

**MANHEIM TOWNSHIP  
PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTES  
Wednesday  
July 18, 2007**

A meeting of the Manheim Township Planning Commission was held on Wednesday, July 18, 2007 at 6:30 p.m. The following members were present: Mr. Kevin Fry; Mr. Jeffrey Sturla; Mr. Steven Geisenberger; Mr. Robert Wolf; Mr. Michel Gibeault, Mr. Cory Rathman and Mr. Donald Reed. The following Township staff was present: Ms. Lisa Greaves and Mrs. Shannon Sinopoli.

**Roll Call**

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

**Announcement**

Mr. Fry announced that he will be resigning as Chairman from the Planning Commission at the August 15<sup>th</sup> meeting due to moving out of the Township and that Mr. Sturla will be taking the position of Chairman. Mr. Fry also indicated that the planning members will be nominating a Vice-Chairman at the August 15<sup>th</sup> meeting.

**Minutes**

Mr. Fry asked for a motion on the June 20, 2007 meeting minutes.

On a motion by Mr. Reed, seconded by Mr. Geisenberger, it was recommended to approve the June 20, 2007 meeting minutes.

**Motion Approved 7-0.**

**Old Business**

**A. Comprehensive Plan steering committee update**

Ms. Greaves provided a brief update regarding the Steering Committee and indicated that the listening sessions will be starting for the updates to the Comprehensive Plan to give the residents an opportunity to come out and voice their opinions.

Ms. Greaves indicated that there will be four evening listening sessions all scheduled from 7:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m. on the following dates and specified locations:

1. Tuesday, August 7, 2007 at Schaeffer Elementary School Gymnasium
2. Wednesday, August 8, 2007 at Reidenbaugh Elementary Cafeteria
3. Monday, August 20, 2007 at The Barn at Overlook
4. Wednesday, November 14, 2007 at Landis Homes Retirement Community Harvest Room

Ms. Greaves advised that the community surveys are currently being printed and that July 27<sup>th</sup> or July 30<sup>th</sup> is the anticipated mailing date with a return date of August 15, 2007.

Ms. Greaves indicated that the next Steering Committee will be held Wednesday, July 25<sup>th</sup> at 7:00 a.m.

## **B. Development Plans**

### **1. Universal Athletic Club – Preliminary/Final Lot Add-On Plan - Oregon Pike and Landis Valley Road - Zoned B-3.**

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

Mr. Strausser provided a brief update and indicated that, since the last Planning Commission meeting, revised plans were submitted and a revised review letter was generated from staff, which generated only minor administrative comments.

Mr. Strausser discussed the 1994 previously recorded plan which included a note stating that any future plan submission for the Quality Inn parcel or the Olde Hickory parcel would need to address curb and sidewalk out along the Oregon Pike frontage.

Mr. Strausser continued by discussing the unrecorded 2002 plan submitted by Olde Hickory, however, he was inaudible due to the lack of using the microphone.

Planning Commission members discussed the note that was recorded as part of the 1994 plan and Mr. Sturla indicated that, although the 2002 plan came in prior to this current add-on plan, the note clearly states that "any" future land development or subdivision plan submitted must address curb and sidewalk.

Mr. Strausser responded by indicating that the word "any" could go on and on and that if they put in the curb and sidewalk today, then it would mean that any future plan that would come in under different requirements may have to tear out the existing curb and sidewalk constructed with this plan and provide complete reconstruction, which in essence creates an endless cycle.

Mr. Sturla indicated that the curbing and sidewalk should be put in now or the applicant should post an escrow in lieu of those improvements as a guarantee that the improvements will be done at some future time.

Mr. Sturla questioned how the escrow amount that's necessary to put in the sidewalk could be determined taking into consideration that the sidewalk will have an impact on impervious surface and then kick in stormwater calculations.

Mr. Sturla questioned the applicant as to how the township would be supplied with an engineer's determination of a cost estimate for all of the outstanding work that they would be asked to do.

