

MINUTES
DILLSBURG BOROUGH PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
November 19, 2008

The November meeting of the Dillsburg Borough Planning Commission was called to order on the above date at 7:30 PM. Planning Commission Members in attendance were Chairman Allen Reeves, Vice Chairman Brian Radcliffe, Paul Eurich, and Leon Zeiders. Also present were Borough Engineer Mike Begis, Borough Solicitor Mark Allshouse, Borough Manager Karen Deibler and Borough Secretary/Treasurer Debbi Beitzel.

Joe Robinson was absent.

The following visitors were present: Francis McNaughton from McNaughton Homes and Bob Fisher from R. J. Fisher & Associates.

The first item on the agenda was the approval of the October 22, 2008 meeting minutes. Vice President Radcliffe moved to approve the October 22, 2008 as presented. Leon Zeiders seconded the motion. – Motion Carried.

The second item on the agenda was the discussion and review of the Meadows Edge Preliminary Subdivision and Land Development Plan, waivers and letter. The Planning Commission reviewed the letter dated November 17th from KPI.

1. Mr. McNaughton indicated correspondence was provided which states multifamily attached dwellings are permitted in a MC zone. Engineer Begis asked the Borough Solicitor what his position was regarding the letter dated February 20, 2002 from former Borough Manager David Witmer. Solicitor Allshouse stated the former Borough Manager who was also the Zoning Officer had determined that multifamily attached dwellings were allowed in the Manufacturing-Commercial zone; no one appealed the determination, therefore the determination has to be honored because Mr. McNaughton relied on it. Engineer Begis asked if the request has to go before Council. Solicitor Allshouse stated Council may ask him what his legal opinion is and might have some questions for Mr. McNaughton. He stated whether the current Board agrees with it or not, there is a written determination from a prior Zoning Officer which must be honored. Vice Chairman Radcliffe asked if there was an official hearing. Solicitor Allshouse stated there was no requirement for an official hearing; under the MPC, the Zoning Officer can make an interpretation, which can then be appealed. He indicated there was no appeal and the appeal period has expired. Mr. McNaughton stated the mayor (at that time) was aware of what was being discussed and forwarded the information to Council. Solicitor Allshouse indicated the Council Meeting minutes from January through April 2002 can be researched for any discussion by Council.

Engineer Begis asked Mr. McNaughton if he was looking for recommendations for the waivers. Mr. McNaughton stated he thought the waivers had already been approved. Engineer Begis indicated the Planning Commission hasn't made

recommendations on any of the waivers. Manager Deibler asked if the Planning Commission had any suggestions for Council to review in December.

2. a. 26-131.A: Stormwater management plan scale. Mr. Fisher stated this reduction (60-scale) would allow the overall plan to be shown on one sheet. Engineer Begis stated the ordinance requires a 50-scale but the plan is readable.

b. 26-146.2: The distance from stream to bottom of the embankment. Mr. Fisher stated the ordinance states 60 feet; grading needs to be done because of the road and the culverts therefore requesting a setback of 20 feet because there is no room. Vice Chairman Radcliffe asked why the plan doesn't show the modification. Mr. Fisher indicated the whole ordinance isn't typically written out on the plan. Vice Chairman Radcliffe stated he understood that, the plan could state required 60 feet requesting and approved for 20 feet. Chairman Reeves indicated the plan should include more detail. Mr. Fisher agreed to comply with this request. Mr. Eurich asked Mr. Begis if he had any problems with the request. Engineer Begis indicated the ordinance is intended typically for a floodplain; however, fill slopes tend to erode easier than cut slopes. Vice Chairman Radcliffe asked him if he foresees any problems. Engineer Begis stated no because of the nature of the site.

