

# MECHANICSBURG BOROUGH PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES August 24, 2015

## ATTENDANCE:

**Planning Commission Members:** Vice Chairman Daryl Ackerman, Secretary Tim DeWire, Bruce Smith, Kyle Hollick, Michael Phillips and Harry Baker

**Absent:** Chairman Chris Knarr

**Borough Council:** Council Liaison Scott Pellman and Mark Stoner.

**Borough Staff:** Patrick Dennis – Borough Manager, Greg Rogalski – Borough Engineer, Roger Ciecierski – Codes and Zoning Officer and Sara Heenan – Administrative Assistant.

**Cumberland County Planning Department:** Kirk Stoner.

**Applicants:** Tara Hiepler – Landmark Homes, Lee Bothel, Alpha Consulting Engineers, Craig Mellott – TPD, Jon Andrews - McNeese Wallace & Nurick and Jim Henke - Pioneer Management, LLC.

**Press:** None.

**Others:** None.

**Next Meeting:** September 28, 2015 @ 6:30 p.m.

**Work Session:** September 21, 2015 @ 6:30 p.m.

## 1. CALL TO ORDER

Acting Chairman Ackerman called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

## 2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE/MOMENT OF SILENT REFLECTION/ROLL CALL:

Acting Chairman Ackerman led those assembled in the Pledge of Allegiance followed by a moment of silent reflection. Attendance was taken and a quorum was present.

## 3. PUBLIC COMMENT:

Acting Chairman Ackerman asked if there was public comment for issues that were not on the agenda. None were offered.

## 4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES (ACTION):

### A. July 27, 2015 – Regular Meeting.

- **Information/Discussion:** Acting Chairman Ackerman advised that a copy of these were included in this evening's packet and via e-mail and asked if there were any comments or questions on the minutes.
- **MBPC Action:** Smith made a motion to approve the minutes and Hollick seconded the motion. The motion passed with all in favor.

## 5. CORRESPONDENCE/UPDATES (INFORMATION):

### A. Committees/Boards/Commissions Updates.

1. **Cumberland County Planning Commission.** K. Stoner had two updates of the Commission, the first being the start of a monthly e-newsletter for all those interested in receiving updates on what is going on with the County. The second being the finalization of the update to the Economic Development chapter of their Comprehensive Plan. The update that the county worked on with the Cumberland Area Economic Development Corporation provides an economic snapshot of the county, sets forth strategies to increase economic development, and identifies some targeted industries. Stoner noted that the county will be happy to share once it is in place, and it will be shared at the county outreach meetings in October if anybody is interested in attending.
2. **Historic Architectural Review Board.** Secretary DeWire reported that there was one application in August that was tabled due to no applicant being present to answer questions the board had on the application. He stated that the Board also took a look at properties for the 2015 HARB Awards.
3. **Environmental Advisory Council/Shade Tree Commission.** Baker reported that at the last EAC meeting they came up with the comments that were submitted to the PC.

### B. Municipal Notification of Developments with Regional Impacts.

1. **Traditions of America at Silver Spring Ph. 3A – Silver Spring Township – State Road – Residential.**

Ackerman made note that as well as the Traditions of America notification there were also two received

that day that were left at each Commission Member's seat, referred to as Arcona and Highpoint. The Commission took a moment to review the Municipal Notifications; having no comment they moved on.

**6. PLANS (ACTION):**

**A. Preliminary Submission – Landmark Homes – 1017 South Market Street.**

Ackerman stated that rather than have a presentation, the Commission would go down the list of modifications requested and possibly take action on them.

