

**MANHEIM TOWNSHIP  
PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTES**

**Wednesday  
January 17, 2007**

A meeting of the Manheim Township Planning Commission was held on Wednesday, January 17, 2007 at 6:30 p.m. The following members were present: Mr. Steven Geisenberger, Mr. Kevin Fry, Mr. Michel Gibeault, Mr. Jeffrey Sturla, Mr. Cory Rathman and Mr. Donald Reed. Mr. Robert Wolf was absent. The following Township staff was present: Ms. Lisa Greaves and Mrs. Shannon Sinopoli.

**Roll Call**

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

**Reorganization**

Mr. Geisenberger welcomed Donald Reed as the new member of the Planning Commission.

Mr. Geisenberger indicated that the first order of business was to reorganize for the year and Mr. Geisenberger handed the gavel to Ms. Greaves.

Ms. Greaves called for nominations for chairman.

On a motion by Mr. Geisenberger, seconded by Mr. Sturla, Mr. Fry was recommended as chairman of the Planning Commission.

Ms. Greaves called for a vote.

**Motion Approved 6-0**

Ms. Greaves handed the gavel to Mr. Fry.

Mr. Fry called for nominations for vice-chairman.

On a motion by Mr. Geisenberger, seconded by Mr. Rathman, Mr. Sturla was recommended as vice-chairman of the Planning Commission.

Mr. Fry called for a vote.

**Motion Approved 6-0.**

**Minutes**

Mr. Fry asked for a motion on the December 20, 2006 meeting minutes.

On a motion by Mr. Geisenberger, seconded by Mr. Rathman, it was recommended to approve the December 20, 2006 meeting minutes.

**Motion Approved 6-0.**

**Old Business**

**A. Development Plans**

1. **IRE/McGovernville Road Tract – Preliminary/Final Subdivision and Land Development Plan - McGovernville Road and Shreiner Station Road - Zoned I-2.**

Mrs. Joan Kimsey, David Miller and Associates, Inc. and Mr. Dale Gingerich, applicant, were present representing this Preliminary/Final Subdivision and Land Development Plan.

Mrs. Kimsey provided a brief update of this land development plan and the proposal for Mini-Storage Facilities.

Mr. Fry questioned the township's concern over the separation distance between the bottom of the detention basin and the seasonal high water table which requires a 4 foot separation distance, however the applicant is proposing a 2 foot separation.

Mr. Fry indicated that the modification request for this difference of 2 feet is not being recommended by the Township Engineer.

Mrs. Kimsey acknowledged the concern regarding the separation of the detention basin and the seasonal high water table.

Mrs. Kimsey indicated that they did raise the basin and that the Department of Environmental Protections 24" guidelines were followed.

Mrs. Kimsey advised that the Manheim Township Stormwater Management Ordinance requires a more stringent requirement and as a result, this modification is being requested.

After further stormwater discussion, planning members requested that the applicant reconfigure the stormwater basin proposal to try and resolve the separation concern with township staff by the February 28, 2007 Planning Commission meeting.

On a motion by Mr. Geisenberger, seconded by Mr. Gibeault, it was recommended to table the requested modifications and plan until all outstanding comments are adequately addressed.

**Motion Approved 6-0.**

**2. GerLe Realty Holdings, LLC - Preliminary/Final Land Development Plan - Warehouse Expansion - Vermont Avenue - Zoned I-1 Industrial. (3/10/07)**

Mr. Robert Murphy, Murphy Engineers and Consultants and Mr. Ryan Lehman, GerLe Realty Holdings were present representing this Preliminary/Final Land Development Plan.

Mr. Murphy advised that all of the review comments have been addressed since the December meeting.

Mr. Murphy briefly revisited the modifications being requested.

Mr. Fry advised that during the December meeting, there were questions raised as to whether or not there were agreements in place for Vermont Avenue since it is a private street.

Mr. Murphy explained that after pulling the deed for the Moove In Partners plan, the recently approved plan adjacent to the GerLe site, he was able to come across a very old recorded right-of-way agreement and has provided a copy to the Township.

Mr. Fry stated that the planning members' questions and concerns related more to the condition of the road and who maintains it.

Mr. Murphy indicated that there is no known legal recorded document for the maintenance of Vermont Avenue, however, there have been notes pertaining to maintenance responsibilities placed on this plan, which mirror the notes on the Moove In Partners plan. Mr. Murphy advised that the best he can tell is that the traffic which utilizes Vermont Avenue today is very minimal for this cartway.

