

**MANHEIM TOWNSHIP  
PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTES  
Wednesday  
May 21, 2008**

A meeting of the Manheim Township Planning Commission was held on Wednesday, May 21, 2008 at 6:30 p.m. The following members were present: Mr. Jeffrey Sturla; Mr. Michel Gibeault; Mr. Robert Wolf; Mr. Cory Rathman; Mr. Donald Reed; Mrs. Mary Ellen Hollinger and Mr. Michael Martin. The following Township staff was present: Mrs. Lisa Douglas.

**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 April 16, 2008 meeting minutes.

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

**Motion Approved 7-0.**

**Comprehensive Plan Update**

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

Mrs. Douglas indicated that the Steering Committee held a publicized interim meeting on Wednesday, May 14, 2008 at 7:00 a.m. to follow-up on land use and density.

Mrs. Douglas indicated that she was not in attendance at the meeting but definitions of terms used in the future land use report were discussed including terms such as infill, regeneration, mixed use, planned commercial development, specific plan, master plan, urban growth area and village growth area. In some instances, the terms were defined and in other instances the current definitions were clarified.

Mrs. Douglas indicated that land classification descriptions were discussed as well as building heights. The Steering Committee recommended that the definition for building height be redefined with height being measured to the eave of the building rather than the average height measured to the mid-point of the roof line.

Lastly, not directly part of the Comprehensive Plan but certainly part of the overall planning process, there was discussion about the Gateways Project. Mrs. Douglas indicated that the project began a number of years ago and was spearheaded by the County. The City, Manheim Township and the County have worked together on this project and the project

focuses on revitalization of the area located in the southern part of MT and the northern part of the City. The County did finalize the "Gateways Revitalization Strategy, Executive Summary" approximately 1 year ago and that document was distributed to the Planning Commission. The summary provided an overview of the project, identified guiding principles and revitalization strategies, and identified several districts within the Gateways area. This is brought to your attention so you are aware that the Township is continuing to look for opportunities to provide compatible transition from one municipality into another.

We are looking at ways to provide better communication and coordination across our borders and are continuing to meet with the City and the County to pursue better planning efforts and coordination.

Mrs. Douglas indicated that the next Steering Committee meeting will be held May 28, 2008 at 7:00 a.m. here at the Township offices.

## **Old Business**

### **A. Development Plans**

#### **1. 2257 Lititz Pike – Preliminary/Final Subdivision/Land Development Plan - 2257 Lititz Pike – Zoned R-2.**

Present representing this plan was Mr. Derek Potter of Harbor Engineering, Inc. and Mr. Bill Bashore, applicant.

Mr. Potter provided a brief overview of the project indicating that in response to a suggestion made by the Planning Commission at the April meeting screening has been added to the plan in along the common southern property line in the vicinity of the terminus of the driveways.

Mr. Potter indicated that they had just received the Highway Occupancy Permit from PennDOT.

Mr. Reed wondered whether the property owner to the north had been contacted.

Mr. Potter indicated that the property owner to the north had been contacted and was not interested in joint access to his site.

Mr. Sturla inquired about the maintenance agreement.

Mr. Potter indicated that the solicitor, Mr. Bashore and the Township's solicitor, were working through the agreement.

Mr. Bashore indicated that the Township solicitor had just offered review comments and that they would be resolved.

Mr. Sturla asked whether Township staff had received a copy of the comments relative to the agreement.

Mrs. Douglas indicated that she had not received a copy.

Mr. Bashore indicated that the comments had been forwarded to Shannon Sinopoli.

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

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

**Motion Approved 7-0.**

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

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

Present representing this Conditional Use request for a Planned Commercial Development was Mr. Charlie Suhr, Attorney, Stevens and Lee; Mr. Steve Horst, property owner; Ms. Jodie Evans, McMahon Transportation Engineers and Mr. Dan Dodge, Berkshire.

