 403.4.M).*
4. *The date, final action and conditions of approval by the Board of Supervisors on any approved modification requests needs to be included on the plan (§403.4.J).*
5. *The location of the percolation holes, deep probe holes, and replacement area easement(s) need to be provided for each lot to be served by an on-lot sewage absorption system. In addition, the replacement sewage absorption area note needs to be included on the plan (§ 403.4.M, 403.4.N).*
6. *All certificates need to be completed prior to recording the plan (§ 403.5).*
7. *Evidence of review by emergency service providers needs to be provided (§ 403.6.A).*
8. *A wetlands study needs to be provided (§ 403.7.E, 408.4).*
9. *A landscape plan, signed and sealed by a landscape architect, needs to be provided (§ 405.2.K).*
10. *Architectural elevations need to be submitted for review by the Township (§ 405.2.N).*
11. *A detailed construction observation schedule needs to be developed and included on a sheet to be recorded. The requirement for a preconstruction meeting needs to be included (§ 504.2, 504.7).*
12. *A cost estimate, financial security, and a financial security agreement need to be provided (§ 405.4.E, 405.4.F, 501).*
13. *An As-Built Plan needs to be prepared and submitted to the Township for review upon completion of the project. A note to this effect needs to be added to the plans (§ 508).*
14. *Curb needs to be provided along Auction Road, the access drive(s) and interior parking lot landscaping islands (§ 602.11)*
15. *The access drive vertical alignment needs to be designed in accordance with the requirements for a local road (§ 603.1.D).*
16. *The parking area detail needs to be revised to provide 3-inch depth of Superpave binder course (§ 605.I.2).*
17. *The number of parking spaces indicated near the proposed building expansion needs to correspond to the plan; a bumper block has been depicted outside of the proposed paving.*
18. *All proposed signage and post installation need to comply with PennDOT TC Standards.*
19. *The plan depicts an encroachment of the gravel area from the adjoining property identified as 1896 Auction Road; the applicant needs to address the encroachment.*
20. *Truck turning movements need to be provided to demonstrate that the largest anticipated vehicle to access the site can enter and exit the facility in a safe manner without encroaching on the opposing lanes of traffic on Auction Road and maneuver around the building and proposed parking areas.*

STORMWATER MANAGEMENT

1. *A plan note needs to be provided referring to the computations and E&S Pollution Control Plan by title and date (§ 404.4.H).*
2. *Profiles of all stormwater management facilities, specifically from I-B1 to MH-B and from I-B2A to I-B2B, need to be provided on the plans (§ 404.4.H.2).*
3. *A cost estimate, financial security, and a financial security agreement need to be provided (§ 405.3, 602).*
4. *All certificates need to be completed prior to recording the plan (§ 406).*
5. *The watercourses need to be contained within drainage easements that are wide enough to contain the unimpeded flow from a one hundred (100) year design rainfall (§ 501.4). It is unclear if the watercourse easement will follow the floodplain line.*
6. *An ownership and maintenance program, in recordable form suitable to the Township, that clearly sets forth the ownership and maintenance responsibility of all temporary and permanent stormwater management facilities and erosion control facilities needs to be provided (§ 501.1.C, 601).*