c. 26-143.B(2)(b): To allow the toe of the basin slope to be within 15 feet of a property line. Mr. Fisher indicated for Basin #2 they are proposing 10 feet and for Basin #3 they're proposing 9 feet. Engineer Begis indicated they're relatively close to the property line and have down slope properties, which may cause complaints from the property owners. Engineer Begis asked the reason why they couldn't be pulled back. Mr. Fisher stated to get as much volume in the basin as possible to control storm water. Mr. McNaughton stated the properties on Gettysburg Street have deep back lots. Chairman Reeves indicated most of the houses have steep hills going up in their backyards. Chairman Reeves asked if the adjacent neighbors would be able to see the basins from their houses. Mr. Fisher indicated there will be a buffer to separate those properties from the project. Chairman Reeves asked if the setback requirements are being violated. Mr. Fisher stated no. Mr. Eurich asked if there were rain gardens at all of the basins. Mr. Fisher stated yes, its part of meeting the NPDES requirements. Vice Chairman Radcliffe asked if the impact of water will change for the properties along the basins. Mr. Fisher stated the water will be controlled by draining down to the existing swale. Mr. Zeiders asked how much will the flow increase between the buildings. Mr. Fisher stated the flow is required to be reduced down to predevelopment conditions. Mr. Eurich asked Engineer Begis what his thoughts were. Engineer Begis stated structurally it doesn't have an effect; the ordinance is for the project of the adjoining properties. Mr. Zeiders asked if there was a safety issue. Engineer Begis stated no. Mr. Eurich stated he thought there were some water problems on Gettysburg Street when there were heavy rains. Mr. Zeiders indicated there is a drain along the road which is totally clogged. Mr. Fisher stated that was the reason why the Borough Engineer recommended inlets being added. There was discussion on the location of the water and sewer lines.

d. 26-142.A(4): Minimum pipe size. Mr. Zeiders asked why the developer wants to downsize. Mr. Fisher indicated the last set of review comments requested some inlets be added at the entrance to the road. He stated the inlets were added to pick up the

stormwater from the entrance and water coming down Gettysburg Street. The problem is the existing inlets are shallow, therefore requesting to use a 12 inch storm pipe as opposed to the required 15 inch pipe. Mr. Zeiders asked about the concern of silting. Engineer Begis stated the concern is with the pipe size, going below 15 inches maintenance becomes an issue. Mr. Eurich asked if it would be beneficial to have two 12 inch pipes. Mr. Fisher stated it's based on the capacity. Mr. Zeiders asked if the pipes could be something other than round. Mr. Fisher stated they had looked at other pipes. Engineer Begis stated he didn't feel the Planning Commission should act on this waiver before he can discuss this further with the developer's engineer.

Vice Chairman Radcliffe moved to recommend to Borough Council that prior to approval of any of the requested waivers for the Meadows Edge Plan, the developer resubmit the request for the waivers in a corrected and consolidated letter that includes the justifications and conditions requested; they also change the conditions of approval of the plan ultimately the plan is changed to show the requested conditions of the waiver on the plan. Motion was seconded by Paul Eurich. – Motion carried.

Vice Chairman Radcliffe moved to recommend Borough Council to approve the following stormwater management ordinance related waiver requests: Section 131.A – Stormwater Management plan scale to be 60 feet per inch; Section 146.2 – Distance from stream to bottom of embankment be a 20 foot setback versus the 60 foot setback requirement; Section 143.B(2)(b) – To allow the toe of basin number two be 10 feet and basin number three be 9 feet to the property line versus the 15 feet minimum requirement. Motion was seconded by Paul Eurich. – Motion carried.

3. a. 502.A(6): To allow private streets (Drive A, B & C) – Vice Chairman Radcliffe stated this has been discussed in previous meetings and the general feelings are to recommend approval.

