

**MANHEIM TOWNSHIP  
PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTES  
Wednesday  
June 18, 2014**

A meeting of the Manheim Township Planning Commission was held on Wednesday, June 18, 2014 at 6:30 p.m. The following members were present: Chairman Mr. Michael Gibeault; Vice Chairman Mrs. Stacie Reidenbaugh; Mr. Donald Reed; Mr. Walter Lee; Mr. Jeffery Swinehart; Mr. John Shipman and Ms. Maryann Marotta. 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.

**Minutes**

Mr. Gibeault asked for a motion on the May 21, 2014 Planning Commission meeting minutes.

On a motion by Mr. Reed it was recommended to approve the May 21, 2014 meeting minutes, seconded by Mr. Shipman.

**Motion Approved 7-0.**

**Subdivision/Land Development Plans**

1. **Lancaster Bible College Student Housing** – Preliminary/Final Land Development Plan – 901 Eden Road – Zoned Institutional.

Present representing this Preliminary/Final Land Development plan was Mr. Dave Madary, Derck & Edson.

Mr. Madary indicated that some of the existing housing, Brubaker Hall and Clemons Hall are outdated and as a part of the overall master plan for the college, both will be phased out.

Mr. Madary advised that there has also been a modest bump in enrollment, therefore the college is pursuing new housing.

Mr. Madary indicated that there are currently 34 housing units in both Brubaker Hall and Clemons Hall for a total of 68 beds that will be phased out and that Brubaker Hall will be demolished to provide for a plaza area and Clemons Hall will eventually be converted into offices.

Mr. Madary advised that the proposed new building will house 110 units for a total of 42 additional beds.

Mr. Madary indicated that existing parking is sufficient and that the existing Township linear trail will be somewhat realigned. Mr. Madary also advised that there will be plaza space between the new Frey Center, the new housing building and the iLead building that will include green space, walks and seating areas.

Mr. Madary indicated that they are in receipt of the Township comment review letter and will be working on addressing those comments.

There were no further discussions.

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

On a motion by Mr. Shipman, it was recommended to table this plan and modifications until all outstanding review comments are adequately addressed, seconded by Mr. Reed.

**Motion Approved 7-0.**

### **Conditional Use Requests**

1. **Village of Olde Hickory Planned Residential Development** – Conditional Use Request – 600 Olde Hickory Road - Zoned R-3; B-2; B-3; D-C Overlay.

Present representing this Conditional Use request was Mr. Paul Browning, Barley Snyder; Mr. Norris Boyd and Ms. Judi Rineer, Boyd/Wilson Property Management; Mr. Seth Shapiro, Barton Partners and Mr. Grant Smith, Rettew Associates.

Mr. Boyd provided a background of the Village of Olde Hickory (VOH) campus which began being developed in 1969 and is recognized as the first PUD in the state of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Boyd advised that VOH is now ready for the next 50 years by planning improvements and additional housing units which has been in the works for 3-4 years.

Mr. Boyd advised that there are issues with the existing older buildings that need corrected and the more modern buildings will be rehabilitated inside in order to bring those buildings up to standards and since the other buildings would need massive renovations, which does not make sense, those buildings will be replaced with new structures. Mr. Boyd stated that the additional density proposed will dilute the buildings that will be torn down.

Mr. Boyd indicated that the new product will be a mix of townhomes, apartments and carriage houses and that garages will also be provided.

Mrs. Reidenbaugh advised Mr. Boyd that there have been calls to the planning commission members as well as township staff with regards to inquiries concerning this proposal and that the callers have indicated that VOH management isn't providing them with any answers. Mrs. Reidenbaugh questioned whether or not this master plan has been shared with the existing tenants and if not, suggested that the applicants keep the current tenants informed since this is now a formal submission which is public knowledge.

Mr. Boyd indicated that he doesn't want to promise something to the tenants when plan approval is still uncertain.

Mr. Gibeault stated that the proposal is an overall improvement to the property and that the tenants should be made aware of the proposals.

Mr. Boyd advised that the tenants have been informed that a long term plan has been in the works and that there has been ongoing conversations with the planning commission regarding such plan.

Mr. Shapiro indicated that there are currently 400 units on the VOH campus and that the first phase will consist of the removal of 24 units and 32 new townhouse units, therefore he is not concerned about any tenants being displaced because the total unit count will never go under 400 units in any of the proposed phases.

Mr. Shapiro provided renderings of the site layout and architecture of each of the proposed structures.

Mr. Boyd advised that the structures to remain will also be refaced in order to blend in with the new structures.

Mr. Gibeault stated that VOH is an asset for this community and is well maintained.

Mr. Gibeault stated that since the golf course was removed and VOH gained that extra area, it is the appropriate time to update the campus and he is glad that this plan is moving forward with the updates.

