

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

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

Roll Call

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

Mr. Sturla welcomed Mrs. Stacie Reidenbaugh as the newest Planning Commission member.

Reorganization - Nominations for Chairman and Vice-Chairman

Chairman Sturla turned the gavel over to Township Staff, Lisa Douglas.

Mrs. Douglas asked for nominations for the 2010 Planning Commission Chairman.

Mr. Rathman moved to appoint Mr. Sturla as Chairman of the Manheim Township Planning Commission. Seconded by Mr. Gibeault. Nominations were closed and motion carried unanimously.

Mrs. Douglas turned the gavel over to Chairman Sturla.

Chairman Sturla asked for nominations for the 2010 Planning Commission Vice-Chairman.

Mr. Rathman moved to appoint Mr. Gibeault as Vice Chairman of the Manheim Township Planning Commission. Seconded by Mr. Reed. Nominations were closed and motion carried unanimously.

Minutes

Mr. Sturla asked for a motion on the December 16, 2009 Planning Commission meeting minutes.

On a motion by Mr. Reed, seconded by Mr. Martin it was recommended to approve the December 16, 2009 meeting minutes.

Motion Approved 7-0.

Subdivision/Land Development Plans

1. **Fulton Bank at Granite Run – Preliminary/Final Land Development Plan – 451 Granite Run Drive – Zoned I-1.**

Present representing this Preliminary/Final Land Development Plan was Mr. Dave Tshudy, Stevens & Lee; Mr. Joel Gibbel, Derck & Edson; Mr. Terry Cain, Fulton Bank and Mrs. Jodi Evans, McMahon Associates.

Mr. Tshudy provided an overview of this plan by indicating that this proposal was to replace an existing office building and drive thru bank located on the corner of Fruitville Pike and Granite Run Drive with a 3,900 square foot full-service bank.

Mr. Tshudy indicated that the existing, problematic access drive closest to the intersection will be closed off and reconstructed and that the existing access drive just to the west will be a right-in, right-out only condition. Mr. Tshudy stated that the current main access for the daycare center and the storage units will continue to operate as a full-movement access.

Mr. Tshudy indicated that the applicants are working through the second set of staff review comments.

Mr. Gibbel discussed the modification request for relief from providing the standard emergency spillway. Mr. Gibbel stated that they are proposing rain gardens, not basins and that these facilities are not in a fill condition. Mr. Gibbel stated that if the rain garden would fill with water, it would flow overland across lawn at a 2% slope and into a catch basin.

Mr. Rathman questioned if there were any other alternatives to the standard design that could be proposed versus proposing nothing at all, for which the planning members may support.

Mr. Gibbel indicated that he had a couple of alternate ideas and would check further into a proposed alternative.

In response to Mr. Reed's inquiry regarding traffic impacts, Mr. Tshudy advised that the traffic would actually be decreased by the removal of the existing office use and that the peak hours for the bank are on Saturdays.

Mr. Tshudy indicated that the Traffic Impact Study did indicate the need for a center left turn lane on Granite Run Drive and that if the Township desired the turn lane, the applicant is willing to create the lane.

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

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

Motion Approved 7-0.

**2. Weaver Road Park Project – Preliminary/Final Land Development Plan – 2883
Weaver Road – Zoned R-2.**

Present representing this Preliminary/Final Land Development Plan was Mr. Sean Molchany, Assistant Manheim Township Manager; Chuck Haley & Mike Huxta, ELA Group.

Mr. Molchany indicated that this project was presented last month and that there are still some outstanding design issues that need to be taken care of. Mr. Molchany provided a brief summary of the plans and noted the changes that had been made since the December Planning Commission meeting which consisted primarily of just adding a pavilion and combining and relocating the tot lots.

Mr. Molchany indicated that staff is meeting with the consultants and township engineer tomorrow morning to discuss stormwater issues.

Mr. Molchany also indicated that a traffic signal is being proposed at the intersection of Weaver and Petersburg Roads with this project.

