

**MANHEIM TOWNSHIP
PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES
Wednesday
June 17, 2009**

A meeting of the Manheim Township Planning Commission was held on Wednesday, June 17, 2009 at 6:30 p.m. The following members were present: Mr. Jeffrey Sturla; Mr. Michel Gibeault; Mr. Cory Rathman; Mr. Donald Reed; Mrs. Mary Ellen Hollinger and Mr. Michael Martin. Mr. Robert Wolf was absent. 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.

Minutes

Mr. Sturla asked for a motion on the May 20, 2009 Planning Commission meeting minutes.

On a motion by Mr. Reed, seconded by Mr. Rathman it was recommended to approve the May 20, 2009 meeting minutes.

Motion Approved 6-0.

Subdivision/Land Development Plans

1. **Landis Homes Retirement Community, South Campus – Preliminary Subdivision/Land Development Plan – 1001 East Oregon Road – Zoned Institutional.**

Present representing this Preliminary Subdivision/ Land Development Plan was Mr. Mark Hackenburg, RGS Associates.

Mr. Hackenburg indicated that the majority of the items have been wrapped up and addressed and that an additional modification was requested to shorten the length of the secondary bridge access.

Mr. Gibeault questioned the need for the Specific Permission request and what work that entailed.

Mr. Hackenburg indicated that the request is for some utilities as well as culverts and the construction of the bridge

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

On a motion by Mr. Martin, seconded by Mr. Rathman, it was recommended to approve this plan, the modifications and the specific permission request contingent upon the applicants obtaining necessary approvals from all regulatory utility authorities and contingent upon a clean review letter.

Motion Approved 6-0.

2. 2363 Oregon Pike – Preliminary Subdivision/Land Development Plan - 2363 Oregon Pike (corner of Oregon Pike & Landis Valley Road) – Zoned B-3.

Present representing this Preliminary Subdivision/Land Development Plan was Mr. Bill Swiernik, David Miller/Associates.

Mr. Swiernik indicated that the majority of the comments have been addressed and that there were additional modifications being requested per staff instruction.

Mr. Gibeault questioned the request for relief from providing curbing along the Oregon Pike frontage of the Village of Olde Hickory property.

Mr. Swiernik acknowledged the request for the modification and staff indicated that they were not in support of this particular modification request.

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

On a motion by Mr. Gibeault, seconded by Mr. Reed, it was recommended that the Manheim Township Planning Commission recommend denial of the requested modifications of Section 804.1 [Curbs Along All Existing Streets] and Section 804.3 [Standard Straight Curb Required Along All Existing Streets] of The Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance of Manheim Township 1998 ("SALDO"). Mr. Gibeault further moved that the Planning Commission recommend approval of the following requested modifications of Sections 502.2.L and N [Existing Features Within 200 Feet], Section 502.4.A(14) [Required Levels of Service], Section 802.1.C [Conditions, Restrictions and Notes Imposed on Prior Plans], Section 802.6 [Impact Fee Reduction to 75%], Section 803.2.K [Reconstruction of Existing Township Streets], Section 803.8.L [Sidewalk Along All Access Drives], Section 804.2 [Curbing Height], Section 805.2 [Sidewalks Along All Parking Compounds], Section 805.5 [Sidewalks to be Located Within Street Right-of-Way], Section 812.6 [Responsibility for Maintaining All Easements], Section 813.8 [Sanitary Sewer Easement Width], and Section 819.4 [Trees Not Permitted Within Easements] of the SALDO and the following requested modifications of Section 403.5.D [Minimum Depth of Pipe Cover], Section 403.6.A(5) [Dewatering Time of Basins], Section 403.6.A(7) [Concrete Cutoff Collars and O-Ring Rubber Gaskets], and Section 403.6.A(13) [Standard Outlet Structures] of the Stormwater Management Ordinance, and, having recommended the granting of such modifications, Mr. Gibeault also moved that the Planning Commission recommend approval of the Preliminary Subdivision/Land Development Plan for 2363 Oregon Pike (the "Preliminary Plan"), such modifications and approval of the Preliminary Plan to be subject to all of the following conditions:

