

**MANHEIM TOWNSHIP  
PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTES  
Wednesday  
August 19, 2009**

A meeting of the Manheim Township Planning Commission was held on Wednesday, August 19, 2009 at 6:30 p.m. The following members were present: Mr. Jeffrey Sturla; Mr. Michel Gibeault; Mr. Robert Wolf; Mr. Cory Rathman and Mr. Michael Martin. Mr. Donald Reed and Mrs. Mary Ellen Hollinger were absent. The following Township staff was present: Mrs. Lisa Douglas.

**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 July 15, 2009 Planning Commission meeting minutes.

On a motion by Mr. Gibeault, seconded by Mr. Wolf it was recommended to approve the July 15, 2009 meeting minutes.

**Motion Approved 5-0.**

**Subdivision/Land Development Plans**

1. **William C. Schwartz, Jr. – Preliminary/Final Lot Add-On Subdivision Plan – 2065 Fruitville Pike – Zoned R-2.**

Present representing this Preliminary/Final Lot Add-On Subdivision Plan was Mr. Jim Heinley. Also present was G. Pat Devery of GPD Engineering.

Mr. Heinly explained that this project consists of adding land to an existing lot currently owned by William Schwartz. Mr. Heinly indicated that the land being conveyed to the existing lot was part of the original terms of the land acquisition between the Schwartz property and the Township property.

Mr. Heinly indicated that they had responded to all Township comments with the exception of a few items. He indicated that the plans and response letter were delivered to the Township earlier in the day.

There was discussion on several of the comments including the amount of land intending to be conveyed as part of the plan, the drainage easements to be dedicated to the Township and the non-motorized path.

Staff indicated that the access drive is not intended to be dedicated to the Township but rather conveyed to the Township as an easement.

Mr. Sturla indicated that in general the Planning Commission did not have concerns with the majority of review comments but that some of the comments required additional discussion with the Township indicating that those issues could not be resolved by the Planning Commission.

Mr. Heinly indicated that discussions are underway with the Township and that the remaining issues would be resolved.

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

On a motion by Mr. Gibeault, seconded by Mr. Mike Martin, it was recommended to table this plan and modifications until outstanding comments are addressed.

**Motion Approved 5-0.**

### **Rezoning/Text Amendment/Conditional Use Reviews**

1. **Penn Ketchum – Text Amendment Petition (restaurant use) – Penn Cinema – 541 Airport Road – Zoned I-3.**

Present representing this Text Amendment Petition was Mr. Penn Ketchum.

Mr. Ketchum explained that this text amendment was presented to the Planning Commission nearly a year ago and that the text amendment petition included the same text. Mr. Ketchum indicated that he wanted to come back before the Planning Commission and the Board of Commissioners and make another attempt with the text amendment petition.

Mr. Ketchum indicated that currently restaurants are permitted in the I-1 and the I-2 Industrial Districts by special exception.

Staff indicated that if Mr. Ketchum is successful with the text amendment petition he would be required to submit a petition for a special exception that is heard before the zoning hearing board unlike conditional use requests that are heard before the Planning Commission and ultimately the Board of Commissioners.

Mr. Gibeault inquired about the restaurant use at the airport.

It was indicated that the restaurant use was an accessory use to the airport.

Mr. Ketchum indicated that he discussed restaurants as an accessory use with Township staff but that he preferred to go the text amendment route because it seemed cleaner.

Mr. Wolf inquired about the concessions at Penn Cinema.

Mr. Ketchum indicated that the theatre does provide concessions but that it is simple basic theatre food. Mr. Ketchum indicated that although customers come to the theatre to watch a movie it would be beneficial to offer an on-site restaurant.

Mr. Wolf indicated that the uses in the I-3 Industrial District are generally geared toward heavier industrial uses rather than service oriented uses. Mr. Wolf indicated that there are a number of restaurants in close proximity to the theatre and indicated that it would be more appropriate to provide a restaurant in those zoning districts where restaurants are currently permitted.

Mr. Sturla indicated that once an industrial zone is opened up to commercial related uses other commercial related uses want to go there. As commercial uses become established the value of the industrial land increases making it less attractive for an industrial user.

Mr. Sturla indicated that if the text amendment were approved, it would open up any I-3 land to restaurant uses.

Mr. Sturla indicated that two members were absent and that the members needed additional time to evaluate the request.

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

On a motion by Mr. Wolf, seconded by Mr. Rathman, it was recommended to table this request.

**Motion Approved 5-0.**

## **Other Business**

### **1. Comprehensive Plan**

Mr. Sturla indicated that Mrs. Douglas has an update on the Comprehensive Plan.