Mr. Gibeault stated that he is encouraged by the proposal and although it will take some time, it will be worth it. Mr. Gibeault stated that he is also appreciative of the fact that the units are not just high-end units and that there are affordable options for families as well.

Mr. Smith indicated that they are taking a passive approach to the stormwater management design by proposing rain gardens, providing better infiltration and water quality and trying to get as much water back into the ground instead of releasing.

Mr. Smith advised that with all of the traffic improvements constructed with the shopping center on the corner of Oregon Pike and Landis Valley Road, the traffic impact study that was conducted for this project indicated that most of the roadway improvements were primarily at the main Oregon Pike entrance.

There were no further discussions.

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

On a motion by Mr. Swinehart, it was recommended to table this Conditional Use request, seconded by Mrs. Reidenbaugh.

**Motion Approved 7-0.**

**2. Union Community Bank Signage – Wetherburn Commons Planned Residential Development – Conditional Use Request - Fruitville Pike and Petersburg Road – Zoned R-3.**

Present representing this Conditional Use request Mr. Michael Grab, Nikolaus & Hohenadel, LLP. and Mr. Michael Mohn, Union Community Bank.

Mr. Grab indicated that Union Community Bank (UCB) is a rapidly growing Lancaster based bank and is proposing to occupy the former Susquehanna Bank site out at Richmond Square/Wetherburn Commons, but would like to add additional signage which requires approval of modifications of the Planned Residential Development (PRD) ordinance sign regulations.

Mr. Gibeault advised Mr. Grab that the proposed modifications were reviewed at the June planning commission workshop meeting and wanted to make the applicants aware that this isn't the first request for signage modifications in a PRD and that in 2008, the Susquehanna Bank came in with their own proposal and they worked extensively to get the signage that is currently out there which is 3 total building signs, 2 on the bank building and 1 on the drive-thru.

Mr. Gibeault stated that one thing everyone has to understand is that this development is a PRD, not a commercial development, and signage within a PRD is looked at completely different. Mr. Gibeault also stated that the Giant To Go had their own requests back in 2008, however, the PC held the ground that what the Susquehanna Bank was approved for was the precedent and the limit.

Mr. Grab indicated that staff did provide him with the 2008 history during a recent meeting.

Mr. Grab provided detailed drawings of each sign and walked through the individual modification requests.

Mr. Grab indicated that pages 1, 2 & 3 represent the main building signage which would include one at the main entrance and then one on each side wing of the building for a total of 3 signs on the main building.

Mr. Grab indicated that page 4 represents directional signage.

Mr. Grab advised that page 5 represents the drive thru signage which would include one on the east and west sides for a total of 2 signs on the drive thru structure.

Mr. Grab indicated that page 6 represents replacing the existing Susquehanna Bank tenant panel on the development center sign with Union Community Bank. Mr. Grab advised that this center sign is already lit, so no lighting is proposed.

Mr. Grab advised that page 7 represents two door signs.

Mr. Grab stated that although this proposal has more signage, it is substantially similar to the Susquehanna Bank signage.

Mr. Mohn advised that the bank needs additional signage to get exposure and to be successful.

Mr. Gibeault stated that he recognizes every retail business wants signage, however, the less the signage the more attractive a development is.

Mr. Gibeault advised the applicant that the way they are measuring the overall square footage, height, etc. is incorrect and that the entire signboard area should be included, therefore, this signage proposal is much greater than what was approved in 2008 and what is out there now.

Mr. Gibeault advised that the applicant could comply with the door signage, by only providing one instead of two and meeting the other couple requirements for height and square footage.

Mr. Gibeault stated that he felt as though 2 signs on the main building and 1 sign on the drive thru structure is enough, which is what Susquehanna Bank had.

With regards to the directional signage request and the applicant believing that Susquehanna Bank also had directional signage, staff clarified that Susquehanna Bank did not have any directional signage and that there may have been a temporary development leasing sign at that location at some point.

Mr. Gibeault questioned staff if Union Community Bank would need any modifications or conditional use approvals if they were to mirror exactly what was approved for Susquehanna Bank.

Staff indicated that there would be no need for a conditional use request and/or modifications thereof if they propose exactly what was approved in 2008 for the Susquehanna Bank.

Mr. Gibeault suggested that the applicants take the planning members suggestions and see if they can make their signage work and fit in under the prior approvals.

There were no further discussions.

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

On a motion by Mr. Reed, it was recommended to table this Conditional Use request, seconded by Mr. Lee.

**Motion Approved 7-0.**

### **Public Comment**

There was no public comment.

### **Adjournment**

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

Motion approved 7-0 and the meeting adjourned at 7:35 p.m.

The next Regular Planning Commission meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, July 16, 2014 at 6:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Shannon L. Sinopoli