1. Landis Valley Partners LP ("Applicant") shall submit with the Final Subdivision/Land Development Plan for 2363 Oregon Pike (the "Final Plan") an agreement in recordable form among Applicant, Casselco, and Village of Olde Hickory, L.P. ("VOH") providing for the coordinated construction of and financial security for the sidewalks and curbs to be installed on or adjacent to the entire street frontages of the properties of Applicant, Casselco and VOH abutting Landis Valley Road and Oregon Pike (the "Coordinated Improvements Agreement").
2. The Coordinated Improvements Agreement shall be in a form and content acceptable to the Township's Director of Planning and Zoning and to the Township Solicitor or Assistant Solicitor, shall run with the land, and shall be binding upon the successors and assigns of Applicant, Casselco and VOH.
3. BJP Associates, Inc. shall join in and consent to the Coordinated Improvements Agreement if it is still the legal owner of 2363 Oregon Pike.
4. The Coordinated Improvements Agreement shall include provisions satisfactory to the Township relating to, among other things, the following:
 - a. The furnishing of financial security to the Township of the type and in the amount required by the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code and the SALDO to secure the construction of curb and sidewalk as shown on the Preliminary Plan (as revised in accordance with Condition No. 5 below) and any revisions thereto shown on the Final Plan which are acceptable to the Township. In the event of a default, the Township shall be permitted to enforce any and all financial security furnished to the Township regardless of whether the improvements to be installed as the result of the default are located on or adjacent to the property of Applicant, Casselco or VOH. All financial security furnished to the Township shall be of an amount and of a nature to assure that all of the curb and sidewalk and related drainage facilities required to be installed as shown on the Preliminary Plan (as revised in accordance with Condition No. 5 below) and any acceptable revisions thereto shown on the Final Plan are completed to the satisfaction of the Township.
 - b. A procedure for the construction of the sidewalks and curbs by a single contractor or by other means acceptable to the Township to assure that the sidewalks and curbs are installed in a coordinated and timely manner in accordance with generally accepted standards for such construction.
 - c. The granting of such street right-of-way and easements to the Township or the Pennsylvania Department of Transportation as may be necessary in connection with the construction of the curb and sidewalk, including any stormwater management facilities, and the roadway widening along Oregon Pike.
 - d. The installation of any stormwater management facilities associated with the construction of the curb and sidewalk.

- e. Appropriate maintenance guarantees with respect to any of the curbs and sidewalks or other improvements which are to be dedicated to the Township.
- f. The future maintenance, repair and replacement of any curbs, sidewalks or other improvements which are to be located outside of a public street right-of-way.

5. The Preliminary Plan and the Highway Occupancy Permit Plans shall be revised in a manner consistent with this Motion and to the satisfaction of the Township's Director of Planning and Zoning prior to the filing of the Final Plan to show and include all required sidewalks, curbs, and stormwater management facilities along the entire Oregon Pike and Landis Valley Road street frontages of the properties of Applicant/BJP Associates, Inc., Casselco and VOH.
6. The modifications of Sections 802.1.C and 812.6 of the SALDO relate only to the Preliminary Plan, and compliance with those Sections of the SALDO will be required in connection with the filing of the Final Plan.
7. The modifications of the Sections of the SALDO and the Stormwater Management Ordinance which have been recommended for approval are limited to the specific modifications requested by Applicant and are subject to compliance with the alternative proposed by Applicant except as otherwise provided in this Motion.
8. Because the requested waivers of Sections 804.1 and 804.3 of the SALDO are being recommended for denial, Applicant shall, subject to the provisions of the Coordinated Improvements Agreement, install or cause to be installed standard straight curbs along the entire existing street frontages (Oregon Pike and Landis Valley Road) of the property of VOH as well as the street frontages of Applicant/BJP Associates, Inc., and Casselco.
9. In the event the Township must be the applicant for any highway occupancy permits required from the Pennsylvania Department of Transportation for the curbs, sidewalks or associated storm drainage facilities, Applicant shall provide the Township with such indemnifications and insurance coverage's as may be deemed necessary by the Township as a condition to the Township being the applicant for any required highway occupancy permits.
10. A Note shall be placed on the Final Plan setting forth all of the foregoing conditions which have been imposed upon the approval of these modifications and the Preliminary Plan.
11. Appropriate Ownership Certificates shall be included on the Final Plan and be properly executed on behalf of Applicant (and BJP Associates, Inc., if it still has an ownership interest in 2363 Oregon Pike), Casselco and VOH.
12. Applicant shall satisfactorily address the comments outlined in the Township's Development Plan Review Report dated June 10, 2009, a copy of which is attached to and incorporated in this Motion.

