

CLAY TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION

MEETING MINUTES

June 7, 2021

Members present were Jon Price, Josh Reist, Adrian Kapp and Rick Gehman.

Also present was Bruce Leisey, Township Manager.

Also present were those listed on the attendance sheet.

The meeting was called to order by Jon Price, Chairman at 7:03 PM.

Bruce Leisey introduced and welcomed Jay Zimmerman to the Planning Commission Board.

Approval of the Minutes

Josh Reist made a motion, seconded by Adrain Kapp to approve the April 26, 2021 meeting minutes. * The motion was unanimously approved with Jay Zimmerman abstaining from the vote.

Correspondence

None

Plan Review

1. Blue Bell MHP - Land Development Plan #20-05 - 8/10/21

David Mease, Diehm & Sons, reviewed the revised plan with the Planning Commission Board. The majority of the review and conversation was based on the requested modifications and deferrals.

Adrian Kapp made a motion, seconded by Jon Price to approve the following modifications and deferrals as outline in the Hanover Engineering letter dated 6/4/21. * The motion was unanimously approved.

Section 303.A - Preliminary Plan

The applicant is requesting a modification of the requirement to submit a Preliminary Plan and is proposing to submit a Preliminary/Final Land Development Plan to meet the requirements of both the preliminary and final plan requirements. The applicant feels

this is justified due to the nature and limited scope of the project. The project is an expansion of an existing mobile home park. The applicant indicates there are no new streets proposed, no subdivision is proposed, and the land development is not a phased project.

Section 402.A.6 - Profile Horizontal and Vertical Scales

The applicant is requesting a modification of the requirement to draw profiles at a scale of 1"=50' and a vertical scale of 1'=10'. The applicant is proposing to provide the profiles at a scale of 1'=30' and a vertical scale of 1'=6'. The justification provided is that the alternative scale in order to be consistent with the rest of the projects plan scale.

Section 402.C.3.b - Sinkholes and Carbonate Geology within 200' of the Subject Tract

The applicant is requesting a modification of the requirement that sinkhole and carbonate geology features be shown on the plan when located within 200' of the subject tract. The applicant is proposing an alternative to identify and address these features by way of a separate geologic report. The applicant notes that the report has been submitted in support of the project. The justification provided is that since relevant carbonate features have been adequately identified and area within the scope of the Geologic Study, they feel it is adequate.

Section 602.A.3 and Section 602.B.3 - Design Speed

The applicant is requesting a modification of this section as they establish a minimum design speed of 30 or 35 mph for roadway design purposes. As an alternative, the applicant is proposing a design speed of 15 mph for the proposed access drive throughout the project site. The applicant believes this request is justified in consideration of the nature of the project. The applicant notes that the AASHTO Green Book (Section 2.3.6) and the PADOT Publication 13M (Section 2.9) identify a number of factors which must be considered in the selection of the design speed, such as anticipated operating speed, adjacent land use, average trip length, safety, economics, etc. The applicant feels that these factors support a lower design speed than the 30-mph minimum stipulated by the ordinance. Utilizing higher design speeds would require more expansively roadway geometric features, which in run would encourage higher operating speeds. This would contribute to unsafe conditions within the mobile home park. The applicant feels a 15-mph design speed, supported by a 15-mph posted speed limit, is both logical and desirable for the project.

Section 602.J - Horizontal Alignment

The applicant is requesting a modification of the requirement that the minimum horizontal curve radius for a street shall be the greater of the design requirements of Design Manual Part II Highway Division Design and/or the AASHTO Green Book, or Table 1 as presented in the Ordinance. As an alternate, the applicant is proposing a minimum horizontal curve radius that is based on the AASHTO Green Book alone. The applicant feels this request is justified regarding horizontal alignment, Section 2.1 of the PennDOT Design Manual Part II simply refers to the AASHTO Green Book and does not present any different criteria for horizontal alignment design. The applicant notes that Table 1 of the Ordinance begins with a design speed of 35 mph and presents no

horizontal curve data for any design speed less than 35 mph. The applicant feels that Table 1 is insufficient to address the proposed design speed of 15 mph. The proposed horizontal alignment of the access drive has been designed in accordance with the AASHTO Green Book which is the authoritative source which address the specific criteria of the project.