7. *Evidence is needed certifying that the proposed detention basin is not located within areas of carbonate geology features listed in the ordinance that restricts construction of such a facility (§ 501.16).*
8. *The underground detention basins need to be analyzed for two conditions to determine the impact on peak discharges and storage volumes: 1) a normal outflow condition assuming no tail water and 2) a tail water condition assuming the downstream flows in the storm sewer system are in operation (§ 502.12).*
9. *Evidence of approval of the Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan and NPDES Permit by the Lancaster County Conservation District needs to be provided (§ 405.1).*
10. *Any part of the storage in Infiltration Beds #1 and #2 that is proposed to address peak rates will need to be available within 24 hours from the end of the design storm (§ 402.12, 506.2.B).*
11. *The infiltration rate used for design purposes needs to include a factor of safety (§ 501.14.B).*
12. *The infiltration rate needs to be determined at the same elevation of the facility bottom (§ 501.14.D.1). The testing for Bed #1 appears to be 0.4'-1.4' above the proposed bottom elevation. The testing for Bed #2 appears to be 2'-4' above the proposed bottom elevation.*
13. *The applicant is proposing an alternate design that does not incorporate impermeable liners to reduce or eliminate the separation distances in Sections 501.16.A and 501.16.B (§ 501.16.F).*
14. *Stage/storage/discharge information along with routings need to be provided for Beds #1 and #2 if they will be used as part of the rate control storage (§ 404.4.H.3).*
15. *The report references the original design information for the existing basin. Any pertinent reference information needs to be included in the report.*
16. *Unless a modification is requested and approved, the maximum spillway width for Basin B shall not exceed 20 feet since the depth is less than two (2) feet (§ 505.3.e.3). The proposed spillway width is 23 feet.*
17. *The spillway elevation used in the analysis for Basin B needs to match the elevation shown on the plans and details.*
18. *The basin shall permit draining the rate control volume within 24 hours, exclusive of BMP storage (§ 505.10).*
19. *The infiltration basin shall be equipped with a device that is capable of only being made operational in the event the facility is not dewatering as designed (§ 505.17).*
20. *It appears that 20 percent of the existing impervious area in Area A has been considered as meadow in existing conditions for volume control. Rather than providing the volume controls in Area A to manage this difference, the applicant proposes to overcompensate with infiltration in post-development Area B. The applicant needs to confirm that the 2-year volume captured by the facilities in Area B will meet or exceed the overall difference computed in Worksheet 4 (§ 506.1.B.2).*
21. *The loading ratios to the proposed infiltration facilities need to be provided (§ 506.1.B.3.a, 507.2.a.2).*
22. *Any portion of the volume control storage (for Basin B and Beds #1 and #2) which is available 24 hours from the end of the design storm based on the stabilized infiltration rate may be used for rate control storage (§ 506.2.B).*
23. *Given the size of the infiltration beds and limited inflow points, loading and balancing across the surface of the beds needs to be provided (§ 507.2.b.2, 507.4).*
24. *Material specifications for the "riverjacks" needs to be included with the detail. Also, the detail needs to identify where the AASHOT No. 3 stops and the riverjack stone begins and if there will be any material separating the two stone types.*
25. *The recommendations for addressing the sinkhole repairs need to be incorporated into the plan as requirements (§ 402.9).*
26. *The applicant needs to confirm the proposed northwestern access will not impact the natural flow of runoff from the adjacent properties to the west and will be stable when conveying flow over the surface (§ 501.13, 504.3).*
27. *The applicant needs to verify that post-development flows in the gravel storage areas will result in non-erosive conditions (§ 504.1).*

REVIEW ITEM:

Sketch plan for Holiday Inn Express and Suites #18-362

East Main Street, Mount Joy

ELA Group, consultant

Mr. Caldwell presented the plan. The applicants seek to develop a 4.6-acre lot on the south side of East Main Street and west of Esbenshade Road. The applicants are seeking comments on a proposed 4-story, 93-room hotel, along with a 7,500 square foot sit-down restaurant, including an outdoor patio. The hotel and restaurant are proposed to be accessed via restricted motion access drives from East Main Street and Esbenshade Road. The property is located in the Mixed Use Commercial Zoning District and would be served by public water and sewer.

Mr. Caldwell noted that the Township and various applicants have been trying to determine whether Esbenshade Road on the south side of Route 230 is a state road. It has been finally determined through the development of this plan, that section is indeed owned by the state.

Mr. Caldwell said that the traffic configuration would have to be right in/right out at both entrances. Ms. Ehrhart had concerns about whether visitors would miss the entrance and make illegal turns.

Mr. Sandy Kime was in attendance on behalf of the applicant and said that they have submitted to PennDOT for a full in-movement entrance, with a right out-movement exit on the Esbenshade Road side.

