

**MANHEIM TOWNSHIP  
PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTES  
Wednesday  
November 20, 2013**

A meeting of the Manheim Township Planning Commission was held on Wednesday, November 20, 2013 at 6:30 p.m. The following members were present: Chairman Michel Gibeault; Vice Chairman Mrs. Stacie Reidenbaugh; Mr. Donald Reed; Mrs. Anita Blumenstock; Mr. Walter Lee and Mr. Jeffery Swinehart. Mr. Ian Hodge was absent. The following Township Staff was present: Mrs. Lisa Douglas and Mrs. Shannon Sinopoli.

**Roll Call**

Mr. Gibeault called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and conducted roll call.

Mr. Gibeault announced that the Quattro Development LLC and Benecon land development plans have been scratched from this evening's agenda.

**Minutes**

Mr. Gibeault asked for a motion on the October 16, 2013 Planning Commission meeting minutes.

On a motion by Mr. Reed, seconded by Mr. Swinehart it was recommended to approve the October 16, 2013 meeting minutes.

**Motion Approved 6-0.**

**Agricultural Security Area Addition**

**i. Ronald and Karen Wenger - 2861 Kissel Hill Road**

indicated that the property owners have submitted a petition to add their 97 acre property to the Agricultural Security Area (ASA). Mrs. Douglas

advised that this property is located in the Agricultural Zoning District and currently being farmed. Mrs. Douglas  
is

indicated that some of the benefits for being in the ASA are that it protects farmer from nuisance laws such as noise and odor as well as protection from any condemnation proceedings. Mrs. Douglas advised that being in the ASA also provides additional financing benefits. Mrs. Douglas  
the  
for

indicated that some of the requirements to join the ASA are to be a productive farm, to have prime agricultural soils and to comply with the municipal Mrs. Douglas

advised that becoming an addition to the ASA is not limited to just property in the Agricultural Zoning District. An actively farmed parcel with prime soils anywhere in the Township could apply to be added to the ASA.

Mrs. Douglas  
located

questioned what would be some of the reasons that such a request would be supported by the Agricultural Preserve Board.

Mr. Gibeault  
not be

advised that lands located outside of the Agricultural Zone could generate complaints from the neighbors with regards to noise or odor or if there is a property might be earmarked to have a future sewer line constructed through it, that might be reason not to include that particular property because then the public utility would have to go through condemnation of farmland proceedings.

Mrs. Douglas  
more  
that  
another

indicated that in this particular situation, the land is located in an Agricultural Zoning District; it consists of 97 acres and is currently an active farm therefore adding this parcel to the ASA seems to make perfect sense.

Mrs. Douglas

Mr. Gibeault asked for public comment. There was no response.

On a motion by Mr. Swinehart, seconded by Mrs. Reidenbaugh, it was recommended that the subject parcel located at 2861 Kissel Hill Road be added to the Agricultural Security Area.

**Motion Approved 6-0.**

The public hearing is scheduled for January 13, 2014.

**Subdivision/Land Development Plans**

1. **Neurology & Stroke Associates MRI Unit** - Preliminary/Final Land Development Plan - 640 East Oregon Road – Zoned I-3 Industrial.

Present representing this Preliminary/Final Land Development plan was Mr. Brent Detter, ELA Group, Inc.

Mr. Detter indicated that this project is located at 640 East Oregon Road, consisting of 1.433 acres, located in the I-3 Industrial Zone and the current use is Medical Office.

Mr. Detter advised that this plan simply consists of a 1,658 square foot building addition to the south of the existing building to house an MRI Unit.

Mr. Detter indicated that the current existing number of 47 parking spaces satisfies the 39 space zoning requirement.

Mr. Detter advised that a small stormwater basin will be constructed on the northeast corner of the property in order to manage the runoff from the addition.

Mr. Detter indicated that all of the remaining staff/engineer comments will be addressed.

Mr. Gibeault stated that the plan appears to be very straight forward and that the remaining comments appear to be clean up items.

Mr. Gibeault asked for public comment. There was no response.

On a motion by Mr. Reed, seconded by Mrs. Blumenstock, it was recommended to approve this plan and modifications contingent upon a clean review letter.

**Motion Approved 6-0.**

## Other

### 1. **Manheim Township** - Zoning Ordinance Amendments

Mrs. Douglas provided a summary of the proposed revisions to the Zoning Ordinance.

Discussions took place regarding the proposal to remove the Planned Commercial Development (PCD) use from the Ordinance

Mrs. Douglas indicated that the PCD was driven by a developer back in 2007 and was somewhat of a spinoff of the Planned Residential Development (PRDs) component of the ordinance with more emphasis on a larger commercial component and smaller residential versus the PRD where the development is primarily residential with a smaller commercial component.

Mrs. Douglas indicated that there are four PRDs that have been developed over the years; Wetherburn Commons (Richmond Square), Brighton, Kissel Hill Commons and Worthington and appear to all be successful, however, there has only been one PCD, The Crossings, that has received conditional use approval thus far but has yet to be developed.

Mrs. Douglas stated that the PCD regulations were actually proposed by the developer of The Crossings for that particular parcel in an attempt to get a true mixed use on that land. The Crossings proposal included such uses as a hotel, restaurants, retail, 285 apartments and a variety of different commercial uses.