b. 502.B: Street right-of-way width (60' required – 52' proposed), cartway width (40' required – 34' proposed), minimum radius, maximum street grade (Winfield Drive) – Chairman Reeves indicated he had a problem with this request and would like to see Winfield Drive the same width as the Winfield Drive in the Winfield Development. Vice Chairman Radcliffe stated it would be a safety issue to narrow the width down. Engineer Begis indicated if the Planning Commission recommends approval, he believes the Winfield Developer would be asking for the same waiver again. Chairman Reeves stated he wants this (Winfield Drive) to be a main street and traffic to be able to move through there. Mr. McNaughton asked if the Planning Commission realizes there's no parking on this street. Chairman Reeves stated yes. Mr. McNaughton indicated Winfield Drive isn't anything but a pass-through street. Vice Chairman Radcliffe stated it will carry a lot of traffic. Mr. McNaughton asked where the traffic is going now. Chairman Reeves indicated the majority of traffic going through Dillsburg isn't the residents of Dillsburg, but we need to accommodate the traffic. Vice Chairman Radcliffe stated it will be used as a shortcut to get to Old York Road. Vice Chairman Radcliffe stated from a Planning Commission standpoint this is good planning to allow for this. Mr. McNaughton stated it's not good planning; it will accelerate the speed of the traffic and make the conditions unsafe. He indicated if the road needed to be wider an alternative was to remove the sidewalks. Manager Deibler asked if the Borough wanted more traffic

turning onto South Baltimore Street without a light. Chairman Reeves stated they don't want to make a dead end street into a development. Vice Chairman Radcliffe stated the traffic will still be there whether the road is 52 feet wide or 34 feet wide. Mr. Fisher indicated a 40 foot road is equivalent to a 4-lane highway and in most new development with no parking on either side the width is 30-32 feet. Mr. Fisher stated the paving cost would increase by 25% going with the additional width of the street and it doesn't make the road any safer.

c. 502.E – Curb construction along private streets (slant curb is proposed) – Chairman Reeves asked what kind of curbs were proposed in the Winfield Development. Solicitor Allshouse stated slant curbs. Planning Commission stated they are OK with recommending approval for slant curbs.

d. 506.2.D(1) – To exceed the maximum fill slope of 3:1 – Mr. Fisher indicated they are proposing 2:1 slopes in order to bring some areas on the site to balance so the grades can work between the public streets and the private streets. He stated some of the slopes would be controlled by having a geotechnical engineer out during construction. Mr. Eurich asked for Engineer Begis' opinion. Engineer Begis indicated there could be some issues with the 2:1 slopes and the steepness of them. He stated the developer needs to justify the necessity for the 2:1 slope. Mr. McNaughton stated sidewalks on one side of the street instead of both sides, would enable them to reduce the slope. Engineer Begis stated it's a possible maintenance and an erosion issue. Chairman Reeves asked if the slope could be stabilized. Engineer Begis stated yes and the Conservation District will take a good look at the slopes. Mr. Fisher stated the maintenance would be done by the Homeowners Association. Engineer Begis indicated they will be Borough Residents and will voice their concerns to Council. Mr. Zeiders stated he had a concern with the slope behind the building having a 30 foot drop and the other one having a 20 foot drop. Mr. Fisher indicated one of the slopes was a combination of a cut and fill slope and is allowed to have a 2:1 slope. Mr. Zeiders stated a fence should be placed around the entire pond behind building 9. Vice Chairman Radcliffe asked what other solutions would there be without removing the sidewalks. Mr. Fisher stated they could add retaining walls or lower the site. Vice Chairman Radcliffe asked if retaining walls were feasible. Mr. Fisher indicated retaining walls are expensive. Mr. McNaughton stated there has to be an economic reality to it and the better option is to discontinue the sidewalk where the roads intersect. Mr. Fisher stated it would only give an additional four feet. Vice Chairman Radcliffe asked if it would be greater than 2:1. Mr. Fisher stated no. Engineer Begis instructed the Planning Commission to request a geotechnical engineer on site during construction if they recommend the 2:1 slope. Mr. McNaughton stated they would have this done in any event and would provide copies of test. Mr. McNaughton asked about the request to terminate the sidewalk. Vice Chairman Radcliffe stated his concern with the slope level was if a child or adult would fall what would stop them from going out into the street. Mr. Zeiders stated it's a 36 foot drop. Chairman Reeves stated it wasn't steep enough to roll down. Chairman Reeves indicated the main concern is water flowing over it and washing it away. Mr. Fisher indicated all the roof leaders are being piped out and the only water falling onto the slope would be rain.

