

**MANHEIM TOWNSHIP
PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES
Wednesday
October 17, 2007**

A meeting of the Manheim Township Planning Commission was held on Wednesday, October 17, 2007 at 6:30 p.m. The following members were present: Mr. Jeffrey Sturla; Mr. Steven Geisenberger; Mr. Robert Wolf; Mr. Michel Gibeault, Mr. Cory Rathman, Mr. Donald Reed and Mrs. Mary Ellen Hollinger. 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.

Announcement

Mr. Sturla announced that the Highland Presbyterian Church plan and the Covenant Crossing at Brethren Village plan have been removed from the agenda and would not be heard during this meeting.

Minutes

Mr. Sturla asked for a motion on the September 19, 2007 meeting minutes.

On a motion by Mr. Reed, seconded by Mr. Rathman, it was recommended to approve the September 19, 2007 meeting minutes.

Motion Approved 7-0.

Old Business

A. Comprehensive Plan Steering Committee update

Mrs. Douglas announced that the township has conducted three of the four Listening Sessions and indicated that the final Listening Session will be held on November 14, 2007 between 7:00 p.m. and 9:00 p.m. at Landis Homes.

Mrs. Douglas indicated that the next Steering Committee meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, October 24, 2007 at 7:00 a.m. at the municipal office and advised that there will not be a November Steering Committee meeting due to the holding of the November Listening Session.

Mrs. Douglas advised that there were 16,300 community-wide surveys sent out and that 3,328 of those surveys were returned which was slightly over a 20% return. Mrs. Douglas indicated that the township consultant has tallied the results of the survey and those results are expected to be available in the very near future.

New Business

A. Development Plans

1. **L.C. Insulations, Inc.** - Preliminary/Final Land Development Plan - 111 Koser Road - Zoned I-1

Present representing this Preliminary/Final Land Development Plan was Mr. Joe Gurney, DC Gohn Associates.

Mr. Gurney indicated that this project is located along Koser Road and is an existing site for L.C. Insulations, Inc.

Mr. Gurney stated that the applicants are proposing to build a 4,800 square foot addition onto the rear of the existing building along with some additional paving for parking.

Mr. Gurney indicated that the stormwater presently sheet flows to the rear of the property into an existing swale and existing basin which was constructed back when the Airport Industrial Park was developed.

Mr. Gurney briefly discussed the modifications being requested in regards to curbing, sidewalk and the existing clear sight triangle.

There were no questions or comments from the planning members.

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

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

Motion Approved 7-0.

2. **CarMax Store 7233** - Preliminary/Final Subdivision and Land Development Plan - Route 72 and Plaza Boulevard - Zoned B-4

Present representing this Preliminary/Final Land Development Plan was Ms. Cheryl Love, ELA Group, Mr. Steve Horst, property owner and Mr. Steve Hudak, CarMax.

Ms. Love indicated that this project site is located between Route 72 and Route 283 and directly across from Plaza Boulevard. Ms. Love indicated that everything currently existing on the site will be demolished in preparation for a complete renovation of the site.

Ms. Love indicated that there are three new buildings proposed for CarMax, one for sales, one for service and one for car washing.

Ms. Love discussed the reconstruction of the access drive at the intersection of Route 72 and the proposal to line it up with Plaza Boulevard across the street.

Ms. Love indicated that they are providing more lanes for traffic flow and are also proposing improvements which will benefit the adjacent Commerce Bank.

Ms. Love advised that the applicants have worked through a number of shared access easement agreements with the neighboring property owners in order to provide the additional access drive lanes and improvements.

Ms. Love demonstrated how the traffic flow is proposed for the subject site as well as for the Commerce Bank site.

Ms. Love provided a brief overview of the CarMax operation including the sales portion, the secured storage of vehicles and the servicing and bar coding of the vehicles upon arrival to the site.

Ms. Love explained the stormwater challenges that the applicants have been desperately trying to undertake. Ms. Love indicated that Mr. Horst has been very active with communicating with the downstream property owners and securing stormwater easements and agreements.

Ms. Love explained and illustrated the proposal for the collection and piping of the stormwater from the surface. Ms. Love indicated that the water will be piped underground through easements and down through the adjoining properties to the north and ultimately exiting into the stream.

