

**MANHEIM TOWNSHIP
PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES
Wednesday
May 18, 2016**

A meeting of the Manheim Township Planning Commission was held on Wednesday, May 18, 2016

at 6:30 p.m. The following members were present: Chairman Michel Gibeault; Members: Mr. Walter Lee; Mr. John Shipman; Ms. Maryann Marotta; Mr. John Hendrix and Ms. Stacey Betts. Vice Chairman Jeffery Swinehart was absent. The following Township Staff was present: Mrs. Lisa Douglas; Mrs. Shannon Sinopoli and Mr. Phil Mellott. Also in attendance was Township Engineer, Mr. Jeffrey Shue, C.S. Davidson.

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 20, 2016 Planning Commission meeting minutes.

On a motion by Mr. Shipman, it was recommended to approve the April 20, 2016 meeting minutes, seconded by Mr. Hendrix.

Motion Approved 6-0.

Subdivision/Land Development Plans

- i. **Lancaster Country Day School - Preliminary/Final Subdivision and Land Development Plan - 725 Hamilton Road - Zoned R-2 Residential District; T-4 Overlay & T-1 Overlay.**

Present representing this Preliminary/Final Subdivision and Land Development Plan was Mr. Brent Detter, ELA Group.

Mr. Detter indicated that this plan has been in the works for several months and that the latest staff review letter generated only housekeeping items; all technical issues have since been addressed.

Mr. Detter advised that the school property is dissected by three municipalities; Manheim Township, Lancaster Township and the City of Lancaster and that the plan received approval by Lancaster Township last week and that the city has deferred all reviews to Lancaster Township and Manheim Township.

Mr. Detter provided a brief overview of the project which consists of two building additions, one for physical education and the other for a theater, as well as an additional parking lot which would consist of 54 parking spaces.

Mr. Detter advised that the new parking lot will be gated and only one gate would be opened during certain times of the day. Mr. Detter stated that the gate at Shreiner Avenue would be open in the morning hours, while the gate off of Hamilton Road would be closed, and then in the afternoon the gate at Hamilton Road would be open, while the Shreiner Avenue gate would be closed.

Mr. Detter advised that the school bus drop off will remain the same which is located along Shreiner Avenue and that Shreiner Avenue will be expanded and curb and sidewalk will be added in the area of the bus drop off.

Mr. Detter stated that an access road will be constructed to align with Clay street to connect with the existing access drive for the lower school student drop off area.

There were no further discussions.

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

On a motion by Mr. Hendrix, it was recommended to approve this plan and modification requests contingent upon a clean review letter, seconded by Ms. Marotta.

Motion Approved 6-0.

ii. **The Crossings at Conestoga Creek – Preliminary Subdivision and Land Development Plan - Planned Commercial Development - Harrisburg Pike and Farmingdale Road – Zoned I-1; D-R Overlay & T-1 Overlay.**

Mr. Gibeault recused himself from discussions due to a conflict of interest and turned the gavel over to Mr. Shipman.

Present representing this Preliminary Subdivision and Land Development Plan was Mr. Ken Hornbeck, High Associates.

Mr. Hornbeck provided a PowerPoint presentation and indicated that this plan consists of a mixed use development with a retail component, which includes Wegmans as the anchor tenant and some small shops and restaurants along the main street. Mr. Hornbeck indicated that there will be a new street proposed which will loop around the project; a new hotel; 258 apartments as well as an extensive walking trail system.

Mr. Hornbeck indicated that since the last presentation and in response to the planning members suggestion, the hotel entrance is now showing as a combined shared access with Toys R Us and that the existing Toys R Us access drive along Farmingdale Road will be closed off.

Mr. Hornbeck indicated that 75 Transferable Development Rights to preserve farmland have been purchased for this development.

Mr. Hornbeck discussed the economic benefits which include 1.5 million in annual school taxes; \$200,000 in Township taxes; \$300,000 in county taxes as well as the creation of 713 direct jobs.

Mr. Hornbeck discussed traffic improvements and indicated that there will be \$8-9 million worth of improvements from Route 30 to the railroad bridge just south of the post office. Mr. Hornbeck indicated that there will be widening and construction of dual left turn lanes on the Route 30 westbound off ramp; widening and dual right turn lanes on the Route 30 eastbound off ramp; intersection improvements at the Long's Park intersection with pedestrian crosswalks and controlled movement; widening along Harrisburg Pike to accommodate dual thru lanes down to the traffic signal at the post office where it will then be reduced to a single lane thru and the far right lane will become a designated right turn lane into the post office site.

Mr. Hornbeck indicated that the retail component will be oriented around the main street which will include pocket parks, plazas, benches, lamps and street lighting.

