

**MANHEIM TOWNSHIP
PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES
Wednesday
February 20, 2008**

A meeting of the Manheim Township Planning Commission was held on Wednesday, February 20, 2008 at 6:30 p.m. The following members were present: Mr. Jeffrey Sturla; Mr. Michel Gibeault; Mr. Robert Wolf; Mr. Cory Rathman; Mr. Donald Reed and Mrs. Mary Ellen Hollinger. Mr. Michael Martin arrived at 6:40 p.m. 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 announced that the Frank Nolt, Preliminary/Final Lot Add-On Subdivision plan has been scratched from this evening's agenda.

Minutes

Mr. Sturla asked for a motion on the January 16, 2008 meeting minutes.

On a motion by Mr. Reed, seconded by Mr. Rathman, it was recommended to approve the January 16, 2008 meeting minutes.

Motion Approved 6-0

Comprehensive Plan Update

Mrs. Douglas provided the planning members and audience with an update of the progress of the Comprehensive Plan.

Mrs. Douglas advised that the draft background sections of the plan have been completed and are available for viewing on the Township website.

Mrs. Douglas indicated that the steering committee focused on land use at the January meeting and will continue to over the next couple of months.

Mrs. Douglas advised that the future land use map is intended to be a guide as an inclusion in the Comprehensive Plan and is intended to provide how the Township is envisioned to develop in the future.

Mrs. Douglas indicated that the Township has received numerous letters from property owners and/or developers requesting consideration for specific land uses and that at this point, the steering committee has been directed to view land uses in the Township holistically before considering any of the submitted letters.

Mrs. Douglas advised that the Comprehensive Plan process is moving along slightly ahead of schedule and that discussion regarding the next step to obtain community input will be taking place.

Mrs. Douglas advised that the steering committee meets at 7:00 a.m. on the fourth Wednesday of each month and that the public is welcome to attend.

Old Business

A. Development Plans

1. **Worthington Planned Residential Development - Final Phase I - Oregon Pike - Zoned R-2; R-2 (Bonus Density); R-3 and B-1.**

Present representing this Final Phase I Plan was Mr. John Mahoney, Attorney for the Applicant; Mr. Mark Johnson, RGS Associates and Mr. Craig Mellott, Traffic Planning and Engineering.

Mr. Mahoney indicated that the applicants have requested a waiver to allow the Final Phase I plan to be recorded prior to receiving the Highway Occupancy Permit from PADOT for the proposed roadway improvements in order to allow for some limited development.

Mr. Mahoney summarized what the phased improvements would entail and the subsequent off-site improvements required by PADOT.

Mr. Sturla indicated that there has never been an approved Planned Residential Development that has been granted the ability to start building homes without constructing the roadway improvements first. Mr. Sturla asked what the compelling reasons were as to why the planning members should even consider the phasing of such improvements.

Mr. Johnson indicated that it's not unusual to permit the recording of plans with a PADOT permit and outlined his waiver request to allow recording the plan without HOP. Mr. Johnson advised that PADOT is ok with phasing and that the applicants will post financial security for all of the proposed traffic improvements.

Mr. Sturla indicated that it is unusual to allow the recording of plans when it's a Planned Residential Development and asked what financial security the applicants would be posting in light that the entire improvements have not yet been designed.

Mr. Johnson indicated that they have enough of the design to generate a cost.

Mr. Johnson indicated that time is very important to the applicant and that there is an enormous amount of improvements which includes a great deal of cost and that the applicants would like to pull ten building permits to build 10 homes as part of a

proposed Phase 1A. This would require a tri-party agreement with the developer, PADOT and the municipality and would allow for things to be more viable for the developer.

Mr. Johnson continued but was inaudible due to the lack of using the microphone.

Mr. Sturla stated that this plan has been in front of the Planning Commission for a long time and questioned why the applicants did not obtain approval from PADOT many months ago since this plan has been in the works for a couple of years and since it is a requirement of tentative plan approval.

Mr. Sturla indicated that from what he has heard, the compelling reason for wanting to phase the roadway improvement is purely for financial purposes.

