

**MANHEIM TOWNSHIP
PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES
Wednesday
May 20, 2015**

A meeting of the Manheim Township Planning Commission was held on Wednesday, May 20, 2015 at 6:30 p.m. The following members were present: Chairman Mr. Michel Gibeault; Vice Chairman Mr. Jeffery Swinehart; Members: Mr. Walter Lee; Mr. John Shipman; Ms. Maryann Marotta; Mr. John Hendrix and Ms. Stacey Betts. 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 April 15, 2015 Planning Commission meeting minutes.

On a motion by Mr. Shipman, seconded by Mr. Swinehart it was recommended to approve the April 15, 2015 meeting minutes.

Motion Approved 7-0.

Subdivision/Land Development Plans

- i. **Kissel Hill Commons Planned Residential Development** – Revised Final Plan – Lots 289 & 290 - Brentwood Drive, Paxton Place and Thornberry Lane -Zoned R-2.

Present representing this Revised Final land development plan was Mr. Greg Strausser, Strausser Surveying & Engineering.

Mr. Gibeault stated that this plan has been reviewed by the Planning Commission numerous times, first as a Conditional Use request and then during the Tentative Plan phase and that this final plan is the last step. Mr. Gibeault asked Mr. Strausser just to provide a brief recap of the project.

Mr. Strausser indicated that this plan consists of 2 parcels previously zoned for commercial use with a prior plan. Mr. Strausser stated that the plans were revised to convert the use from commercial to residential.

Mr. Strausser advised that there will be 2 apartment unit buildings on one of the parcels consisting of a total of 26 apartments and 16 townhouse lots on the other parcel.

Mr. Gibeault stated that Kissel Hill Commons consists of more residential than commercial and felt that the change in use from commercial to residential was appropriate.

There were no further discussions.

Mr. Gibeault asked for public comment.

Ms. Margaret Iseman, 241 Buckfield Drive questioned the density.

Mr. Strausser indicated that the entire development consists of 90+ acres and has a density of 2.8 units per acre. Mr. Strausser indicated that these two particular parcels have a higher density however, additional open space has been dedicated as well.

Ms. Iseman questioned how the open space will be used.

Mr. Strausser said the open space is for passive recreation and also includes a non-motorized trail system around and throughout the site.

On a motion by Mr. Swinehart, it was recommended to approve this Revised Final Plan contingent upon a clean review letter, seconded by Mr. Hendrix.

Motion Approved 7-0.

- ii. **Belmont** – Preliminary Subdivision and Land Development Plan – Planned Commercial Development I – Fruitville Pike - Zoned R-3; I-2; D-R Overlay & T-1 Natural Resources Overlay.

Present representing this Preliminary Subdivision and Land Development Plan was Mr. Philip Frey, Manbel Devco I; Mr. Kevin Lahn, R.J. Waters & Associates; Mr. Alex Piehl, RGS Associates; Mr. Jarred Neal, Traffic Planning and Design and Mr. Matt Crème, Nikolaus & Hohenadel, LLP.

Mr. Piehl advised the planning members that this Planned Commercial Development 1 (PCD-1) preliminary plan was previously presented to the Planning Commission on February 19th and since that time there was a resubmission made and updated comments received from Township Staff.

Mr. Piehl conducted a PowerPoint presentation to outline the changes made since the February meeting with regards to comments received by Township Staff; Planning Commission as well as comments from the public.

Mr. Piehl indicated that this development will consist of 372,000 square feet of commercial uses and 87 residential uses consisting of 74 townhouses and 13 single family detached dwellings. Mr. Piehl advised that the residential portion abuts the existing Glen Moore neighborhood and acts as a residential buffer area for the existing home owners.

Mr. Piehl indicated that there has been a second access point added from Access Drive E to Building F in order to improve the circulation and provide some relief at the first intersection of Access Drive A.

Mr. Piehl indicated that in light of this additional access drive to Building F, a water quality basin has been added to the north of Buildings E & F.

Mr. Piehl advised that another change is in regards to Access Drive F and the revision to the movement from a right-in/right-out to right-in only due to safety concerns with the right-out and lane crossing.

Mr. Piehl discussed the movement along Access Drive A and at the first intersection. Mr. Piehl indicated that Access Drive A will be free flowing with no stoppage in order to eliminate any back up onto Fruitville Pike and Access Drive C as well as the access drive between Buildings E & F will both be stop sign controlled.

Mr. Piehl indicated that pedestrian crossing at this intersection has also been modified and reduced to one point of pedestrian movement across Access Drive A.