**1. Discussion and Possible Action on the Modifications Requested.**

- a. Section 22-604.B.(4)** *Super-elevation shall be required on minor street when curve radii are less than 200 feet.* Ackerman asked for comments and there was a brief discussion clarifying what speed limits would be set. DeWire motioned to recommend approval for modification request for Section 22-604.B.(4) pertaining to super-elevation for minor streets when curve radii are less than 200 feet, conditioned upon the streets being posted for 25 mph speed limit or less. Hollick asked if the motion should be specific to the preliminary plan or state that it is based on the June 5<sup>th</sup> submission documents and subsequent narrative. Codes Officer Ciecierski stated that the waivers apply to the entire development, not just the preliminary plan; they will not be revisited during the final submission. Engineer Rogalski stated that he does not believe it is necessary. Hollick then seconded the motion and it passed with all in favor.
- b. Section 22-604.C.(2)** *Minor streets and alleys shall be designed with a minimum 200' vertical curve distance.* Ackerman asked for any comments, DeWire stated that he had no issue with the modification as long as speed limits are posted at 25 mph or less. Ackerman commented that it would be a similar motion to the previous. DeWire motioned to recommend approval for modification request for Section 22-604.C.(2) in regard to minor streets and alleys shall be designed with a minimum 200' vertical curve distance, conditioned upon the streets being posted for 25mph speed limit or less. Smith seconded the motion and it passed with all in favor.
- c. Section 22-604.D.(6)** *Intersection: Streets entering opposite sides of the intersection shall be laid out either directly opposite one another or with a minimum offset of 200' between their centerlines. The minimum offset may be reduced to 125' with the incorporation of approved traffic calming devices.* Ackerman asked if there were any comments or discussion. DeWire stated that given there are only two intersections it applies to, he takes no issue with the modification. Baker asked if the motion needed to be specific to those two intersections, DeWire clarified that it is shown on the plan. DeWire motioned to recommend approval of modification to Section 22-604.D.(6) the SALDO pertaining to offsets of opposing intersection. Baker asked if this was a waiver or a modification to the SALDO. DeWire stated that it was a modification from the SALDO. Smith seconded the motion. Ackerman asked if it was necessary to identify those two intersections or if it is understood that is where the modification occurs. DeWire stated that the applicant cannot go back and make wholesale changes to the plan to make everything closer than 125'. The motion passed with all in favor.
- d. Section 22-604.D.(7)** *Centerline approaches to an intersection shall follow a straight course 100'.* Ackerman noted that the roundabouts in the plan were the exceptions. DeWire motioned to approve a modification request for Section 22-604.D.(7) of the SALDO pertaining to centerline approaches for intersections. Hollick seconded the motion. Baker stated that he would like to add "to accommodate the roundabouts" to the motion. Henke explained that there were other areas in the development that it applies to. With no further discussion the motion passed with all in favor.
- e. Section 22-604.D.(8)** *Curb radii at intersections shall be 25' for minor streets.* Hollick had a question regarding the response letter from the applicant to Fire Chief Seagrist, specifically the fourth bullet point (see attached). Hollick stated that there were a few areas it looked like there were changes made. Henke explained that after the Chief made his comments they went back and looked at all the radii of minor streets and when they ran the turning movements for the largest fire trucks they had difficulty getting through. So, they widened the opening to make the radii larger and then submitted the turning template drawing (see attached) to the Chief to look at and accept. DeWire asked if they got in without running up over the curb? Henke confirmed that they did and that change, if acceptable, would get changed in the full set of plans as it comes through again. Ackerman asked if in approving this on curb radii it is understood that it will be changed in the next set of plans. Rogalski suggested that "in accordance with July 22, 2015 letter" be incorporated into the motion. Phillips had a question in regard to Sketch A3 (see attached) meeting the requirements for the fire trucks. Henke assured that it would. Ackerman asked if the drawing in the response letter dated June 5, 2015 includes the fire department changes. Hollick pointed out that the title block for that sketch was still dated June 5 and

Ackerman noted that the dimensions look like they haven't been changed. Henke suggested that the easiest way would be for the Commission to put in the motion that it be in accordance with the Fire Chief's revision. Rogalski stated that for reference that is a 26-foot wide cart-way on the Chief's revision. DeWire motioned to recommend approval of the modification request to Section 22-604.D.(8) pertaining to curb radii at intersections for minor streets conditioned upon the response letter to the Fire Chief's comments from Pioneer Management dated 7-22-15. Smith seconded and the motion passed with all in favor.