Mr. Sturla stated that the phasing idea doesn't make sense to him and questioned what would happen if they were permitted to build the 10 homes and the homes were not successful and the developer walks away from the development. The Township would then be stuck with no improvements and only 10 homes in a Home Owners Association.

Mr. Sturla stated that the original plan proposed 113 homes with Phase I and all of the commercial component and now the applicants are proposing phases of those original phases and wish to start without an approved Highway Occupancy Permit. Mr. Sturla indicated that when the planning members allowed the modifications when this plan was first presented, they were all under the understanding that the commercial was to be completely built out, the roadway improvements done and the 113 houses built. Mr. Sturla stated that this proposal made sense to the planning members, but that this new phased approach does not make much sense and questioned what changed on the applicants end to make it alright to propose 113 homes six months ago and not now.

Mr. Reed quoted from the January 2008 meeting minutes which stated that "Mr. Johnson indicated that Phase I consisted of 103 single family detached homes and 10 single family semi-detached homes" and questioned what changed in one month and why the Township was informed by PADOT that the Phase I proposal is for 40-50 homes, but tonight the proposal is now only 10 homes? Mr. Reed said it's very confusing.

Mr. Johnson indicated that plan's phasing is the same as it has always been and that just the traffic improvements are being phased.

Mr. Sturla stated that ALL of the design improvements should be submitted prior to final plan approval.

Mr. Craig Mellott indicated that when the applicants met with PADOT, traffic phasing was discussed and it was determined that approximately 40 homes would be the limit of what could be built without having to do the off-site improvements.

Mr. Mellott summarized the proposed phasing of traffic improvements.

Mr. Gibeault questioned why the phasing is different than what has been presented all along and wondered why the commercial component isn't being accounted for and provided in Phase I of the traffic improvements.

Mr. Mellott indicated that there is still only a Phase 1 and Phase 2, however, Phase I is being proposed as subdivided phasing.

Mr. Sturla suggested that the applicants get all of the required improvements in place now and then build how ever many homes they wish instead of proposing the subdivided phasing. Mr. Sturla stated that this whole idea of wanting to do little improvements here and there is confusing and is only being done for financial reasons and doesn't mitigate any risks on the Township.

Mr. Mahoney commented but was inaudible due to the lack of using the microphone.

Mr. Sturla advised that he is not in favor of a developer starting any construction without an approved Highway Occupancy Permit.

Mr. Wolf questioned what would happen if the applicants never received a Highway Occupancy Permit and asked the applicants how they can be certain, under the new PADOT regulations, that they will be successful in obtaining such permits since there are no guarantees anymore from PADOT as has occurred in the past.

Mr. Mellott indicated that they cannot guarantee that a Highway Occupancy Permit will be issued; however, they are very confident of such.

Mr. Wolf also questioned if the applicants have obtained all of the necessary indemnification letters.

Mr. Mellott indicated that there are some outstanding indemnification letters that need to be obtained.

Mr. Gibeault stated that the applicants are spending their effort in the wrong place by coming to the Planning Commission, when they should be spending it with PADOT and working towards obtaining the permit first and then they could come back with a phasing plan.

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

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

Motion Approved 7-0.

2. CarMax Store 7233 - Preliminary/Final Subdivision and Land Development Plan - Route 72 and Plaza Boulevard - Zoned B-4.

Present representing this Preliminary/Final Land Development Plan was Ms. Cheryl Love, ELA Group and Mr. Frank Vargish, Blakinger, Byler and Thomas.

Mr. Dan Melchiorre, property owner of Lancaster Dodge was also present in the audience.

Ms. Love indicated that, in response to the planning members concerns regarding the ponding issue at the access drive in the vicinity of proposed inlet I-3 and the Commerce Bank entrance, a meeting was held with the Township Staff, Township Engineer, Mr. Melchiorre as well as planning members Mr. Rathman and Mr. Gibeault.

Ms. Love advised that as a result of that meeting they were able to effectively reduce the flow and meet the ordinance requirements by adding a second pipe and utilizing the correct calculations.

Ms. Love indicated that the flow reduction for the 2, 5 and 10-year storms has been reduced to 1" and 3" for the 25-year storm; 4" for the 50-year storm and 5" for the 100-year storm.

