

**MANHEIM TOWNSHIP
PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES
Wednesday
June 20, 2007**

A meeting of the Manheim Township Planning Commission was held on Wednesday, June 20, 2007 at 6:30 p.m. The following members were present: Mr. Kevin Fry; Mr. Jeffrey Sturla; Mr. Steven Geisenberger; Mr. Robert Wolf; Mr. Cory Rathman and Mr. Donald Reed. Mr. Michel Gibeault was absent. The following Township staff was present: Ms. Lisa Greaves and Mrs. Shannon Sinopoli.

Roll Call

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

Minutes

Mr. Fry asked for a motion on the May 16, 2007 meeting minutes.

On a motion by Mr. Sturla, seconded by Mr. Reed, it was recommended to approve the May 16, 2007 meeting minutes.

Motion Approved 6-0.

Old Business

A. Comprehensive Plan steering committee update

Ms. Greaves provided a brief update regarding the steering committee and indicated that the meetings are being held monthly, every fourth Wednesday at 7:00 a.m. at the Township Offices.

Ms. Greaves advised that at the last steering committee meeting, four evening listening sessions were scheduled from 7:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m. on the following dates and specified locations:

1. Tuesday, August 7, 2007 at Schaeffer Elementary School Gymnasium
2. Wednesday, August 8, 2007 at Reidenbaugh Elementary Cafeteria
3. Monday, August 20, 2007 at The Barn at Overlook
4. Wednesday, November 14, 2007 at Landis Homes Retirement Community Harvest Room

Ms. Greaves indicated that these dates and times are being provided on the Township Website as well as the July Township Newsletter.

Ms. Greaves advised that the surveys are nearing completion and will be finalized at the June 27, 2007 meeting, which will in turn be mailed out to all area residents.

B. Development Plans

1. Lancaster Airport Authority – Preliminary/Final Land Development and Subdivision Plan Lititz Pike and Airport Road – Zoned I-3.

Present representing this Preliminary/Final Land Development and Subdivision Plan was Mr. Dave Eberly, Lancaster Airport Authority; Mr. Matt Kundro and Mr. William Eshenfelder, Delta Airport Consultants.

Mr. Kundro provided a brief update of the project and indicated that after meeting with Township Staff and the Township Engineer, they have now been able to address the stormwater concern that was discussed at the May Planning Commission meeting.

Mr. Kundro indicated that they are now providing equal pre and post development volumes by making some grading adjustments which now shows that they are meeting this requirement.

Mr. Kundro indicated that the Township Engineer also had concerns regarding the modification request of Section 402.4 which pertains to providing water quality storage and treatment. Mr. Kundro indicated that they have resolved these concerns by agreeing to provide water treatment facilities and BMP' s for all future improvements which will become a part of the recorded plan.

Mr. Reed questioned the suggestion by Township Staff to provide fencing around the basin.

Mr. Kundro indicated that this was also discussed with Township Staff and the conclusion was that since this basin is located within an industrial area, away from any residential uses, providing such fencing would be more of a hassle than a safety mechanism.

Mr. Fry asked for public comment.

There was no response from audience members.

On a motion by Mr. Sturla, seconded by Mr. Wolf, it was recommended to approve this plan conditioned upon the applicant providing an analysis to address Section 302.6.F of the Stormwater Management Ordinance.

Motion Denied 6-0.

On a motion by Mr. Sturla, seconded by Mr. Wolf, it was recommended to:

*Approve the modification request of Section 402.4 - Water Quality Storage and Treatment Facility contingent upon the applicant providing BMP Water Quality Treatments/Facilities upon the construction of all future improvements.

*Approve the remaining modification requests contingent upon a clean review letter.

*Approve this plan conditioned upon the applicant providing an analysis to address Section 302.6.F of the Stormwater Management Ordinance.

Motion Approved 6-0.

Ms. Greaves indicated that for clarification, if there is something missing in the analysis different than what was discussed with Township Staff, the applicants will not move onto the Board of Commissioners until such is resolved.

2. Airport Industrial Park - Lot 33 - Preliminary/Final Land Development Plan - Richard Drive - Zoned I-1.

Present representing this Preliminary/Final Land Development Plan was Mr. Keith Miller, RGS Associates.

Mr. Miller indicated that at the last meeting, all comments were being addressed, however, there was an additional modification which need to be requested pertaining to Section 803.8.F for the access drive separation requirement.

Mr. Miller advised that this modification has since been requested.

Mr. Fry asked if there were any questions from the planning members.

There was no response.