13. Any failure to fulfill the conditions contained in this Motion shall be deemed to be an automatic revision of the recommendation of approval of the Preliminary Plan by the Township Planning Commission.
14. Applicant shall accept in writing the foregoing conditions imposed upon the recommendation by the Planning Commission of the granting of these modifications and the recommendation of approval of the Preliminary Plan within 10 business days of this meeting. If Applicant does not accept these conditions in writing within 10 business days, then the recommendation for approval of the modifications and of the Preliminary Plan shall be automatically rescinded.

Motion Approved 6-0.

Rezoning/Text Amendment/Conditional Use Reviews

1. Giant To Go – Conditional Use Request – Planned Residential Development Signage Regulation Modifications – Wetherburn Commons – Fruitville Pike and Petersburg Road – Zoned R-3.

Present representing this Conditional Use Request was Mr. Michael Kostiew, McNees Wallace & Nurick (applicants attorney); Mr. Kerry Eck, applicant and Mr. Bill Swiernik, David Miller/Associates.

Mr. Kostiew indicated that the applicant is requesting modifications to Article 16-A, Section 1673 so as to permit directional signage at the Giant To Go location in order to address vehicle stacking and circulation problems that have transpired since the store opened for business.

Mr. Kostiew indicated that the proposal is to try and re-route all of the fuel traffic to the rear side of the pumps in order to avoid blocking vehicles that are parked in front of the store.

Mr. Kostiew stated that the modification requests are to permit 3 free standing directional signs; 2 wall mounted Do Not Enter signs to be placed on the fuel pumps; and 8 pavement markings (6 directional and 2 Do Not Enter).

Mr. Sturla asked if all of the signage, including pavement markings were located on this particular site.

Mr. Kostiew indicated that there are 2 pavement markings proposed in a common drive area.

Mr. Rathman stated that the Giant To Go is a new store and that 6-months from now, once the patrons get used to the circulation, the problem may fix itself.

Mr. Kostiew stated that signage is necessary now in order to teach the habits and that the applicants are always hopeful for new clientele as well.

Planning members agreed that the proposal was a bit overkill of signage and suggested the applicants start out with just the Do Not Enter signs and pavement markings and remove the 2 pavement markings on the common street area as well as the 3 free standing signs.

Mr. Kostiew asked if the on-site pavement markings would also be considered by the planning members.

Planning members indicated that they did not have any concerns with the pavement markings on the Giant To Go site.

Mr. Kostiew and Mr. Eck both agreed to revise the proposal to remove the 3-Free Standing signs and the 2-Off-site pavement markings in the common drive area.

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

On a motion by Mr. Gibeault, seconded by Mr. Rathman it was recommended to approve this conditional use request but limit it to on-site Fuel Directional Pavement Markings; 2-Wall Mounted Do Not Enter Signs on the pumps; and 2-Do Not Enter Pavement Markings at the front of the pumps.

Motion Approved 6-0.

Public Hearing scheduled for August 10, 2009.

Comprehensive Plan

Mr. Sturla indicated that a special meeting for the presentation of the Comprehensive Plan was held in November and that for the past 7 months since that meeting, the planning members have been accepting public comments whether via mail, email or during the public meetings.

Mr. Sturla indicated that tonight's meeting is specifically for the planning members to discuss and make comment pertaining to their thoughts and ideas and that afterward, the Planning Commission will again take any additional public comments as well as address the comments that have already been received over the past several months.

Mr. Sturla announced that Mr. Steve Gabriel of Rettew Associates (engineering firm responsible for drafting this plan) is also present to answer any questions.

Planning members held discussions and provided individual comments pertaining to each section of the draft plan.

Natural & Cultural Resources

Mr. Rathman stated that he felt this section lacked some of the existing area resources in the Township and that objectives and strategies section can be applied to any LIMC municipality and that there is nothing unique to Manheim Township.

Mr. Rathman indicated that there is no mention of any scenic views, wooded areas or meadows as a natural resource, leaving an impression that only agricultural areas and floodplains are worth of preservation to the exclusion of passive green areas.

Mr. Rathman felt that this particular Section does not provide for a plan or direction so that the Natural and Cultural Resources are developed in a coordinated and linked manner as opposed to a random approach.

