

**MANHEIM TOWNSHIP
PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES
Wednesday
September 21, 2011**

A meeting of the Manheim Township Planning Commission was held on Wednesday, September 21, 2011 at 6:30 p.m. The following members were present: Mr. Michel Gibeault; Mr. Cory Rathman; Mr. Jeffrey Sturla; Mr. Donald Reed; Mrs. Mary Ellen Hollinger and Mrs. Stacie Reidenbaugh. Mr. Michael Martin was absent. The following Township staff was present: Mrs. Lisa Douglas and Mrs. Shannon Sinopoli.

Roll Call

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

Minutes

Mr. Gibeault asked for a motion on the August 17, 2011 Planning Commission meeting minutes.

On a motion by Mr. Sturla, seconded by Mr. Reed it was recommended to approve the August 17, 2011 meeting minutes.

Motion Approved 6-0.

Subdivision/Land Development Plans

1. Brooklawn – Preliminary Subdivision/Land Development Plan – Delp Road, Bonnie Drive and Dolly Drive – Zoned R-2.

Present representing this Preliminary Subdivision/Land Development Plan was Mr. Greg Strausser, Strausser Surveying & Engineering.

Mr. Strausser indicated that the plan consists of 73 lots to house single family dwelling units with the extension of Delp Road, Bonnie Drive and Dolly Drive.

Mr. Strausser indicated that since the last time this plan was in front of the Planning Commission, all of the geotechnical, stormwater and bridge detail comments have been addressed.

There were no questions or comments by the Planning Commission.

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

On a motion by Mr. Sturla, seconded by Mr. Rathman it was recommended to approve this plan and modifications with the condition that the applicants comply with the Transferable Development Rights requirement prior to presenting this plan to the

Board of Commissioners for action and contingent upon a clean review letter.

Motion Approved 6-0.

2. Cedar-Oregon Pike LLC – Preliminary/Final Subdivision and Land Development Plan – 1611 Oregon Pike – Zoned B-3.

Present representing this Preliminary/Final Subdivision and Land Development Plan was Mr. Sandy Kime, David Miller/Associates.

Mr. Kime indicated that this plan consists of an 11.5 acre lot along Oregon Pike and at the terminus of Crown Avenue. Mr. Kime indicated that a 4 lot subdivision is being proposed and land development for Lot #1 to house a proposed Patient First office building.

Mr. Kime indicated that since the last time this plan was in front of the Planning Commissions, all of the stormwater and geotechnical comments have been addressed.

There were no questions or comments by the Planning Commission.

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

On a motion by Mr. Sturla, seconded by Mr. Reed it was recommended to approve this plan and modifications with the condition that the applicants submit the Highway Occupancy Application to PADOT as well as submitting the Highway Occupancy Indemnification Agreement for approval and execution prior to presenting this plan to the Board of Commissioners for action and contingent upon a clean review letter.

Motion Approved 6-0.

3. Grandview United Methodist Church – Preliminary/Final Lot Add-On and Land Development Plan – 888 Pleasure Road – Zoned R-3.

Present representing this Preliminary/Final Lot Add-On Subdivision and Land Development Plan was Mr. Todd Vaughn, David Miller/Associates.

Mr. Vaughn indicated that this plan consists of eliminating a property line and the addition of a small vestibule, porch and walkway. Mr. Vaughn indicated that the stormwater improvements related to the additional impervious area is being captured in a rock bin.

Mr. Vaughn indicated that other than the need for approval from the City of Lancaster for the relocation of an existing fire hydrant, all outstanding comments are of administrative nature.

There were no questions or comments by the Planning Commission.

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

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

Motion Approved 6-0.

Conditional Use Request

1. Manheim Township Historical Society – Community Club -Conditional Use Request – 601 Granite Run Drive – Zoned R-2.

Present representing this Conditional Use request was Mr. Roy Baldwin, Manheim Township Historical Society.