Mr. Fry asked for public comment.

There was no response from audience members.

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

Motion Approved 6-0.

3. Fruitville Daycare Center - Final Land Development Plan - Erbs Quarry Road - Brighton PRD - Zoned R-1. (8/14/07)

Present representing this Final Land Development Plan was Mr. Sandy Kime, David Miller and Associates.

Mr. Kime indicated that since this plan was last reviewed, the applicants have met with Township Staff to work out the concerns and that the outstanding comments have since been addressed.

Mr. Fry asked if there were any questions from the planning members.

There was no response.

Mr. Fry asked for public comment.

There was no response from audience members.

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

Motion Approved 6-0.

C. Rezoning/Text Amendment/Conditional Use/Ordinances

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

Present representing this Preliminary/Final Land Development Plan was Mr. Charlie Suhr, Attorney, Stevens and Lee; Mr. William McCollum, Berkshire Development; Mr. Steve Horst, property owner; Mr. David Madary, David Miller and Associates; Ms. Jodie Evans, McMahon Transportation Engineers and Mr. Scott Pollick, Arrowstreet Architecture.

Mr. Suhr indicated that a request for a time extension has been submitted which would extend the time out to August 13, 2007 for the Board of Commissioners hearing commencement date.

Mr. Suhr indicated that after a full submission at the last meeting, their primary focus for this evening's meeting is traffic.

Mr. Suhr informed the planning members that the applicants had met with the Township Staff and Township Traffic Engineer earlier this week which prompted the need for some additional traffic improvements.

Mr. Pollick presented a brief power point presentation outlining some of the changes including the renovation proposals for the existing daycare, landscape improvements and walking path attributes.

Mr. Fry questioned which of the three storage units on the adjacent parcel was proposed to be eliminated.

Mr. Pollick indicated the one closest to the development site.

Mr. Geisenberger stated that he was questioning why the developer isn't removing all three storage units and questioned why the applicant would want to continue the storage facility to the east of the Planned Commercial Development since such industrial use would not fit in with the proposed retail development.

Mr. Geisenberger asked how many acres houses storage units.

Mr. Madary indicated that Lot 15C, which Mr. Geisenberger is referring to, contains 3.26 acres.

Mr. Sturla asked what the applicant and developer were proposing for the Orthopedic building in order to tie it in with the remaining development.

Mr. Pollick indicated that, architecturally, the existing building is an attractive structure and that there is no intention of modifying that particular building.

Mr. Pollick advised that the idea is to expand from the existing picnic area to create outdoor seating and more intensive landscaping and to create a second one down the hill from it which will start the pedestrian path and travel throughout the site.

Mr. Sturla questioned if Mr. Pollick believed that the Orthopedic building is of the same style architecturally in keeping continuity with the proposals for the remaining buildings.

Mr. Pollick indicated that the Orthopedic building is not in the same architectural style.

Mr. Sturla stated that the planning members are really struggling with the idea of having a collection of existing buildings which are being tied into this development to simply meet the 40 acre minimum requirement.

Mr. Sturla further stated that the idea of a Planned Commercial Development (PCD) was that there would be architectural continuity between all of the

buildings and that he would like to ensure that the average motorist would be able to clearly realize that this building is a part of the entire PCD.

Mr. Pollick indicated that in his experience, when there are numerous buildings in a particular location, the desire is to have a wide amount of variety in the architectural styles and that that he does feel that the buildings need to all be the same to actually make the environment.

Mr. Sturla reiterated his concern.

Mr. Madary presented a brief slide presentation of the detailed site plans.

Mr. Geisenberger questioned the open space calculation.

Mr. Madary indicated that 30% is required and that 40% is proposed.

Mr. Rathman questioned the distance between the Orthopedic building and the beginning of the eastern most parking lot.

Mr. Madary indicated that there is 300 feet between those two points.

Mr. Madary proceeded with providing the planning members with site concepts for the new retail portion of the site as well as the redevelopment portion of the proposal.

Mr. Madary indicated that the proposals for the redevelopment include modifications to the existing parking lots, drive connections and the removal of the one storage unit on adjacent Lot 15C in order to gain an additional 73 parking spaces for the main site in order to help provide a balance of parking for the various buildings.

Mr. Madary provided the planning members with proposed lighting plans.

**Note: Mr. Gibeault was present as of 7:20 p.m.*

Brief discussions took place in regards to the modifications to the facades of the existing buildings to the west of Carerra Drive.

