

**SPRINGETTSBURY TOWNSHIP
WORK SESSION**

**APRIL 6, 2017
APPROVED**

The Springettsbury Township Board of Supervisors held a Work Session on Thursday, April 6, 2017 at 6:15 p.m. at the offices of Springettsbury Township located at 1501 Mt. Zion Road, York, PA.

MEMBERS IN

ATTENDANCE: Mark Swomley, Chairman
George Dvoryak, Vice Chairman
Kathleen Phan, Assistant Secretary/Treasurer
Blanda Nace

MEMBERS NOT

IN ATTENDANCE: Bill Schenck

ALSO IN

ATTENDANCE: Benjamin Marchant, Township Manager
Charles Rausch, Solicitor
John Luciani, Civil Engineer
Dennis Crabill, Environmental Engineer
Jessica Fieldhouse, Director of Community Development
Mark Hodgkinson, Director of Public Works/WWT
Dori Bowders, Manager of Administrative Operations
Shawn Strausbaugh, Plan Review and Inspections Supervisor, Community Development
Raphael Caloia, Planning Assistant, Community Development
Jean Abreght, Stenographer

1. CALL TO ORDER

A. Opening Ceremony

SWOMLEY Chairman Swomley called the special Work Session to order. He stated the purpose of the Work Session involved three issues: Timber Harvest Services on Township Property, MS4 and Proposed Township Fee Schedule.

2. NEW BUSINESS

A. Timber Harvest Services on Township Property – J. L. Gossert & Co. Forestry

HODGKINSON Mr. Hodgkinson introduced the subject, which had been discussed during a January meeting. Mr. Jeff Gossert had reviewed various township lands for timber harvest. There were two specific parcels: Waste Water Treatment Plant and an area at Camp Security. Mr. Gossert supplied a very detailed report that indicated there is a viable crop of timber at both locations.

GOSSERT Mr. Gossert provided a review of his findings and offered to respond to any questions. A summary follows:

- Parcels involved are on Lower Glades Road (2) and Locust Grove Road (2) with mature trees.
- Proper preventative measures and good management techniques will be used.
- First application will be trimming out the worst area; second application will be to thin crowded groups of trees.
- Outlets for purchase of small wood harvests are minimal because most buyers want large yield.
- No restrictions for harvesting were found during review.
- Potential for gaining funding may be available through the Cap 106 Management Plan through NRCS.
- Potential for negative public perception due to top debris remains; good management practices to be used and structure trees will remain.
- Residents to be informed through newsletter, Facebook, etc.
- Estimates/economics of the plan will not be known until physical inventory is done.
- No fees are involved. A Service Agreement will be created obligating Mr. Gossert to do the work. Potential timber sale may generate a value of between \$10,000 to \$12,000.

Consensus of the board was to move forward with the timber harvest.

Public Comment: There were no public comments.

B. MS4 Discussion

MARCHANT Mr. Marchant brought the MS4 discussion forward. He noted that during September/October of 2016 the board agreed to enter into the consortium on the Chesapeake Bay Pollution Reduction Plan. However, the board was concerned about the potential obligation, the financial cost and what the government structure would be. The township has indicated participation and had moved forward with meetings with the Civil Engineer, Community Development Director and York County Planning Commission. There are several deadlines to be met.

- Deadline for filing a Notice of Intent application for the permit with DEP by September 15, 2017. This Notice of Intent must include the Chesapeake Bay Pollution Reduction Plan to meet with the mandate of removing 10% sediment, 5% Phosphorous and 3% Nitrate, all of which must go through a Public Hearing.

- March 2018 -Deadline for the NTS Permit renewal for the next five-year period.
- Potential cost-sharing criteria: \$175,000 – Administration or \$4,000 per entity. Split \$28 million 55% regional, 45% local.
- Locally, miles of stream, acreage of impervious surface involved in the cost.
- Estimated \$615,000 a year for five years; a \$3 million obligation over five years; could be lower if Springettsbury is considered 28% of the regional land area; split \$28 million by 28% = \$1.25 million a year for five years or \$5.5 million.
- Six municipalities include West Manchester, Manchester, York Township, Springettsbury, York City, and Spring Garden.
- Consultant to assist with study of all the variables and costs.

DELL

Felicia Dell, Director of York County Planning Commission addressed the board with a report on the results of the YCPC work done toward regionalization of the Chesapeake Bay Pollutant Reduction Plan. She provided the overall scope of a very complex project and identified the pros and cons of joining the Consortium aspect. She identified the goals involved and the advantage of joint planning versus attempting the project as a single entity. One of the considerations is that there would need to be four actual PRP's; one for Mill Creek, one for the Codorus Creek, one for unnamed tributaries to the Kreutz Creek and one for the Susquehanna River. By joining the Consortium, only one project is needed. York County is the only county doing a regional plan and has been recognized by the state. Ms. Dell indicated that they continue to work on the funding aspect and under consideration is the creation of a Storm Water Authority, which would minimize the number of permits required.