Ms. Love stated that, although the applicants could have utilized the No Harm Option, they chose to be good neighbors and try to correct the surface water flow situation for the downstream properties. Ms. Love stated that they are trying to mitigate and work with the downstream properties in order to make the current conditions better, although they are under numerous site constraints.

Ms. Love indicated that, in addition to increasing green space, according to the stormwater calculations for existing conditions, this proposed system would significantly improve the surface condition for the downstream properties by providing a 90% reduction of surface flow water based on the 2-year storm event.

Mr. Rathman asked if the system will be a closed system and if there will be any inlets along that system.

Ms. Love indicated that it is basically a closed system, with a couple of manhole turning points and that water will be collected in an inlet at the low point of the site (just to the rear of Commerce Bank) and then piped the rest of the way down to the stream. Ms. Love indicated that there were also a few inlets proposed on the CarMax site as well.

Mr. Rathman questioned the oversized pipes and if the calculations looked at these pipes as some type of detention facility, whereby the water is being routed, and then at the end of the "pre" to "post" development scenarios, there was a reduction.

Ms. Love answered yes.

Mr. Rathman asked what the reduction is.

Ms. Love indicated that the information she was provided indicates that in the 2-year storm event, the overland reduction is decreased by 91% to the downstream properties and in the 100-year storm event the overland reduction is 52%.

Mr. Rathman stated that, although there is a reduction in the overland surface water runoff, it is not a reduction in peak flows and that the volume of flow is still the same.

Mr. Wolf asked how many cars, entering into the site, could stack if they were turning left into the Commerce Bank.

Ms. Love indicated that five cars would be able to stack there without being in the flow of traffic.

Mr. Wolf asked, in looking at the truck turning movements, if there was any concern that the carrier trucks turning into the site, both north bound and south bound on Manheim Pike, will be blocked from entering the site if two or more cars are waiting to make a left hand turn into the bank, whereby blocking the Route 72 intersection or preventing trucks from entering the site.

Ms. Love indicated that they had received a copy of the approved traffic study for Commerce Bank project and that her understanding was that the queuing, that would be expected there, does not utilize the full lane width, therefore the trucks should not have a problem entering the site from either direction.

Mr. Geisenberger suggested widening the southern most lane of the access drive.

Ms. Love indicated that they could look at pushing the lane over farther into their site.

Mr. Reed questioned if an agreement with Commerce Bank existed for the reconstruction of the access drive.

Mr. Horst indicated that they he has secured an executors agreement which provides for an ultimate access easement agreement and allows them to proceed with this plan and then ultimately record the easement agreement with the final plan.

Mr. Reed questioned if they have secured easement agreements for the piping of the stormwater across the adjoining downstream properties.

Ms. Love indicated that they have secured the easement agreements with all of the property owners.

Mr. Sturla questioned the modification request from filing a preliminary plan.

Mr. Sturla indicated that the township engineer is recommending denial of this modification request and that he would have to agree to this recommendation due to the stormwater issues and the significance of this plan.

Mr. Sturla stated that he felt as though this plan should not be a Preliminary/Final and questioned how this request would need to be procedurally handled if the planning members were in agreement that this plan should have two separate plan submittals, a preliminary plan submittal and a final plan submittal.

Staff indicated that the applicants could withdraw the modification request and simply change the plan name to Preliminary.

Ms. Love indicated that they have submitted it as a combined preliminary and final plan in order to help streamline the review processing of it.

Ms. Love indicated that she feels very confident on the stormwater portion of the project in light of all of the hard work they have put into it and having secured what they need downstream.

Ms. Love advised that they had also met with ARRO last week and was under the perception that most of the items are clean up items and that ARRO is in agreement with the system design itself other than the upsizing of some of the pipes.

Mr. Sturla indicated that there are a fair amount of issues, even with how the traffic impact study should be done, and he felt that there are a lot of comments and questions with this plan to be asking for a preliminary/final modification.

Mr. Sturla suggested that the applicants withdraw the modification request and submit it as just a preliminary plan.

Ms. Love indicated that the applicants are also seeking relief from providing curbing and sidewalk along the access drives and sidewalk along Route 72.

Mr. Sturla questioned the access drive between the El Rodeo Restaurant and National Tire and Battery.

Ms. Love indicated that it is an existing 80 foot access drive and that they are asking that it be maintained as an access point for possible future usability and flexibility.

Ms. Love advised that this access drive would be replaced with a 24 foot wide cartway and the access drive would dead end, be fenced and not utilized.