Mr. Baldwin indicated that the Manheim Township Historical Society is requesting a conditional use permit to allow for a Community Club to operate in the Stoner House located next to the barn in the Overlook Community Campus.

Mr. Baldwin indicated that the second floor would be restricted from public use due to safety issues; however, the proposed uses for the first floor of the Stoner House would include a museum with an artifact display and genealogical records; a small library and small community events for groups up to about 20 individuals.

Mr. Baldwin indicated that a variance from the required parking was granted by the Zoning Hearing Board in August and that a long term lease with the Overlook Foundation is in the process coordinate events between the other uses in order to avoid stressing the parking by overlapping events.

There were no questions or comments by the Planning Commission.

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

On a motion by Mr. Reed, seconded by Mrs. Reidenbaugh it was recommended to approve this Conditional Use Request.

Motion Approved 6-0.

The public hearing is currently scheduled for November 14, 2011.

Draft Zoning Ordinance

Mrs. Douglas provided a brief background of the Zoning Ordinance update process and indicated that in August 2010, the Board of Commissioners awarded the project to Thomas Comitta Associates (TCA) and since that time the Township has been working with TCA to prepare the Zoning Ordinance that is being presented this evening.

Mrs. Douglas indicated that the Zoning Ordinance document was created with the help of a work group that consisted of representatives of the Planning Commission, a representative from the Zoning Hearing Board, a representative from the Board of Commissioners and several staff members. Mrs. Douglas advised that, in addition to the work group, TCA interviewed over 30 area applicants to gain input.

Mrs. Douglas indicated that during the process, the work group met on a monthly basis and that 10 work group meetings were held. Mrs. Douglas advised that in addition to the monthly work group meetings, TCA provided updates to the Planning Commission throughout the process including updates at both the public noon briefing meetings as well as the regularly scheduled public evening meetings.

Mrs. Douglas indicated that updates have been continually posted on the Township's website and that various newsletter articles and updates were also included in the monthly newsletters in an effort to keep the public informed.

Mrs. Jennifer Leister Reitz with TCA was present to provide an overview of the draft zoning ordinance. PowerPoint handouts were provided to the Planning Commission as well as all audience attendees to follow along with the discussions.

Mrs. Leister Reitz provided an overview of the process beginning with an initial tour of the Township that was conducted in August 2010 followed by nearly 50 stakeholder interviews as well as monthly meetings and bi-monthly Planning Commission status updates.

Mrs. Leister Reitz indicated that the framework for the updated zoning ordinance began with the recently adopted Comprehensive Plan utilizing those goals, and the Future Land Use Map as the big tools to structure the proposed revisions to the Zoning Ordinance, focusing on areas that are targeted for growth and special attention areas such as the villages, corridors; urban transition areas and the airport.

Mrs. Leister Reitz indicated that the base zoning districts will remain the same and that the majority of the revisions and updates include form-based code regulations to comprise of overlay districts, updates to the Planned Residential Development (PRD) and Planned Commercial Development (PCD) as well as revisions to include more use of Transferable Development Rights (TDRs) specifically in nonresidential areas as well as general updates.

Mrs. Leister Reitz spoke of the standard form-based code design elements and indicated that each overlay district was thoroughly reviewed to see what type of design should occur in each of the T-Zone Overlay Districts, such as the Village Overlay, where building location and streetscape are essential to emulate and protect existing features.

Mrs. Leister Reitz ran through some of the transformation concepts with regards to pedestrian gathering areas; village infill areas as well as mixed use redevelopment and commercial corridor retrofitting.

Mrs. Leister Reitz discussed the revisions made to the PCD and PRD standards and also advised that in light of the tweaks to the PRD standards, the existing Cluster Development regulations would be repealed.

Mrs. Leister Reitz presented examples of mixed use developments from existing developments in neighboring counties as a visual guide.