Ms. Love indicated that there was one additional modification being requested which was to allow for the sanitary sewer easement to be twenty feet wide instead of the thirty foot requirement.

Staff indicated that LASA has approved the twenty foot easement and was supportive of 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 approve the plan and modifications contingent upon a clean review letter.

Motion Approved 7-0.

3. Montessori Academy - Preliminary/Final Land Development Plan - 2750 Weaver Road - Zoned R-1.

Present representing this Preliminary/Final Land Development Plan was Mr. Hugh Cadzow, ELA Group and Mr. Brian Hollinger, Montessori Academy Board President.

Mr. Cadzow indicated that they have worked through the outstanding stormwater comments and that most of the remaining comments involve third party approvals.

Mr. Gibeault questioned the modification request from providing internal curbing.

Mr. Cadzow indicated that curbing is provided on the inside of the parking area and around the parking islands to help collect stormwater. Mr. Cadzow advised that stormwater currently sheet flows into an existing sup area and to an existing inlet.

Mr. Cadzow stated that the landscaping is flat and if the grading were to change, it would create a new type of watershed.

Mr. Gibeault questioned the area along the existing tree row on the south side of the property.

Mr. Cadzow indicated that curbing could go on that side, but would not be a benefit.

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

On a motion by Mr. Reed, seconded by Mr. Rathman it was recommended to approve this plan and modifications contingent upon a clean review letter.

Motion Approved 7-0.

4. Lancaster Northwest Gateway - Preliminary/Final Lot Add-on Plan - Terminus of Manheim Ave, Liberty St, Charlotte St, Stevens St and Lincoln St - Zoned B-4 & R-3 (4/26/08)

Mr. Todd Vaughn, David Miller and Associates were present representing this Preliminary/Final Lot Add-On Plan.

Mr. Vaughn indicated that these plans involve the redevelopment of several city blocks which consists of 47 acres with 2.94 acres residing within the jurisdiction of Manheim Township and the rest within the City of Lancaster.

Mr. Vaughn indicated that the applicants were withdrawing two modification requests due to being able to meet ordinance requirements now.

Mr. Vaughn advised that the first modification to be withdrawn is from Section 803.1 of the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance. Mr. Vaughn indicated that they have changed Lincoln Street from a one-way public road to a two-way road, therefore meeting the requirement.

Mr. Vaughn indicated that the second modification no longer needed is from Section 403.6.A.5 of the Stormwater Management Ordinance as they are now meeting the requirement of dewatering the basin within a 24-hour time frame.

Mr. Vaughn briefly summarized the remaining modifications being requested.

Mr. Sturla questioned the request for the modification regarding the placement of street trees in the public right-of-way.

Mr. Vaughn indicated that the applicants desire to have a uniform streetscape throughout the entire project and with the majority of the redevelopment being located in the city and with the city encouraging street trees in the right-of-way; the applicants desire the same for the portion that is located within the Township.

Mr. Vaughn indicated that this site is going to be retained in single ownership and that the owners are willing to work out a maintenance agreement for the care of the trees.

Mr. Vaughn advised that at this time, no development, other than the infrastructure, utilities and athletic fields are being proposed and that Lancaster General Hospital is still working on their master planning for their portion of the project.

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

On a motion by Mr. Wolf, seconded by Mr. Reed, it was recommended to approve this plan and modifications contingent upon a clean review letter.

Motion Approved 7-0

B. Rezoning/Text Amendment/Conditional Use/Ordinances

1. Berkshire-Lancaster LLC – Planned Commercial Development – Conditional Use request – Granite Run Drive – Zoned I-1.

Present representing this Conditional Use request for a Planned Commercial Development was Mr. Charlie Suhr, Attorney, Stevens and Lee; Mr. William McCollum, Berkshire Development and Ms. Jodie Evans, McMahan Transportation Engineers.

Mr. Suhr indicated that at the December Planning Commission meeting, discussions took place in regards to whether the Fruitville Pike/Route 30 and Route 30/Route 283 were defined interchanges and the potential for required improvements.