There was no planning member discussion.

Mr. Sturla asked for public comment.

Patron #1: John Light, 2882 Weaver Road

Mr. Light indicated that he lives directly across the street from the proposed park entrance and was concerned about the increase in traffic coming through his neighborhood and was wondering why an additional access from Petersburg Road wasn't proposed.

Mr. Molchany indicated that they only acquired a 12-foot leg out to Petersburg Road with the acquisition of the property and that additional land would have to be purchased in order to provide an access at that location. Mr. Molchany indicated that he did approach the adjacent property owner to the west of the 12-foot slither about the possibility of purchasing additional land from them, however, the property owner did not entertain the idea.

Mr. Molchany advised that there would also be significant sight distance issues and grading issues in order to provide and construct an access at that location along Petersburg Road.

Mr. Light indicated that this is an expensive project and he would like to see the Township do whatever they can to acquire additional land to have that alternate access off of Petersburg Road, possibly by acquiring the additional land from the adjacent church to the east.

Patron #2: Donna Wodarczyk, 257 Pulte Road

Mrs. Wodarczyk indicated that her property abuts the park where the emergency access onto Pulte Road is proposed and questioned the usage of the access.

Mr. Molchany indicated that the access onto Pulte Road is not being proposed as a full access and that it will be gated and utilized only as an emergency access.

Mrs. Wodarczyk questioned how far the fields would be setback off of the property line where her property abuts.

Mr. Molchany advised that there would be a 63-foot setback off the property line and that fencing would be provided around the fields and permanent landscaping would be planted along the property line in order to provide a buffer for the adjacent residential users.

Patron #3: Walter Seace, 320 Petersburg Road

Mr. Seace indicated that bringing all of the traffic out onto Weaver Road and to the proposed traffic signal at Petersburg Road is the safest and best means for traffic flow.

Mr. Seace questioned the proposed future access to the pavilion at the end of the Stonemill Estates development.

Mr. Molchany indicated that the access would only be proposed to access the parking area for the pavilion and not the entire site. Mr. Molchany stated that it is unclear if that pavilion will ever be constructed, but wanted to propose it for stormwater purposes in the event that the Township feels the use is needed in the future.

Patron #4: Devon Donmoyer

Mr. Donmoyer indicated that he was the original owner of the Stonemill Estates development and was worried about the baseball field closest to that development and was wondering if that particular field was for the smaller kids or would it be used by high school or adult teams.

Mr. Molchany indicated that the basefield adjacent to the Stonemill Estates development is proposed for teams 12 years of age and younger.

Mr. Donmoyer expressed concerns regarding the proposed traffic signal and the possibility of cut-thru traffic through the Stonemill Estates development in order to avoid a red light.

There were no further discussions.

On a motion by Mr. Reed, seconded by Mr. Gibeault, it was recommended to table this plan until all outstanding items can be adequately addressed.

Motion Approved 7-0.

3. Integrity Bank – Preliminary/Final Land Development Plan – 1683 Oregon Pike – Zoned B-4.

Present representing this Preliminary/Final Land Development Plan was Mr. Greg Strausser, Strausser Surveying & Engineering and Mr. Jim Gibson, Integrity Bank.

Mr. Strausser indicated that this project consists of a 1.3-acre tract located on the corner of Oregon Pike and Butler Avenue, which is currently the location of the Eat 'N Park restaurant.

Mr. Strausser indicated that this plan proposes to demolish the existing restaurant and construct a new 5,055 square foot bank.

Mr. Strausser indicated that several zoning variances were necessary in light of existing site conditions and that the Zoning Hearing Board granted all of the approvals at their December 7, 2009 zoning hearing board meeting.

Mr. Strausser discussed the circulation of the proposed site and indicated that the traffic flow is designed to run counter-clockwise around the bank building.

Mr. Strausser indicated that they are reducing the impervious area on the site and are proposing 5-foot sidewalk along the entire Butler Avenue and Oregon Pike frontages.