Mr. Piehl advised that there is an extensive non-motorized trail network throughout the site which will connect into the Glen Moore neighborhood and that sidewalk is being provided along the entire Fruitville Pike frontage.

Mr. Piehl advised that there will be a commercial main street and will consist of a mix of retail uses and restaurants with Buildings B, C & D consisting of restaurant users; Buildings A, G, H & I retail users and Building N will house Whole Foods.

Mr. Piehl stated that, with regards to concerns raised at the February meeting relating to the residential area and the concern over the lack of visitor parking, there are 25 on-street spaces being provided and 28 additional off-street visitor spaces are now also proposed. Mr. Piehl indicated that the townhouses will all have two car garages and the single family detached dwellings will all have two car garages, plus two additional parking spaces in the driveways.

Mr. Piehl indicated that there was one modification request he wished to discuss with the Planning Commission which is in regards to the request to permit overhead utility lines versus underground which would run behind the anchor stores and along the southern property line.

Mr. Piehl indicated that a project team member met with PP&L and that PP&L's primary concern with placing the utilities underground is that because these particular lines are primary lines which would limit the ability to upgrade as well as creating maintenance issues for now and in the future. Mr. Piehl stated that PP&L indicated that overhead lines are much easier to service and having overhead primary lines would make it easier to extend the service in the future.

Mr. Piehl indicated that the pole height would range from 45-50 feet and that the separation distances from the proposed poles to the existing Glen Moore neighborhood ranges from 400-500 feet.

Mr. Swinehart questioned why the overhead lines had to come back into and through the site and why that would be necessary if these lines were just servicing the site itself.

Mr. Crème explained PP&L's planned future upgrades and grid connection and the accessibility for PP&L to have these primary lines above ground.

Mr. Gibeault stated that it would be a convenience to have the lines above ground, but placing them underground is not impossible.

Mr. Shipman stated that he feels that it doesn't make sense to have the above ground lines through the site since it does not occur over at Red Rose Commons or any other developed areas and he suggested the applicants take another look at this issue.

Mr. Gibeault asked the planning commission members for general comments.

Ms. Marotta stated that it would be a misfortune to have exposed power lines within the site.

Ms. Marotta questioned what the proposal is for getting traffic accessing Fruitville Pike from York Road to the site as backups already occur at this location.

Ms. Marotta also expressed her concern with regards to the potential congestion on Access Drive A between Buildings E & F and questioned how that will function.

Mr. Neal indicated that the Fruitville Pike and York Road movements will meet PennDOT's level of service with some traffic optimization.

Ms. Marotta questioned what the level of service is now and what it will be with this development.

Mr. Neal indicated that PennDOT's level of service requirements are that you cannot degrade an intersection, so as an example if the current level of service would be a C, then it has to stay a C and if the level of service would drop, then physical roadway improvements would be required. Mr. Neal indicated that the level of service for that intersection with the timing optimization improvements will be a D.

Mr. Neal stated that, with regards to Ms. Marotta's concern about the possibility of congestion on Access Drive A between Buildings E & F, the design of Access Drive A will be free flowing to provide more queuing than necessary so there will be no blockage at that intersection.

Ms. Marotta stated that she was concerned with the person trying to go from the access drive between Buildings E & F across to Access Drive C which would require crossing 6 lanes of traffic.

Mr. Hendrix questioned the right-in along Fruitville Pike, Access Drive F and what is proposed to prevent someone from trying to leave the site via that access drive.

Mr. Piehl indicated that the travel lane to the first parking lot access points will be narrow and that signage will also be installed to prevent someone from entering that one-way movement.

Mr. Shipman questioned whether or not there were any stop signs proposed around the traffic circle.

Mr. Piehl indicated that the traffic circle is free flowing with no stops.

Mr. Gibeault suggested softening up the center of the traffic circle with additional landscaping features versus hardscape.

Mr. Swinehart stated that he has concerns with the proposed multiple restaurant usage in Building F and the traffic circulation around the building which appears to be very confusing and will be congested.

Mr. Gibeault stated that he was happy to see an additional access drive proposed to and from Building F.

Mr. Gibeault indicated that it may be helpful to have a stop sign at the northern end of the crosswalk at the square on Access Drive A for safer pedestrian crossing.

Mr. Fry indicated that they will take another look at what type of traffic slowing or calming mechanisms are out there that they could propose.

Mr. Swinehart questioned the purpose of the center thru lane leaving the site from Belwyck Drive in light of the fact that there is no development on the opposite side of Fruitville Pike.

