

**MANHEIM TOWNSHIP  
PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTES  
Wednesday  
February 19, 2015**

A meeting of the Manheim Township Planning Commission was held on Thursday, February 19, 2015 at 6:30 p.m. The following members were present: Chairman Mr. Michel Gibeault; Vice Chairman Mr. Jeffery Swinehart; Members: Mr. Walter Lee; Mr. John Shipman; Ms. Maryann Marotta; Mr. John Hendrix and Ms. Stacey Betts. The following Township Staff was present: Mrs. Lisa Douglas and Mrs. Shannon Sinopoli.

**Roll Call**

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

**Minutes**

Mr. Gibeault asked for a motion on the January 21, 2015 Planning Commission meeting minutes.

On a motion by Mr. Shipman, seconded by Mr. Swinehart it was recommended to approve the January 21, 2015 meeting minutes.

**Motion Approved 7-0.**

**Subdivision/Land Development Plans**

- i. **Belmont** – Preliminary Subdivision and Land Development Plan – Planned Commercial Development I – Fruitville Pike - Zoned R-3; I-2; R-2; D-R Overlay & T-1 Natural Resources Overlay.

Present representing this Preliminary Subdivision and Land Development Plan was Mr. Philip Frey, Manbel Devco I; Mr. Kevin Lahn and Mr. Joe Waters, R.J. Waters & Associates; Mr. Alex Piehl, RGS Associates and Mr. Jarred Neal, Traffic Planning and Design.

Mr. Piehl advised the planning members that this Planned Commercial Development 1 (PCD-1) project received conditional use approval in 2013 and that they are now in the land development stage of the project.

Mr. Piehl provided a brief background of this project which consists of 3 tracts of land; Tract 1 being located on the west side of Fruitville Pike just south of Red Rose Commons containing approximately 6 acres; Tract 2 being located on the east side of Fruitville Pike consisting of approximately 72 acres; and Tract 3 being located on the north side of Route 30 consisting of approximately 15 acres.

Mr. Piehl indicated that there are no proposed improvements on Tract 1 other than some roadway widening along the frontage.

Mr. Piehl advised that the bulk of all improvements for the PCD-1 are located on Tract 2 which will include 372,100 square feet of commercial, retail and restaurant uses as well as a residential transition area which will include 74 townhouses and 13 single family detached homes which will abut the existing Glen Moore neighborhood. Mr. Piehl indicated that some other improvements that will take place on Tract 2 consist of reconfiguring the existing quarry, preserving the existing cemetery as well as reshaping and re-vegetating the existing floodplain and wetland areas.

Mr. Piehl advised that Tract 3 will only consist of a stormwater management facility to address existing offsite stormwater that flows to the property.

Mr. Piehl indicated that Tract 2 will also provide plenty of pedestrian circulation with sidewalks along Fruitville Pike as well as throughout the site. Mr. Piehl indicated that there will also be a bituminous walking trail which will run along the southern part of the project with connection over to Crescent Avenue. Mr. Piehl indicated that there would be no vehicular access to the existing Glen Moore neighborhood.

Mr. Piehl advised that there will be a commercial main street with a prominent streetscape and will consist of a mix of retail uses and restaurants.

Mr. Lahn indicated that they are continually having conversations with potential tenants for the site and that one that has definitely committed is Whole Foods which will be located in Building N.

Mr. Lahn advised that the remaining buildings have been set up to house certain types of tenants. Mr. Lahn indicated that Building A will consist of smaller scale retail uses; Building B will consist of smaller scale restaurant uses; Buildings C & D would consist of larger single restaurant tenants; Building E will consist of a national restaurant chain with a drive-thru; Building F will be divided into 2-3 smaller restaurant uses; Buildings G-I will consist of retail uses and Buildings J – M are set up to house large national retailers.

Mr. Lahn indicated that he has several letters of intent with potential tenants.