Mr. Geisenberger recommended that at some point, the users of Vermont Avenue should incorporate a legalized document for the maintenance responsibilities of this roadway. Mr. Geisenberger encouraged Franklin & Marshall College representatives to possibly take the lead on creating such agreement along with their future plans for those portions of land.

Mr. Reed stated that over the summers, Franklin and Marshall College runs soccer games, tournaments, etc. Mr. Reed indicated that over this past summer, Franklin and Marshall advised for the first time that there would be no parking on Vermont Avenue. Instead parking was taking place at Country Day School. Mr. Reed indicated that because of such stance there has certainly been a decrease in the amount of traffic and parking on Vermont Avenue.

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

**Motion Approved 6-0.**

**B. Rezoning/Text Amendment/Conditional Use/Ordinances**

**1. Berkshire Development LLC - Text Amendment to amend the Zoning Ordinance to modify Article 23, Section 2319(2)(Q)(ii) of the Planned Commercial Development ordinance. (Hearing Date 3/12/07)**

Mr. Charlie Suhr, Attorney from Stevens and Lee, representing Berkshire Development was present to discuss this petition for a proposed text amendment to the Planned Commercial Development (PCD).

Mr. Suhr presented planning members with another revision to this original proposal. Mr. Suhr indicated that this latest revision was township driven due to language recommendations and additions generated by Planning Commission Solicitor Bill Crosswell.

Mr. Fry asked Mr. Suhr to identify the changes that have transpired since the amendment was last discussed.

Mr. Suhr advised that there was an Interchange definition added and a new paragraph incorporated mirroring the existing language in the ordinance advising that if an applicant wishes to develop a Planned Commercial Development (PCD), there will be mandatory traffic improvements.

Mr. Suhr advised that he, along with the applicant, just received this latest version today and indicated that it will be resubmitted to the Lancaster County Planning Commission to be reviewed at their February 26, 2007 meeting.

Mr. Suhr also indicated that all previously submitted amendments and revisions have been formally withdrawn and that the new hearing date for this latest text amendment will now be March 12, 2007.

Planning members raised concerns in regards to intersection and interchange improvements and how they are graded, as to whether the intersections are graded or the moving lanes of traffic.

Ms. Greaves indicated that, specifically for intersections (Section i), the language is very clear and is based on the lane groups of intersections.

Planning members questioned the specifics for Section ii and iii and questioned if the interchange grade is the grade of the worst lane group or if it is an average of the lane groups.

Mr. Suhr indicated that he believed it to be an average, but it was unclear how the traffic engineers would average such.

Planning members recommended clarifying the language and intent with the Township Traffic Engineer prior to making any recommendations and prior to submitting this proposal to the Lancaster County Planning Commission.

Mr. Fry asked for questions or comments from the audience members. There was no response.

On a motion by Mr. Sturla, seconded by Mr. Reed, it was recommended to table this Text Amendment for the revisions to the PCD Ordinance as presented by Berkshire Development.

**Motion Approved 6-0.**

**2. Manheim Township - Text Amendment to amend the Zoning Ordinance by increasing the number of required Transferable Development Rights for Planned Commercial Developments. (Hearing Date 3/12/07)**

Ms. Lisa Greaves, Township Staff presented a brief update of the recent changes to this proposed text amendment to the Planned Commercial Development (PCD), brought forth by the Manheim Township Commissioners.

Ms. Greaves reminded planning members that under the current PCD provisions, recently adopted by the Commissioners, specifically Section 2319.3.b.2, for each acre of impervious coverage for a PCD, one Transferable Development Right (TDR) is required.

Ms. Greaves indicated that the main point of this proposed text amendment, as indicated at last month's meeting, was to increase the number of TDR's required with a PCD.

Ms. Greaves stated that at the last meeting there was some concern expressed by the Planning Commission in regards to the alternate methods for securing TDR's.

Ms. Greaves advised that those concerns were taken back to Mr. Crosswell, Planning Commission Solicitor, and additional language revisions were incorporated into this latest proposal. In light of the revisions, the new hearing date for this proposed text amendment is March 12, 2007.

Ms. Greaves indicated the current language which is in place right now states that, as an alternative to acquiring TDR's, the developer may propose another method for approval by the Board of Commissioners, provided that the alternative method furthers the townships interest in protecting natural resources, farmlands and/or prime agricultural soils.

Ms. Greaves mentioned that when this current language was presented at the Board of Commissioners meeting, one of the Commissioners expressed concerns over the potential for such language being too open and that some alternative could be proposed and the Commissioners would be required to accept that alternative.