Ms. Love indicated that Steve Horst, as the property owner, would like to maintain it as an access point for future flexibility rather than having to go back and re-permit it through PADOT.

Mr. Sturla suggested that the access drive at least be shown with all of the required improvements necessary to meet township standards in case that access drive is ever reopened.

Mr. Sturla also expressed his concern regarding cars inadvertently driving back the access drive thinking it's a road. Mr. Sturla stated that it will be difficult for the vehicles to turn around with only a 24 foot wide cartway.

Mr. Sturla stated that he would rather see the access drive completely closed off or the applicants construct a cul-de-sac.

Mr. Gibeault questioned the access off of Arcadia Drive.

Ms. Love indicated that it is the emergency access and is a secondary point that is being provided and connected as a gated system.

Ms. Love illustrated how the truck carriers would enter the site, unload the vehicles and exit the site.

Mr. Gibeault inquired about the proposed security of the site.

Ms. Love explained that there is fencing provided around the entire sight and that a gate system will be installed.

Mr. Hudak, CarMax provided a demonstration of the typical sales process and explained how the general public will enter through the main access point and park in the public parking lot, then enter through the sales building where they will be greeted and provided with help on their vehicle selection. The customer would then be escorted out to the inventory lot at which time a CarMax associate will suggest a test drive. The associate will back the car out of its space, proceed to and through the security gate abutting the access drive and then over to the

public parking lot where the customer will change places with the associate and take the vehicle for a test drive.

Planning members raised concerns regarding the interference with traffic coming into the site and the cars being pulled out into the access drive for test driving. Suggestions were made to look at possibly relocating the sales lot gate to avoid the entering traffic.

Mr. Sturla asked for public comment. .

Patron #1: Patrick Parks Jr., 521 East Roseville Road. Mr. Parks, Jr. asked if the access drive was going to be a private roadway and if so, will they have enough room for their Snow removal equipment to maneuver around without coming out onto Manheim Pike in light of the congestion that occurs there.

Ms. Love indicated that the snow removal would primarily be entering into the site and then disposing it onto the CarMax site. Ms. Love indicated that PADOT will be responsible for the removal within the right-of-way along Manheim Pike.

On a motion by Mr. Wolf, seconded by Mr. Gibeault it was recommended to table this plan until all outstanding comments can be adequately addressed.

Motion Approved 7-0.

3. Brighton Commercial Lot 87 - Brighton PRD Final Land Development Plan - Fruitville Pike and Erbs Quarry Road - Zoned R-1 (PRD)

Present representing this Preliminary/Final Land Development Plan was Ms. Linda Michels, David Miller & Associates, Frank Vargish, Blakinger, Byler and Thomas and Bob Riahi, Brighton Land Company.

Ms. Michels indicated that this is a final land development plan for the remaining commercial component of the 1996 approved plan for the Brighton Planned Residential Development which is located along the northern side of Erbs Quarry Road across from Brighton Avenue, and directly across from the existing commercial buildings of the Brighton Development.

Ms. Michels indicated that the buildings are proposed to be constructed so that the fronts of the buildings face Erbs Quarry Road as with the existing commercial buildings.

Ms. Michels indicated that they have received the comments from the township and the county and are in the processing on working on a resubmission.

Ms. Michels briefly discussed the modifications being requested.

Mr. Wolf raised a concern regarding the proposed on-street parking. Mr. Wolf indicated that there is a safety concern and asked if there has been any thought put into eliminating some of the on-street parking.

Mr. Riahi indicated that, after meeting with the township staff, one parking space was removed since it was too close to the proposed crosswalk.

Mr. Riahi advised that the rest of the proposed on-street parking is not obstructing any line of sight and is in compliance with the main street requirements of the PRD and that the front of the shops are located along the street, therefore, some patrons will need to be able to park in front of these shops in order to use those businesses.

Mr. Wolf asked the applicant if there would be any objections if it was determined that some of those spaces might or should be removed from a safety standpoint.

Mr. Riahi stated that there needs to be motivation for someone who wants to have a shop there, and that having successful businesses there is his ultimate goal.

Mr. Riahi indicated that the entire PRD concept is focused on having a pedestrian shopping center which is the main street concept and what they are trying to do. Mr. Riahi stated that he believes that he would not have any tenants if no one would be able to park out in front of these buildings.