Mr. Hornbeck advised that the residential component will consist of 6 apartment buildings; a clubhouse and pool building and a few garage structures.

Mr. Hornbeck indicated that riparian buffers and stream restoration is a part of this project as well as walking trails which will cross over to Long's Park and over to the trail system on the LCSWMA property by way of a bridge structure. Mr. Hornbeck also indicated that the existing farmhouse will be preserved and maintained.

Mr. Hendrix questioned how many hotel rooms were proposed.

Mr. Hornbeck indicated 127 rooms.

Ms. Marotta questioned if the hotel would have a restaurant.

Mr. Hornbeck answered not a full service restaurant.

Ms. Marotta questioned if the trail system would be built at the same time as the rest of the site is being constructed or if this would occur at a later time.

Mr. Hornbeck indicated that all improvements would be constructed at the same time.

Mr. Hendrix questioned if there is a connection walkway between the Wegmans store and the rest of the commercial component.

Mr. Hornbeck indicated that a walkway has been provided.

Ms. Marotta questioned whether or not there were any committed tenants for the smaller shops.

Mr. Hornbeck indicated that he has an idea of who the tenants will be but cannot disclose that as this time.

Mr. Hendrix questioned whether or not PennDOT was on board with the project and roadway improvements.

Mr. Hornbeck indicated that there have been several meetings with PennDOT and that the proposed improvements are technically acceptable.

Mr. Shipman asked for public comment.

Mr. Melvin Hess, Solicitor for the City of Lancaster, stated his concerns with regards to the impacts that this development will have on the city, especially with regards to traffic and the lack of any improvements from the railroad overpass to the city.

Mr. Hess indicated that he also has concerns with regards to the 258 apartment units and Longs Park becoming the playground for the children living in those apartments in which case they would need to cross over the heavily travelled Harrisburg Pike and although there are designated crosswalks he is concerned about the children darting across the pike.

Mr. Hess stated that although modifications to the stormwater were approved years ago and he hasn't reviewed the latest plans, he still has concerns about flooding impacts to Longs Park.

Mr. Hess stated that originally the sewerage from the site was to go to the city's system in which case the city relied on this and constructed improvements which were based on the flows coming from this project, however, he recently became aware that this is no longer the case and is not sure why that changed.

Eric Ashley, 1048 West Roseville Road (East Hempfield Township) indicated that he had concerns with regards to the 2009 Specific Permission approval; the 2011 Conditional Use approval as well as the current stormwater modification requests.

Mr. Ashley provided the planning members with a written letter expressing such concerns dated May 1, 2016 and then proceeded to read the letter for the planning members and audience. *Such letter is attached to and made part of the Minutes of this meeting.*

Mr. Ashley recommended that this plan not be approved.

Mr. Ralph Stone expressed his concerns with regards to the effect the additional commercial space will have on the existing shopping centers and outlets in the area and the probability of seeing an increase in empty stores.

There was no further discussions.

On a motion by Mr. Lee, it was recommended to approve this plan and modification requests contingent upon a clean review letter and conditioned upon the applicant addressing all outstanding stormwater comments prior to presenting this plan to the Board of Commissioners for action, seconded by Mr. Hendrix.

Motion Approved 5-0 (with Mr. Gibeault abstaining).

Conditional Use Requests

- i. **Wetherburn Commons - Revised Conditional Use Request – Wetherburn Commons Planned Residential Development South Meadow and East Meadow**

Sections - Scotland Court; Richmond Drive; Prince George Drive & Petersburg Road - Zoned R-3; R-1 & T-1 Overlay.

Present representing this Revised Conditional Use request was Mr. Randy Hess and Mr. Edward Buckwalter.

Mr. Hess indicated that the applicants received feedback from the Planning Commission last month and have since addressed those concerns and revised their request.

Mr. Hess advised that with regards to the garage setbacks from the front of the house in the South Meadow portion for 9 subject lots, the applicants have revised the request to propose a 4'-6" setback which they can make work.

Mr. Hess indicated that in response to the concern about the potential for vehicles parked in the driveway encroaching upon the sidewalk on Lots 74, 75 & 76, the applicants are now proposing to slightly relocate the sidewalk in front of these lots and reduce the beauty strip in order to provide an 18-foot length driveway.

Mr. Hess stated that with regards to the request for the elimination of the 50-foot building restriction for Lots 1 & 51 in East Meadow, the request has been revised to propose a 22-foot building restriction versus complete elimination.

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 approve this Revised Conditional Use request and modification requests, seconded by Mr. Hendrix.

Motion Approved 6-0.

ii. **T-Mobile – Conditional Use Request - Manheim Township School District - 140 School Road - Zoned R-3 & T5 Neffsville Village Overlay.**

Present representing this Conditional Use request was Mr. Tom Koch, Manheim Township School District.