- f. Section 22-604.E.(9) Drainage:** *Bridges shall be provided with a paved flow line and with deep aprons and wing walls at each end.* DeWire stated that this was the modification that the Commission had requested to see a scour analysis done, since the applicant is proposing not to have a low flow channel through the bridge. He made a suggestion to Henke and stated that he was fine with the modification contingent upon a scour analysis being handed in and approved. DeWire moved to recommend approval of modification to Section 22-604.E.(9) pertaining to low flow channels for bridges contingent upon a scour analysis being submitted to the Borough for review and approval prior to final plan approval. Phillips seconded the motion and it passed with all in favor.
- g. Section 22-604.F.(4).(c) General Development Standards:** *Not less than one tree shall be planted for each 3,000 square feet of total area of the tract.* After a brief discussion, the Commission decided to table the modification in order to allow for the Applicant to get a better estimate of how many more trees (closer to the mandatory 2,700) there will be planted in excess of the 817 proposed street trees. Smith motioned to table the modification, Phillips seconded it and it passed with all in favor.
- h. Section 22-607.C Lots and Lot Sizes:** *Side lot lines shall be substantially at right angles or radial to street lines.* After a brief discussion, Phillips motioned to approve the modification request as written. DeWire seconded the motion and it passed with all in favor.
- i. Section 22-604.F(7) Material and Construction standards for streets, curbs and gutters, storm and sanitary sewers and sidewalks shall conform to the Borough Standards.** After a brief discussion, DeWire motioned to approve the modification request for Section 22-604.F(7) pertaining to curbs. Smith seconded and the motion passed with Ackerman, DeWire, Smith, Hollick and Baker voting for and Phillips voting against.
- j. Section 22-612.A.(1) Other public facilities and monuments:** *Monuments of concrete shall be placed at property line intersections with street rights-of-way.* Ciecierski stated that he would like to see one to three marked per block with at least one monument every so often in order to prevent existing problems with property lines not being properly marked. DeWire motioned to recommend approval of the modification request for Section 22-612.A.(1) regarding monuments to be placed along intersections of property lines at streets right of way contingent upon the Developer working with Borough staff and the Borough Engineer to develop a plan for survey control. Smith seconded the motion and it passed with all in favor.
- k. Section 22-513.B.(3).d Existing intersections impacted by development traffic shall maintain a minimum LOS D for each traffic movement: or if future base (without development traffic) LOS is E then mitigation shall be made to maintain the LOS E with development traffic. If future base LOS is E, then degradation in delays shall be mitigated.** Engineer Rogalski explained that based on the traffic study, the Developer would be making a contributions of a fee-in-lieu of actually physically making improvements, because the actual amount of traffic the development would be interjecting into the system would be a small percentage of the amount of traffic that is already there. He also noted that this would be further expounded upon in the Developer's Agreement. Baker motioned (with Rogalski's assistance) to approve the waiver and to accept the fair share contribution in-lieu-of improvements, the amount of which would be determined through the Developer's Agreement. Smith seconded the motion. DeWire asked if the motion should note that it pertains only to two particular intersections. Rogalski agreed and the motion was amended to approve the waiver and to accept the fair share contribution in-lieu-of improvements for the intersections as identified in the traffic study, the amount of which would be determined through the Developer's Agreement. DeWire asked if based on this waiver request the Commission is to understand that the other intersections looked at in the study will meet the level of service requirements of the ordinance? Rogalski stated that it would, or the improvements that are suggested in the study will be implemented. Ackerman clarified that those improvements will be followed through on even though this waiver is being approved. Rogalski stated that they would. With no further discussion the motion passed with all in favor.
- l. Section 26-121.9 Storage facilities should completely drain both the volume control and rate control capacities within 72 hours from when the end design storm, subject to site conditions.** After a brief discussion on the need for more information and revised calculations, DeWire

motioned to table the modification request for Section 26-121.9 of the Stormwater Management Ordinance. Phillips seconded and the motion passed with all in favor.

- m. Section 26-123.A.(1)** *Do not increase the Post-Development total run-off volume for all storms equal to or less than two-year, 24-hour duration precipitation.* After discussion it was decided to table the modification until the Commission can see the revised stormwater calculations. Phillips made a motion to table the modification, pending further investigation. DeWire seconded the motion and it passed with all in favor.
- n. Section 26-125.5.F** *Basins which are located in or adjacent to a residential zone and viewed by the Borough as a potential hazard to the public safety shall be completely surrounded by a fence or wall not less than four feet in height, the fence or wall shall not have any opening or gap larger than two inches.* Hollick stated that he thought this idea was much better than a fence. After a brief off topic discussion, Hollick motioned to approve the request for Section 26-125.5.F as it pertains to the fence around the basins. Baker seconded the motion and it passed with all in favor.
- o. Section 26-125.7.A** *Maximum water depth (measured from the base of the crest of the emergency spillway) in earth fill dams shall not exceed six feet.* Ackerman stated that this came with no exception from the Borough Engineer. Rogalski confirmed and also stated that there is no dam permit required, in response to a question raised at the work session. DeWire motioned to recommend approval of the modification of Section 26-125.7.A of the Stormwater Management Ordinance pertaining to maximum water depth. Phillips seconded the motion and it passed with all in favor.
- p. Section 127.7.C** *The side slopes of earth filled dams shall not be steeper than three horizontal to one vertical (3:1) on both sides of the embankment.* Ackerman stated that he believed it applied only to Basin 1. Henke confirmed that it does and only at the retaining wall in Basin 1. Phillips motioned to accept the modification request as written, Smith seconded. DeWire suggested that the motion state that it is specific to the retaining wall at Basin 1. Both the motion and the second were confirmed to have included the justification that stated so. With no further discussion the motion passed with all in favor.
- q. Section 26-125.9** *For the purposes of inlet placement, flow depths for a 10-year storm event shall not exceed two inches in a gutter condition, and one-half inch across intersections and travel lanes.* After a brief discussion DeWire motioned to recommend the request for modification to Section 26-125.9 of the stormwater management ordinance pertaining to inlet placement. Phillips seconded the motion and after a slightly off topic discussion it passed with all in favor.
- r. Section 26-306.1.A.B.C** *No land disturbance activities shall be conducted and no building, structures, roads, utilities, storm water management facilities shall be placed in or over sinkholes, closed depressions, lineaments, or faults if un-remediated in accordance with the Borough's codes. (B). Nor shall any of the above land disturbances (where permitted) be located no closer than 100 feet from the rim of un-remediated sinkholes, and no closer than 50 feet from lineaments, faults, or closed depressions. (C). Nor shall outflows from a storm water management basin be directed to any of the above features.* DeWire stated that there would need to be notes added to the plans indicating that the geo-technical engineering-report has to be referred to and, as mentioned in the Borough Engineer's review, sinkholes need-to be remediated by the Developer during construction and anything that happens post-construction is the property owner's responsibility. Also, notification procedures will have to be put in place with the homeowner's association (HOA) and notes to that effect on all of these items need to be added to the plan so it is recorded. DeWire motioned to recommend approval of the modification for Section 26-306.1.A.B.C contingent upon notes as per the Borough Engineer's comment letter dated August 10, 2015, Item No. 20 and that further language be developed with the HOA documentation to be provided to the Borough Solicitor for review and approval prior to approval and recording of the final plans. Phillips seconded the motion and Baker asked if it was Section G20 of the Engineer's report that was being referenced. It was confirmed and the motion passed with all in favor.
- s. Section 22-604.E.(5)** *Storm sewers shall have a minimum grade of 0.5%.* Rogalski stated that the number is based on meeting a minimum velocity and due to the volume of water moving through that will not be a problem and thus the Borough Engineer takes no issue with this request. After a brief discussion Hollick motioned to recommend modification request Section 22-604.E.(5) of the Stormwater Management Ordinance as it pertains to the minimum grade of the storm sewers. Smith seconded and the motion passed with all in favor.