Mr. Strausser responded, but again was inaudible due to the lack of microphone usage.

Mr. Reed stated that whether the 2002 plan was recorded or not, the previous arrangement was sold on the basis that the note was there and that the Township was expecting someone to do it.

Planning members had no further comments.

Mr. Fry asked for public comment.

There was no response from audience members.

On a motion by Mr. Rathman, seconded by Mr. Reed it was recommended that the following modifications be approved:

1. Section 501: Preliminary Plan Processing Procedure
2. Section 502.2.I: Existing Contours
3. Section 502.2.Q and 602.3.H.4: Stormwater Management Control Measures
4. Section 803.8.E: Access Drive Parking
5. Section 803.8.L: Access Drive Curb and Sidewalk

On the same motion, it was recommended to approve the modifications of Section 802.1.C (Note 11 on the Village of Olde Hickory Lot Add-On Plan recorded in Subdivision Plan Book J-190, Page 17) , Section 803.1 (right-of-

way and cartway width along Oregon Pike), Section 804.1 (curbing along Oregon Pike and Landis Valley Road), and Section 805 (sidewalk along Oregon Pike and Landis Valley Road) of the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance of Manheim Township 1998 and, having recommended the granting of such modifications, I move that the Planning Commission recommend approval of the Preliminary/Final Lot Add-On Plan for Universal Athletic Club dated May 30, 2007, such modifications and approval of the Current Plan to be subject to all of the following conditions:

1. The granting of these modifications shall relate only to the Current plan and shall be temporary in nature.
2. Applicant shall furnish financial security of the type and the amount required by the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code and the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance to secure the construction of curb and sidewalk along the entire frontage, approximately 528 feet, of the land now owned by Casselco and the land intended to be added to the land of Casselco by the Current Plan. Applicant shall grant such right-of-way to the Township as may be necessary in connection with the construction of the curb and sidewalk in order to comply with Section 805.5 of the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance and shall also install any associated stormwater management facilities.

\*\*Motion was paused to question the applicant when the parking lot improvements are proposed to be installed. Mr. Strausser indicated a realistic time frame would be five (5) years.

Motion continued....

These curb and sidewalk improvements shall be installed by Applicant at the time any land development plan, subdivision plan or stormwater management plan is required by the Township in connection with any future expansion of, or additions or other improvements to, Universal Athletic Club or the Casselco Property or any expansion or redevelopment takes place on the lands now owned by BJP Associates, Inc., or within five (5) years of the recording of the Current Plan, whichever occurs earlier. In the event any dispute should arise as to the time within which these improvements must be installed, the Township, in its sole discretion, shall make the final determination. It is the intent of this condition to grant Applicant temporary relief from the requirements of the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance pertaining to these improvements, but because development is occurring and is contemplated to continue to occur along this corridor, the Township shall have the authority to determine when these improvements need to be

installed.

Planning Commission  
July 18, 2007  
Page 5

3. Applicant shall obtain from Village of Olde Hickory, L.P., a written acknowledgment in recordable form satisfactory to the Township Solicitor or Assistant Solicitor that the granting of these modifications shall not in any manner modify or release the obligations of Village of Olde Hickory, L.P., pursuant to Note 11 on the Village of Olde Hickory Lot Add-On Plan recorded in Subdivision Plan Book J-190, Page 17 and that Village of Olde Hickory, L.P., will comply with Sections 803.2.K, 804.1, and 805 of the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance in connection with any future land development or subdivision of Lot 1 and Lot 2 as designated on the Prior Plan, including the land joined in common with Lot 2 on the Prior Plan.
4. Applicant shall obtain from BJP Associates, Inc., a written acknowledgment in recordable form satisfactory to the Township Solicitor or Assistant Solicitor that the granting of these modifications shall not in any manner modify or release the obligations of BJP Associates, Inc., pursuant to Note 11 on the Prior Plan and that BJP Associates, Inc., will comply with Sections 803.2.K, 804.1, and 805 of the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance in connection with any future land development or subdivision of Lot 1 and Lot 2 as designated on the Prior Plan, including the land joined in common with Lot 2 on the Prior Plan.
5. A Note shall be placed on the Current Plan setting forth all of the foregoing conditions which have been imposed upon the approval of these modifications and the Current Plan.
6. Applicant shall satisfactorily address the comments outlined in the Plan Development Review Letter dated July 9, 2007.
7. Applicant shall accept in writing the foregoing conditions to the granting of these modifications and shall accept in writing these conditions of approval of the Current Plan. If Applicant does not accept these conditions, then approval of the modifications and the Current Plan shall be automatically rescinded.