Mr. Frey discussed the residential portion and indicated that with the PCD-1, there is a stipulation that a residential transition area and buffer be provided when the project is adjacent to an existing residential neighborhood. Mr. Frey advised that the residential transition area includes 13 single family dwellings which back up to existing homes and that the size of such dwellings will mimic the sizes of the existing dwellings to the east. Mr. Frey indicated that the ordinance requires two different types of dwelling units in which case they are providing 74 townhouse units as well which will all be owned by residents and operated by a Homeowners Association.

Mr. Lahn discussed signage and advised that there will be two development signs positioned in the stormwater basin at the corner of Fruitville Pike and Chester Road; 2 entrance signs located at both of the signalized intersections as well as 2 monument signs located in the islands of the streets as you enter the site.

Mr. Frey indicated that there will be \$6.9 million worth of traffic improvements associated with this project and that such improvements will be discussed with PennDOT next week.

Mr. Gibeault stated that he feels as though this use is an excellent use for this particular property as everyone knew it would never remain a farmed piece of ground.

Mr. Gibeault asked the planning commission members for comments.

Mrs. Marotta questioned the scale of the residential units.

Mr. Frey indicated that the single family detached dwellings will be 2-story and that the townhouses will be 3-story with first floor garages.

Ms. Betts questioned where the parking would be for the townhouses and stated that first floor garages were mentioned, however, she wondered if they are 2-car garages or single.

Mr. Frey advised that he believed all of the garages are double garages and in addition there are on-street overflow spaces.

Mr. Gibeault questioned the impervious areas that are shown running between the townhouses and asked if parking is also located in those areas.

Mr. Frey advised that those areas are referred to as "auto courts" and basically provide an area for vehicles to get in and out of their garages.

Mr. Shipman questioned the width of the residential street and the number of on-street parking spaces being provided.

Mr. Piehl advised that there are just under 20 on-street parking spaces on the townhouse side of the street only.

Mr. Gibeault questioned the width of the street and wondered where visitors would park if there are only 20 spaces being provided along the street.

Mr. Piehl indicated the width of the street is 21 feet, plus 7 feet with the on-street parking.

Mr. Gibeault suggested that the applicants look into more options to provide additional parking for guests.

Mr. Swinehart expressed concern regarding the added onsite intersection at Access Drive A & E and the close proximity with the Access Drive A & C intersection. Mr. Swinehart advised that there are safety, movement and congestion concerns with regards to this additional intersection.

Mr. Neal indicated that there were 19 intersections studied as part of the conditional use traffic impact study which included this intersection and is stop controlled. This added intersection was tenant requested to beef up the overall circulation to avoid congestion.

Mr. Swinehart indicated that these intersections are too busy and have too many movements associated with each. Mr. Swinehart questioned how this intersection would function if he was coming out from the main shopping center parking lot to the intersection and wants to take a left across three different movements.

Mr. Neal advised that there are two egress movements, one a shared left-thru and the other a shared right-thru.

Mr. Gibeault stated that this set up reminds him of the circulation at the Red Rose Commons, in particular, around the Barnes and Nobles store and the blockage that occurs there which also gives him concerns with regards to this added intersection, especially being full movement and so close to the other intersection and felt as though the better scenario would be to eliminate one of these intersections.

Mr. Neal stated that there has been some changes since the conditional use approval, however, dedicated turn lanes have also been provided which should help alleviate congestion.

Mr. Shipman indicated that with a large retailer, depending on who that is, the traffic flow could be significant and questioned if the worst case scenario has been considered.

Mr. Neal advised that specific land uses are considered and more trips are applied to different areas of the center based on the tenant square footage.

Mr. Shipman indicated that regardless of the large retailer, there will be at least 2 high volume drive-thru restaurants proposed in Buildings E & F.

Mr. Neal indicated that these users are not the largest square footage, but will generate more traffic.

Mr. Shipman questioned the addition of Access Drive F and advised that this access seems redundant in light of the fact that if someone is heading north, they will turn into Access Drive B since that is the first access that they hit. Mr. Shipman also indicated that the right-out would scare him if he was exiting Access Drive F and wanted to go over to Red Rose Commons, he would have to cut across multiple lanes to do so. Mr. Shipman further stated that the short distance between the other two signalized intersections doesn't make sense and doesn't seem warranted.