Mr. Nissley was concerned that traffic would attempt to cross multiple lanes of traffic to get to the Sheetz. The group agreed it would be impossible to prevent that at that location.

The Commission reviewed a conceptual drawing of the proposed exterior of the Holiday Inn Express.

Mr. Caldwell felt they would have challenges to meet some of the Mixed Use Commercial Zoning District requirements, particularly with regard to sidewalks.

Mr. Boyd inquired about the applicants' ownership of the private section of Harrisburg Pike at the rear of the property. Mr. Kime said the grading at that location would make it very difficult for them to add an entrance there.

Mr. Kime said the applicant was interested in moving quickly. He noted that there was survey work to complete.

The Commission agreed that this use is a good fit for this property. Ms. Ehrhart thought the traffic circulation would be the greatest challenge of the design. Mr. Kime said they were seeking a scoping meeting with PennDOT. Ms. Ehrhart suggested the applicant be open-minded to alternate traffic design.

The group agreed that there is not a need for sidewalk in the entire site.

BRIEFING ITEM:

J. Phillip Garber Revised Final Plan #18-363

684 Milton Grove Road

Strausser Engineering, consultant

Mr. Caldwell presented the plan. The applicants propose a lot add-on to combine a previously subdivided 2-acre lot with a portion of the remaining parent tract. A 20.169-acre parcel would be created. The property is located in the Agricultural Zoning District and is served by on-lot water and sewer.

Mr. Caldwell said that an additional modification has been requested for plan scale.

Mr. Greg Strausser of Strausser Engineering was in attendance and spoke on behalf of the applicants. He said they are moving quickly with meeting the conditions of the Rettew review letter.

Ms. Ehrhart made a motion, seconded by Mr. Nissley, to move the item from a briefing to an action item. All in favor.

Ms. Ehrhart made a motion, seconded by Mr. Boyd, to recommend approval of the plan conditioned upon the September 6 Rettew review letter, with the addition of approval of the requested modification of plan scale, provided a formal request is made in writing following the meeting. All in favor. The conditions are listed in abbreviated format as follows:

CONDITIONS:

ZONING

1. *The proposed "Farm Core" use needs to be defined (301.B).*
2. *The minimum lot width at the street line needs to be revised to one hundred (100) feet (§ 301.C.1).*
3. *The maximum grade for the driveway(s) shall not exceed eight (8) percent within twenty-five (25) feet of the dedicated right-of-way line (§ 515.E.3).*
4. *A riparian corridor needs to be included on the plan (§ 524).*

SUBDIVISION AND LAND DEVELOPMENT

1. *Unless a modification is requested and approved, the plan needs to be presented at a maximum scale of one (1) inch equal to fifty (50) feet (§403.1.A).*
2. *The date, final action and conditions of approval by the Board of Supervisors on any prior variances or modifications or approved modification requests needs to be included on the plan (§ 403.2.I, 403.4.J).*
3. *A Proposed Features Sheet showing all proposed improvements needs to be provided (§403.4).*
4. *A wetlands study needs to be provided (§ 403.7.E, 408.4).*
5. *An inspection schedule needs to be provided on a plan sheet to be recorded (§ 405.2.L, 504).*
6. *All certificates need to be completed prior to recording the plan. The Board of Supervisors Final Plan certificate needs to be provided. In addition, the Recorder of Deeds certificate needs to be removed (§ 405.3).*
7. *Evidence of an approved planning module, exemption request, or notice that a planning module is not required needs to be provided (§ 405.4.A).*
8. *A cost estimate, financial security, and a financial security agreement need to be provided (§ 405.4.E, 405.4.F, 501).*
9. *The following note needs to be added to the plan: "This plan reserves additional right-of-way along all or portions of the existing road frontage of the subject property. This additional right-of-way is hereby reserved for possible future use by PennDOT and/or Rapho Township for future roadway and related improvements."*