Mr. Suhr advised that, as a result of a meeting with Township staff, it was determined by the staff that both Fruitville Pike/Route 30 and Route 30/Route 283 were classified as interchanges, in which case roadway improvements pursuant to the ordinance would need to occur or relief from such requirements would need to be approved through the Zoning Hearing Board.

Mr. Suhr indicated that Mrs. Evans conducted a Single Point Urban Interchange (SPUI) analysis which resulted in the determination that a SPUI would not work at either one of these interchanges and that staff had concurred.

Mr. Suhr indicated that the applicants are proposing improvements at the Fruitville Pike/Route 30 interchanges to include additional dual turning lanes and that the proposed improvements are 33% better than what a SPUI would provide, however, they can only yield an 11-23% reduction in overall delay and cannot meet the required 33% reduction in delay.

Mr. Suhr advised that an application for two zoning variances has been made and will be heard at the March 3, 2008 Zoning Hearing Board meeting. This application consists of a request for the determination as to whether or not Route 283/Route 30 is correctly interpreted as an interchange and whether improvements would need to occur there and relief from providing the 33% reduction in delay.

Mr. Suhr indicated that a variance from the required thirty foot improvement area out along the front portion of the daycare was also included in the Zoning Hearing Board application.

Mr. Sturla questioned why the Zoning Hearing Board would need to approve such requests if the Township hasn't approved the proposed alternative improvements yet.

Mrs. Douglas indicated that based on the conversations with the Township Engineer, Staff, Solicitor and the applicants, the designed alternative was satisfactory, however, the ultimate determination lies with the Commissioners.

Mr. Sturla indicated that significant and monetary traffic improvements were the intent of the development of a Planned Commercial Development and a SPUI.

Mr. Suhr indicated that a SPUI would not be approved by PADOT and that it doesn't make sense and would be impossible to do.

Mr. Wolf indicated that the cost of a SPUI can be shifted to other areas along Fruitville Pike to improve traffic to the point where the planning members agree that those costs offset what might have been spent on a SPUI.

Mr. Suhr indicated that off-site improvements have been planned from the beginning of this plan, but a SPUI does not work at Route 283 and Route 30, and

they are not proposing to take the money for a SPUI that doesn't work and put that somewhere else in the Township.

Mr. Wolf stated that, although the SPUI may not work, what limit is the planning members willing to go to for other improvements to solve the traffic problem.

Mr. Suhr indicated that Mrs. Evans will present the proposed traffic improvements.

Mrs. Evans presented the proposed improvements to the Fruitville Pike/Route 30/Chester Road/York Road network and discussed the recent SPUI analysis.

Mr. Suhr advised that, at the request of the Township and although not necessary, they are now showing a right turn lane on Granite Run Drive at Fruitville Pike.

Mr. Gibeault questioned whether or not it was impossible to get to the 33% reduction.

Mrs. Evans indicated that the issue is the capacity and that even if they could provide 15 lanes, it would bottle neck somewhere creating a worse situation and it still would not be meeting the 33% reduction.

Mrs. Evans provided a summary of the previously proposed improvements.

Mrs. Evans was inaudible do to the lack of using a microphone.

Mrs. Evans discussed the overall traffic study scope approved by the Township Traffic Engineer.

Mr. Suhr indicated that the applicants have worked with the Township Traffic Engineer's recommendations and have put those into place, which were ultimately approved by the engineer.

It was noted that the limit of the traffic study was at the Delp Road/Fruitville Pike intersection.

Lengthy discussions took place regarding the entire Fruitville Pike Corridor from Route 30 to Petersburg Road and the levels of service pre-development and post-development.

Planning members felt that the traffic study scoping limits should have exceeded what was approved by the Township Traffic Engineer and have had a concern about the negative traffic impact along the Fruitville Pike corridor.

Mr. Suhr indicated that although they have proposed numerous improvements, even improvements not required by ordinance, if there are additional intersections that the planning members want them to study; they are willing to do that.

Planning members indicated that the applicants have done an adequate job along Manheim Pike; however, with this proposal and the impact to Fruitville Pike, they felt that each intersection from Route 30 to Petersburg Road should be studied.

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

On a motion by Mr. Gibeault, seconded by Mrs. Hollinger, it was recommended to table this Conditional Use request pending further study of additional intersections along Fruitville Pike.