Mr. Rathman suggested including a linked greenway/park plan or an expanded non-motorized path to incorporate greenway.

Mr. Rathman stated that the plan lacks discussion of open space preservation, greenways and parks mentioned in this section and that while they are discussed in the Infrastructure section, they seem to be inherently linked to Natural and Cultural Resources and should be included and discussed in this section.

Mr. Gibeault agreed with Mr. Rathman on the idea of linking or creating an overlay to the non-motorized path network with existing green space by joining pathways with green areas.

Mr. Sturla stated that he felt that the plan lacked a vision for the future of the Township and that he'd like to see some type of preamble or preface to the document for what Manheim Township envisions comprehensively with a vision of solutions to the existing problems throughout the Township.

Mrs. Hollinger agreed with Mr. Sturla and stated that the 1995 Comprehensive Plan included an introduction with a vision statement, and that excluding such preamble or statement in this plan leaves the residents questioning what this plan really is.

Mrs. Hollinger also suggested incorporating the changes over the decade as the 1995 plan provided.

Mr. Reed stated that Penn Township has preserved over 2,000 acres of Agricultural land without having a TDR program by working with the Conservancy, Farmland Trust and Agriculture Preservation Boards. Mr. Reed stated that Warwick Township also has preserved over 2,000 acres by utilizing a TDR program in conjunction with these same boards.

Mr. Reed stated that Manheim Township has preserved less than 500 acres through the combination of budget and allowing additional build out on residential and commercial sites via our TDR program and that these preserved acres are all in the northeast quadrant of the Township with no support program for farms in other areas of the Township and that the current program is a failure.

Mr. Reed recommended finding out what Penn and Warwick Townships are doing and pursue similar programs and to not restrict support to the northeast quadrant by helping all farms by supporting Clean and Green and other programs including the TDR program.

Staff responded by indicating that comparing Penn Township and Warwick Township to Manheim Township is a far stretch and reminded Mr. Reed that basically all of Manheim Township (excluding the Agricultural zone and the Village of Oregon) is classified within the Urban Growth Area, whereas Penn Township and Warwick Township are not.

Staff further mentioned that the only means the Township has to preserve farmland is through the TDR program and that the other boards, such as the Ag Preservation Board have their own set of standards for preservation, one being contiguous acres of farmland and not single smaller farms.

Staff indicated that the Clean and Green program is run through the County Tax Assessment office and again, is not a Township program. Staff advised that the Township cannot force a farm owner to preserve his farm.

Housing

Mr. Rathman stated that he felt this section was well done and that the objectives and strategies section provides specific examples of projects unique to the Township. Mr. Rathman recommended that the Preferred Residential Development Styles Exhibit show connectivity to adjacent neighborhoods and/or commercial areas.

Mrs. Hollinger recommended that the plan include specific names of the existing Planned Residential Developments somewhere in the document.

Mr. Martin stated that this section was drafted a couple of years ago and questioned if, in today's economic times, this section would have been looked at differently today.

Mr. Gabriel and staff stated that they would not examine it any differently today and that the criteria would still be set up the same.

Land Use

Mr. Rathman stated that the pilot project of the master plan for Neffsville was an excellent idea and a plan should be developed to master plan other areas of the Township.

Mr. Rathman questioned if an evaluation and/or discussion of whether promoting high density residential and large commercial in the Township takes away from any redevelopment of the City.

Staff indicated that Urban Transition areas are specifically identified in the joint Gateways plan project and that the Township, City and County are all working together on this project as well as a Transportation Revitalization Investment District (TRID) plan.

Mobility

Mr. Rathman stated that he felt the plan should focus more on regional solutions to solve traffic problems as the plan seems to focus on isolated projects such as intersection improvements and non-motorized paths within the Township which will not address future traffic problems resulting from increased density, commercial development and pass-through traffic which is 48% of the total traffic.

Mr. Rathman stated that since he was just informed of the TRID plan and its regional capacity, maybe the plan should mention this program.

Mr. Gabriel indicated that the Roadway Sufficiency portion takes into account the existing, pass by and new traffic thru the year 2033.

Mrs. Hollinger stated that she felt that Figure 4.6 was very well done.

Mr. Martin stated that he felt that this section was an overall good section and that the diagrams and street connectivity are were very good.

Mr. Gibeault stated that Figure 4.7 was very surprising to him when he saw all of the existing bus routes.