Mr. Suhr indicated that they were before the Planning Commission in April , 2008.

Mr. Suhr indicated that the Zoning Hearing Board had approved a variance of Section 2319.2.Q.ii., a variance of Section 2319.3.D.5.iv for the encroachment of existing parking spaces within the improvement area and a variance of Section 2208 to allow the time to pull permits and construct the facilities to be tied to the approval of the land development plan.

Mr. Suhr indicated that the variance of Section 2319.2.Q.ii included the interchange of Route 283 and Route 30 and Fruitville Pike and Route 30 at the collector roadways.

There was discussion on the conditions of Zoning Hearing Board approval. It was indicated that the conditions included all proposed roadway improvements as presented to the Planning Commission and Zoning Hearing Board as well as other conditions.

Mr. Suhr indicated that he was hopeful for a recommendation on the conditional use.

Mr. Sturla indicated that Jodie Evans should say something since she has played such a large part in the process.

Mr. Sturla asked for clarification on the improvements proposed at the Intersection of Delp Road and Fruitville Pike.

Ms. Evans indicated that the proposed improvements at this intersection include a shared left/through and separate right turn lane for the southbound movement and three lanes northbound.

Mr. Gibeault inquired about the permitting of the off-site improvements.

Mrs. Douglas indicated that permits would have to be obtained and financial security posted before they can begin construction. She also indicated that all improvements would have to be substantially complete prior to occupancy.

Mr. Sturla indicated that tremendous progress has been made. Mr. Sturla indicated that the Planning Commission would like the improvements to go further suggesting that the third lane on Fruitville Pike be carried through to Petersburg Road but realized the third lane might be a little onerous.

Mr. Sturla indicated that he would like to see the Township assist you (Berkshire) in trying to put the third lane in but not necessarily make that a condition of approval. Mr. Sturla suggested that perhaps the impact fee could be utilized for this improvement.

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

On a motion by Mrs. Hollinger, seconded by Mr. Rathman, it was recommended to approve the conditional use request contingent upon the applicant meeting all of the zoning conditions and with the suggestion to the Commissioners to look at using any traffic impact fee monies obtained toward the addition of a third lane along Fruitville Pike from Delp Road to Petersburg Road.

**Motion Approved 7-0.**

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

**1. Manheim Township – Text Amendment Request to amend the Manheim Township Zoning Ordinance (regarding apartments, building height and TDRs in Cluster Developments in R-1, R-2 and R-3 Districts).**

Mrs. Douglas, Manheim Township Planning and Zoning Director presented this text amendment request.

Mrs. Douglas indicated that the main presentation on the text amendment took place last month and she did not have a lot to present this month. Mrs. Douglas indicated that she did want to respond to a few questions raised at last month's meeting.

Mrs. Douglas repeated that the goal is to find additional opportunities to utilize transferable development rights in an effort to preserve agricultural lands in Manheim Township.

Mrs. Douglas indicated that she wanted to respond to a question raised by Mr. Reed who inquired about acreage in the R-3 Residential District (In April Mr. Reed wondered why acreage figures were included for the R-1 and R-2 Residential Districts). Mrs. Douglas provided a table with R-3 Residential District acreage indicated that the density in the R-3 Residential District does not change under the proposed text amendment because there isn't a limiting density figure like there is in the R-1 and R-2 Residential Districts. Mrs. Douglas indicated that since the minimum size requirement for apartments is 6,000 square feet per unit it does matter if you go up or out, you would arrive at

the same density. The use of a transferable development right just allows you to go up not obtain additional density.

Mrs. Douglas indicated that some modifications were made to the screening portion of the text amendment relative to the R-3 Residential Zoning District text amendment. Specifically, Mrs. Douglas indicated that the width of the landscape screen area was enlarged from 10' to 25' and clarification was added to require "evergreen" trees rather than just "trees".