Mrs. Douglas advised that there was a second PCD proposal known as Berkshire that never came to fruition and was ultimately disavowed.

Mrs. Douglas indicated that with the 2011 Zoning Ordinance a spinoff of the PCD was added known as the PCD-1 which is what the current proposal by the Belmont

applicants are trying to develop under. The main difference between the PCD and the PCD-1 was that the PCD had a more defined traditional pattern of integrated mixed commercial/residential uses with a main street style that would allow residents to live, work and play within walking distance and not rely heavily on vehicle transportation, whereas the PCD-1 was geared more towards creating a mixed-use commercial area at or near highway interchanges.

Mrs. Douglas indicated that as history has shown with The Crossings, Berkshire and the current Belmont PCD-1; there have been many hurdles with developing under the PCD/PCD-1 regulations and requirements.

Mrs. Douglas indicated that one of the main requirements for both the PCD and PCD-1 is the extensive off-site roadway improvements that are required to be constructed. Mrs. Douglas advised that this has been a particular hurdle because of the amount of money involved and if grant money isn't received, most developers cannot make it work economically.

Mrs. Douglas indicated that the 2011 Zoning Ordinance actually pulled in a lot of the pieces of the PCD and PCD-1 regulations with the creation of the Overlays which can also require a mix of uses in certain locations. This allows for particular properties to still be able to development similar to the PCD, however, the extensive off-site roadway improvements would not be required unless driven by PennDOT similar to the off-site improvements that the Overlook Town Center must construct which is a conventional mixed commercial/residential use project developed under the D-R Overlay requirements.

In addition, Mrs. Douglas indicated that the PCD requirement of purchasing two Transferable Development Rights (TDRs) per each acre of impervious coverage would not apply to all of the Overlay zones, however, this would apply in the T-5 Overlay and that there are other provisions in place for requiring the purchase of TDRs for density, building height, building length in other Overlay zones as well as any development (whether in or out of an overlay) that wishes to exceed the base density of that particular underlying zoning district.

Mrs. Douglas indicated that there are nine Overlays within the Township. The T-1 which is the Natural Resources area and encompasses the entire Township; the T-4 which is the Urban Neighborhoods area and is located south of route 30; there are two T-5 overlay areas, the Neffsville Village Overlay and the Oregon Village Overlay; the T-6 which is the Urban Transition areas located close to the city; the D-R which is the Development Retrofit area located primarily adjacent to major corridors; the D-A which is the Airport overlay and encompasses primarily the land owned by the Lancaster Airport; the D-C which is the Corridor Overlay located primarily along Oregon Pike; the Historic Overlay which has been a part of the ordinance and is based on the 1991 Historic Survey and the Airport Safety Zone overlay which has also been a part of the ordinance prior to the 2011 Zoning Ordinance.

Mrs. Douglas indicated that because of these new overlays which provide for additional uses, mixed uses and the design elements that must be followed in the Appendices, it was suggested that the PCD/PCD-1 be removed from the ordinance.

Mrs. Douglas indicated that some of the other proposed amendments consist of adding municipal uses in all districts as well as adding regional stormwater facilities as a permitted use in all zoning districts except for the Agricultural District.

In addition, Mrs. Douglas advised that minimum lot size requirements have been adjusted back to the prior zoning regulations for single family semi-detached dwelling units in the R-2 as well as apartments and townhouses in the R-3.

Mrs. Douglas indicated that the base densities in the Planned Residential Development are being reverted back to the prior regulations and that the upper range has stayed as is requiring the purchase of Transferable Development Rights (TDRs).

There was no further discussion.

Mr. Gibeault asked for public comment. There was no response.

On a motion by Mr. Reed, seconded by Mr. Lee, it was recommended to table the Zoning Ordinance Amendments.

**Motion Approved 6-0.**

The public hearing is scheduled for January 13, 2014.

**2. Manheim Township – Floodplain Ordinance Amendments**

Mrs. Douglas provided a summary of the proposed revisions to the Floodplain Ordinance.

Mrs. Douglas indicated that the bigger ticket item mainly consists of clarifying the process as to where the Board of Commissioners have jurisdiction and where the Zoning Hearing Board has jurisdiction and to specify that specific permission uses will now be processed through the Board of Commissioners as a Conditional Use which provides an extra layer of review and allows the Board of Commissioners to grant modifications of certain provisions.

Mrs. Douglas indicated that if the applicant cannot comply with any of the other criteria in the Floodplain Ordinance (outside of the specific permission criteria) the applicant will need to seek a variance through the Zoning Hearing Board.

Mrs. Douglas indicated that in addition, riparian buffers and riparian forest buffers standards have been added to mimic the Zoning Ordinance requirements for both and definitions have been added and revised.

There was no further discussion.

Mr. Gibeault asked for public comment. There was no response.

On a motion by Mr. Reed, seconded by Mr. Lee, it was recommended to table the Floodplain Ordinance Amendments.

**Motion Approved 6-0.**

The public hearing is scheduled for January 13, 2014.

**Public Comment**

There was no public comment.

**Adjournment**

On a motion by Mr. Reed, seconded by Mr. Lee, it was recommended to adjourn the meeting.

Motion approved 6-0 and the meeting adjourned at 8:25 p.m.

The next Regular Planning Commission meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, December 18, 2013 at 6:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Shannon L. Sinopoli