STORMWATER MANAGEMENT

1. *A stormwater management plan, prepared in accordance with the Rapho Township Stormwater Management Ordinance, needs to be provided for review and approval.*

BRIEFING ITEM:

KRM Ventures, LP Final Subdivision/Land Development Plan #18-364

Rapho Triangle East Lot F7 (1160 Strickler Road)

D.C. Gohn, consultant

Mr. Caldwell presented the plan. The applicants propose to subdivide the existing 19.142-acre property into four lots. Lot 1 would comprise 8.119 acres, with two light industrial/office buildings and associated parking. Lot 2 would comprise 2.583 acres, and would be designed for an office building to be constructed upon the completion of the improvements on Lot 1. Lot 3 would comprise 1.264 acres and would include a proposed 6,000 square foot warehouse building with loading docks. Lot 4 would comprise 7.176 acres and would be designed for a 92,250 square foot warehouse building. A number of modifications are requested, including requests for relief from sidewalk, curbing, and street tree requirements, along with several requests for waivers from the Stormwater Management Ordinance. The site would be served by public water and sewer, with sewage capacity drawn from the Rapho Triangle allotment. Stormwater is proposed to be managed by the existing stormwater basin located on the eastern portion of the site, plus additional BMPs throughout the site. The property is part of the Mount Joy Industrial Park, formerly termed Rapho Triangle East, in the Industrial Zoning District.

Mr. Caldwell noted that the property was bisected by a gas line. He noted that the applicants' proposal would include an electrical business, which is a subsidiary of Herr and Sacco on Auction Road.

Mr. Caldwell noted that the proposal as presented would result in buildings that could not meet required setbacks. He said there are a number of easements proposed to manage stormwater.

Mr. Caldwell explained the modifications requested by the applicants. He discussed their request for waivers of curbing, on which he had deferred recommendation until the applicants could show what their alternate proposal would be. The group agreed that more curbing might be necessary for such a busy site.

There were a number of modifications requested under the stormwater ordinance.

Mr. Caldwell noted that one of the buildings is proposed for a warehouse use, but he said they could change that to avoid a conditional use application for this plan. There was some discussion of the parking layout and the truck docks.

Mr. Caldwell explained that the newly added subgrade inspections and financial security requirements of the SALDO would apply to this application. He felt this is a very busy plan. He said it the largest tract remaining in the Triangle plan.

REVIEW ITEM:

Consider Zoning Ordinance amendment petition by M5v2 LLC to rezone 38.2 acres from the Mixed Use Commercial Zoning District to the Industrial Zoning District, to increase maximum lot coverage in the Industrial Zoning District, and to reclassify Strickler Road as a Collector Street

Mr. Boyd questioned the size of the area to be rezoned. Mr. Sandy Kime of ELA was in attendance to represent M5v2 LLC and clarified that the 38.2 acres includes a section of Route 283 that is included in the MUC Zoning District.

Ms. Ehrhart made a motion, seconded by Mr. Shellenberger, to recommend approval of the petition. All in favor, with Mr. Gainer abstaining.

REVIEW ITEM:

**Planning module house and cottage Sonora Farms
1919 Sonora Lane**

Ms. Ehrhart made a motion, seconded by Mr. Nissley, to approve the planning module. All in favor.

Good's Country Properties LLC, 1335 Strickler Road

The property has been previously subdivided, with this plan proposing the development of Lot 2 of 3, which comprises 3.77 acres. The applicants propose to construct a 28,750 square foot commercial building, including a 16,020 square foot warehouse, distribution and wholesale facility, a 2,880 square foot office, and a 10,540 square foot future warehouse expansion, plus parking and loading facilities and stormwater conveyance facilities. Stormwater would be managed by an existing regional detention basin on the southeastern side of the property. The proposed impervious area is 67.1%. The building would be accessed via a joint driveway. Several modifications are requested. The project was granted conditional use approval by the Board of Supervisors on April 19, 2018. The property is located in the Industrial Zoning District and is served by public water and sewer.