Mr. Wolf wondered if there have been any thoughts or discussions as to if this was right use for this particular land since original idea and intention for the site was to create a business park in Granite Run.

Mr. Wolf asked what happened to those original plans which have now led the owner or developer to determine that the original business park idea will not be successful or that the buildings are not marketable anymore.

Mr. Wolf stated that his dilemma is going to be whether or not the applicants are taking this new ordinance and this new classification because of the timing and

trying to use it towards their advantage for a good project or if they are taking advantage of the new classification and the new ordinance and trying to ask the Planning Commission to use their imaginations and stretch what lifestyle project has been painted in the minds of the planning members during the review and approval of the PCD text amendment.

Mr. Wolf continued by stating that the proposal of readapting existing buildings was not in the minds of the planning members when they painted a picture of a piece of ground or project being built from the ground up. Mr. Wolf indicated that he was not saying that readapting the buildings could not be a part of a new lifestyle center, but he felt in his opinion and in a short period of time, he is now looking at an existing business center that was built to be a business center and a corporate center and all of the sudden now the planning members have to try and picture in their minds how those existing types of buildings can be readapted and create the same end project as what was envisioned during the text amendment process with High.

Mr. Wolf stated that the bottom line was that he is wondering if that land can't be developed under the existing zoning or if those buildings aren't marketable anymore and questioned what the real reason is and why the planning members should look at changing this property to a new zoning classification as a PCD versus leaving it as it is and seeing the possibility of a very successful business park.

Mr. Suhr responded, however, it was inaudible due to the lack of using the microphone.

Mr. Wolf advised that during the process of the PCD Text Amendment, the planning members tried to be comfortable in knowing that specific language was being put into the ordinance which would allow the Board of Commissioners to ensure that they still had control over what projects fell under that ordinance and that it was the right project and one that is in the best interest of the Township. Mr. Wolf further stated that there was a concern that once the ordinance was written, that projects may try to take advantage of this new zoning and stretch what the Township thought when the Planning Commission helped write the ordinance.

Mr. Suhr responded, but again was inaudible.

Mr. Sturla stated that is the reason why this use is permitted only by special exception instead of being permitted by right because the planning members did not want every property that is zoned Industrial to develop as a PCD.

Mr. Sturla further stated that, during the text amendment process, the Planning Commission sent a clear message that they do not feel that each parcel of Industrial Zoned land should be developed this way and asked the applicants to tell the planning members why they should consider changing this parcel and project from Industrial to a PCD.

Mr. McCollum indicated that he has looked at Lancaster over the years for development opportunities including the High site and sites going out east on Route 30 and had approached Steve Horst 1-1/2 years ago about this piece of property and that while it is zoned Industrial for office buildings, Mr. McCollum stated that this property is an absolutely beautiful piece for retail development.

Mr. Fry asked if it was of Mr. McCollum's opinion that the highest and best use of 20 years ago may have been industrial but given the density of the Township and the changes that have occurred in the last 20 years, the highest and best use is retail.

Mr. McCollum answered that Mr. Fry is correct and that is his opinion due to the access and visibility from the freeway, this site is perfect for retail development.

Mr. Fry indicated that he agrees with the comments which were made by the other planning members and stated that, in his opinion, it is the applicant and developers obligation to prove to the Planning Commission that this is the best use.

Mr. Horst responded to address Mr. Wolf's question in terms of why this use on this particular land.

Mr. Horst indicated that they have developed about 360,000 square foot of office area and that he strongly believes that they have enough office product to serve the community in this area for many years to come.

Mr. Horst further indicated that he is looking at what could be a good compliment to the existing amount of office space with the strong occupancies and started looking at upscale retail as a nice compliment to what is already developed in Granite Run.

Mr. Horst stated that he doesn't foresee any other real strong candidates to be developed here. Mr. Horst indicated that, in addition to this lot being narrow, it is also carved in half by a gas line easement that runs right through the middle of this property and bisects it, and therefore the biggest building that he could get on there wouldn't be a good industrial building.

Mr. Fry asked for the applicants to provide the traffic updates.

Mrs. Evans presented the planning members with drawings showing the conceptual overview of the traffic study area and the proposed improvements.

Mrs. Evans advised that an updated trip generation analysis was also created to incorporate all of the existing uses in addition to the proposed.

Focusing on community benefits, Mrs. Evans advised that there are some new traffic improvements being proposed based on comments generated by the Township Traffic Engineer.

Mr. Rathman questioned why Plaza Boulevard was not included in the traffic study.

