

**RAPHO TOWNSHIP
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES
MAY 2, 2016 7:00 p.m.**

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

The minutes of the April 4, 2016 meeting were approved on a motion by Mr. Boyd, seconded by Mr. Nissley. All in favor.

ACTION ITEM:

Wilmer and Frieda Nolt – Hilltop Acres Final Land Development Plan #16-314

347 Rife Run Road

Diehm and Sons, consultant

Mr. Caldwell presented the plan. The applicants propose to add on a .7-acre tract to their 21-acre property, remove the dwelling on the smaller property, and expand the Hilltop Acres parking lot along with access drive relocations. The 21-acre property currently includes one residential building, the Hilltop Acres Market, a barn, and various out buildings. The applicants received a variance from the Zoning Hearing Board for a “de minimus” addition to the building, including a modification of a condition of a previous decision in 1996. A number of modifications have been requested, relating to, among other provisions, dedication of right-of-way, clear sight triangles, and proximity of the parking area to the public street. Stormwater for the expanded parking lot is proposed to be managed by a subsurface infiltration trench. The property is located in the Agricultural Zoning District.

There was some discussion on why a modification had been requested relating to the 100’ clear sight triangle. Mr. Caldwell noted that to meet that requirement, the distance would stretch back so far it would eliminate a number of parking spaces. Staff had requested that the applicants complete a running speed study and Mr. Caldwell felt with the safe stopping distance and the speeds determined, they have addressed our concerns.

The applicants are proposing that a sign be posted to prevent trucks from turning right turn out of one of the driveways. Staff has recommended curbing to protect the Township road and define the entrance.

Mr. Kevin Varner of Diehm and Sons was in attendance on behalf of the applicants, and questioned the curbing requirements recommended by the engineer. The applicants felt that the curbing would be unattractive at the site. Mr. Caldwell had suggested an 8” reveal for the curb. Mr. Boyd suggested they could grade the paving to the top of the curb which would make it less visible from the house.

Ms. Ehrhart felt that the curbing was not really necessary. Mr. Caldwell said he was concerned about cars cutting the corner and driving over the edge of the road, which would damage the road over time. Mr. Nissley wondered if cars would do that much damage to the road if they strayed off the driveway if there was no curbing. Mr. Caldwell suggested the applicants could install pavement offset to give additional protection to the roadway, if the Commission was inclined to waive the requirement for curbing.

Mr. Nissley said he was OK with requiring the curbing, but would be willing to consider an alternative. Mr. Caldwell was also concerned that a no right turn sign would be ignored by truck drivers.

Ms. Ehrhart noted that the curbing would help direct stormwater which would reduce erosion.

Mr. Boyd made a motion, seconded by Mr. Shellenberger, to approve the plan conditioned on the RETTEW review letter of May 2, 2016. All voted in favor. The conditions are listed in abbreviated format as follows:

MODIFICATIONS:

SUBDIVISION AND LAND DEVELOPMENT

A. Section 305.A – 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 408.4 – Wetland Study

The applicant has requested a modification of the requirement to provide a wetland study. No alternative is provided.

We recommend approval of this modification with the condition the applicant provide a modified presence/absence wetland study.

C. Section 602.5.E – Dedication of Additional Right-of-Way

The applicant has requested a modification of the requirement to provide additional right-of-way along Rife Run Road. No alternative is provided.

We recommend approval of this modification based upon the justification provided with the condition that the applicant provide a Roadside Maintenance Easement Agreement, in a recordable form acceptable to the Township, for the future roadwork along the subject tract.

D. Section 602.10.D – Clear Sight Triangle

The applicant has requested a modification of the requirement to provide a one hundred foot (100') clear sight triangle at the western and eastern access drives intersections with Rife Run Road. In the alternative, the applicant is proposing to provide:

- *A clear sight triangle that is seventy-five feet (75') in depth along the centerline of the western access drive and seventy-five feet (75') in length in a westerly direction along Rife Run Road;*
- *A clear sight triangle that is fifty feet (50') in depth along the centerline of the western access drive and fifty feet (50') in length in a easterly direction along Rife Run Road;*
- *A clear sight triangle that is fifty feet (50') in depth along the centerline of the eastern access drive and fifty feet (50') in length in a westerly direction along Rife Run Road; and,*
- *A clear sight triangle that is seventy-five feet (75') in depth along the centerline of the eastern access drive and seventy-five feet (75') in length in an easterly direction along Rife Run Road.*

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

E. Section 602.10.F – Minimum Radii at Street Intersection

The applicant has requested a modification of the requirement to provide the minimum required thirty-five foot (35') radii at the intersection of the eastern access drive with Rife Run Road. In the alternative, the applicant is proposing to provide a twenty foot (20') radii at the intersection of the eastern access drive with Rife Run Road.