e. 506.7.A(4): Number of access drives per lot – Mr. Fisher indicated there are three access drives per lot. Chairman Reeves stated when the Borough ordinance was written no one ever thought there would be numerous residents living on one lot. Mr. Fisher stated there are many ordinances that don't anticipate condominiums and it's difficult to interpret the ordinances when working with condominium situations. Chairman Reeves argued the Borough ordinance isn't applicable in this situation. Engineer Begis indicated it's a matter of interpretation. Solicitor Allshouse indicated there are two access drives. Mr. Fisher clarified there are three access drives. Engineer Begis stated there are two properties, one is OK and the other has two access drives. Vice Chairman Radcliffe asked if the developer needed approval for two access drives per lot. Mr. Fisher stated yes. Solicitor Allshouse indicated an access drive is defined as a private drive, other than a driveway, which provides for vehicular access between a street and a parking area, loading area, drive-in service window, or other facility within a land development; they aren't driveways because driveways only serve a single family or two family dwelling. Solicitor Allshouse indicated one lot has one access drive which is fine and the other lot has two. Chairman Reeves stated he felt this waiver should be granted.

Chairman Reeves indicated in item #3, the Planning Commission has a, c, d & e to recommend approval for. Mr. Zeiders stated he wouldn't agree to #3d (to exceed the maximum fill slope of 3:1). Chairman Reeves asked even with proper engineering. Mr. Zeiders stated no, it's too much of a slope. Chairman Reeves asked if the other members agreed to not recommending approval for #3b (street right-of-way width and the cartway width). Everyone agreed. Mr. Fisher stated even with a 40 foot street the minimum radius would be 150 foot and the requirement is 300 foot and the maximum street grade would be 8.1% and the requirement is 7%; which is another section of part b. Engineer Begis indicated the reasoning is because Winfield Drive is considered a collector street. Engineer Begis stated it would be a greater concern if it was toward one of the intersections. Mr. Fisher stated at the intersection the grade is 4%. Chairman Reeves asked since the street is to have a sharp curve, it can't be a main street. Mr. Fisher stated yes. Chairman Reeves and Vice Chairman Radcliffe both stated the minimum radius and the maximum street grade request wouldn't be a problem. Chairman Reeves asked if the waiver could be split. Solicitor Allshouse stated the Planning Commission could make a recommendation to approve the requested waivers as to minimum radius and maximum street grade on Winfield Drive and then can follow up with the next motion to disapprove as to right-of-way width and cartway. Solicitor Allshouse indicated 502.B is a chart and can't separate the four characteristics into sub-sections per code.

Vice Chairman Radcliffe moved to recommend to Borough Council subject to the developer providing a corrected and consolidated waiver request and including the detailed waiver requests on the plan; the Planning Commission recommends Borough Council to approval the waiver request for Section 502.A(6), to allow private streets for drive A, drive B and drive C. Motion was seconded by Paul Eurich. – Motion carried.

Vice Chairman Radcliffe moved to recommend to Borough Council subject to the developer providing a corrected and consolidated waiver request and including the detailed waiver requests on the plan; the Planning Commission recommends Borough

Council to approval the waiver request for Section 502.B, only with regards to the request for the minimum centerline radius to be 150 feet and the maximum street grade to be 8.1% on Winfield Drive. Motion was seconded by Paul Eurich. – Motion carried.

Vice Chairman Radcliffe moved to recommend to Borough Council subject to the developer providing a corrected and consolidated waiver request and including the detailed waiver requests on the plan; the Planning Commission recommends Borough Council to approval the waiver request for Section 502.E, to permit slant curbs construction for the development along private streets. Mr. McNaughton asked if it's only for the private streets. Vice Chairman Radcliffe stated the request was only for the private streets. Engineer Begis stated a vertical curb provides better separation of pedestrian traffic from vehicular traffic. Motion was seconded by Leon Zeiders. – Motion carried.