**Motion Approved 7-0.**

Mr. Fry acknowledged and welcomed Boy Scout, Eli Geisenberger, who was present in the audience.

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

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

Present representing this Preliminary/Final Land Development Plan was Mr. Charlie Suhr, Attorney, Stevens and Lee; Mr. William McCollum, Berkshire Development; Mr. Steve Horst, property owner; Ms. Jodie Evans, McMahon Transportation Engineers and Mr. John Rufo, Arrowstreet Architecture.

Mr. Suhr indicated that there were only a few minor changes to the plans since the meeting last month and that, according to the latest review generated by staff, the technical details for the design have been cleared up.

Mr. Suhr further indicated that Mr. John Schick, Township Traffic Engineer, has essentially signed off on all of the proposed traffic improvements.

Mr. Fry stated that it appears that the applicants have responded to the comments generated by staff and the traffic engineer, however, the planning members concerns comments, which have been raised during each meeting, have not yet been addressed as the plans do not reflect anything different from previous samplings.

Mr. Suhr indicated that staff did express the planning members concerns during a recent meeting in regards to this plan meeting the general criteria and intent for a Planned Commercial Development since the plans include a retail component, a rehabilitation portion and a medical office building off to the side of the site.

Mr. Suhr advised that the applicant's are seeking a recommendation from the planning commission to move forward and hold the public hearing on August 13, 2007 and that they hope to answer these concerns for the Planning Commission and make it the focus of this evening's presentation.

Mr. McCollum stated that the Lancaster area is under-retailed in comparison to other similar markets and that, due to the access abilities and visibility from the freeway, this site would be perfect for retail development.

Mr. McCollum further stated that in addition to the access and visibility, the fact that this site was part of a 145 acre development, which was started about 20 years ago, also intrigued Berkshire from the standpoint that there was existing

offices, retail, banking, daycare and hotels, which provided a great mix that retailers like to see.

Mr. McCollum indicated that after contacts with Mr. Horst, they felt the best way to approach the retail idea was to request a conditional use to allow for a Planned Commercial Development to be constructed on this site.

Mr. McCollum indicated that they are proposing a main street at the core of the development and that the core would encompass the majority of the development.

Mr. McCollum indicated that the proposed development is 40 acres which would consist of approximately 305,000 square feet of buildings.

Mr. McCollum advised that approximately 184,000 square feet would be new construction; 18,000 square feet of commercial recreation space and the remaining would be the rehabilitation of the existing retail uses, bank, daycare and the orthopedic medical office building.

Mr. McCollum indicated that this development would provide benefits to Manheim Township such as the creation of approximately 460 jobs and the projection of \$650,000 in new taxes each year. Mr. McCollum further indicated that, in addition to the jobs and taxes, Manheim Township would be receiving approximately \$3 million worth of roadway improvements.

Mr. Gibeault indicated that only 180,000 square feet of the total will be located within the core of the development and questioned how the remaining uses interact with this core and meet the main street concept, especially the orthopedic building and other buildings located away from the main street and away from the core of the site.

Mr. Rufo indicated that the overall concept is that there are a number of existing structures with improvements being proposed architecturally and core connectivity. Mr. Rufo stated that the core is meant to provide an architectural language that the other existing buildings can mirror, and that they are planning extensive renovations coupled with the street improvements so that there is connectivity and landscape treatments all the way through it.