Hollick asked about the modification request from the Borough's sewer engineer, HRG, that came in the day of the work session. It was decided that the Commission would look at it at the next meeting. Ciecierski asked Henke about how progress was coming with United Water and he explained that United Water won't even look at their drawings until they get approval from the Borough on the final plans. Ackerman requested that staff clarify whether the HRG request is an issue that the Planning Commission should even be acting on at all. Ciecierski stated he would look into it.

**2. Discussion of the Comments from the Cumberland County Planning Commission and the Mechanicsburg Borough Engineer's Comments.**

Ackerman stated that those have been furnished to you and that they are being worked on. Rogalski stated that he has been working on them and he gave his notes from the work session to Henke. Andrews stated that the Developer's plan is to prepare for September's meeting by looking at the comments from the different Boards and Commission in 5 categories. The first; architectural design, especially in regard to the apartments and the commercial area; stormwater, as they look at the routing of the basins and de-watering times, etc.; the open space plan calculations and recreational facilities being included with open space; connectivity of the development with the Borough and within that, transition areas and finally lighting overall, specifically street lighting. DeWire also pointed out there are a few general clean up items that need to be taken care of, citing Upper Allen & County's comments on the "Borough" vs. "Township" mix up and omission of mention to Cumberland County. Andrews stated that a revised resubmission is envisioned to be prepared for October. He also thanked the Commission for their diligent efforts.

Ackerman asked for any other comments and if there were any items not discussed that need addressed. DeWire stated that he thought that all of the important matters had been touched on between the many groups' reviews. Ciecierski stated that he had a few housekeeping comments to attend to that he will e-mail to the Applicant. Ackerman stated that he too had a few he would forward to Ciecierski to send with his so as not to send the same thing twice. Ciecierski encouraged the rest of the Commission to do the same.

Hollick stated that he would like to see more as to how the commercial area would be developed and whether there was opportunity to create more public space there.

Ackerman asked if the Borough's work session notes would be provided to the Applicant. Staff confirmed that if it is so desired they can be. It was agreed upon to provide Henke with the work session notes once they are worked up.

Ackerman stated that if there were additional comments to get them to Ciecierski by the end of the week.

Ackerman asked the Applicant if they had any desire to present on anything. They declined.

**7. OLD BUSINESS (ACTION):**

None.

Hollick asked if there was any update from Rebecca Yearick on her redevelopment project. Dennis stated that there was not as there is a lot of red tape to get around and that the project is moving in the right direction, just at a slower pace than Yearick was anticipating.

**8. NEW BUSINESS (ACTION):**

None.

**9. COMMENTS FOR THE GOOD OF THE ORDER**

Secretary DeWire asked that motorists yield to pedestrians in crosswalks and especially in sidewalks.

Smith asked as to why there were curb cuts going on at the start of school. Ciecierski stated that it was supposed to begin in late June/July.

**10. ADJOURNMENT:**

With no further business to be discussed, Baker motioned to adjourn the meeting at 8:33 p.m. Hollick seconded the motion, which passed with all in favor.