Vice Chairman Radcliffe moved to recommend to Borough Council subject to the developer providing a corrected and consolidated waiver request and including the detailed waiver requests on the plan; the Planning Commission recommends Borough Council to approval the waiver request for Section 506.2.D.1, to permit exceeding the maximum fill slope to a maximum of 2:1, with the condition the developer will have a geotechnical engineer on site to monitor and approve the stabilization of the fill and must be stated on the plan. Motion was seconded by Paul Eurich. Mr. Zeiders asked what would happen if the engineers don't approve the stabilization of the fill. Chairman Reeves stated the developer wouldn't be able to do it. Mr. Zeiders asked what happens next. Mr. Fisher indicated a geo fabric would have to be put into place or do a soil supplement. Leon Zeiders opposed the motion. – Motion carried with a three to one vote.

Vice Chairman Radcliffe moved to recommend to Borough Council subject to the developer providing a corrected and consolidated waiver request and including the detailed waiver requests on the plan; the Planning Commission recommends Borough Council to approve the waiver request for Section 506.7.A (4), relative to the number of access drives per lot, to permit two access drives to occur on Lot 3. Motion was seconded by Paul Eurich. – Motion carried.

Vice Chairman Radcliffe moved the Planning Commission recommends Borough Council to disapprove the waiver request for Section 502.B, relative to the street right-of-way width and cartway width; and recommend the appropriate width for the street to be a collector street with a 60 foot right-of-way and 40 foot cartway, which is consistent with other developments in the Borough and the connecting street in the Winfield Development. Motion was seconded by Leon Zeiders. – Motion carried.

4. Mr. McNaughton provided the Borough Solicitor with a draft copy of the Homeowners Association documents. Engineer Begis requested a copy for their office for review.

Mr. Eurich questioned general notes #25, the future maintenance and repair of a proposed retaining wall will be the responsibility of the lot owners where the wall is located and #28, the developer/lot owner shall be responsible for maintenance of retaining walls until the lot is transferred to the homeowners association, after which the association shall assume responsibility. Solicitor Allshouse stated the notes conflict and

should be combined. Mr. Fisher stated the homeowners association will be responsible for the maintenance of the retaining walls. Solicitor Allshouse stated #25 should be deleted. Chairman Reeves and Manager Deibler asked how many retaining walls there are and the location of them. Engineer Begis indicated there is one wall and it's located close to the entrance onto Gettysburg Street. Vice Chairman Radcliffe asked if there would be one or two homeowners associations. Mr. Fisher stated one. Mr. Zeiders asked if the single family dwelling would be part of the homeowners association. Mr. McNaughton stated no. Vice Chairman Radcliffe asked if the single family dwelling will be subdivided. Mr. Fisher stated it already was.

Mr. Eurich asked why Robert Sabatini was listed in the public utilities section on the sheet one of the plan under the Dillsburg Borough contact information and is Adelphia Cable still in existence. Mr. Fisher stated the information is out dated and will be corrected.

Mr. Zeiders stated Carroll Township comments should be listed separate from Dillsburg Borough comments. Mr. Fisher indicated they would separate them.

5. An owner's acknowledgement and related certifications by the Surveyor and Engineer are required to be executed. Mr. McNaughton and Engineer Begis agreed this is OK.

6. Sewage planning approval is required. Mr. McNaughton and Engineer Begis agreed this is OK.

7. An approved Erosion Control Plan and NPDES permit are required. Mr. McNaughton and Engineer Begis agreed this is OK. Engineer Begis stated typically the comments from the Conservation District would be requested for the first round.

8. Approval of the stormwater management plan by Carroll Township is required. Mr. McNaughton and Engineer Begis agreed this is OK.