Mr. Rufo indicated that the very first statement of the Planned Commercial Development talks about the other uses being able to be connected to the core of the main street development. Mr. Rufo advised that this site is such that it's quite dispersed, but with the look of the treatment that is being proposed and rehabilitation of the existing structures, they plan on unifying the site and creating pedestrian and vehicular linkage.

Mr. Rufo further stated that it would be very difficult to achieve the one main street concept all of the way through this particular site.

After a brief presentation of the pedestrian trail system and street connectivity, Mr. Gibeault asked if they are suggesting that people will be walking along a tree lined pathway which would be going from the core of the development up and between the back of the existing buildings where the loading docks and the neighboring mini-storage facilities are located.

Mr. Rufo answered yes.

Mr. Gibeault asked if Mr. Rufo would refer to that as a main street concept.

Mr. Rufo said he is referring to it in a way that is connecting the public through from place to place and that by looking at it in the context, one would be hard pressed to identify something in that site location as a main street, however, they are trying to connect the whole of the site through to the core of the main street.

Mr. Geisenberger asked Mr. Rufo if this is how he would create a main street concept if the four existing buildings were not there.

Mr. Rufo answered no.

Mr. Geisenberger responded by questioning if the developer was willing to spend the money to knock those buildings down, would the main street be designed differently.

Mr. Rufo answered that if this was a blank slate, yes, however, they are working with existing conditions.

Mr. Geisenberger stated that, even if the planning members could get passed the idea of the mini-storage facilities being right next door (for which are controlled by the applicants who have the ability to do something with but have chosen not to), and even if the planning members could get by the concept that somehow the orthopedic building should be connected to meet the 40 acre minimum requirement, the Planning Commission is being told that the main thing preventing the applicants from putting in an appropriate main street, a full main street concept, is because of the fact that the developers are not willing to knock those four buildings down.

Mr. Rufo answered that the existing buildings are the site constraints.

Mr. Wolf questioned the square footage sizes of the existing offices and hotels located within the Granite Run Development.

Mr. Horst indicated that there is about 315,000 square of office space currently developed, for which is largely occupied. Mr. Horst advised that he does not have the sizes of the hotels or the other uses.

Mr. Horst further indicated that he is looking at this proposal as an amenity to the office space to keep the office vibrant and keep the kind of tenants that they are trying to attract in the Granite Run Development.

Mr. Wolf questioned Mr. Horst about how he felt he was meeting the intent of the Planned Commercial Development ordinance when one of the key purposes of the ordinance is for the offices and hotels to be a secondary use to the lifestyle center, however, there is approximately 250,000 square feet proposed for the lifestyle center and there is between 400,000-500,000 square feet of office space and hotels. Mr. Wolf stated that with those square footage calculations, the lifestyle center then becomes the secondary use of Granite Run where the intent of the ordinance was for the lifestyle center to be the primary focus and the offices and hotels to be the secondary use.

Mr. Horst responded by stating that he didn't write the ordinance, and that they are just trying to deal with it as it was written and as they understand it.

Mr. Horst stated that in his reading of the ordinance, he never saw a definition of a main street having to stretch from end to end in some fashion and connect every piece of the development to a main street.

Mr. Horst indicated that he feels that this proposal does accomplish the things from the ordinance that it is looking for and that he is not prepared to go in and demolish any buildings and he feels that the uses will fit and the elements will pull together with the plans for the refurbishing of the existing structures.

Mr. Sturla stated that he felt the entire plan just did not look right because of the odd parts to it and the mini-storage buildings being right next door. Mr. Sturla stated that there are parts of the project that really do not go to the essence of the entire ordinance and that there are pieces of each part of the ordinance that the applicants seem to be pulling out and saying that they meet it here and there.