Mr. Neal indicated that the thru lane would take someone onto the minimum use driveway that services the existing farm house. Mr. Neal advised that in designing for the future development of the farm house lot on the west side of Fruitville Pike, it was recommended by the Township Traffic Engineer to build to the full width now in order to ensure alignment for those future improvements.

Mr. Gibeault indicated that he was concerned that someone would get into that center thru lane and then be stuck with nowhere to go or with the choice of trying to meander over a lane to go left or right. Mr. Gibeault asked the applicants to take another look at this movement and come up with some type of restriction.

Mr. Crème suggested building the road to the full width for the future improvements and line painting for just right and left turn movements only for now until the farm house lot is developed.

Mr. Gibeault questioned the status of the proposed dual left improvements at Chester Road and Oregon Pike.

Mr. Neal advised that they are still working with Township Staff and PennDOT concerning those improvements.

Mr. Gibeault suggested that the applicants take a hard look into the overhead utility line issue and stated that the proposed trail system is a wonderful feature however, having 50-foot tall electrical poles running along beside it certainly does not make it an attractive feature.

Mr. Gibeault asked for public comment.

Ms. Margaret Iseman, 241 Buckfield Drive questioned what is being done to preserve the night sky with all of the building happening in the Township and what the lighting choices were for this project.

Mr. Gibeault indicated that the lighting proposed for this development is shoebox style which directs the lighting towards the ground and not the sky.

Mr. Gibeault advised that also with this project comes along the preservation of farmland through the use of Transferrable Development Rights whereby development cannot occur on preserved land. Mr. Gibeault stated that the focus is to have development occur in areas already developed, or infill areas, and saving the non-developed or underdeveloped areas.

There was no further discussions.

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

Motion Approved 7-0.

- ii. **Village of Olde Hickory** – Tentative Land Development Plan – Planned Residential Development - 600 Olde Hickory Road – Zoned R-3; B-2; B-3; D-C Overlay & T-1 Natural Resources Overlay.

Present representing this Tentative Land Development Plan was Mrs. Caroline Hoffer, Barley Snyder; Ms. Judi Rineer, Boyd/Wilson Property Management; Mr. Marc Olsen, Barton Partners and Mr. Joel Young, Rettew Associates.

Mrs. Hoffer indicated that this Planned Residential Development proposal was in front of the Planning Commission last year for Conditional Use and received a favorable recommendation.

Mrs. Hoffer advised that Conditional Use approval by the Board of Commissioners was received in September 2014 and that this tentative plan is the next step.

Mrs. Hoffer advised that the applicants have received the comment review letter from the Township and are working through those comments and will be resubmitting in the near future.

Mr. Olsen indicated that the Village of Olde Hickory campus began being developed in 1969 and is recognized as the first PUD in the state of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Olsen advised that presently the campus consists of 400 residential units and approximately 36,000 square feet of commercial uses.

Mr. Olsen indicated that this plan would increase the number of residential units to 625 which would be a density increase from 4.3 dwelling units per acre to 6.45 dwelling units per acre. Mr. Olsen indicated that the commercial portion would increase slightly from 36,000 square feet to 40,000 square feet.

Mr. Olsen advised that the residential portion will consist of 9 midrise apartment buildings, 150 townhouses and 34 carriage style units.

Mr. Olsen indicated that there will be a central gathering area within the center of the campus as well as scattered passive recreation areas. Mr. Olsen stated that half of the site will be open space.

Mr. Olsen advised that this plan also proposes a non-motorized trail connection to the adjacent Worthington development, however, the location of where this trail should be

located is still uncertain. Mr. Olsen indicated that the Township's Official Map shows the location running along the southwest property line, however, there are wetlands in this vicinity and all of the area is within the floodplain.

Mr. Olsen stated that he was hoping to get some direction from the planning members as to where they would like to see such connection.

Mrs. Douglas indicated that the location of the trail connection on the Official Map is just a general vicinity and that the Manheim Township Pathways Committee is the group that should determine the exact location.

Mrs. Douglas advised that the committee will be meeting next week and this particular trail connection will be a topic of discussion.

Mr. Gibeault advised Mr. Olsen to work with staff and the pathways committee.

Mrs. Hoffer indicated that with the Planned Residential Development ordinance, modifications are permitted and that this plan will have a number of modification requests primarily due to existing site conditions.

There were no further discussions.

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

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

Motion Approved 7-0.

Public Comment

There was no public comment.

Adjournment

On a motion by Mr. Shipman, seconded by Ms. Betts, it was recommended to adjourn the meeting.

Motion approved 7-0 and the meeting adjourned at 8:40 p.m.

The next Regular Planning Commission meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, June 17, 2015 at 6:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Shannon L. Sinopoli