

Red Lion Borough Planning Commission
Meeting Minutes
Monday, February 28th, 2022

Members present

Cindy Barley
Beth Nidam
Joyce Seabolt
Ian Montgomery
Wade Elfner

Others present

Dan Shaw, Codes/Zoning
Mike Craley, Solicitor
Samantha Craley, Solicitor
Dianne Price, Borough Manager
Stacy Myers, Recording Sec'y

Visitors

Blaine Markel

1. The meeting was called to order @ 7:00p.m. followed by the pledge to the flag.
2. **Reorganization of the Commission**—Mrs. Barley made a motion to keep Commission officers the same as last year with Wade Elfner as Chairman & Beth Nidam as Vice Chair. Mr. Montgomery seconded. All were in favor; motion carried.
3. **Approval of Meeting Minutes**—Ms. Nidam made a motion to approve the November 15th, 2021 Meeting Minutes; Mrs. Barley seconded. All were in favor; motion carried.
4. **From the November 15th, 2021 Meeting**, Dan reported Alpine Signs changed the dimensions of the sign at 675 S. Main Street, so that it met the Ordinance rather than apply for a Variance to install a larger directional sign.
5. **Land Development Plan was submitted by Glenn & Linda Rexroth Et Al for 100 Redco Avenue.** Mr. Rexroth's Engineer, Blaine Markel was present tonight for Mr. Rexroth. Before the Commission is a preliminary final Land Development Plan for Leverwood Knifeworks, who is a current tenant of the Rexroth Industrial Park in need of more space for general manufacturing purposes as well as warehouse/storage space in this 11,000 sq. ft. building. The plan is proposing to construct a building addition onto the northern side of the former Yorktowne Kitchens building. Leverwood is proposing a ramp that will extend from the existing impervious area up into the building, as well as two additional loading docks. York County Planning Commission & Borough Engineer, Jeff Shue have reviewed the plan & submitted their comments which basically mirrored each other. Blaine submitted revisions back to Jeff Shue, who was satisfied other than verifying that the number of parking spaces & the number of loading spaces complied with the Borough's Zoning Ordinance. This has been verified based on the number of employees & the square footage of the building. For the number of tenants in that location, 139 parking spaces are required & currently there are 270 parking spaces. Blaine said there are even more available parking spaces in the area, but they're not line striped yet. Glenn Rexroth has agreed to create an as-built plan of the industrial park so that the Borough can stay up to date with the tenants on the site. He agreed to have the as-builts completed 6 months after occupancy of this expansion. An aerial view (along with manual surveying) will provide a good survey of the onsite buildings. There are several loading docks onsite, but Leverwood will be adding two additional docks. Blaine said 30 required off-street loading docks are required for the location & there are currently 55 onsite (including the 3 more that Leverwood is proposing). There are four Waiver requests for the plan:
 - Submittal of a Preliminary Plan as a Final—*Jeff Shue had no objections to this*
 - Existing topography contours for the entire tract—*when surveyed by air, it will be an accurate site survey of the whole parcel; however, the area right around Leverwood has already been manually surveyed.*

- Location of all existing improvements & utilities—*plan is showing what needs to be done based on only Leverwood; however, on an as-built, all will be shown*
- Location, arrangement & dimensions of all parking spaces—*once the aerial survey & as-builts are completed, all will be known, but with just the Leverwood plan, 41 parking spaces are proposed + more to be line striped.*

Of note, the only work outstanding on this site, once Leverwood's addition is complete, would be from the 2nd plan submitted when Mr. Rexroth proposed building two 15,000 sq. ft. buildings (behind trailer park).

Mrs. Price stated Jeff Shue was comfortable with the proposed as-builts & the 6-month timeframe for Mr. Rexroth to submit them.

Mrs. Barley made a motion to recommend approval of all 4 Waivers as presented; Ms. Seabolt seconded. All were in favor; motion carried.

Mrs. Barley made a motion to recommend approval of the 2/21/2022 version of the Land Development Plan with all appropriate notes regarding the 6-month timeframe (after occupancy) for as-built submittal; Ms. Seabolt seconded. All were in favor; motion carried.

Blaine foresees building to begin as soon as permission is obtained because Leverwood is anxious to move forward.

6. **Other Business to come before the Committee**

- Dan Shaw asked for Commission input on the interpretation of the “clear sight triangle” in the Zoning Ordinance. Arterial & collector streets are considered main streets & require a 150’ clear sight triangle. His questions pertained mainly to the lot on the corner of High Street & N. Franklin Street where the trailer was vacated. He was contacted by someone who questioned what could be put on that lot. Being a corner lot, there would be two “fronts” for this parcel.

Is the intent for 150’ on both High & N. Franklin, that nothing higher than 3’ be in that whole sight triangle? Or was the interpretation 150’ down High Street when sitting at the Stop sign? “Sight Distance” & “Sight Triangle” are used interchangeably in the Zoning Ordinance, so he wanted clarification. From working in traffic planning for years, Ms. Nidam said everything in a sight triangle is to be 3’ or below in order for the driver to see; however, sometimes the topography limits sight distance.

Committee members & Mr. Craley said it makes sense to measure the sight triangle from the Stop bar (painted line on the road at the Stop sign). Maybe that was the intention in the Zoning Ordinance, but with no diagram it’s hard to determine. Ms. Nidam will research this & report back to Dan & the Commission with diagrams that may be helpful in interpreting this.

Given the history of this lot, Mr. Craley said dimensional Variance relief would be warranted, should someone want to build something on that parcel.

- Ian Montgomery discussed a situation that occurred in the Fall involving the demolition of a 3-story building near his house. The contractor installed no fencing while demolishing, so concrete blocks were falling near his vehicle & surrounding properties. He questioned why the Borough didn’t require a fence be installed for safety purposes while demolishing a 3-story building.

Dan & Mrs. Price said if anyone would get hurt, it would be the contractor’s insurance company who is held responsible.

Dan had talked to the contractor about the unsafe conditions & the contractor said the building was unstable to begin with. But when it’s actively being demolished, Ian would think the Borough could require fencing to be installed around it. Dan said if he would’ve written a Notice of Violation, the violator has 90 days in which to bring a property into compliance. By that time, the building would’ve been down.

A permit is required for a demolition, as part of the UCC (Uniform Construction Code) but a 3rd-party inspector, not the Borough, signs off on the permit. The 3rd-party would oversee the project & enforce necessary action. The Borough wouldn't have anything to do with it.

Going forward, this type of issue could be discussed with contractors when safety is an issue & precautions should be taken.

7. **Adjournment**—With no further business before the Committee, Mrs. Barley made a motion to adjourn the meeting @ 8:02p.m. Motion carried; meeting adjourned.

Respectfully submitted by:

Stacy Myers, Recording Secretary