Mrs. Evans responded by advising that only 15% of the traffic from the development site was projected to travel towards Plaza Boulevard and that the remaining 85% are expected to utilize other travel courses.

Mrs. Evans indicated that they are proposing to continue the second northbound lane on Manheim Pike at Granite Run Drive, which will then drop into the existing right turn lane onto Lausch Lane.

Mrs. Evans indicated that another change along Manheim Pike is to extend the proposed second southbound through lane so that it starts back farther than originally proposed in order to provide more queuing and storage areas and become more usable as a second through lane going southbound.

Mrs. Evans stated that another improvement along Manheim Pike includes the creation of dual left turns, a through lane and a right turn lane at the light at Granite Run Drive.

Mrs. Evans indicated that the proposed traffic improvements for the Manheim Pike and Route 283 interchange have remained the same per the Township Traffic Engineer's concurrence with the proposal.

Mrs. Evans stated that they are proposing improvements including a separate left, through, right going northbound on Fruitville Pike at the intersection with Delp Road and extending the storage volume for the westbound left turn lane.

Mrs. Evans indicated that the Fruitville Pike and Granite Run Drive improvements include an additional southbound through lane by widening Fruitville Pike and the addition of a single left, a through and a right turn lane heading northbound at the Granite Run intersection.

Mrs. Evans continued but was no longer audible due to the lack of using the microphone.

Mr. Reed expressed his concern for the residents who reside along the eastern side of Fruitville Pike and was concerned that these residents could lose 10 foot of their front yards. Mr. Reed stated that it would come really close to the houses, similar to what has happened further down on Fruitville Pike when the Red Rose Commons was developed and where they came within about 6 foot of the houses.

Mr. Wolf asked how all of the traffic improvements relate to PADOT.

Mrs. Evans indicated that for any off site improvements along the state roads, a highway occupancy permit will need to be obtained from PADOT.

Mr. Wolf indicated that his concern with PADOT not being fully involved is that a lot of improvements will now be resting solely on the Township Traffic Engineer since PADOT will not be requiring the applicants to study all of the intersections and make the developer mitigate the intersections so that the grade level is no less than before.

Mr. Geisenberger questioned the posting of financial security for all of the roadway improvements.

Staff indicated that the applicants would have to post financial security based on the Township Engineers approved construction cost opinion and that this security would need to be in place prior to the recording of the plans. Staff advised that, in addition to posting securities with the Township, the applicants will also have to post securities with PADOT for any of the work taking place along the state roadways.

Mr. Fry asked for public comment.

Patron #1: Helen Collums, Valleybrook resident expressed her concerns regarding traffic throughout Manheim Township and suggested forcing developers to add traffic lanes to existing two lane roads when they wish to develop a site.

Patron #2: Frank Belfano, East Petersburg resident commented Route 283 heading west and you exit to go up to Manheim Pike and you come up to that yield sign to enter Manheim Pike, it's impossible to yield you really have to stop because you can't see down the road, but that's something I would like to be considered if they are going through with this project.

On a motion by Mr. Rathman, seconded by Mr. Geisenberger, it was recommended to table the conditional use request.

Motion Approved 6-0, with Mr. Gibeault abstaining due to his late arrival.

NEW BUSINESS

A. Development Plans

- 1. Universal Athletic Club – Preliminary/Final Lot Add-On Plan - Oregon Pike and Landis Valley Road - Zoned B-3.**

Present representing this Preliminary/Final Lot Add-On Plan was Mr. Gregory Strausser, Strausser Surveying and Engineering.

Mr. Strausser indicated that this plan involves two properties located at the intersection of Oregon Pike and Landis Valley Road to include the Quality Inn and Universal Athletic Club.

Mr. Strausser advised that Lot #1, as shown on the plan, is where the Universal Athletic Club is for which consists of a 90,000 square foot commercial recreation facility located on 4.637 acres.

Mr. Strausser indicated that Lot #2, as shown on the plan, is the Quality Inn & Suites which is located on 11.3 acres.

Mr. Strausser stated that the purpose of this plan is to increase the parking area for the Universal Athletic Club by taking 2.018 acres of the Quality Inn & Suites parcel and adding it onto the Universal Athletic Club parcel by shifting the property line.

Mr. Strausser advised that there would be an additional 134 of existing parking spaces added to Lot #1 and that of that 134, there would be 32 spaces eliminated between the new boundary lines in order to comply with the Zoning Ordinance requirement which requires 20 feet of improvement area around the perimeter of the boundary line. Mr. Strausser indicated that the boundary line on Lot #2 for the Quality Inn & Suites requires a 10 foot improvement area.