Mr. Reed stated that he recently attended a County road improvement project breakfast and noticed that the list of improvements concentrated primarily within East Hempfield Township, with no proposed projects within Manheim Township and that based on one of the steering committee meetings, solving traffic congestion was to be first priority with additional development following.

Mr. Gabriel indicated that one focus of the steering committee was to look at other means of transportation to reduce the use of vehicles, such as park and ride, bike paths and mass transit.

Infrastructure

Mr. Rathman felt that a higher priority should be placed on and made a primary concept for seeking out alternative sewage treatments as it relates to sections such as land use and mobility.

Mr. Rathman questioned whether or not conversations have taken place regarding improving existing storm sewers and asked if any known problem spots, that get flooded on a regular basis, have been pin-pointed.

Staff indicated that it was discussed but that a priority list does not exist.

Mr. Sturla asked if there's any means for incorporating a mandatory requirement for open space and/or recreation fields with land development plans.

Staff indicated that the current Subdivision and Land Development has those requirements, however, past practice has always been to accept the Fee in Lieu of the land dedication for recreation.

Mr. Gabriel indicated that primarily the solutions looked at was upgrading the existing infrastructure in lieu of the creation of new roadways in addition to adjusting traffic signals to try and avoid some congestion issues.

Mr. Sturla asked Mr. Gabriel to respond to the public comments received. Mr. Sturla indicated that at the direction of the Planning Commission, Rettew was asked to look at and respond to all public comment received either via public meeting comments, emailed comments or postal mail. Mr. Sturla stated that there were numerous comments pertaining to the same subject or focus in which Rettew was asked to group together in order to form one response.

Audience members were provided with the list of review of the public comments and the responses to each.

Responses to public comments:

Comment #1: Grammar corrections.

Mr. Gabriel stated that one of the steering committee members recommended some grammar and typographical corrections within the plan and advised that these corrections will be made.

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

Comment #2: Hess Property – concern over the future land use classification of the three parcels and its level of development intensity.

Mr. Gabriel stated that the future land use map classifies the main Hess parcel as Corridor/Interchange Commercial and Medium-High Density Residential. The Hess parcel on the north side of Route 30 is classified low-medium density residential. The Hess parcel on the west side of Fruitville Pike is classified Corridor/Interchange Commercial. The Steering Committee discussed these parcels extensively – for the main parcel, the Committee recommended providing a medium-high density residential classification as a transition from the existing adjacent neighborhood to the Corridor/Interchange Commercial classed portion.

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

Comment #3: School Lane Hills/Baker Field – concern for impact to neighborhood of proposed medium-high density classification.

Mr. Gabriel stated that the future land use was discussed at length by the Steering Committee. The proposed classification reflects the more intense existing commercial and industrial development and higher traffic volumes on Harrisburg Pike nearby. However, the residents have expressed strong commitment to the neighborhood and Franklin and Marshall has indicated complete agreement with a low-medium residential classification for the lands.

Mr. Sturla suggested the possibility of designating the portion of Baker Field abutting Harrisburg Pike commercial and then designating the remaining portion of the parcel Low to Medium Residential as a residential buffer.

Staff indicated that a transition area for the Baker Field parcel was not discussed during the steering committee meetings.

Mr. Sturla asked for public comment.

1. Patron; Jeff Ross, Newton Road Resident

Mr. Ross indicated that he is a board member for School Lane Hills Neighborhood Association and was present on the behalf many of his neighbors.

Mr. Ross indicated that the School Lane Hill development primarily consists of single family dwellings on quiet streets with minimal cut thru traffic and expressed his concern with classifying Baker Field as Medium to High Density in light of the potential for a new roadway from Harrisburg Pike through the School Lane Hills development.

After a brief discussion planning members were all in favor of revising the classification of this area to Low to Medium Density.

Comment #4: Density – concern about the proposed density levels for residential development with and without the use of Transferable Development Rights (TDRs); concern over higher density focus on those lands south of Route 30.

Mr. Gabriel stated that the low to medium residential density classification in the draft plan covers most all of the lands in the Township currently zoned R-1 and R-2. The draft plan calls for basic density in the low to medium residential class to be 0 – 4 units per acres; current basic density in the R-1 and R-2 zoning districts is 1.75 and 2.2 units per acre. With the use of TDRs, the draft plan allows for up to 7 units per acre in the low to medium density residential class; current zoning allows 2.2 and 2.9 units per acre with TDRs in the R-1 and R-2 zoning districts and up to 2.9 and 4.3 units per acre in R-1 and R-2 zoning districts for lands with density bonus overlay.