Motion Approved 7-0.

New Business

A. Development Plans

1. **Stonehenge Reserve - Preliminary Subdivision/Land Development Plan - Northwest corner of Fruitville Pike and Koser Road - Zoned R-1 with TDR Option.**

Present representing this Preliminary Subdivision/Land Development Plan was Mr. Bob Shenk, Herbert Rowland and Grubic.

Mr. Shenk indicated that this preliminary plan consists of a subdivision for 151 lots proposed to house single-family dwelling units. Mr. Shenk indicated that this development is located on the corner of Koser Road and Fruitville Pike, directly across from the Wetherburn Commons Development.

Mr. Shenk indicated that a pre-application meeting was held with PADOT and that a meeting with Township Staff also took place.

Mr. Shenk outlined the traffic improvements proposed for Fruitville Pike and Koser Road and advised that the traffic analysis will be complete very soon.

Mr. Shenk advised that this plan is proposing three phases and that all of the Fruitville Pike improvements will be constructed with Phase I.

Discussions took place regarding having only a single access out along Fruitville Pike for both Phase I and II since the Koser Road access isn't being proposed until Phase III.

Mr. Shenk indicated that 52 Lots are being proposed with Phase I; 53 Lots with Phase II and 46 Lots with Phase III.

Mr. Shenk indicated that since Koser Road was recently reconstructed with the Wetherburn Commons development that a modification from improving Koser Road to the centerline is being requested as they do not wish to re-mill a new road.

Mr. Shenk discussed the remaining modification requests including: Five foot sidewalk width along Koser Road; Sidewalks located within one foot of the right-of-

way along Fruitville Pike; Inlets in lawn areas; Storm pipes perpendicular to the street centerline and Basin outlet structure configuration.

Mrs. Douglas indicated that the Township Engineer is not yet convinced that the two inlets proposed in yard areas cannot be located elsewhere and outside of an individual lot.

Mr. Shenk indicated that a Homeowners Association is being proposed for the maintenance of the stormwater basins.

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

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

Motion Approved 7-0.

B. Rezoning/Text Amendment/Conditional Use/Ordinances

1. Charter Homes At Grandview Inc. – Rezoning Petition – New Holland Pike, Pleasure Road and Esbenshade Drive - Request to change zoning of property from Zone R-2 to R-3.

Mr. Rob Bowman, Charter Homes was present representing this rezoning request consisting of a 54.25 acre tract situated on New Holland Pike, to the north of Pleasure Road and the east of Esbenshade Drive.

Mr. Bowman advised that two separate petitions have been submitted. One petition is to rezone approximately 24.41 acres from R-2 Residential to R-3 Residential and the second petition (to follow below) is to rezone approximately 29.84 acres from R-2 Residential to B-4 Business District.

Mr. Bowman reminded the planning members and audience that the first proposal for this site, also known as the Gammache Property, consisted of a Planned Residential Development (PRD) which consisted of 200 residential units and a large commercial component however, due to the failure of the proposal to install a traffic light out on Route 23, that plan was withdrawn.

Mr. Bowman indicated that this property has many restraints due to 18 acres being located within the floodplain and the lack of a sound wall along Route 30.

Mr. Bowman indicated that his intention for this site is to add onto the existing Grandview development and to give it the same neighborhood appeal.

Mr. Bowman advised that a meeting, regarding this latest proposal, was held in the beginning of January at the Lancaster Catholic High School with 125 residents of Grandview in attendance.

Mr. Bowman indicated that 70 homes sites are proposed and would have connection with Esbenshade Drive and Helen Avenue. Mr. Bowman advised that this proposal is a downscale from what was originally proposed and that this proposal would also include a significant portion of land that will remain undeveloped.

Mr. Bowman indicated that everything around the site is currently zoned R-3 and that he wishes to continue to pattern that with the Grandview Development and is proposing identical lot sizes as to what exists in Grandview now.

Mr. Bowman indicated that Esbenshade Drive will be improved per Township requirements and that a modification from providing alleys in the new development would be sought.