Mrs. Douglas explained where staff and Rettew were in the process of responding to comments. Mrs. Douglas indicated that ultimately the Planning Commission would be asked to make a recommendation on the plan including any or all of the recommended revisions to the plan.

Mr. Gabriel, Rettew Associates, Inc., further explained the process in responding to the comments. Mr. Gabriel indicated that Rettew and staff would be meeting to discuss the comments from the adjacent municipalities and the County.

Mr. Sturla indicated that the Planning Commission would like to make a recommendation in September.

Mr. Sturla asked for public comment.

1. Patron; Robert Bovie, 1957 Geraldson Drive Resident

Mr. Bovie stated that he agreed with statements in the Comprehensive Plan that cut through traffic should be discouraged. Mr. Bovie referred to the future roadway network map in the mobility chapter identifying future street connections. Mr. Bovie indicated that he liked the current language discouraging cut through traffic.

Mr. Bovie expressed concern over the loss of farmland indicating that he does not want the nature of Manheim Township to change.

Mr. Bovie expressed concern over the population per square mile and the densities identified in the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Bovie wondered how the City was able to synchronize traffic lights along state highways but Manheim Township could not.

2. Patron: Larry Pulkrabek, 230 Eshelman Road Resident

Mr. Pulkrabek indicated that he agreed with Mr. Bovie regarding cut through traffic and that the Planning Commission should really consider discouraging cut through traffic.

Mr. Pulkrabek indicated that he had looked through the information provided by the County in the Neighborhoods of Lancaster document. Mr. Pulkrabek indicated that the dense communities in the County as represented in the document were holsum neighborhoods but if the neighborhoods could easily go another way if they are not maintained. Mr. Pulkrabek indicated that neighborhoods are not just neighborhoods based on the layout of the neighborhood but rather by the way people react in these neighborhoods. Mr. Pulkrabek encouraged the Planning Commission members to read the book.

2. Lancaster County Planning Commission – Harrisburg Pike Land Use and Transportation Study Presentation

Mr. Danny Whittle, Lancaster County Planning Commission presented information on the recently adopted Harrisburg Pike Land Use Transportation Study. Mr. Whittle indicated that Cory Rathman, Carol Simpson and Steve Geisenberger sat on the committee that helped drafted the document. Mr. Whittle indicated that the document outlines issues and consequences of development along the Harrisburg Pike corridor. Mr. Whittle referred to the map highlighting future improvements and tables outlining those improvements. Mr. Whittle indicated that the document is consistent with the draft Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Whittle indicated that the County is seeking acknowledgement and acceptance of the document, ultimately hoping to obtain approval from the governing body through a resolution. Mr. Whittle indicated that the County is also filing for a TIGER grant which would provide funding to accomplish the improvements listed in the document. Mr. Whittle indicated that the TIGER grant application is due September 15, 2009.

It was indicated that projects covered by the grant must be underway by the end of 2010 or early 2011 and the projects must be under construction by 2012.

Mr. Sturla asked whether the projects were in the design phase.

Mr. Whittle indicated that the projects were at various stages in the process so the grant includes money for both design costs and construction.

Mr. Sturla indicated that he was uncomfortable making a recommendation at this time.

Mr. Whittle indicated that perhaps the members could review the document and if any of them thought it was appropriate they could contact at least one of the Commissioners offering support of the document.

Mr. Rathman indicated that he was familiar with the document since he was part of the committee that prepared the document. Mr. Rathman indicated that he would be comfortable making a motion in favor of the document.

Having no further comments, on a motion by Mr. Rathman it was recommended that the Board of Commissioners adopt a resolution to support the plan and ultimately support the TIGER grant. The motion was seconded by Mr. Wolf.

**Motion Approved 5-0**

**3. Lancaster County Planning Commission – Envision Partnership Presentation**

Mr. Scott Wails, Lancaster County Planning Commission presented the Envision Partnership indicating that the partnership is simply a handshake between all parties. Mr. Wails indicated that the partnership includes all municipalities that participated in the LIMC Regional Comprehensive Plan. The County's role is to ensure that there is consistency between planning documents within the region so that all parties involved can work toward common goals.

Mr. Wails asked that the Planning Commission consider the information presented and that he would be back next month to gain support of the Planning Commission.

Mr. Sturla asked for public comment.

**Adjournment**

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

Motion approved 5-0 and the meeting adjourned at 8:30 p.m.

The next Regular Planning Commission meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, September 16, 2009 at 6:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Lisa A. Douglas