Mrs. Douglas also indicated that the language was expanded to indicate that the plantings will be arranged in such manner as to provide an effective visual barrier "so as to block the ground level views between grade, and a height of six (6) feet. The effective visual barrier..." shall be achieved within two (2) years of planting. Further, subsections 3 and 4 were added indicating that "The Township encourages naturalistic plantings and encourages the preservation of existing plantings if it can provide an effective visual screen" and "Any tree or shrub, planted to meet the requirements set forth in Section 2312.5, which dies within eighteen (18) months of planting shall be replaced".

Mrs. Douglas also indicated she wanted to visually show the benefit to using the cluster provisions. Mrs. Douglas provided the Planning Commission members with a copy of the layout plan for the existing Wheatstone and Parkridge cluster developments and a copy of a proposed layout if the subject properties had been developed under conventional zoning regulations. Mrs. Douglas pointed out that under the cluster development provisions the overall density is established through a calculation provided in the ordinance and the density is fixed based on that calculations. Mrs. Douglas indicated that transferable development rights may be used to increase the density but again the upper density limit is fixed by ordinance. Mrs. Douglas pointed out that under conventional zoning open space is provided but it is on an individual lot basis while with a cluster development open space is provided in larger pockets for common usage.

Mrs. Douglas indicated that the Parkridge development was a great use of the cluster development provisions. Mrs. Douglas indicated that the property had a number of constraints including limited usable frontage, a power line, and a water tower and by using the cluster development provisions the developer was able to better utilize the property.

Mrs. Douglas indicated that based on discussions during the Comprehensive Plan process and as mentioned during the summary of the Comprehensive Plan earlier in the meeting, it is likely that discussions on building height will continue and addition ordinance revisions will likely occur.

Mr. Sturla called for questions.

*Patron #1: Not identified*

The patron requested a list of R-3 Residential property owners similar to the list provided for the R-1 and R-2 Residential property owner list.

Mrs. Douglas indicated that she would provide a copy to the patron.

Mrs. Douglas indicated that the public hearings are scheduled for July 14, 2008.

Motion by Mr. Gibeault, seconded by Mr. Reed, it was recommended to table this text amendment request.

**Motion Approved 7-0.**

**2. Manheim Township - Text Amendment Petition to amend the Manheim Township Zoning Ordinance (regarding apartment building height and TDRs in the R-3 District). (Hearing Date 6/9/08)**

The discussion on this text amendment was discussed as part of the Text Amendment Request to amend the Manheim Township Zoning Ordinance (regarding apartments, building height and TDRs in Cluster Developments in R-1, R-2 and R-3 Districts), listed above.

*\*\*Note: Refer to any public comments regarding either text amendment above.*

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

**Motion Approved 7-0.**

**New Business**

**A. Development Plans**

**1. Craig & Christina Clark - Preliminary/Final Subdivision/Land Development Plan – 1834 Lititz Pike – Zoned R-2.**

Present representing this Preliminary/Final Subdivision and Land Development Plan was Mr. Michael Kotay, Diehm and Sons, Inc.

Mr. Kotay provided an overview of the project indicating that the site is situated along Lititz Pike and Nanticoke Road. Mr. Kotay indicated that the subject property is currently developed with a monastery and a semi-detached dwelling unit. Mr. Kotay indicated that the semi-detached dwelling unit will be subdivided from the monastery and subdivided such that each portion of the semi-detached dwelling unit will be situated on an individual lot.

Mr. Kotay indicated that the applicant received a special exception and variances from the zoning hearing board.

Mr. Kotay discussed each modification.

Mr. Reed wondered if deliveries were made to the monastery.

Mr. Diehm indicated that deliveries are made to the back of the monastery using Nanticoke Road.

There was discussion about Nanticoke Road. It was indicated that the applicant would dedicate the required right-of-way so that the roadway could

be dedicated to the Township but that the applicant was requesting relief from other street design regulations since the street is existing.