Mr. Caldwell reviewed the plan. He reviewed each of the requested modifications. He noted specifically that he had determined that the modification request for separate emergency access should be approved because the joint driveway would function as a local street.

Mr. Caldwell had recommended postponing action on the request to eliminate curbing, which was required in order to keep mud from accumulating on the drive. He felt that curbing was the best way to address stormwater flow. Mr. Bill Swiernik was in attendance and spoke on behalf of the applicant. He requested that the applicant not be required to provide a long continuous curb, but rather only have curbing at the entrance to the access drive. He said it would be difficult to install curbing throughout the site due to the pipeline easement. There was some discussion about adding boulders or stone to prevent

trucks from undermining the edge of the driveway. Mr. Nissley said he would feel comfortable with having boulders or bollards instead of curbing. Applicant Mr. Ferrill Good indicated that he felt boulders discourage truck drivers from going off the driveway more than tapered curb.

Ms. Ehrhart asked about the flow of stormwater throughout the site as it related to curbing. Mr. Swiernik identified several locations where the drive had been widened to allow adequate space for trucks to make the turn without running onto the ground.

Mr. Caldwell talked about the potential for pedestrian connections. He noted that they have recommended waiving landscape screening requirements each time this site has applied to the Township throughout the development process.

Mr. Boyd made a motion to move the item from a briefing item to an action item, seconded by Mr. Nissley. All in favor.

Mr. Boyd made a motion, seconded by Mr. Nissley, to recommend conditional approval based on the May 30, 2018 Rettew letter, provided that a revision to the letter requesting modification item E. is made so that the applicants would place curbing at all access drive intersections and/or boulders along curves in the parking and internal access drive areas. All in favor. The conditions are listed in abbreviated format as follows:

MODIFICATIONS:

SUBDIVISION AND LAND DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE

A. Section 305 – Preliminary Plan Application

The applicant has requested a waiver of the requirement to process a preliminary plan and, in the alternative, proceed directly to final plan.

Because this plan is subject to the provisions of the preliminary plan for Rapho Triangle East LLC, dated June 1, 1999, last revised March 22, 2000, preliminary plans are not required for the development of the individual lots. Accordingly, this request can be withdrawn, in writing, by the applicant.

B. Section 403.1 – Profile Scale

The applicant has requested a modification of the requirement to provide profiles at a horizontal scale of one inch equals fifty feet (1"=50') and, in the alternative, provide a horizontal scale of one inch equals thirty feet (1"=30').

We recommend approval of this modification request based upon the justification provided and consistency with plan scale.

C. Section 529.E – Emergency Access

The applicant is requesting a modification of the requirement to provide a separate access. In the alternative, the applicant is proposing to use the shared access drive to access the site.

Because the shared access drive functions as a "local street", and the applicant has three (3) separate access points to the shared access drive, we recommend approval of this modification request based upon the justification provided.

D. Section 602.10.D – Clear Sight Triangle

The applicant is requesting a modification of the requirement to provide one hundred (100) foot clear sight triangles at the intersections of the access drives with the shared access drives. In the alternative, the applicant is proposing a seventy (70) foot clear sight triangle at the northern entrance, and a forty (40) foot clear sight triangle at the middle entrance.

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

E. Section 602.11.A - Curbing

The applicant is requesting a modification of the requirement to provide curbing along the interior parking areas.

We recommend the Township postpone action on this request to allow the applicant to amend its request to include an updated narrative and exhibit depicting the proposed limits of curbing on the site.

F. *Section 602.12.A and B. – Sidewalks*

The applicant has requested a modification of the requirement to provide sidewalk along the north side of Strickler Road.

Because this plan is subject to the provisions of the preliminary plan for Rapho Triangle East LLC, dated June 1, 1999, last revised March 22, 2000, sidewalks are not required along the north side of this portion of Strickler Road. Accordingly, this request can be withdrawn, in writing, by the applicant.

G. *Section 602.5 – Reconstruction of Existing Street*

The applicant has requested a modification of the requirement to reconstruct Strickler Road to its centerline.