Mr. Strausser stated that, in order to keep compliance with the parking requirements for the hotel, they have shifted the parking on Lot #2 by adding parallel spaces along the access drives.

Mr. Strausser provided a brief background of the history of the Universal Athletic Club site and indicated that there have been numerous parking struggles that have plagued this property for the 13 years that Universal Athletic Club has been in business.

Mr. Strausser continued by advising that since this club has grown throughout the years it has been quite a struggle to keep up with adequate parking for the high demand of use of the facility and that currently, the owner has been leasing additional parking spaces from the Quality Inn and Suites which is renewed on a yearly basis.

Mr. Strausser indicated that Universal Athletic Club's parking lot currently has 209 parking spaces and that in order to bring this use into compliance with Zoning requirements of 300 parking spaces, they are proposing to purchase this additional land and to provide over 300 parking spaces.

Mr. Fry questioned the modification requests of providing curb and sidewalk.

Mr. Fry indicated that there is a note on a previously recorded plan which included the Quality Inn parcel and Olde Hickory and that the language on the recorded plan clearly states that any future land development or subdivision plan submitted, for either one of those lots, for Township review must address curb and sidewalk for the entire frontage of these lots.

Mr. Strausser responded by indicating that when they had first prepared this plan, they were unaware of that note being a part of the recorded plan, however, that this has since been relayed to him and the applicant.

Mr. Strausser indicated that the applicant is willing to provide the curb and sidewalk, however, he indicated that there isn't a timeframe in which the owner has to complete the installation of such for a lot add-on plan and that basically it is the applicant making the commitment to do the work, but it's an open end commitment.

Mr. Fry questioned whether or not the Township could place a deadline on when these improvements had to be installed by.

Mr. Strausser indicated that he didn't think the ordinance allows for it, however, they have notes on the plan indicating that the work is intended to be done in order to bring everything into compliance and that the work is going to be done in conjunction with the future reconfiguration of the parking area which will be covered by the whole future Stormwater Management plan.

Mr. Strausser indicated that they would still like to request the modification with this lot add-on, but make these improvements a condition that such will be done in conjunction with the future Stormwater Management Plan.

Mr. Reed responded by asking when that would be.

Mr. Strausser indicated that it would be at the discretion of the owner.

Mr. Reed responded by indicating that it may never happen.

Mr. Fry suggested that this issue be viewed by the Township Solicitor and that the planning members should have an opinion from the solicitor prior to voting on this plan.

Mr. Sturla agreed that they need to find a way to somehow ensure that the improvements get done in a timely matter.

Mr. Fry asked for public comment.

There was no response from audience members.

On a motion by Mr. Reed, seconded by Mr. Gibeault it was recommended to table this plan and modifications.

Motion Approved 7-0.

B. Rezoning/Text Amendment/Conditional Use/Ordinances

1. SprintNEXTEL – Conditional Use Request - Manheim Township School District - 140 School Road - Zoned R-3.

Present representing this Conditional Use Request was Mr. Robert Cronin Jr., Attorney from Nikolaus & Hohenadel and Mr. Larry Lahr, Launch Wireless, SprintNextel Representative.

Mr. Cronin Jr. informed the planning members that they are seeking approval to co-locate an antenna on top of a light pole structure at the Manheim Township School District Athletic Facilities.

Mr. Cronin Jr. indicated that the pole is 105 feet and is the preferred location for the antenna which will bring the height to 115 feet acceptable pursuant to the Township Zoning Ordinance

Mr. Cronin Jr. advised that, in addition to the antenna, they are proposing to construct a 10' x 20' equipment shelter which will be enclosed with a 30' x 23' fence compound at the base of the light pole.

Mr. Fry questioned the location of the pole in which this antenna will be placed.

Mr. Cronin Jr. indicated that it will be on the press box side of the football field.

Mr. Reed questioned the fencing that is proposed.

Mr. Cronin Jr. indicated that this is being added just for this particular light pole as it is a requirement to keep the equipment safe.

Mr. Fry asked for public comment.

There was no response from audience members.

Ms. Greaves indicated to the applicants that the fencing requirements reflect a 6 foot maximum height and advised the applicant to include this requirement on the plans.

Mr. Lahr concurred.

On a motion by Mr. Wolf, seconded by Mr. Geisenberger, it was recommended to approve this Conditional Use request.

Motion Approved 7-0.

The public hearing is set for August 13, 2007

2. Highland Presbyterian Church – Rezoning Petition - Oregon Pike and East Roseville Road - Request to change zoning of property from Zone R-2 to IN.