Mr. Sturla further stated that the body of the ordinance is looking for a 40 acre cohesive Planned Commercial Development and not a couple of paths that run

around and link pieces together. Mr. Sturla indicated that the intentions of this plan are great, but that he doesn't feel that the applicants have met what they are trying to accomplish.

Mr. Horst stated that the mini-storage buildings stick out when it's look at on an aerial photograph, however, in reality, they are buried behind and wrapped around by other buildings which makes it hard to see them.

Mr. Rathman, in questioning about the floor space, stated that there are approximately 180,000 square feet of floor space along the main street and about 125,000 square feet of floor space that is not even going to be within 100-200 feet of the main street and therefore 40% of the other buildings will not even be located on the main street corridor.

Mr. Horst responded but was inaudible due to the lack of using the microphone.

Mr. Geisenberger stated that if the existing buildings were not there, the applicants could have a real main street.

Mr. Wolf stated that the applicants are trying to be creative with the current situation that they have and are trying to make the best of it, however, when the planning members were involved in the drafting of the ordinance they were relying on research that was done on successful main street lifestyle centers and supplied with visions of such.

Mr. Wolf further stated that the planning members are now being put in a position of having to try and be open minded with this proposal and all of the site constraints and the proposal of trying to take something and make it better in comparison to the sample of lifestyle centers that we are familiar with.

Mr. Horst indicated that lifestyle centers and town centers come in different sizes and this is a smaller center, but it fits with its surroundings.

Mr. Wolf indicated that only about half of the proposal is your core, main street area.

Mr. Horst indicated that he was unclear as to what it was that the planning members were struggling with and stated that it is too esoteric to him to say that it doesn't work because....(inaudible).....and he doesn't understand how this doesn't end up being a good project.

Planning members indicated that no one was saying that it wasn't a good project, that it's just not a good Planned Commercial Development.

Mr. Gibeault indicated that this is a good main street on a 20 acre site, but it's not a good main street on a 40 acre site.

Mr. Fry indicated that the planning members have been clearly and consistently expressing the same concerns from the initial submission.

Mr. Suhr addressed the planning members but was inaudible due to the lack of using the microphone.

Mr. Fry asked for the applicants to provide the traffic updates.

Mrs. Evans indicated that since the last meeting, there were only a couple of updates.

Mrs. Evans stated that the planning members expressed their concerns at the last meeting in regards to the merge point coming off of the westbound ramp off Route 283 and in response to those concerns, and included in the revisions, they are now proposing to have the off ramp flow into the right turn lane at Granite Run Drive.

Mrs. Evans indicated that there were also a few minor revisions to the Granite Run and Carrera Drive intersection.

Mrs. Evans advised that they have also added a left turn lane at both Delp Road and Fruitville Pike and that there will be a center left turn lane along the Fruitville Pike corridor between Delp Road and Granite Run Drive.

Mr. Geisenberger asked if the applicants would be required to pay an impact fee in addition to the \$3 million of roadway improvements.

Ms. Greaves indicated that the impact fees have not been calculated.

Mr. Fry asked for public comment.

There was no response from audience members.

On a motion by Mr. Geisenberger, seconded by Mr. Reed, it was recommended to deny the conditional use request based on not meeting the full requirements of Section 2319 of the Planned Commercial Development Ordinance.

**Motion Approved 7-0.**

Mr. Geisenberger asked that the record be kept open for a week in order for the planning members to supply further individual comments to the applicants and the Board of Commissioners.

**The public hearing is set for August 13, 2007**

**2. Highland Presbyterian Church – Rezoning Petition - Oregon Pike and East Roseville Road - Request to change zoning of property from Zone R-2 to IN.**

Present representing this Rezoning Petition was Mrs. Caroline Hoffer, Barley-Snyder; Mr. Bob Kornman, Derck & Edson; Mr. Steve Proctor, CEO Presbyterian Homes Representative.

Mrs. Hoffer indicated that since the June Planning Commission meeting, they have received the review letter from Lancaster County Planning Commission which recommended approval of the request.