Mr. Gabriel indicated that the draft plan calls for basic density in the medium to high residential class to be 0 – 8 units per acre; current basic density in the R-3 zoning district is 0 – 7 units per acre. With the use of TDRs, the draft plan allows for up to 12 units per acre in the medium to high density residential class; current zoning does not provide for the use of TDRs in the R-3 zoning district.

Mr. Gabriel advised that the Lancaster County's target density for new residential development in the urban growth areas of the County (the entire Township except the agricultural northeast quadrant and Village of Oregon is classified as an urban growth area) is an average of 7.5 units per acre. Based on lands available for development in the low to medium and medium to high density classifications, the densities called for in the draft plan, and historical development patterns, new development in the Township would average 2 – 5.5 units per acre assuming none or some of new development involves the use of TDRs; only if all new development took place at the maximum density allowed in both land classes and TDRs were used in all cases would the average density of new development reach 7.5 units per acre.

Mr. Gabriel stated that TDR research in Lancaster County and elsewhere indicates that the difference between the allowable densities with and without TDRs needs to be large enough to provide an incentive for property owners and developers to go through the fairly

complicated process of purchasing and using TDRs. So the draft plan creates a larger difference in the densities with and without the use of TDRs than the current program difference. The TDR program was set up in part to provide value to the farmers in the northeast quadrant of the Township whose land was rezoned to agricultural from other more intense uses where the development value was greater.

Mr. Gabriel stated that development in Manheim Township south of Route 30 is at higher densities than development north of Route 30 (for example, Grandview 3.7 to 6.5 units per acres, Golden Triangle Apartments 6.8 units per acre). This is the historical development pattern which has been reinforced by current zoning. At the current higher densities, the area south of Route 30 is close to the density levels that can successfully support mass transit. Red Rose Transit Authority services the area south of Route 30 more extensively than other parts of the Township.

Mr. Sturla stated that there is a market out there for people that want to live in beautiful houses that do not mind having only 5-feet of yard between each neighboring house.

Mr. Reed questioned if the density is increased without the use of TDRs, will the TDR usage go down.

Mr. Gabriel indicated that the draft plan recommends densities that are fairly close to those that are allowed in the current zoning ordinance, therefore, not much change would result except when TDRs are used. Mr. Gabriel stated that the TDR process is complex and time consuming so the significant difference between the proposed base densities that are allowed and those densities allowed when TDRs are used is an incentive. Mr. Gabriel stated that is why the plan calls for a 3 and 4 unit per acre difference between the base densities without TDRs and the densities allowed with TDRs in the two land classifications.

Staff indicated that in the mid 1980's, the Lancaster County Planning Commission came up with the Urban Growth Boundary looking at the entire county as a whole. This Urban Growth Boundary was then the building block for the Lancaster Intermunicipal Comprehensive Plan (LIMC) which then created the framework for this draft Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Sturla asked for public comment.

1. Patron; John Hershey, Pleasure Road Resident

Mr. Hershey suggested incorporating visual photographs into the plan showing developments in the area that are currently developed at the 7 units per acre density as a way to educate the public visually what such a density really looks like versus seeing only the numbers.

2. Patron; Nelson Rohrer, Oregon Pike Resident

Mr. Rohrer expressed his concerns over the effect on traffic in other parts of the Township if density were to be increased and the deterioration of the infrastructure.

Comment #5: High Profile Development - Concern over development and re-development of high profile development sites such as the Stockyards, Armstrong Corporation, the Amtrak Train Station, the Stehli Silk Mill, the Gammache Farm, and the Hess property and the height and intensity compatibility of that development with surrounding properties.