We recommend approval of this modification based upon the alternative provided with the condition that the applicant provide turning movements for both access drive intersections that demonstrate that the largest vehicle anticipated to access the site can enter, maneuver through, and exit the site without encroaching on opposing lanes of traffic on Rife Run Road and subject to the applicant installing concrete curbing at both access drive intersections with Rife Run Road.

F. *Section 605.D – Parking Compound Setback*

The applicant has requested a modification of the requirement to have no portion of the parking compound within ten feet (10') of the Rife Run Road right-of-way. In the alternative, the applicant is proposing to provide a seven foot (7') setback for the parking compound from the Rife Run Road right-of-way.

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

STORM WATER MANAGEMENT ORDINANCE

A. *SWMO Section 504.4.a.4 – Minimum Pipe Diameter (New Request This Submission)*

The applicant has requested a modification of the requirement to use a minimum storm sewer pipe diameter of eighteen inches (18"). In the alternative, the applicant is proposing to provide eight inch (8") diameter storm sewer pipes for the collection of two small onsite drainage areas for conveyance to the infiltration trench. Calculations have been provided to show the eight inch (8") pipe is capable of conveying the 100-year peak flow.

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

CONDITIONS:

ZONING

1. *Interior parking lot landscaping calculations, including shade trees, need to be provided. The area used to determine interior landscaping requirements shall include all areas within the perimeter of the parking lot, including parking spaces, access drives, aisles, islands and curbed areas. Landscaping that is situated along the perimeter of the parking area and areas surrounding buildings shall not be included in the interior landscaping requirements (§ 520.E.1, 520.E.5).*

SUBDIVISION AND LAND DEVELOPMENT

1. *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 (§ 403.2.I, 403.4.J).*
2. *The location of the percolation holes, deep probe holes, and replacement area easement needs to be provided. In addition, the replacement sewage absorption area note needs to be included on the plan (§ 403.4.M, 403.4.N, 611.C.2, 611.C.3, 611.C.4.b).*
3. *The landscape plan needs to be signed and sealed by a landscape architect. In addition, the Landscape Plan needs to be recorded (§ 405.2.K).*
4. *The inspection schedule needs to include the following (§ 405.2.L, 504):*
 - *Removal of the existing macadam within the Township right-of-way;*
 - *Installation of vertical curb within the Township right-of-way;*
 - *Proof roll one hundred feet (100') back from right-of-way line; and,*
 - *During installation of access drive paving one hundred feet (100') back from right-of-way line.*
5. *All certificates need to be completed prior to recording the plan (§ 405.3).*
6. *Evidence of an approved planning module, exemption request, or notice that a planning module is not required needs to be provided (§ 405.4.A).*
7. *A cost estimate, financial security, and a financial security agreement need to be provided (§ 405.4.E, 405.4.F, 501).*
8. *A lighting plan, including photometrics, pole, fixture, and footer details needs to be provided (§ 605.H).*

STORM WATER MANAGEMENT

1. *Evidence of approval of the Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan by the Lancaster County Conservation District needs to be provided (§ 405.1).*
2. *Evidence is needed certifying that the proposed storm water facility is not located within areas of carbonate geology features listed in the ordinance that restricts construction of such a facility. In addition, a note needs to be provided indicating that a professional geologist or geotechnical engineer, in addition to the Township, shall be contacted upon the discovery of any sinkhole or carbonate geology formations during construction of the storm water management facilities (§ 501.16).*
3. *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 storm water management facilities and erosion control facilities needs to be provided (§ 601).*

OTHER BUSINESS:

Mrs. Gibson reported on the progress of the potential renovations and addition for the Township building. She noted that the Board of Supervisors had approved a contract with Kimmel Bogrette Architects for the design of the improvements.

Mrs. Gibson told the group that Chiques Creek Watershed Alliance members and guests had participated in a tour of the White Oak dam area, led by Phil and Ed Nissley, owners of the property. CCWA, in cooperation with the property owners and the municipalities, is completing a concept plan for possible floodplain restoration improvements at the property.

Mr. Caldwell expressed appreciation for being permitted to use the Watershed Alliance's model rain garden at the RETTEW booth at the Pennsylvania State Association of Township Supervisors. RETTEW had made a contribution to the Alliance.

There was some discussion on the Alternative Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) calculation for the Chiques that is currently being developed by the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection. DEP has identified the Chiques as a priority watershed.

There being no further business to come before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 7:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Sara M. Gibson
Township Manager