

**MANHEIM TOWNSHIP
PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES
Wednesday
October 20, 2010**

A meeting of the Manheim Township Planning Commission was held on Wednesday, October 20, 2010 at 6:30 p.m. The following members were present: Mr. Jeffrey Sturla; Mr. Michel Gibeault; Mr. Cory Rathman; Mr. Donald Reed and Mrs. Stacie Reidenbaugh. Mrs. Mary Ellen Hollinger and Mr. Michael Martin were absent. The following Township staff was present: Mrs. Shannon Sinopoli.

Roll Call

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

Minutes

Mr. Sturla asked for a motion on the September 15, 2010 Planning Commission meeting minutes.

On a motion by Mr. Reed, seconded by Mr. Gibeault it was recommended to approve the September 15, 2010 meeting minutes.

Motion Approved 5-0.

Subdivision/Land Development Plans

1. Worthington – Revised Tentative Plan – Planned Residential Development – Oregon Pike - Zoned R-2 and R-3 w/ TDR option.

Present representing this Revised Tentative Plan was Mr. Mark Johnson and Mr. John Snyder, RGS Associates; Mr. Craig Mellott, Traffic Planning & Design and Mr. Greg Hill, Keystone Custom Homes.

Mr. Johnson indicated that this proposal is for the revised tentative plan and modifications for the redesign of a portion of Phase I, primarily consisting of the commercial component layout of the previously approved Planned Residential Development (PRD).

In regards to the numerous sign modifications, Mark Johnson indicated that the applicants may be separating such requests from the revised tentative plan in order to move the plan along while trying to better define and provide better specifics for the signage.

Mr. Sturla indicated that separating the two would probably be the better route to take in light of the lack of details and specifics with this current proposal. Mr. Sturla indicated at this point with the lack of specifics, the planning members would be in

no position to make any positive recommendations on the sign modifications being requested.

Staff indicated that if the applicants chose to deal with signage separately, then they would need to file a separate conditional use request specifically for signage relief, which could run parallel with the final plan submission.

Mr. Sturla advised the applicants that a time extension to schedule the public hearing for the present proposal needs to be submitted and that the applicants need to decide if they will be separating the sign modification requests from the tentative plan or not in order to ask for an appropriate amount of time to hold the public hearing on the present proposal.

Discussions took place in regards to the new planning modifications being requested with the revised plans.

Mr. Sturla, along with consensus from the planning commission, indicated that the request for a restaurant drive thru, or pick up window (Section 1658.8.D) will not be supported by the planning commission.

There was consensus amongst the planning commission to support the request for not providing parallel parking on both sides of street (Section 1664.7.B) provided that the relief is specific to just the Main Street (Royer Drive).

There was consensus amongst the planning commission to support the request for not providing a five foot planting strip along commercial uses (Section 1664.7.C) provided that the relief is specific to just the Main Street (Royer Drive), however, the consensus for the request for relief from providing the 10-foot sidewalk along commercial uses was not supported by the planning commission and the applicants were advised to remove such request and provide the 10-foot sidewalk along both sides of Royer Drive as previously proposed.

The applicants indicated that they will propose the sidewalk on the next submission.

In regards to the modification request of providing a minimum of 80-square foot apartment terraces (Section 1665.10) and instead proposing small balconettes, the planning commission questioned what the exact size of the balconettes would be. The applicants indicated that they would need to check with the architect. Section 1665.10 further advises that a common rear yard area or patio shall be provided for access by all apartment dwelling units. After some discussion, the applicants agreed to provide a 100-square foot area for the apartment users.

In regards to the modification request of exceeding the 15,000 square foot maximum ground level footprint (Section 1666.6) for the 20,000 square foot commercial/apartment building, there was consensus amongst the planning commission to support the request provided that the maximum area devoted to a single business shall not exceed 5,000 square feet and provided that commercial buildings shall provide several front façade treatments, each façade treatment shall not exceed fifty (50) feet in length.

There was consensus amongst the planning commission to support the request for a lesser sidewalk width in commercial areas (Section 1668.2) as shown on the plan drawings, provided however that the applicants provide the 10-foot required width along the front of the 5,000 square foot commercial/apartment building located on Lot 261.

The applicants indicated that they will revise the plans to propose 10-foot sidewalk in that vicinity.

In regards to the modification request of allowing a 65-foot clear sight triangle versus the required 75-feet (Section 1686.2.A.(24)) for the intersection of Access Drive A and Prescott Street, the planning commission suggested that the applicants take a look at possibly pushing back the house on Lot 255 to try and at least provide the 75-feet on the northern side of the intersection.

The applicants indicated that they will take a look at shifting the structure on Lot 255 out of the clear sight triangle.

In regards to the new Stormwater Management modification request of providing 3 to 1 basin side slopes versus 4 to 1 side slopes as required (Section 403.6.A.(3)), the planning commission had some concerns and were worried about the safety of the neighborhood children.

The applicants indicated that the 3 to 1 slopes were approved with the previous plans and that the township engineer at that time did not feel a modification was necessary and approved the proposed slopes. However, the current township engineer made the comment which is why they are now requesting the modification as a catch up request.

Mr. Sturla questioned if they were providing any trees and/or fencing around the basins.

The applicant indicated that landscaping was being provided, but would not prevent someone from entering the basin.

Mr. Sturla suggested that the applicants provide more details for this request.

The applicants indicated that they would take a look at it and talk with the township engineer.

In regards to the sign modification request of Section 1673.2.B.(1), discussions took place as to the interpretation of this Section. Staff indicated that prior PRD projects and interpretations would need to be reviewed.

It was decided that discussions concerning the remaining sign modification requests would be postponed until the applicant can provide more renderings with specifics, details, elevations, etc.

Discussions took place regarding the location of the dumpsters along Oregon Pike. Planning members recommended that the applicants take a look into other possible locations for the dumpsters and possibly embedding the dumpster for the Turkey Hill into the actual building design.

Discussions took place regarding the 2 additional accesses onto Prescott Street which were added with these revised plans. There was consensus amongst the planning commission to eliminate these two additional accesses in an effort to avoid commercial cut thru traffic encroaching into the residential portion of the development.

The applicants indicated that they would remove the 2 access connections.

Mr. Sturla indicated that the architecture of a PRD is a very relevant component and, opposite of conventional development where the planning members have no say, architecture comes first when the planning members review a PRD which is also a huge deciding factor in whether to support a PRD development.

Mr. Sturla suggested that the applicants get some better architectural renderings showing elevations, colors and façade details.

Mr. Sturla recommended that the applicants take a look at the signage out at the Wetherburn Commons/Richmond Square PRD for guidance on what signage was acceptable to the planning commission.

Mr. Sturla also suggested that the applicants pursue the idea of separating the signage from this tentative plan proposal.

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

On a motion by Mr. Rathman, seconded by Mr. Reed it was recommended to table this revised tentative plan and modifications requests until all outstanding comments can be adequately addressed.

Motion Approved 5-0.

Public Comment

There was no public comment.

Adjournment

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

Motion approved 5-0 and the meeting adjourned at 8:25 p.m.

The next Regular Planning Commission meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, November 17, 2010 at 6:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Shannon L. Sinopoli