Mr. Gabriel stated that compatibility is repeated as an objective many times in the Land Use chapter. Under Growth Management, Strategy #3 calls for updating zoning regulations to ensure compatibility of infill development with surrounding properties by including

requirements for enhanced building-to-building setbacks, landscape buffering, limited application of design standards, and appropriate street frontage setback transitions. Under Preferred Development, zoning regulations are to allow multi-story residential buildings adjacent to areas of commercial and entertainment activity and other areas deemed appropriate with sufficient buffering of adjacent single family detached residential dwellings. Development compatibility including building height is emphasized many times under the Land Classes section of the Land Use chapter. Under Residential – Building heights up to three (3) stories will be allowed, but specific applications will be reviewed for solar compatibility. Compatibility of higher density development adjacent to single family residences will be ensured through the same enhanced building-to-building setbacks, landscape buffers, design standards, and consistent street frontage setbacks as noted above. Similar buffering will be provided for development in commercial, industrial, urban transition, campus, and highway regeneration land classes where building heights up to 5 stories are to be allowed. These principles are anticipated to be applied at the Hess property where a portion of the site is classified Interchange Highway Corridor Commercial and land between the Commercial classification and existing single family dwellings is classified medium to high density residential which will also be subject to a significant landscape buffer.

Mr. Gibeault stated that compatibility should be the focus and that blending neatly into adjoining neighborhoods makes sense.

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

Comment #6: Traffic – improvements needed to deal with excessive congestion.

Mr. Gabriel indicated that within the Mobility Chapter, extensive roadway improvements (as contained in the Township's 1998 Transportation Impact Fee Capital Improvements Plan) are recommended for inclusion in the Township's Capital Budget. Further, roadway recommendations were provided to accommodate additional population associated with the proposed future land use plan. Many are aimed at keeping traffic moving, reducing idling, and improving air quality. Additional bus stops and routes are mapped along with expanded non-vehicular pathways alignments to provide alternative travel modes to existing and future populations. Bike lane projects in various forms are recommended as well.

Mr. Sturla indicated that he thinks everyone agrees that traffic is a problem and that correcting the problem will need to be a coordinated effort.

Comment #7: Encourage reasonably priced housing.

The Plan's Housing Chapter includes a number of strategies to promote reasonable housing costs. Under Preferred Housing Development – 1) identify and capitalize on opportunities for mixed-use, mixed income housing development within the Urban Growth Area and along transit lines; 2) retain and support existing areas of affordable housing with neighborhood maintenance and updating; 3) seek private and non-profit partnerships for provision of new affordable housing. Under the Land Use chapter – higher density areas are maintained and mixed use residential and residential/commercial development that fosters more compact and affordable housing is promoted. The Neffsville Master Plan Pilot Project in the Land Use chapter anticipates that kind of mixed use, compact, more reasonably priced housing in portions of the study area.

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

Comment #8: Agriculture/farm preservation – properties outside of the northeast quadrant that are being farmed but are projected for residential or commercial use on the future land use map and are not zoned strictly for agricultural use.

Mr. Gabriel stated that the Township's focus over the years has been to promote agricultural preservation in the northeast quadrant of the Township where a large group of farms sit together. Preservation programs in the county also focus their efforts on groups of adjoining farms rather than on isolated farms surrounded by development. Those programs do not generally pursue farms that are located within municipal designated growth areas or those that are zoned for uses other than agriculture. Many of the individual properties still being farmed in the Township outside of the northeast quadrant, including the Hess property, have been zoned for development for many years. Farming is a permitted use in all zoning districts so properties currently being farmed but zoned for other uses can continue to be farmed for as long as the property owner desires.

Mr. Sturla advised that the Township does not have a vehicle to spot zone which is what would need to happen if a farmed parcel zoned Residential would desire to be zoned Agricultural. The farmer would need to seek a rezoning petition. Mr. Sturla stated that although it's a good intention, and the Township will continue to support the farmers to keep their properties green, this cannot be accomplished through zoning.

Mr. Sturla asked for public comment.

1. Patron: Jeff Ross, Newton Road Resident

Mr. Ross presented the planning members with a letter from Ms. Debra Frantz, 1835 Eden Road resident concerning Farmland Preservation.

Mr. Sturla thanked him for delivering Ms. Frantz's comments.

Comment #9: Promoting “green infrastructure” and environmentally friendly styles of development.

Mr. Gabriel indicated that the Steering Committee discussed and emphasized these concepts. They are noted several times under the Opportunities and Indicators of Success within the Natural and Cultural Resources, Land Use, and Mobility Chapters. Preferred Development in the Natural and Cultural Resources Objectives and Strategies notes promoting development that can use mass transit, incentives for development away from natural/cultural resources, encouraging “green design” features in ordinances, promoting redevelopment, promoting renovation rather than ‘tear down’, promoting recycling and water conservation; in the Housing Chapter, Safe and Connected Communities Objectives and Strategies call for pedestrian and non-vehicular connectivity to community facilities and commercial centers; in the Land Use Chapter, similar concepts are to be required/promoted under the Growth Management and Preferred Development Objectives and Strategies; in the Mobility Chapter, all 9 of the

Connectivity and Mobility Objectives and Strategies are aimed at non-vehicular transportation and environmentally sensitive vehicular movement.