Mr. Koch indicated that Manheim Township School District is replacing their stadium light poles with updated and taller poles which created the need for T-Mobile to relocate 3 of their existing antennas onto the new poles at the greater height than the existing poles. The request also consists of 3 additional telecommunications antennas.

Mr. Koch stated that the applicants have received a variance from the Zoning Hearing Board for the height increase.

There were no further discussions.

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

On a motion by Ms. Marotta, it was recommended to approve this Conditional Use request and modification requests, seconded by Ms. Betts.

Motion Approved 6-0.

Other

i. Manheim Township - MS-4 Stormwater Permit Presentation

Mr. Jeffrey Shue, Manheim Township Engineer and Mr. Phil Mellott, Manheim Township Public Works Director were in attendance to introduce the MS-4 Stormwater Permit Program.

defined Mr. Shue provided a PowerPoint presentation of the Township's MS-4 program. Mr. Shue indicated that MS-4 stands for Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System and explained that Manheim Township is located in a designated urbanized area as defined by the Bureau of the Census for regulated MS-4s.

people Mr. Shue indicated that an urbanized area is a land area comprised of a residential population of at least 50,000 and an overall population density of at least 1,000 people per square mile.

which minimize the satisfy Mr. Shue indicated that the stormwater requirements of the federal Clean Water Act are administered under the PA DEP (Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection's) Municipal Separate Storm Sewer (MS4) Program which requires municipalities to implement a stormwater management program to minimize the impacts from runoff, reduce the discharge of pollutants, protect water quality and satisfy the appropriate water quality requirements of the Clean Water Act.

management Construction Housekeeping Mr. Shue advised that under the MS-4 Program, permittees are required to incorporate 6 Minimum Control Measures (MCMs) into their stormwater management programs which are; Public Education and Outreach on Stormwater Impacts; Public Involvement and Participation; Illicit discharge Detection and Elimination; Construction Site Stormwater Runoff control; Post-construction Stormwater Management in new development and redevelopment areas and Pollution Prevention/Good Housekeeping for municipal operations and maintenance.

implementation of the above 6 measures is basically reversed. Municipal operations/maintenance is the first step; then maintaining what is built Post Construction; then preventing construction site runoff from being the problem; then checking storm sewer discharge points to find and eliminate pollution threats and finally to engage and educate the public.

potential that initially enforcement. Mr. Shue stated that if the Township does not implement such a plan, there is potential for an audit by the Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) and/or the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). Mr. Shue indicated that the Township was audited by the DEP on March 23rd with the focus of such audit being on compliance that we are meeting the program requirements. Mr. Shue advised that the DEP will be initially auditing all municipalities, with again the focus being on compliance and not enforcement.

Mr. Shue indicated that EPA audits would focus on enforcement in which case a municipality not in compliance could be fined.

to that be Mr. Shue indicated that the permit for the 2nd permit cycle has not yet been issued to Manheim Township, however, the 1st permit cycle was extended. Mr. Shue advised that the draft permit for the 3rd cycle of permitting beginning in 2018 will require such to be submitted in September 2017 with a one month public review and comment.

the
Total
Plan
Plan
overlap of the

Mr. Shue indicated that in addition to the Township maintaining the 6 MCM requirements under the current permit cycle, the 3rd cycle of permitting will require Township to create stream pollution reduction plans which includes reducing the Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) for Lititz Run; a Chesapeake Bay Pollutant Reduction (CBPRP) for sediment and PH reduction; and Impairment Plans, which is an overlap of the CBPRP & streams impaired by Pathogens, metals or organics.

retention areas and
biological

Mr. Shue discussed a detention basin retrofit project that the Township recently completed at the Overlook Campus which created reforestation areas, bio-retention areas and wetland pockets which improves the water quality through the filtration and biological processes in the basin. Mr. Shue stated that this pollutant load reduction could be a component of the Township MS-4 compliance strategy.

the
who
these

Mr. Shue stated that for the Lititz Run TMDL plan which is primarily located within Agricultural District, efforts will be made to work with the local farmers and find out who has conservation plans and who doesn't and the goal is to build partnerships with farmers.

identify the
that
be
targeted
plan

Mr. Shue indicated that pollution reduction plans will need to be established to source of pollution/impairment such as sediment, phosphorous, metals, etc. and within one year of permit coverage (2019) a map and a list of known sources must be generated showing what it is and why it is in the stream. Mr. Shue stated that the Township will then need to define the current levels of pollution and what the goal is and within 3 years of permit coverage (2021) the investigation and action associated with each source of pollution should be complete.

education

Partnerships with the private sector, watershed groups, school districts/higher institutions and neighborhood groups/homeowners associations shall be created.

township
and

Mr. Shue stated that the impacts of the MS-4 program involves all aspects of functions: storm sewer conveyance systems, roadway infrastructure; land planning recreational facilities to name a few.

increased
private
an increase in taxes.