Section 602.N.1 - 100 Foot Clear Sight Triangle

The applicant is requesting a modification of the requirement to provide a 100-foot clear sight triangle at all street intersections, measured from the intersection of the street centerlines in all directions. As an alternative, the applicant is proposing a clean sight which is equivalent to the “departure sight triangle” as stipulated by the AASHTO Green Book for an intersection with stop control on the minor road. The departure sight triangle legs would be equivalent to the recommended intersection sight distances along the major roadway (as identified on the plan), and the “decision point vertex” along the stop controlled minor road. The decision point vertex is typically measured at 14.5’ from the edge of the major roadway, or 18’ where practical (as utilized on this project). The applicant believes this is justified since the AASHTO Green Book (Chapter 9) is the authoritative source that is referenced by PennDOT with regard to the establishment of clear sight triangles (see PennDOT Pub 13M, Section 3.3C).

Section 603.B - Sidewalks required along all adjacent streets

The applicant is requesting a deferral of the requirement to provide sidewalks along the entire length of any lot fronting on a principal arterial street in the AG-Agricultural Zoning District. As an alternative, the applicant is proposing no sidewalk along the frontage. The applicant believes this request is justified as no sidewalks currently exist along West Main Street in the vicinity of the project site. The project is not expected to contribute any pedestrian traffic along the roadway. Also, the existing road shoulder and adjacent lawn area provides adequate width and grade for occasional pedestrian traffic.

Section 603.C - Curb

The applicant is requesting a deferral of the requirement that curbs be provided where sidewalk is required or provided. As an alternative, the applicant proposes no curbing along the road frontage. The applicant feels this request is justified as no curbing exists along West Main Street in the vicinity of the project site. Also, a deferral has been requested to not install sidewalks along the road frontage.

Stormwater Management Ordinance - Section 307.A.1 - Basin Bottom to be 24” above Bedrock

The applicant is requesting a modification of this section as it requires that for above-ground storage facilities, the excavated basin bottom shall be 24” above the seasonal high-water table or bedrock liming zones. As an alternative, since a basin is proposed which will incorporate a clay liner to prevent infiltration, we propose to excavate and remove any bedrock encountered during the basin excavation. The applicant believes this request is justified due to the soil probes which were excavated around the basin area indicating that there is no seasonal high-water table or bedrock within 24” of the

design elevation of the basin bottom. The applicant notes that the northeast corner of the basin will be constructed into an area with observable rock outcroppings, i.e. bedrock. The applicant feels that based on the finding of the geologic study for the project, infiltration is not recommended or proposed. Therefore, the 24" separation between the basin bottom and the bedrock limiting zone is not critical. A seasonal high-water table is not anticipated within 24" of the basin bottom based on the results of the soil probable. Any bedrock that is encountered during the basin construction will be removed down to the level of the proposed clay liner.

Rick Gehman made a motion, seconded by Josh Reist to approve the following modification request as outlined in the Hanover Engineering letter dated 6/4/21. The request was approved with Jon Price voting no.

Section 710-B - Play Areas

The applicant is requesting a modification of the section that requires that play spaces for children be provided within the mobile home park, including suitable equipment to provide safe activities for children over a wide range of age. The minimum required area is 5,600 SF based on the 23 new mobile homes lots which are proposed. The applicant is proposing an alternative children's play area consisting of 2,050 SF which will include play equipment (i.e. a swing set, a spinner and a slide). The applicant further states that they propose to supplement the children's play area with a 9,546 SF walking trail around the perimeter of the expanded portion of the site and extending along the western boundary of the existing park area. The walking trail will consist of a 4' wide wood chip surface which will tie into the main access drive at two (2) points so that a complete loop is made. The walking rail will be completed with several park benches, foot bridges over the swale area and a gazebo. The applicant feels the modification is justifies since the mobile home park primarily consists of residents who are age 55 and over. They also feel the proposed children's play area and walking trail will provide ample age appropriate and recreational opportunities for all of the residents.

There were some concerns expressed with the stormwater discharge into the neighboring property.

The Developer will investigate and attend a future meeting for plan approval.

2. Wyndale - Subdivision Land Development Plan #20-09 - 7/20/21

Bruce Leisey and Bob Lynn updated the Planning Commission Board on the status of the plan and appropriate classification of the proposed development. There has been difficulty by the Township Staff to review the current plan caused by the fact that the plan essentially proposes a stand-alone Compact Neighborhood Development absent the community amenities required by Section 542 of the Conditional Use Decision.

New Business

None

Old Business

1. Update on Regional Comp Process

Bruce Leisey updated the Planning Commission Board on the status of the LCPC North East Comp Plan. The next segment to be discussed in October 2021 is Housing Choices and Community Amenities.

Adjournment

Josh Reist made a motion, seconded by Adrian Kapp, to adjourn the meeting at 8:52 p.m. *The motion was approved unanimously.

Jon Price, Chairman

Adrian Kapp, Vice Chairman

Josh Reist, Secretary

Rick Gehman, Member

Jay Zimmerman, Member