Mrs. Douglas indicated that staff was comfortable with the modifications requested. Mrs. Douglas indicated that the Township currently maintains the street but that it was never dedicated to the Township.

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

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

**Motion Approved 7-0.**

**2. Amy Schultz & Robert Sherfy – Preliminary/Final Lot Add-On Subdivision Plan – Corner of Hollywood Drive and Park Road – Zoned R-2.**

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

Mr. Strausser provided an overview of the proposal which consists of combining an 8,588 square foot lot with a 8,327 square foot lot. Mr. Strausser indicated that a dwelling is currently situated on the smaller lot and that the applicant is proposing to combine the two tracts. Mr. Strausser indicated that the applicant owns both lots.

Mr. Strausser indicated that the applicant was successful in obtaining three (3) variances from the Zoning Hearing Board.

Mr. Strausser indicated that the properties were separate on an old subdivision plan but they are mapped and taxed as one property.

Mr. Strausser discussed the existing right-of-way of Park Road indicating that the current right-of-way is forty (40) feet wide or twenty (20) feet from centerline. He indicated that the cartway width is 24'. Mr. Strausser indicated that by Ordinance the applicant would be required to provide additional right-of-way in the width of five (5) additional feet from centerline. If required to provide the additional right-of-way the right-of-way line would fall within 4.41' of the dwelling. Mr. Strausser indicated that the Zoning Hearing Board granted relief for the encroachment but that the applicant would prefer not to provide the additional right-of-way.

Mr. Strausser indicated that he would like to know if there is a need or future plan to expand the right-of-way or cartway along Park Road. If there is than so be it and the right-of-way will be shown on the plan and dedicated but if not is it really necessary to obtain the additional right-of-way.

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

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

**Motion Approved 7-0.**

**2. George & Barbara Young – Preliminary/Final Lot Add-On Subdivision Plan – 801 Lititz Road – Zoned R-1.**

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

Mr. Strausser provided an overview of the proposal which consists of combining an existing lot with portions of a much larger tract in the R-1 Residential District. The combined total lot size will be 0.759 acres.

Mr. Strausser indicated that currently a home is situated on the property and that the applicant is proposing to add additional land to the subject property.

Mr. Strausser indicated that the applicant was successful in obtaining approval from the Zoning Hearing Board.

Mr. Strausser indicated that he had one question on the review letter relative to the on-lot well and the required testing.

*\*\*Note: Tape One ended and Tape Two did not record the rest of the meeting. The remaining meeting minutes were compiled using notes.*

There was discussion on the required testing with Mr. Strausser outlining his point of view and Mr. Sturla expressing his point of view.

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 the plan and modifications contingent upon a clean review letter.

**Motion Approved 7-0.**

**3. Bucher Elementary School – Preliminary/Final Lot Add-On Subdivision and Land Development Plan – Corner of Candlewyck Road and Brockton Road – Zoned R-3.**

Mr. Reed indicated that he would recuse himself.

Present representing this Preliminary/Final Lot Add-On Subdivision Plan and Land Development Plan was Ms. Melissa Kelly, Rettew Associates, Inc., Josh Bower, Crabtree Architects, and Joe Kurjaka, Manheim Township School District.

Ms. Kelly provided an overview of the project indicating that the project is situated at the intersection of Candlewyck Road and Brockton Road. Ms. Kelly indicated that the school is being expanded.

Ms. Kelly indicated that the Manheim Township School District received the necessary approvals from the Zoning Hearing Board for expansion of the use.

Ms. Kelly indicated that as part of the project, there will be five (5) soccer fields and two (2) ball fields.

Ms. Kelly indicated that an underground system is proposed for water reuse and that the water would be used to flush toilets.

Ms. Kelly indicated that there are a number of modifications and that two (2) new modifications have been added including a modification of the grass strip between the sidewalk and the curb line and a request for specific permission for work within the floodplain.