We recommend approval of this modification request subject to verification of the repair of the existing damaged curb and street base course and completion of the wearing course on the Four Star section of Strickler Road to the satisfaction of the Township.

H. Section 603.1.F., 601.3.G – Access Drives setbacks

The applicant is requesting a modification of the requirement to provide a fifteen (15) foot setback along the western lot line. In the alternative, the applicant is proposing a one (1) foot setback between the access drive and the side lot line to allow for a 1' minimum access drive setback along the western lot line.

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

I. Section 609.1.A – Landscape Screen

The applicant is requesting a modification of the requirement to provide a landscape screen along the adjoining residential properties.

We recommend approval; of this modification request subject to the applicant providing an alternative landscape plan acceptable to the Township.

STORMWATER MANAGEMENT ORDINANCE

A. Section 402.6, 501.1.D.2, and 506 – Volume Control

The applicant is requesting a waiver of the requirement to provide volume control measures via infiltration so that the post-development runoff volume does not increase for the 2-year, 24-hour storm event. In the alternative, the applicant proposes to provide water quality measures.

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

CONDITIONS:

ZONING ORDINANCE

7. General Design Note #1 needs to indicate Warehousing, Distribution, and Wholesaling as the use, in lieu of “Light Industrial” (§ 304.B).

SUBDIVISION AND LAND DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE

1. Evidence of approval of the Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan from the Lancaster County Conservation District will need to be provided (§ 405.4.C).
2. Evidence of approval and receipt of water and sewer financial guarantees will be needed (§ 405.4.E, 405.4.G).
3. A lighting plan, including access drive lighting needs to be provided (§ 602.13, 603.2).
4. Evidence of notification, concurrence of the project, and any restrictions imposed on the site by the utility easements will need to be provided (§ 608.3.A, 608.3.B).

STORMWATER MANAGEMENT ORDINANCE

1. Computations are needed to verify dewatering time (§ 402.11).
2. An Operations and Maintenance Agreement, in recordable form acceptable to the Township needs to be provided (§ 501.1.C).
3. The basins shall comply with the above-ground storage facility design criteria. The embankment top widths and exterior and interior side slopes need to be provided. The embankment construction, pipe collar, and spillway requirements for facilities with a depth of over 2 feet need to be provided for BMP Area #1. The spillway widths need to be provided. Calculations for the routing of the 100-year storm needs to be provided through both the outlet structures and emergency spillways, which should establish the top of grate for the outlet structures (not provided) (§ 505.3).
4. The applicant will need to demonstrate that the overall development of the “K Lot” will not increase the rate of runoff for the 2-yr storm event.

Mr. Caldwell noted additionally that he believed gravel had been installed at the Spring Hollow Enterprises property with no stormwater improvements since the Township’s stormwater ordinance was adopted in 2016. Mr. Keener said that the property had been purchased by the applicant in 2017.

Mr. Keener felt the applicant should not be required to meet these standards for the small business. There was some discussion on the benefits of doing work on customers’ sites rather than bringing equipment to his small buildings.

Mr. Nissley emphasized his concern that vehicles to be repaired or resold would still need to be washed. Mr. Caldwell noted that the applicant had stated at the previous meeting that he would be taking vehicles to a car wash. Mr. Nissley felt that was unlikely.

OTHER BUSINESS:

Mr. Caldwell presented a chart tracking the precipitation of the August 31 rain storm and flooding event. He noted that Rettew had inspected the structural integrity of multiple bridges and stormwater basins in the Township.

There being no further business to come before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 8:40 p.m. There was some discussion on the potential for revised standards for the MS4 plans. The Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection may be considering new requirements for defining stormsewersheds, based on deficiency letters that have been received by other municipalities. Rapho Township has not received a letter yet. Mrs. Gibson felt the Chiques municipalities' plans were not being reviewed yet because the Alternative TMDL had not been completed by DEP

Respectfully submitted,
Sara M. Gibson
Township Manager