9. Sidewalks should be provided on both sides of Winfield Drive and Drive A. Vice Chairman Radcliffe asked if sidewalks were proposed on both sides of Winfield Drive in the Winfield Development. Chairman Reeves stated yes and he would prefer to see sidewalks on both side of the street. Manager Deibler stated the residents want sidewalks. Mr. Fisher indicated not having sidewalks would help them with the grading. Chairman Reeves stated he understands their point of view. Vice Chairman Radcliffe indicated there was no waiver request from the ordinance presented to the Planning Commission. Mr. McNaughton stated he didn't want any sidewalks on Winfield Drive. The Planning Commission agreed they would comply with the ordinance. Mr. McNaughton stated they will submit a waiver request.

10. Traffic Impact Study. Engineer Begis indicated comments were received and will provide copies to the developer. He stated the only issue that might affect the plan is with the left sight distance on the intersection of Gettysburg Street. Engineer Begis indicated the traffic engineers can further discuss this.

11. The development as presented contains only one access. Winfield Drive within the Winfield Development is a stub street until it becomes developed. Engineer Begis stated if the Winfield Development doesn't go through, Meadows Edge is stuck with a stub street without a cul-de-sac. Vice Chairman Radcliffe stated a provision for a cul-de-sac is needed in case the Winfield Development isn't approved. Mr. Fisher asked

if placing a temporary cul-de-sac would resolve the situation. Engineer Begis stated yes. Solicitor Allshouse indicated a cul-de-sac can be put in place temporarily; if the Winfield Development doesn't get approved, the cul-de-sac would have to become permanent at time of dedication. Solicitor Allshouse indicated a note can be put on the plan to state the temporary cul-de-sac shown on the Winfield Drive connection with the adjoining Sealover property would be eliminated upon the streets being connected if Sealover's plans are approved. Engineer Begis stated there will be only one access. Engineer Begis stated an easement was provided to show the connection to Hanover Street and an adequate right-of-way was provided. Mr. Zeiders asked why the gate was at an angle. Mr. Fisher asked if the Planning Commission would like the gate to be orientated parallel to the property line. Mr. Zeiders stated yes.

12. Evidence of wetlands. Chairman Reeves asked if there are any wetlands on this property. Engineer Begis indicated there are some encroachments. Mr. Fisher stated a small DEP permit is needed.

13. The length of the road proposed in phase 1 exceeds the maximum cul-de-sac length allowed. Mr. Fisher indicated if the road is shortened, there wouldn't be any emergency access to Hanover Street. Solicitor Allshouse asked if there was a waiver request. Mr. Fisher stated no. The Planning Commission stated a waiver request is needed.

14. Street Lights. Engineer Begis indicated details of the street lights being proposed have been provided and need the Planning Commission's approval as long as they meet Met-Ed requirements. Mr. Zeiders asked if the lights were different than what has been used in the Borough. Engineer Begis stated yes. Manager Deibler asked if the lights are comparable with the lights in Winfield Development. Engineer Begis stated they are different.

15. a. Gate appears to be located partially on Hanover Street. Mr. Fisher indicated they will move it all onto the Meadows Edge property and parallel to the street.

b, c, & d. Mr. Fisher indicated ownership of the gate will be the homeowners association. Chairman Reeves asked if the president of the homeowners association will have access to the key. Mr. Fisher asked how they wanted the rules of the gate. Engineer Begis stated the lock needs to be controlled by an EMS key or a Knox Box. Manager Deibler stated a Knox Box would be recommended. Mr. Fisher asked if the Borough had a detail of what Knox Boxes should be used. Manager Deibler stated Citizens' Hose has the information. Engineer Begis indicated the gate should be used for emergency services only and not as a shortcut to Hanover Street.

e. Signs – Engineer Begis indicated signs should be placed to show the access is for emergency use only and there should be no parking signs.

f. Gate to be reviewed by local emergency services. Solicitor Allshouse indicated the developer should talk to the Fire Chief and work out all the details with him. Mr. Fisher asked who the Fire Chief was. Manager Deibler stated he should contact Ed McCoy.

16. a-e. These comments pertain specifically to the utility plans. Engineer Begis indicated the developer hasn't submitted the utility plans to DAA and didn't have

to be addressed at this time. Vice Chairman Radcliffe stated for 16e, the water line will have to be a loop water line due to the regulations of the Authority.