Mr. Shue indicated that the implementation of these requirements will mean expenses and regulations for the township including administrative compliance; add-ons to public works projects; watershed improvement goals; regulations on property for improvements (since the Township cannot waive stormwater management); as well as an overall increase to township costs which equals an increase in taxes.

There were no further discussions.

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

Mr. Gibeault thanked Mr. Shue and Township Staff for doing a great job in keeping up with this MS-4 program and moving it along.

General Public Comment

There was no public comment.

Adjournment

On a motion by Mr. Hendrix, it was recommended to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Mr. Shipman. Motion approved 6-0 and the meeting adjourned at 7:57 p.m.

The next Regular Planning Commission meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, June 15, 2016 at 6:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Shannon L. Sinopoli

I appreciate the opportunity to once again express my concerns with this project. As before, I will try to be as brief. I would like to share some comments and questions on how this Plan relates to the 2009 Specific Permission and the 2011 Conditional Use Approval. I will conclude with some thoughts on one of the pending Stormwater Ordinance modification requests.

Specific Permission

The Specific Permission Request regarding floodplain encroachment was approved on January 12, 2009. It was approved with 18 conditions. Have each of those conditions been met? In Particular:

Condition 1: "The post-development floodplain volume shall be greater than or equal to the pre-development floodplain volume for all storm events."

Comment: A portion of the volume compensation lies within the proposed stormwater basins. This volume should only be credited for either the floodwater or the stormwater, not both.

Condition 2: "The floodplain elevations and velocities shall be equivalent or less than the information proposed within the Floodplain Analysis, dated October 14, 2008."

Comment: Has this been evaluated based on the current grading plan? Proper modeling would treat the interior of the stormwater basins located in the flood plain fringe as ineffective flow areas.

Condition 3: ".The post-development floodplain surface area deficit shall be limited to 1.9 acres for the 25-year storm, 3.4 acres for the SO-year storm, and 4.5 acres for the 100-year storm."

Comment: What is the flood plain surface area deficit of the current plan? Has it been checked? I did not see a delineation of the existing 100-year flood plain on the drawings.

Condition 9: "Constructed wetlands shall be provided. These wetlands shall be capable of treating the 2-year runoff from the proposed development."

Comment: What portion of the proposed 46 acres of impervious surface is directed to the proposed wetland? It looks like 7 acres, or only 15%, of the impervious surface runoff is directed to the wetland.

Conditional Use

The 2011 Conditional Use Approval included 52 conditions. Has this plan been specifically evaluated to ensure conformance those conditions? Have each and every one of the 52 conditions been met? For example: Condition 11 - "The applicant shall cause the installation of two left turn lanes from the westbound 30 exit ramp onto Harrisburg Pike and two right turn lanes from the eastbound 30 exit ramp onto Harrisburg Pike".

Stormwater Management Plan

There are 11 Stormwater Ordinance modification requests in addition to the Rate Control waiver already approved. I have concerns regarding several of the requests, however for the sake of time I would like to focus on one item - Maximum Water Depth.

The request is to exceed the six foot maximum depth for Pond C. The proposed depth is nine feet. At first blush this maximum depth limit appears to be related to safety. However, due to the geology of the site, the issue runs deep. This site has karst topography. It is prone to sinkholes. Surely enough, according to the Site Evaluation for Stormwater Infiltration dated April 21, 2016, sixteen sinkholes have been identified on the site.

The PADEP recommends that the loading ratio for infiltration basins in karst areas should be limited to 3:1. That is; for each 3,000 sf of drainage area, 1,000 sf of infiltration surface should be provided. The proposed loading ratio for Pond C is 29:1, nearly 10x the recommendation! If the surface area of the pond were enlarged to approach the recommended loading ratio, less depth would be required. A shallower pond would provide better infiltration function and reduce the threat of sinkhole development.

A Technical Bulletin from the Chesapeake Stormwater Network (CSN) lists Large Scale infiltration as a prohibited practice in karst areas. Large scale infiltration is defined as individual practices that infiltrate runoff from a contributing drainage area between 20,000 and 10,000 square feet. The drainage area to Pond C is over 1,500,000 square feet (75x the CSN limit). The Bulletin also recommends limiting the depth of an infiltration basin to 3 feet. It also states, "The use of centralized treatment practices with large drainage areas is strongly discouraged even when liners are used". Some notes from a review of documents on stormwater infiltration BMP's are attached for your consideration.

In summary, it is my professional opinion that you do not recommend the current plan for approval. Sincerely,



Eric Ashley, PE

**1048 West Roseville Rd Lancaster, PA
17601**