Mrs. Hoffer also indicated that they put together a memo to address some of the questions and concerns which were brought up at the previous meeting.

Mr. Proctor presented planning members with brochures outlining the essentials involved with Presbyterian Homes and provided a brief overview of the organization which is dedicated to serving seniors.

Mr. Proctor indicated that Presbyterian Homes serve approximately 4,000 people daily in nineteen (19) locations in Pennsylvania, Maryland and Delaware and that they provide a variety of services from independent living to skilled nursing care and a variety of community services.

Mr. Proctor advised that they are related to, but independent of, the Presbyterian Church and that there is a very positive relationship between the two.

Mr. Proctor indicated that they provide service to about 20% Presbyterians and the remaining are of folks from every other religious denomination.

Mr. Proctor stated that Presbyterian Homes have been interested in developing senior housing at the Highland Church for about 10 years and have been visiting there for some time.

Mr. Proctor indicated that the proposal consists of a total of 125 units of senior housing that would be offered in three (3) buildings with underground parking below each structure.

Mr. Proctor advised that they will be embracing a broad range of economic levels to include one building being a tax credit housing building which will target people that are 60% or below the median income for the area.

Mr. Reed indicated that the proposal is to take one portion of the site and subdivide it to sell it off to Presbyterian Homes, however, that the rezoning request is including the entire site. Mr. Reed questioned how it is going to be proposed that the remaining area would not be developed the same way and that more housing units would not be built on the church site in the future.

Mr. Kornman indicated that there is a minimum open area requirement of 50% and with the proposed church expansion, there would be little open area left to construct any other buildings.

Mr. Fry questioned the rezoning of this tract now versus waiting for the updated Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Geisenberger indicated that he felt it is a great project, but by looking at the current future land development map, Institutional is not projected in or near the area of the church and in trying to develop the Oregon Pike corridor from a planning perspective, typically buildings would be brought closer to the roadway and there would not be a blank stretch along Oregon Pike.

Mrs. Hoffer indicated that when talking about zoning, one needs to look at what else it could be used for and what else it could be zoned. Mrs. Hoffer stated that the property owner has a major commitment to this location and has been there for 50 years, and although they could develop the site as offices, the property owner has no intention to ever put offices on this property as he would rather use this property in a way that is consistent with the church use and to extend the mission of the church.

Mr. Wolf stated that the comprehensive plan argument could be used both ways and questioned if it's fair to penalize or reject a truly good project because of the timeframe that it may take a municipality to finalize a Comprehensive Plan and the question as to the date that that might be.

Mr. Kornman commented but was inaudible due to the lack of using the microphone.

Mr. Wolf responded that he thinks that if it was a marginal project or a gray area then it would be a good argument, but the planning members need to decide if this is a good project and if so, whether it is fair to reject it or penalize it based on an unknown timeframe.

Mr. Gibeault indicated that by reviewing the Lancaster County comments and the LIMC plan, the County is looking for those infill sites within the urban growth

area to be developed and that with Manheim Township having the second oldest median age, this proposal provides for a nice variety of income level on an infill site with minimal impact on the traffic and schools.

Mr. Fry asked for public comment.

Patron #1: Scott and Ann Fischer, 854 Valley Road residents indicated that they saw an article in the newspaper about the Highland project and the possibility of Presbyterian Homes joining that site. Mr. Fischer indicated that they did not have any connection with Presbyterian Homes or Highland Presbyterian as his wife is a pastor elsewhere and he is the executive director of the Lancaster County Council of Churches.

Mr. Fischer stated that they were present to speak very favorably about Presbyterian Homes as they are familiar with their projects and advised that Presbyterian Homes are a premier provider of senior services and retirement communities and that they are a tremendous asset for every community where they reside. Mr. Fischer stated that they would like to see Presbyterian Homes be constructed in Manheim Township and hoped that the planning members would seriously consider the rezoning petition and favorably act upon it.

There were no further questions or comments.