LUCIANI

John Luciani mentioned the fact that the project was very challenging. He noted that one area, such as the Yorktown Center has a large impervious area and had spent approximately \$1 million to infiltrate and control storm water, etc. Walmart, when that was built, piped the storm water into the stream. He was concerned about the appearance of a level playing field.

SWOMLEY

Chairman Swomley questioned the sediment tonnage requirements divided among communities and municipalities in the region. As an example, if York County does a great job of preventing a lot of sedimentation entering the stream system into the Susquehanna, and Lancaster County has a lot of farmland that is dumping a lot of phosphates, etc., he wondered whether that would be recognized.

MARCHANT

Mr. Marchant noted that the time frame for a decision is June.

PHAN Ms. Phan reiterated the takeaways on this specific meeting that the board will wait until the next Board of Supervisors meeting.

MARCHANT Mr. Marchant added that he would create a memo summarizing the status.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

C. Proposed Township Fee Schedule

MARCHANT Mr. Marchant reported that Community Development has been reviewing all aspects of their purpose, service to the community, operations, protocols, process and fee structures. Additionally, the department has new staff within the last year. They did a comprehensive review of everything, as did Public Works and Parks and Recreation. A review of Parks and Recreation will be held during another Work Session prior to a Regular Board of Supervisors meeting. Mr. Marchant stated that Ms. Fieldhouse had created a memo and will respond to any questions.

A summary of the discussion follows:

- Developer's Meeting is done more of a courtesy and a fee should not be charged.
- Springettsbury is extremely favorable on the fee schedule side compared to many of the surrounding communities.
- Goal is to improve the Customer Service experience and eliminate surprises; have clear expectations of the cost.
- Bonding for Land Development Plans – Release of bonding depends upon the Pennsylvania Municipal Planning Code, a legislated process. Engineer must inspect and identify that construction has been installed adequately and to all of the township's codes and standards. Township bonds the improvements.
- Fee Schedule indicates that the Inspection Escrow should be 10% of the Bond amounts.
- Zoning Hearing Board - \$500. If an individual is asking for a Zoning Hearing Board appeal, that is proposed to be considered a Zoning Hearing Board determination, which is a legal process.
- Building Permit Fee - Administrative
- Sewage Enforcement Fee – What is defined as a Major Repair/Major Modification versus a Minor Repair/Minor Modification. All up to the SEO.
- Minor Subdivision plan increased from \$50 to \$500 to streamline items for smaller plans.
- Application Fee – An Administrative fee; either \$50 or \$550.
- Escrow to be raised to \$1500.
- Zoning Permit versus Building Permit - \$25.

STRAUSBAUGH Mr. Strausbaugh explained that a fence is not a Building Permit. A Fence is a Zoning Permit. A patio at grade is a Zoning Permit, \$25 minimum. If a roof is placed over that structure and it is a structural member, it will be considered a Building Permit at \$100 minimum. Administratively it is necessary to do a Plan Review on those plans, those construction documents to build that roof over that patio or that portion of the structure. Following that, an inspection is necessary, a minimum of twice.

A lengthy discussion took place. Ms. Fieldhouse will create a new document based on the discussion and re-submit the document for the board's review.

Public Comment: There was no public comment

MARCHANT Mr. Marchant introduced a subject that had been intended for the March meeting that was not held. The board's feedback is needed with regard to high-density, low-income housing. The applicant is looking at the old York Valley Inn site that had been cleared on East Market Street. It fits the zoning, but the developer really needs the Board of Supervisor's blessing for the project in order to be eligible for the HUD funding they are seeking. This is a request for the philosophical interest of the board to support this type of development or not. The developer, Tim Pasch, would consider rezoning those two parcels from Commercial Highway to High Density Residential.

DVORYAK Mr. Dvoryak questioned whether there is not already an area in the township zoned to allow for that type of property.

FIELDHOUSE Ms. Fieldhouse responded that there are areas of the township that are zoned R-1 high density residential. However, zoning cannot be based on income. The question is whether or not there are areas in that R-1 existing zone that are available for development.

DVORYAK Mr. Dvoryak noted that it is the high-density issue that is at question.

General consensus of the board was agreeable to the project. Chairman Swomley needed more information.

MARCHANT Mr. Marchant questioned an issue regarding the Wallingford Development, which has a May 31 deadline. The issue is with the Homeowners Association that came before the board and asked to be part of the walk through. The developer indicated he would do the walk through with the township but not if the Homeowners Association is present. He indicated he would walk away and leave the bond to the township. There will be more productive value from the developer making the improvements he is willing to make and negotiating it, that having a much higher value than anything else.

SWOMLEY Chairman Swomley indicated they should be allowed to go because we are not in a legal position to force the developer to have a walkthrough.

MARCHANT Mr. Marchant responded that they had been discussing inviting the HOA to come in, meet with staff, and let them know the concern.

4. ADJOURNMENT

SWOMLEY Chairman Swomley reminded the board of the short Executive Session to be held immediately following adjournment. He adjourned the meeting at 8:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Doreen K. Bowders
Secretary

ja