Mr. Neal indicated that originally there were only two accesses from Fruitville Pike which are Access Drives A & B, however, after receiving feedback from tenants, the push to relieve pressure from the other internal intersections is the reason behind the addition of Access Drive F with the theory to get customers in and out without having to go through the entire center.

Mr. Swinehart questioned the functionality of the proposed traffic circle along Access Drive C.

Mr. Piehl indicated that the circle is designed as a traffic calming mechanism as well as to funnel traffic continually by circling the roundabout.

Mr. Piehl indicated that it would be a full function roundabout with a 15-foot travel lane.

Mr. Gibeault questioned what the purpose of the roundabout was, other than traffic calming.

Mr. Piehl indicated that this particular area is more of a high pedestrian area rather than vehicles where the community green abuts as well as access over to the transit stop and to the big retail shops.

Mr. Gibeault asked for public comment.

Mr. Edward Walton, 1574 Crescent Avenue indicated that he shared Mr. Gibeault's concern regarding the parking in the residential area and felt that it was inadequate especially around the holidays in which case only having 20 overflow spaces will not be enough for 74 townhouses.

Mr. Bob Hagen, 93 Roosevelt Boulevard advised that he is very pleased with how this project has progressed thus far and appreciated the interaction the developer has had with the Glenn Moore neighborhood.

Mr. Hagen asked if the existing landscape is being retained.

Mr. Piehl indicated yes, other than invasive species, which will be removed.

Mr. Hagen stated that he is glad to see Whole Foods as a tenant, which should set a good precedent for the site.

Mr. Hagen questioned what the plans were for the green area below the project where a dead end street is being shown and if there are plans to build in that area, what happens when it gets built?

Mr. Gibeault indicated that this particular piece is not a part of the PCD-1 as it lacks the necessary overlay zoning, however, the base zoning for this parcel is Residential 3 in which case any type of residential units could potentially be built there by right, they would just need to come through the land development process.

Mr. Hagen questioned what accommodations would need to be made to the floodplain in order to build on this parcel.

Mr. Gibeault advised that nothing can be built in the floodplain.

Mr. Hagen asked if there would need to be a secondary access for this parcel if it were ever developed.

Mr. Gibeault indicated that would be determined during preliminary sketch plans.

Mr. Hagen stated that early on, this parcel was shown to have townhouses proposed and questioned what the reason was for that proposal to be withdrawn.

Mr. Piehl advised that early on it was the intent to develop the entire site of Tract 2, however, it was realized that this area is in a different overlay zone which could not be a part of the conditional use.

Mr. John King, 1558 Cedar Road advised that his property abuts the proposed trail connection to the Glen Moore neighborhood in which case his driveway currently sits on this piece of land and wondered what will happen with his driveway.

Mr. Frey indicated that after checking back through deeds, this piece was an old farm lane never separated from the main farm with extends over your driveway and out to the curb.

Mr. Frey advised that they are working on solving 3 issues; one being creating the walking path; two being working with Mr. King with regards to his driveway and three being stormwater control in that area.

Mr. Thomas, 132 Lincoln Street, questioned the Dillerville Swamp and the wetlands existing on the Belmont Tract with regards to vegetation and stormwater management.

Mr. Piehl indicated that the existing onsite wetlands will remain, however, since they consist largely of invasive plant material, there will be some reworking of the vegetation to supply native species.

Mr. Thomas questioned the stormwater management across Fruitville Pike.

Mr. Piehl indicated that his team is looking at that and advised that it will be more controlled and filtered.

There was no further discussions.

On a motion by Mr. Shipman, seconded by Mr. Hendrix, it was recommended to table this plan and modifications until all outstanding review comments are adequately addressed.

**Motion Approved 7-0.**

**Public Comment**

There was no public comment.

**Adjournment**

On a motion by Mr. Swinehart, seconded by Ms. Betts, it was recommended to adjourn the meeting.

Motion approved 7-0 and the meeting adjourned at 8:15 p.m.

The next Regular Planning Commission meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, March 18, 2015 at 6:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Shannon L. Sinopoli