Mr. Strausser indicated that although only 23 parking spaces are required, they are providing an additional 27 spaces to the rear of the site for employee parking and for an additional paved area in order to sponsor youth club car washes, etc.

Mr. Strausser discussed the access drive separation comments made in the review letter.

Mr. Sturla indicated that the applicant should request a modification of those requirements in light of the existing conditions.

Mr. Strausser questioned the need to reconstruct Butler Avenue as mentioned in the review letter.

Mrs. Douglas advised that as long as the Traffic Impact Study doesn't indicate the need for improvements, staff would be supportive of a modification of this requirement.

Mr. Rathman suggested the idea of cutting down on some of the existing parking spaces in order to gain additional green space.

Mr. Jim Gibson provided the planning members with a brief summary of Integrity Bank's operations and functions and indicated that Integrity Bank strives to serve the community and support the area residents and he felt that having that additional paved area and parking to support carwash events for the youth sports, scouts, etc. would be a benefit to the community.

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

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

Motion Approved 7-0.

Conditional Use

1. Netherbloom – Conditional Use Request – Planned Residential Development – Landis Valley Road – Zoned R-2.

Present representing this Conditional Use Request was Mr. Robert Gabriel and Gerald Horst.

Mr. Gabriel indicated that this proposal consists of 42.7-acres on the east side of Landis Valley Road and is situated between The Settlements at Landis Valley development and Calvary Church.

Mr. Gabriel indicated that the applicant is proposing a Planned Residential Development (PRD) for this site utilizing Transferable Development Rights (TDRs).

Mr. Gabriel advised that the proposal would consist of 190 residential units broken down as 77 Single-Family Detached Dwellings; 24 Single-Family Semi-Detached Dwellings; 27 Townhouses and 62 apartments. Mr. Gabriel indicated that 11,840 square feet of commercial space is also proposed.

Mr. Gabriel indicated that approximately 13-acres of open space is being proposed with a large community open space in the center of the development.

Mr. Gabriel stated that there are some challenges with the site due to a pipeline running straight through the development site.

Mr. Gabriel indicated that an initial trip generation indicated that there would be 171 additional A.M. Peak Hour trips and 320 P.M. Peak Hour trips associated with this proposal.

Mr. Sturla indicated that after looking at this proposal, he was not overwhelmed with the project as presented and felt that the layout has more of a look and feel of a traditional and conventional development and is lacking the necessary details that a PRD possesses.

Mr. Gibeault concurred with Mr. Sturla's statement and indicated that during a Conditional Use request, the planning members would like to see what the development will feel like such as the Brighton and Wetherburn Commons PRDs which have a special feel. Mr. Gibeault stated that he felt the proposal for low end commercial for this site was a good thing and questioned the type of commercial uses that would be proposed.

Mr. Horst indicated that he felt the location was not suited for retail users and that commercial office space would make more sense.

Mr. Gibeault stated that he would like to see a better entry way into the development because the entrance impacts the entire development and with this proposal, when you first enter, all you will see is commercial/apartment buildings and then more apartment buildings as you get further into the site.

Mr. Gibeault indicated that the main community green is not defined and that he would like to see the applicant do something with it and not have houses backing up onto it with the possibility of sheds being added to the back yards. Mr. Gibeault indicated that with the community green proposed as such the residents will feel more like they are in someone's backyard versus a public community green.

Mr. Martin concurred with Mr. Sturla and Mr. Gibeault and stated that the applicant should really focus on the entry of the development because PRDs are unique and have their own special character and the entry should leave a strong first impression.

Mr. Martin also felt that the use and proposal for green space should be thought out more and that additional rear access for the residential units should be considered.

Mr. Sturla stated that a PRD should create a sense of belonging and provide a mix of residential uses and commercial and it should be built like a community. Mr. Sturla stated that he was in favor of the lesser amount of commercial for this particular site.

Mr. Rathman suggested proposing an alley system to support the residential units on the lower side of the development abutting the church property. Mr. Rathman stated that focus should also be on the streetscape, community spaces and architecture throughout the development.