Mr. Sturla advised that the planning members view Grandview as a jewel of the community and that he will not jeopardize such development and is reluctant to go on good faith without a guarantee that the existing Grandview Development is not endangered in any manner.

Mr. Rathman indicated that he had the same concern and that a use by right scenario would now be put into place and if it gets rezoned, there is then the possibility that the commercial traffic could come through Helen Avenue and out onto Pleasure Road. Mr. Rathman stated that there is no protection in place prohibiting from that happening.

Mr. Bowman indicated that if that's a concern of the Planning Commission, then he will address the concern by means of a legal mechanism which restricts any development to Single Family Detached Dwelling units for Single Family Semi-Detached Dwelling units only.

Mr. Gibeault questioned why Mr. Bowman is proposing to rezone to the R-3 District when he can build Single Family Detached Dwelling units on the current R-2 Zoning designation.

Mr. Bowman advised that he could build 86 Single Family Detached Dwelling units under the current regulations, but it would be a Condominium Association. Mr. Bowman indicated that he is trying to provide the same development pattern as Grandview and to mirror Grandview in relation to lot size, etc.

***Note: Refer to any public comments below.*

Motion by Mr. Reed, seconded by Mr. Rathman, it was recommended to table this rezoning request.

Motion Approved 7-0.

2. **Charter Homes At Grandview Inc. – Rezoning Petition – New Holland Pike, Pleasure Road and Esbenshade Drive - Request to change zoning of property from Zone R-2 to B-4.**

Mr. Rob Bowman, Charter Homes was present representing this rezoning request consisting of a 54.25 acre tract situated on New Holland Pike, to the north of Pleasure Road and the east of Esbenshade Drive.

Mr. Bowman advised that the B-4 proposal would have access only from Route 23 and the access would be a right in, right out only movement.

Mr. Bowman indicated that these 29.84 acres would be proposed to consist of approximately 35,000 square feet of light office use and possibly 20,000 square feet of retail on the corner.

Mr. Reed questioned how someone would enter and exit the site if it's restricted to right in, right out only.

Mr. Bowman indicated that it will be necessary for the site to have restricted access until the intersection at Route 30/Route 23 is rebuilt.

Mr. Sturla indicated that it has been the protocol of the Township to not approve Rezoning requests unless there is a definite use proposed. Mr. Sturla advised that he finds it hard to change a R-2 zoning status to a B-4 status without knowing exactly what is going to be there.

Mr. Bowman indicated that the most intense use proposed would be 35,000 square feet of office space, however, the B-4 designation would allow him the option for retail as well.

Mr. Wolf asked if it was Mr. Bowman's intention to only construct on 5 acres of the 29 acres and to leave the remaining 24 acres undeveloped.

Mr. Bowman answered yes and indicated that the 29 acres has a sanitary main that runs through it and that a significant portion is located within the floodplain. Mr. Bowman indicated that there are about 8 acres in the northeast corner that is feasible to build upon, and after subtracting all of the setback requirements, it will be approximately 6 acres of land being developed.

Concerns were raised that if this property were to be rezoned and then sold off (instead of being developed as single-family dwellings), there would be a variety of other, more intense uses now permitted at that site.

Planning members indicated that the applicant is proposing a hotel and offices on the site proposed for B-4, however, such uses would be permitted under B-3 classification, therefore, they would not need the B-4 classification.

Mr. Bowman indicated that he has received interest from people wanting to convert the existing farmhouse into a restaurant, in which case would require the B-4 status.

Mr. Sturla suggested that Mr. Bowman work with the Township during the present updating of the Comprehensive plan for this property.

Mr. Sturla asked for public comment.

Patron #1: Craig Husted, 851 Grandview Boulevard Resident

Mr. Husted expressed his appreciation of Mr. Bowman for keeping the neighbors up to speed with the proposals. Mr. Husted expressed his concern about the uses that could possibly be placed on the site if it were to be rezoned R-3, such as apartment buildings, cluster developments, etc. Mr. Husted also questioned the use of TDRs and the possibility of using them at this location to gain additional density and smaller lot sizes. Mr. Husted indicated that he is also against the B-4 zoning due to the variety of uses that could occur allowing intense light sources which could illuminate and destroy the neighborhood.