On a motion by Mr. Sturla, seconded by Mr. Wolf, it was recommended to approve this rezoning request.

**Motion Approved 6-1, with Mr. Geisenberger voting no.**

The public hearing is set for August 13, 2007

## **NEW BUSINESS**

### **A. Development Plans**

#### **1. Covenant Crossing At Brethren Village – Preliminary Land Development Plan – Lititz Pike – Zoned IN**

Present representing this Preliminary Land Development Plan was Mr. Jim Wenger, Derck and Edson.

Mr. Wenger provided a brief summary of this preliminary land development proposal.

Mr. Wenger indicated that the property was master planned in the year 1990 and that in the last 2-3 years it has been re-master planned to show the build out of the property and the repositioning of this 110 year old campus for the facilities that are outdated and no longer usable for the type of uses that they want to use them for.

Mr. Wenger indicated that in the core of the campus they are looking to reinvent their health care facilities to be state of the art and rework their existing healthcare facilities for other uses.

Mr. Wenger indicated that Founders Hall and Westridge, two buildings currently located along 501, are proposed to be razed and in its place would be a new, state-of the art health care facility and that the existing health care facility will be converted into assisted living facilities.

Mr. Wenger continued by indicating that part of the goal of the overall plan is that the main entrance to Brethren Village will now be at the signal at the Bloomfield Square Restaurant coming in on Fieldcrest Drive and then residents and visitors will be directed to the core campus. Mr. Wenger indicated that the main drive circulations throughout the campus will remain as is.

Mr. Wenger advised that the additional Fieldcrest building will not have underground parking as the original building was constructed due to the existing underground spaces not being a very popular lease and instead there will be open carports around the buildings to provide a variety of parking facilities.

Mr. Fry questioned the timing of this project and if phases were proposed.

Mr. Wenger responded that it is projected to take approximately 3-1/2 years, with Fieldcrest being started immediately and then the moving of cottages and utilities and moving residents from existing facilities to other temporary facilities. Mr. Wenger thought that with this core and with taking a phased approach, these improvements will span over several years.

In response to staff review comments, Mr. Wenger discussed curbing and sidewalk modifications as well as a waiver from reconstructing the existing private streets within the campus. Mr. Wenger continued to discuss a few other additional requirements which relief will be sought for.

A brief stormwater proposal was provided.

Mr. Reed questioned if there would be sidewalk along Route 501.

Mr. Wenger indicated that there is currently sidewalk located along there that the residents use within the development.

Mr. Fry questioned if someone would be able to access the sidewalk if they were coming from the adjacent lot.

Mr. Wenger indicated yes, it could be used by the general public although they do not encourage public use.

Brief discussions regarding the potential for a bike path within the development took place. Mr. Wenger indicated that because Brethren Village focuses on security, any public movement through the campus would not be looked upon highly.

In response to Mr. Wenger's inquiry and as a general guidance, the planning members indicated that they were generally comfortable with the proposed modifications as discussed, but would like to contemplate the sidewalk request along Route 501.

Mr. Geisenberger questioned staff if there were any future thoughts for long term pedestrian access along Route 501 corridor from Airport Road to Millport Road.

Ms. Greaves indicated that there are no intentions for pedestrian access along that corridor.

On a motion by Mr. Gibeault, seconded by Mr. Rathman, it was recommended to table this Preliminary Land Development Plan and modification requests.

**Motion Approved 7-0.**

**B. Acknowledgement**

**1. Eden Road Spur - Roadway abandonment**

Mr. Fry and the remaining Planning Commission members acknowledged the abandonment request of the Eden Roadway Spur.

Mr. Fry announced that a new Lancaster County Planning Commission representative was present in the audience.

Mr. Scott Wails introduced himself as the new county representative for Manheim Township and complimented the Planning Commission for conducting a thorough and professional meeting.

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

The meeting adjourned at 9:05 p.m.

The next Regular Planning Commission meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, August 15, 2007 at 6:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Shannon L. Sinopoli