Mr. Martin wanted an explanation about the size of the existing building versus the proposed building.

Ms. Kelly indicated that the existing building size is 54,000 square feet and the addition is approximately 45,000 square feet in size.

Mr. Martin inquired about the proposed uses.

Ms. Kelly indicated that there is approximately 22,000 square feet for office use for the district office option.

Mr. Wolf summarized that there is one less ball field with the layout.

Ms. Kelly indicated that the number of soccer fields have increased since it was determined that there is a need for more soccer fields. Ms. Kelly indicated that the soccer fields sizes are two (2) 60'x105' fields, one (1) 75'x150' and one (1) 120'x210' field.

Mr. Gibeault inquired about the pick-up and drop-off areas.

Ms. Kelly indicated that there would be a separate bus and parent drop-off/pick-up areas.

Ms. Kelly indicated that the parent drop-off would occur from the Candlewyck Road entrance and the bus drop-off would occur from the Candlewyck Road entrance with buses exiting onto Brockton Road.

Mr. Gibeault inquired about the queuing length for buses.

Ms. Kelly indicated that the queuing length is about 250'. Ms. Kelly indicated that four (4) buses are used today and that will continue into the immediate future.

Ms. Kelly indicated that both access points are one-way access points.

Someone inquired about the current and future parking needs.

Ms. Kelly indicated that there are currently 55 parking spaces and with the expansion there will be 171 parking spaces.

There was a brief discussion about the floodplain and the process needed to obtain permission for work within the floodplain.

Someone inquired about the potential number of buses that could access the site.

Ms. Kelly indicated that ultimately there could be 8-9 buses.

Mr. Rathman inquired about the vault used to collect stormwater runoff for reuse in the building. Mr. Rathman wondered how infiltration would be addressed.

Ms. Kelly indicated that infiltration would not occur because of the underlying karst geology.

Ms. Kelly indicated that she would need to provide more information on the underground vault and the underdrains so that she could fully answer Mr. Rathman's questions.

Mr. Wolf asked about the current district office.

Ms. Kelly indicated that the current district office building is located on Lititz Pike and consists of about 18,000-19,000 square feet of space.

Mr. Kurjiaka indicated that the district office has been at this location for about 7 years. Mr. Kurjiaka indicated that the district office was previously attached to the high school.

It was indicated that the School District had discussed three (3) potential options for the vacant space. It was indicated that the use could be the district office, Pre-K, or district storage of supplies/materials.

Mr. Sturla indicated that a petition, dated May 2008, had been submitted to the Township and distributed to the Planning Commission.

Mr. Sturla called for public input.

Patron #1 Ms. Monica Forte

Ms. Forte expressed her concern over traffic related issues indicating that the study presented at the Zoning Hearing Board used dated material.

Ms. Forte wanted to know what area was studied for the traffic impact study.

Ms. Forte indicated that some improvements to the plan have been made and they are an improvement but more changes are needed.

Ms. Forte indicated that currently there are 278 students but in the information presented it is anticipated that there will be 350-550 students.

Ms. Forte questioned the 60 second delay to make a left hand turn onto Fruitville Pike.

Ms. Forte indicated that Chelsea Road is not a thoroughfare and should not be used as such. Ms. Forte indicated that the buses should use Cambridge Road so that they can use the light at Fruitville Pike and Delp Road.

Ms. Forte indicated that she liked keeping the fields at the lower end of the school.

Ms. Forte indicated that she did not like the district office at this location, she did not like the size of the school and that traffic was a big concern.

Ms. Kelly indicated that the executive summary of the Traffic Study was presented to the Zoning Hearing Board and a full blown traffic study was submitted with the land development plan. She indicated that the current traffic study is dated April 2008.

A Planning Commission member wondered what intersections were studied and was Berkshire considered in the analysis.