Present representing this Rezoning Petition was Mrs. Caroline Hoffer, Barley-Snyder; Mr. Bob Kornman, Derck & Edson; Reverend Bill Jackson and Howard Livingston.

Mrs. Hoffer indicated that the church property consists of 28 acres and that the purpose of the rezoning petition is to go from R-2 Residential to Institutional District.

Mrs. Hoffer indicated that the reason for this request is because of an opportunity which has presented itself to the church to partner with Presbyterian Homes and to provide a retirement community in order to extend the mission of the church.

Mrs. Hoffer stated that with the current plans for the proposed expansion of the existing church, that there is now a lot of synergy between the two uses.

Mrs. Hoffer provided a brief background of the site and the surrounding parcels utilizing aerial photographs.

Reverend Jackson followed by providing additional background in regards to the church and the site.

Reverend Jackson indicated that the church is 49 years old and that the original members always had a vision of providing an addition on the property for elderly residents. Mr. Jackson stated that this has been a long term thought over the years and that with the growth of the church and this present opportunity with Presbyterian Homes, the church now has the opportunity to fulfill that mission and that it is a very exciting point in time for the church and church members.

Mr. Reed asked about the total site being changed to institutional and stated that he could not find any church in Manheim Township which is located in an Institutional Zone on the Zoning Map.

Mrs. Hoffer responded by indicating that when the current comprehensive plan was adopted in 1995, an Institutional District was not yet created and at that point, these types of units were being constructed through the R-4 Zone.

Mrs. Hoffer continued by indicating that there was an acknowledgement, however, in the Comprehensive Plan identifying that there was an older population and that the Township would need to deal with this issue of what they were going to do for housing the senior population.

Mrs. Hoffer continued by stating that, in 1998 the Zoning Ordinance was changed to incorporate an Institutional District. Mrs. Hoffer indicated that

churches were and are allowed by special exception in all the districts, therefore, there was not a need to surround the churches as being Institutional Districts, however, there was a need then to take all the existing retirement communities and acknowledge the existing land use as Institutional because the R-4 district was taken away.

Mrs. Hoffer indicated that in the past, although most retirement communities were an extension of churches, they were constructed separately, however, this particular proposal is to incorporate the retirement community beside the church and to develop and design it to be a cooperative use.

Mr. Geisenberger questioned if the retirement community would be a continuing care facility and a taxable facility.

Mrs. Hoffer answered that it would not be a traditional assisted living facility and that this proposed community would not be continuing care units, they would be independent units with some supportive services, which therefore, would be taxable.

There were some discussions involving the types of buildings and the layout of the buildings.

Mr. Kornman indicated that there would be a total of three buildings proposed with 50 units in each, three stories tall and that the parking would be underneath the buildings.

Mr. Kornman advised that the access to the retirement community would be via an access drive off of Roseville Road with a proposed connection up to the church and that there would also be walking trails throughout the site for access back and forth from the church to the retirement community.

Brief stormwater and parking discussions took place.

Mr. Geisenberger asked what the open space requirement would be.

Ms. Greaves advised that in the Institutional District, the open space requirement would be 50%.

Planning members requested that the applicant provide more in depth detail in regards to the proposed retirement units for the July meeting.

Mr. Rathman asked the applicants what the timeframe would be for a full land development plan submission if the rezoning request would be approved.

Mr. Kornman answered that a land development plan would probably be submitted within one year of rezoning approval.

Planning Commission

June 20, 2007

Page 16

Mrs. Hoffer indicated that with the land development plan, the intention will be to create a separate parcel for the retirement community.

Mr. Rathman questioned why the applicants decided not to wait for the conclusion of the updates to the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Kornman indicated that the applicants really have a need for this today and wish to move forward for all of the people that have a big desire and need for this at the present time.

Mr. Geisenberger indicated that the Lancaster Bible College has been discouraged from petitioning rezoning within the recent years pending the update of the Comprehensive Plan and also indicated that Brethren Village was actually denied a rezoning request in the past few years pending the Comprehensive Plan updates.

Mr. Fry asked for public comment.

Patron #1: Frank Belfano, East Petersburg resident commented that he felt the planning members asked very good questions and thanked the Planning Commission.

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

Motion Approved 7-0.

The public hearing is set for August 13, 2007

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

The meeting adjourned at 9:45 p.m.

The next Regular Planning Commission meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, July 18, 2007 at 6:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Shannon L. Sinopoli