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

Comment #10: Efforts to protect architectural and cultural resources inadequate.

Mr. Gabriel stated that in the Natural and Cultural Resources Chapter, the protection of such resources is highlighted under Opportunities 4, 5, and 6 and Preferred Development Strategies 1 and 8, incentives for recognition of historic structures and adaptive reuse. In the Housing Chapter, the redevelopment and reuse value of historic properties is a noted Opportunity and adaptive reuse and redevelopment in context with historic sites and structures are strategies under Promote and Maintain Neighborhoods. This is in addition to the Township Zoning Ordinance’s existing Historic Overlay District which applies to the entire Township and regulates demolition and adaptive reuse.

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

Comment #11: Request for Men’s Warehouse, property, 1601 Manheim Pike, future land use classification to be Highway/Interchange Commercial.

Mr. Gabriel indicated that the future land use was shown as industrial in relation to the property’s previous use and current zoning. It is surrounded by commercial uses, is located on a highway corridor near a route 283 interchange – classification as Highway/Interchange Commercial would be consistent.

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

Comment #12: Request for Bloomfield Village property, 3140 Lititz Pike, future land use classification to be either of the Commercial classifications rather than the Village classification.

Mr. Gabriel stated that the Village future land use classification for the Bloomfield Village property indicates that the property is considered part of the Neffsville Village planning area. The property's future land use classification will be more specifically addressed as part of the Neffsville Village Master Plan Pilot Project following Comprehensive Plan adoption. This project is meant to plan for the use of the various properties in the planning area as a whole, integrating and coordinating their individual uses so that the greater Neffsville community functions in best way possible.

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

Comment #13: Request for Quality Inn property, 2363 Oregon Pike, future land use classification of Office/Local Commercial be allowed to include banks and convenience stores.

Mr. Gabriel advised that the Steering Committee wrestled with the inclusion of banks and convenience stores in the Office/Local Commercial. There was concern over the traffic especially generated by convenience stores and how that can detract from nearby residences. However, prohibiting banks and convenience stores from the Office/Local Commercial class results in long drives to such facilities just to make a deposit or buy a gallon of milk. The Township might consider including banks and convenience stores in the Office/Local Commercial land use class so long as traffic impacts to adjacent residential areas are addressed by access management requirements that keep most traffic on arterial or major collector roads, allow access only with right in/right out drives, etc.

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

Comment #14: The plan needs a vision and/or mission statement.

Mr. Gabriel indicated that a vision and/or mission statement for the Township can be added based on Goals, Objectives, Strategies and Indicators of Success located within each plan chapter.

No further Comprehensive Plan discussions took place.

Other Public Comment

Mr. Sturla asked for other public comment.

1. Patron: Nelson Rohrer, Oregon Pike Resident

Mr. Rohrer expressed his concern over the failing TDR program and the lack of promotion and priority of the program.

Mr. Rohrer stated if the Commissioners do not want to take the reins over making the TDR program a priority, then he suggests that the Township look into the possibility of creating a Farmer's Committee that has the ability to have direct discussions with developers as well as to broaden the use of TDRs and promoting the program.

Mr. Sturla agreed that the existing program is a problem and that the planning members certainly do support the program.

2. Patron; Scott Wails, Lancaster County Planning Commission

Mr. Wails stated that he wanted to go on record as supporting the Planning Commission, staff, Rettew and the Steering Committee with all they've done with this project.

Mr. Wails indicated that the County is working towards providing the planning members with some courtesy comments very shortly.

Mr. Wails mentioned that there are several county documents which may be very helpful to some of the planning members such as Greenscapes, Choices, Balance, and Heritage.

Mr. Wails stated that the County Planning Commission supports all the work that has been done and he appreciates being asked to participate and continue to work with Manheim Township.

Adjournment

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

Motion approved 6-0 and the meeting adjourned at 10:10 p.m.

The next Regular Planning Commission meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, July 15, 2009 at 6:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Shannon L. Sinopoli