Patron #2: Fred Dohm, New Holland Pike Resident

Mr. Dohm questioned how someone would access the area proposed for the B-4 portion of the site if they were coming out of the City heading north on New Holland Pike since the access would be a right in, right out only.

Mr. Bowman indicated that entering into the site heading North on New Holland Pike would not be permitted.

Mr. Dohm asked how many stories would be proposed if there would be apartments constructed on the B-4 site.

Mr. Bowman advised that apartment buildings are not permitted in the B-4.

Patron #3: Mr. Mark Newkirk, 1152 Country Club Drive Resident

Mr. Newkirk expressed his appreciation of Mr. Bowman's communications with the residents. Mr. Newkirk questioned whether the B-4 site would have access to the west of the property abutting Jaycee Park.

Mr. Bowman indicated that there is no access proposed there.

Mr. Newkirk indicated that there were some comments and concerns generated at the Lancaster Catholic meeting held in January. Mr. Newkirk stated that some of the concerns with this current plan is about Esbenshade Drive being widened and the tree line removed; the exit coming out down by

the park and the loading of the schools. Mr. Newkirk felt that the open area would be a good location for athletic fields or some other use with similar value for the Township.

Patron #4: Mr. Allen Hawkins, 1025 Grandview Boulevard Resident

Mr. Hawkins applauded Mr. Bowman for inviting all of the neighboring property owners to the Lancaster Catholic High School meeting. Mr. Hawkins stated that Esbshade Drive is a great walking area and suggested that a sidewalk or walking trail be provided for the safety of the pedestrians. Mr. Hawkins also expressed his interest in seeing some traffic calming measures put into place on Grandview Boulevard.

Patron #5: Mrs. Joan Hawkins, 1025 Grandview Boulevard Resident

Mrs. Hawkins suggested that the zoning remain R-2; provide sound barriers up along Route 30 and to build the residential homes up closer to the highway versus abutting the Grandview Development.

Mr. Sturla thanked the residents and the applicant.

Mr. Bowman indicated that he does not want to wait for the Comprehensive Plan to be finalized and that he plans on going back and trying to address the concerns raised at tonight's meeting.

Motion by Mr. Rathman, seconded by Mr. Gibeault, it was recommended to table this rezoning request.

Motion Approved 7-0.

Mr. Sturla asked for public comment.

Mrs. Douglas announced that the planning members will be receiving an invitation for an upcoming workshop to introduce the Lancaster County TDR (transferable development rights) Practitioner's handbook.

Mrs. Douglas advised that the handbook was developed over the last year which was started by Warwick Township which then moved forward to involve the County and several municipalities which all joined together in order to craft the handbook.

Mrs. Douglas indicated that the handbook will be unveiled by the Lancaster Farmland Trust and Lancaster County Agricultural Preserve Board at two meetings, the first meeting being held on March

Planning Commission

February 20, 2008

Page 16

11, 2008 between the hours of 9:00 a.m. and 12:30 p.m. and the second meeting being held on March 12, 2008 from 6:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m.

Mr. Sturla suggested that the staff and planning members consider innovative ways to use TDRs and to also revisit past suggestions such as length of building, etc. in order to preserve additional Agricultural land and to gain more use of TDRs.

Mrs. Douglas advised that staff will pursue additional avenues to utilize TDRs and that as the Comprehensive Plan is moving along, staff can look at boosting higher densities, particularly in the southern portion of the Township and abutting the northern portion part, or gateway, coming out of the city.

Mrs. Douglas indicated that there is a transition area coming out of the city and into the Township and is presently an area of Brownfields and in thinking of the rehabilitation for this area, the steering committee and staff can look at heights, widths, or even the whole redevelopment with increase density opportunities.

Mrs. Douglas stated that a few years ago the planning commission proposed increased building heights with apartments and adding apartments to the cluster provisions, however, the proposals did meet with opposition at which point the Township tried to look at ways to lessen the effect of adjoining properties by means of increased setbacks, etc. so as not to become offensive to any existing user.

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

The meeting was adjourned at 10:50 p.m.

The next Regular Planning Commission meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, March 19, 2008 at 6:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Shannon L. Sinopoli