Ms. Kelly identified the intersections that were analyzed and indicated that improvements were not warranted at the side streets entering onto Fruitville Pike. She indicated that she would consult with the traffic engineer on whether the Berkshire improvements were considered.

*Patron #2 Ms. Tonya Puffer, Candlewyck Road*

Ms. Puffer indicated that 75 cars are on the roadway between 8:40 a.m. and 8:55 a.m. and 100 cars are on the roadway between 3:15 a.m. and 3:30 p.m.

Ms. Puffer indicated that any other use of the property is a bad idea. Ms. Puffer indicated that if a district office is provided it should be provided at the high school site.

*Patron #3 Mr. Michael Gish, Brockton Road*

Mr. Gish indicated that he likes the fields.

Mr. Gish questioned the grade on the upper field.

Mr. Gish indicated that he doesn't like the idea of storage on the property because of delivery traffic associated with storage facilities.

*Patron #4 Mr. Barry Gregory, 2201 Brockton Road*

Mr. Gregory wondered whether the school district was being fiscally responsible. He indicated that if the new wing was used for Pre-K and there were 9 classrooms, based on the square footage the cost would be about \$140/square foot. He wondered if there was a way to reduce cost.

*Patron #5 Ms. Diane Supple, 18 Lake Land Court*

Ms. Supple indicated that she has grandchildren that play on the fields.

Ms. Supple indicated that she is very familiar with the property because she had relatives that owned the property.

Ms. Supple indicated that she was happy with the fields but that she has concerns with the two story building.

Ms. Supple suggested that a rendering be provided so that residents can visualize how the building would look.

Ms. Supple indicated that business use should not be permitted.

Ms. Supple indicated that the traffic impact study was a boiler plate study and the applicant should be requested to do more.

**Patron #6 Mr. Greg Strausser, 409 Delp Road**

Mr. Strausser indicated that 78 parking spaces are required for the classrooms and 19 spaces for the administrative office but yet 171 parking spaces are shown on the plan.

Mr. Strausser questioned the liberal interpretation of accessory use relative to the expansion of the elementary school. Mr. Strausser handed out portions of the Zoning Ordinance to the Planning Commission members and expressed his concern over the expansion of the elementary school including the district office.

Mr. Strausser indicated that he had gone through Township files and found minimal information in the Zoning Hearing Board transcripts relative to the district office.

Mr. Strausser expressed concern over classifying the district office as an accessory use to the school.

Mr. Sturla indicated that relief was granted by the Zoning Hearing Board relative to the expanded use and suggested that staff consult with the Township solicitor. Mr. Sturla indicated that the Planning Commission is in a difficult position since they do not hear zoning related matters just land development/subdivision related matters.

Mrs. Douglas indicated that there were some references during the Zoning Hearing Board meeting relative to the district office but there were minimal. Mrs. Douglas indicated that the Township was proceeding based on the approval by the Zoning Hearing Board.

Mr. Strausser indicated that if the Planning Commission makes a recommendation to move the plan forward it would suggest including language to reevaluate the use.

Mr. Singer, Manheim Township School District Superintendent provided a lengthy summary of the planning that went into the expansion of Bucher Elementary indicating that several options were evaluated during the process. Mr. Singer discussed each option indicating that the best option is the district office.

Mr. Singer indicated that the School District does monitor enrollment very closely.

Mr. Wolf wondered whether the district office was shared with other users and inquired about the square footage needed.

Mr. Singer indicated that the current district office is under condominium ownership and the leased size is about 18,000-19,000 square feet.

Ms. Forte spoke again at the end of the meeting.

Patron #7 Mr. Michael O'hara, 406 Chelsea Drive expressed concern over a mega school.

On a motion by Mr. Rathman, seconded by Mr. Gibeault, it was recommended to table the plan.

### **Public Comment**

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

### **Adjournment**

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

The meeting was adjourned at 10:35 p.m.

The next Regular Planning Commission meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, June 18, 2008 at 6:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Lisa A. Douglas