Ms. Michels indicated that there are seven proposed on-street parking spaces.

Mr. Reed stated that there are five, 8-foot wide existing parking spaces on the south side of Erbs Quarry Road and the travel lane for road traffic is 8-foot wide, which leaves a total of 18-feet on the northern side for which the applicants are proposing additional parking spaces.

Mr. Reed stated that, after visiting the site, he didn't feel that there was adequate width to allow additional on-street parking spaces, especially if two trailer trucks try to pass through there at the same time, which creates a serious danger.

Mr. Riahi indicated that this on-street parking design is exactly per the ordinance requirements. Mr. Riahi provided a brief background in regards to the origination of the Brighton PRD and the main street concept. Mr. Riahi indicated that, twelve years ago when this development was first presented, he was forced by the township to create this main street by realigning Erbs Quarry Road and provide on-street parking.

Mr. Reed questioned why Mr. Riahi feels that he needs the parking spaces out front since there is adequate off-street parking in the rear of the buildings.

Mr. Riahi answered that it would be a burden for patrons to park in the back of the buildings and have to walk around to the front, for example just to purchase

an ice cream cone, and then have to walk around to the back again to sit in their car and eat it.

Mr. Riahi indicated that with the realignment of the roadway to create the "main street", he feels that the truck traffic going through there is the bigger problem.

Mr. Riahi indicated that this "main street" was designed per ordinance requirements as a 25 mile-per-hour roadway and that it was not intended to be a 35 mile-per-hour speed limit as it is currently posted.

Mr. Sturla questioned whether or not the on-street parking could be shifted back 8-feet towards the property in order to gain additional width for the on-street parking whereby not encroaching all of the parking on the road.

Ms. Michels indicated that this PRD design was a traffic calming, intentional design concept and when there are cars parked on both sides of the roadway, traffic is forced to drive slower.

Mr. Vargish indicated that when the road was designed, the ordinance designated this road to be designed at a 25 mile-per-hour speed, in which case it was designed to create a traffic flow that would be consistent with a 25 mile-per-hour speed limit.

Mr. Reed stated that the road is posted at 35 miles-per-hour.

Mr. Vargish answered yes, but they were told to design it to 25 miles-per-hour.

Mrs. Douglas indicated that after meeting with the applicants, township staff was in agreement that this main street was intended to be a place where you bring people and you slow traffic.

Mr. Vargish indicated that during that meeting with staff, the applicants asked the township to look into two things. One was to find out what would legally need to take place in order to reduce the speed limit to 25 miles-per-hour and make it consistent with what it was designed for and the second item was to restrict the truck traffic and encourage the quarry trucks to take a different route in order to get out to Fruitville Pike.

Mr. Vargish further indicated that according to Phil Mellott (township public works), this issue came up early in the development process and the idea was that the truck traffic would not come out through this development, that they would take more of a direct route to Fruitville Pike. Mr. Vargish stated that, when construction of this development began, a letter was sent to the quarry which worked for awhile, but then over time the trucks started coming back through there again.

Mr. Wolf indicated that he felt the best solution would be to eliminate the on-street spaces, which would provide a more visible atmosphere to the project by means of outdoor cafes and display windows which would allow just as much patron traffic there.

Mr. Wolf stated that he thinks that the cars along the street would be more of a hindrance to the marketing of these shops from the standpoint of seeing what's in the windows. Mr. Wolf indicated to the applicant that, although they created this commercial component per requirements, the township now has to come up with a solution to protect the people that are going to walk to these shops from the residences across the street.

Planning members were all in agreement that the speed limit should be posted at the 25 miles-per-hour that the project was designed for and to also place a restriction on the truck traffic.

Mr. Vargish indicated that they would also look into the idea of shifting the spaces back 8-feet.

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

On a motion by Mr. Gibeault, seconded by Mr. Rathman it was recommended to table this plan until all outstanding comments can be adequately addressed.

Motion Approved 7-0.

On a separate motion by Mr. Geisenberger, seconded by Mrs. Hollinger it was recommended that the speed limit along Erbs Quarry Road be reduced to 25 miles-per-hour and to look into the possibility of prohibiting truck traffic through the site.

Motion Approved 7-0.

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

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

The meeting was adjourned at 8:15 p.m.

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

Respectfully submitted,

Shannon L. Sinopoli