17. a. Engineer Begis indicated the swale along the steep slope on Winfield Drive which the Planning Commission recommended approval, they couldn't determine what size inlet was proposed. Mr. Fisher stated it's a standard Penn DOT 2 X 4 size box. Engineer Begis asked if the swale could be extended to the retaining wall. Mr. Fisher stated he would take a look at it further.

b. Engineer Begis stated the maintenance and repair to the proposed retaining wall would be covered by the HOA documents.

c. Fence at the top of the slope at basin #1A. Engineer Begis stated it was his understanding the Planning Commission recommended it being circled. Mr. Fisher indicated he thought the concern was someone coming out from the back of building #9 and this was why the fence was only placed behind the units. Mr. Zeiders asked how deep the water could get in the basin. Mr. Fisher stated six feet. Engineer Begis asked what the bottom elevation on the basin was. Mr. Fisher stated between five and half feet to six feet. Mr. Zeiders stated his concern was when the slope gets snowy; kids will sled down the hill. Mr. McNaughton suggested they would plant trees on the slope. Manager Deibler indicated the Borough ordinance and the UCC code states if anyone has a pond, pools, etc that can hold 30 inches of water, it needs a fence around it. Mr. Fisher stated the basin shouldn't hold water for more than 24 hours. Mr. Fisher stated the preference of the Planning Commission is to plant trees along the embankment. Chairman Reeves stated yes.

18. The following comments pertain specially to the stormwater management plan:

a. The detailed ownership and maintenance program is being covered by the HOA documents.

b. The toe of the basin slopes of basin numbers two and three appear to be within 15 feet of the property line. Engineer Begis stated the Planning Commission recommended the waiver for this.

c. Engineer Begis stated all parking areas proposed to have slant curbing should be properly labeled.

d. Engineer Begis indicated this didn't need to be discussed; it would be discussed with the design engineer.

e. Graphical access to basin 1a. Engineer Begis indicated the developer has provided a graphical access to basin 1a, but it's unclear how to get access to the other basins to be maintained. Chairman Reeves asked what a graphical access was. Engineer Begis stated it was the access into the basin for maintenance.

f. This was skipped.

g. Engineer Begis indicated there are some safety concerns over the proximity of basin 1b to the surrounding buildings which wasn't on the original plan. Mr. Fisher stated it was added due to Carroll Township's comments and was the only area where it could be added. Mr. McNaughton asked how deep the basin was. Mr. Fisher stated four feet deep. There was discussion on the basin's location. Mr. McNaughton stated they would take another look at this.

Solicitor Allshouse commented on Manager Deibler's question: Section 26-143.B (2)(k) Stormwater Management Construction Facilities, Detention Basins, Basin Construction Standards: Fencing may be required where the Borough, following consultation with the Borough Solicitor and/or Borough Engineer, determines the need for each specific case. Height of such fence shall be four feet to six feet and shall include a locking main gate and vehicle access.

h, i & j. Engineer Begis indicated these didn't need to be discussed; they would be discussed with their design engineer. Engineer Begis questioned why the developer was crossing Gettysburg Street rather than staying on the same side of the street. Mr. Fisher indicated it was because of the water line and possible gas line.

Vice Chairman Radcliffe moved to table the plan for continued review and for the developer to further work to address the engineer's comments from the letter dated November 17, 2008 and the Planning Commission comments from tonight's meeting. Motion was seconded by Paul Eurich. – Motion carried.

Old Business: There was none.

New Business: There was none.

Adjournment: As there was no further business, Leon Zeiders moved to adjourn at 10:06 PM. – Motion Carried.

Debbi L. Beitzel
Secretary/Treasurer

cc: A. Reeves M. Allshouse
 B. Radcliffe Mayor Snyder
 J. Robinson K. Deibler, Borough Manager
 P. Eurich Council
 L. Zeiders T. Knoebel