Mr. Sturla asked for public comment.

Patron #1: Howard Knisely, 721 Wallingford Road

Mr. Knisely expressed his concerns about developments in general proposing amenities on plans, but never completing the projects. Mr. Knisely stated that he would like to see a way to ensure that all of the amenities that are proposed on land development plans get fully completed so the Township is not left with vacant lots and vacant buildings.

Patron #2: Melvin Hess, 1112 Hunsecker Road

Mr. Hess indicated that he is the farmer to the east of this proposed development and will actually be looking up at this development if it is constructed.

Mr. Hess stated that he would like to see the higher densities located out toward Landis Valley Road and then lessen the further back into the site and adjacent to the neighboring properties.

Mr. Hess expressed his concerns regarding stormwater runoff and water levels. Mr. Hess suggested that if this conditional use request gets approval, then a condition should be placed on any approvals to ensure that the elevation of the water table does not increase.

Mr. Hess expressed his concerns regarding cut-thru traffic issues as well.

Mr. Horst indicated that this development will actually have a traffic calming design due to narrower streets, pedestrian crossings, etc. which should deter cut-thru traffic.

Patron #3: Steven Bright, 2478 Carriage Drive

Mr. Bright stated that although the township is pushing for PRDs and higher densities, the actual residents do not like them and want them to stop.

Mr. Bright expressed his concern over the new residential cut-thru that will take place with the additional homes and that back up that will occur on Whitemarsh Drive and the general overall increase in traffic throughout the Settlements of Landis Valley development. Mr. Bright stated that he was not in favor of the roadway connection into Settlements of Landis Valley.

Patron #4: Brian ?, 1058 Fondersmith Drive

Patron #4 indicated that his family recently purchased this property which is located at the end of Fondersmith Drive, on the corner of Fondersmith and Crofft Drives and abuts the subject parcel.

Patron #4 expressed his concern over a proposed Access Road "B" which would run behind his house which in essence his property would now intersect with three roadways which is a concern because of being a young family and recently having a child.

Patron #4 stated that he is not opposed to the development and welcomes the potential for meeting new residents and having new neighbors, but he is worried about traffic that will occur with this additional access and the

other connections as well as the apartment building being located so close to his property for safety reasons and property values.

Patron #5: Vincent Parelli, 15 Ferree Circle

Mr. Parelli expressed his concerns regarding traffic and using the Settlements at Landis Valley development as a short cut out to Oregon Pike.

Mr. Parelli stated that he doesn't want to see another development constructed where there are pockets of empty lots everywhere.

Mr. Parelli stated that people don't want the PRD type developments, they want bigger lots.

Mr. Sturla provided some insight to the reasoning behind high density development and the preservation of agricultural land that comes along with permitting such development within a designated area mapped for development. Mr. Sturla advised that the other PRDs in the Township have shown a lot of success and the residents that live in those PRDs enjoy that type of development design.

Mr. Sturla indicated that although the Board of Commissioners set a hearing date for March, the actual hearing will probably be delayed as the applicant moves through the process with the Planning Commission and advised the audience to keep checking the Planning Commission agenda's and minutes for any updates to the status of the hearing date.

On a motion by Mr. Rathman, seconded by Mrs. Hollinger, it was recommended to table this conditional use request.

Motion Approved 7-0.

Public Comment

Mr. Jamie Brubaker, Charter Homes indicated that they have applied for the February 1, 2010 Zoning Hearing Board to try and obtain necessary variance approvals for the proposed Grandview Development and if successful, will be redesigning the land development plans and resubmitting.

Mr. Sturla indicated that a new plan needs to be submitted as soon as possible since it was agreed at the December 22nd staff meeting that the applicants would run the zoning approvals and land development plan submissions concurrently in order to keep this plan moving along.

Adjournment

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

Motion approved 7-0 and the meeting adjourned at 9:30 p.m.

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

Respectfully submitted,

Shannon L. Sinopoli