Ms. Greaves advised that because of such concern, the question was raised as to whether or not the language was tight enough and whether or not the inclusion of protecting natural resources should remain as opposed to just farm lands and/or prime agricultural soils.

Ms. Greaves stated that the previous submittal indicated that the Township may, but shall not be required to approve an alternative for securing TDR's furthering the townships interest in preserving farm land.

Ms. Greaves noted that this latest version goes quite a bit further by being specific on how that can be achieved.

Ms. Greaves mentioned that there was also concern expressed at the Commissioners meeting in regards to the number of required TDR's and that one commissioner, in light of a Planned Commercial Development (PCD) being a new concept, wanted to see TDR's purchased and incorporated as part of a PCD to increase and promote the use of TDR's. Therefore the required TDR's are proposed to be increased from 1 TDR for each acre of impervious coverage, to 2 TDR's for each acre of impervious coverage in a PCD.

Brief discussions took place in regards to the TDR program as it currently exists and questions were raised as to whether or not the approval of such alternate method should lie in the hands of the Commissioners, or if such approval should come before a different body such as an Agricultural Preservation Board, etc.

Questions were raised as to what the value of the TDR alternate is or what it should be and felt that such determination should be placed in the hands of someone with expertise in making that decision.

Mr. Geisenberger stated that he felt as though the language in this version of the amendment is certainly better than the previous submittal and thought that it was strengthened very well.

Mr. Geisenberger continued by stating that the TDR value is suppressed because of the Township selling them in the past, which were sold under value. Mr. Geisenberger felt that the number of TDR's required is not the issue and that the real issue is the market value of the TDR's and in light of the Township no longer selling TDR's, they won't be selling under value anymore, therefore, he could not justify changing the required number of TDR's from 1 to 2.

Mr. Fry asked for questions or comments from audience members. There was no response.

On a motion by Mr. Geisenberger, seconded by Mr. Gibeault, it was recommended to approve the proposed language of the Text Amendment, but not to change the required number of TDR's.

**Motion Denied 4-2.**

On a motion by Mr. Sturla, seconded by Mr. Reed, it was recommended to table this Text Amendment for the revisions to the PCD Ordinance as presented by Manheim Township.

**Motion Approved 6-0.**

**New Business**

**A. Development Plans**

**1. Franklin & Marshall College Athletic Field - Revised Preliminary/Final Land Development Plan - Harrisburg Avenue - Zoned B-4 Business. (4/27/07)**

Mr. Mark Shrift of Hayes Large Architects was present representing this revised preliminary/final land development plan.

Mr. Shrift provided a brief overview of this plan and advised that the project consists of the construction of a new synthetic turf, multi-purpose field and some parking.

Mr. Shrift indicated that this is a revision to a previously approved plan and that only changes have been made such as the location of the field, parking area reconfiguration and the potential for a small building to be utilized as storage, bathrooms, electrical equipment room and film viewing platform.

Mr. Shrift informed the planning members that the applicants are requesting a modification from providing sidewalk along the access drive.

Mr. Shrift advised that sidewalk currently exists along the east side of the access drive, however the modification is being requested for western portion of the access drive. Mr. Shrift stated that the applicants would instead provide sidewalk along the western edge of the parking lot whereby serving two purposes; 1) To provide a way to get people from the parking lot to the fence and; 2) Allow day students to be able to walk down to the main sidewalk at Harrisburg Pike and then travel down to the city line pedestrian intersection.

Mr. Shrift briefly explained the remaining modifications being requested and informed the planning members that all of the modifications being requested with this plan are the same as the waivers granted on the previously approved plan.

Brief conversations regarding fencing, parking and stormwater matters took place.

No further questions or comments were received from planning member or audience members.

On a motion by Mr. Sturla, seconded by Mr. Rathman, it was recommended to table the requested modifications and plan until all outstanding comments are adequately addressed.

**Motion Approved 6-0.**



**Announcements**

Mr. Fry welcomed Ms. Gwen Newell, Lancaster County Planning Commission, as the new contact representative for Manheim Township.

Ms. Newell thanked Mr. Fry and provided a brief introduction of her background with Lancaster County Planning Commission.

Mr. Fry thanked Mr. Geisenberger for his past service as Chairman.

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

The meeting adjourned at 8:10 p.m.

The next Regular Planning Commission meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, February 28, 2007 at 6:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Shannon L. Sinopoli