In regards to TDRs and to progressively support Agricultural Land Preservation, Mrs. Leister Reitz indicated that presently TDRs can be used in the residential receiving areas to increase density in appropriate areas and increase apartment building heights in appropriate areas. Mrs. Leister Reitz stated that the revisions to the TDR section would allow for TDRs to be used in nonresidential receiving areas to increase building height and length by overlay district and increase nonresidential lot coverage (such as in the PCD) and/or create a master site planned development in the T-5 Village of Oregon Overlay. All usages of TDRs would be based on appropriate design characteristics, area and overlay district.

Mrs. Leister Reitz indicated that additional highlights of the updates include: a Natural Resources Overlay District which has regulations and requirements for riparian buffers; wetlands and wetland buffers; Alternative Energy Sources such as the use of Geothermal; Anaerobic Digesters; Outdoor Hydronic Heaters and Solar (as a principal use); Parking ratios as well as a parking needs assessment that can be conducted in order to avoid large unused parking areas; Signage revisions (which happened to be the number one comment during the interview process) which would increase the size of signage along commercial corridors and the addition of electronic variable messaging.

Mr. Gibeault asked for Planning Commission comments.

Mr. Rathman, with regards to the T-Zone Overlay Districts, questioned whether or not it would be a requirement to design and development utilizing the form based codes.

Mrs. Leister Reitz indicated that *all* new development within an overlay district would be required to develop under that districts regulations and a *percentage* of redevelopment would need to abide by the requirements.

Mr. Rathman questioned the difference between the PCD and the PCD-1 regulations.

Mrs. Leister Reitz indicated that no one felt satisfied with the existing PCD language therefore the intent of the overlay design was looked at and then incorporated into the existing language. Mrs. Leister Reitz advised that the PCD-1 is an alternative option to the regular PCD with a different angle which has more flexibility with the mix of uses, more flexible Main Street requirements and a necessity for a residential buffer when next to an existing residential development.

Mr. Reed stated that existing traffic heading south from Route 30 is already bad and questioned how future development, such as a PCD or PCD-1 would relieve additional traffic burden.

Mrs. Leister Reitz indicated that connections to existing street networks would be a desired step as well as infrastructure to promote an increase in public transportation usage.

Mr. Gibeault asked for public comment.

Mr. John Hershey, 1005 Pleasure Road indicated that he is a member of the Historic Preservation Trust of Lancaster County and noted that preserving neighborhood character was something that the revised ordinance should embrace. Mr. Hershey indicated that in 1991 a study was conducted and the results indicated that there were 738 historic properties noted in Manheim Township. Mr. Hershey indicated that instead of preserving such properties, the Township has always permitted demolition versus promoting adaptive re-use. Mr. Hershey indicated he would like to see the Zoning Ordinance strengthened when it comes to historic preservation.

Ms. Carol Hickey, also representing the Historic Preservation Trust of Lancaster County reiterated Mr. Hershey's comments and advised that the Trust is here and available to complete or adjust the historic overlay district as there is a strong interest in working with Manheim Township.

Mr. Randy Harris, 314 W. Chestnut Street, Lancaster City, also former director of the Historic Preservation Trust of Lancaster County presented the planning members with a list of comments and suggested revisions that could be incorporated into the existing Historic Overlay District language.

Mr. Harris stated that in 1991 a document was put together that required every municipality to add provisions to their ordinances for protecting historic and natural resources; and that Manheim Township has not held their end or legal responsibility. Mr. Harris indicated that Manheim Township only deals with Nationally Historic Significance and that the Township's inventory does not recognize hundreds of properties listed as historic resources in its inventory for purposes of permit application review, evaluation and decision. Mr. Harris stated that this is not a consistent treatment of this class of properties that warrant municipal protection.

Mr. Harris advised that he would be glad to continue conversations regarding historic preservation with the Planning Commission.

Mr. Reed, in speaking of the Mayer property, indicated that there were originally 14 buildings and now there are 5 left that are in very bad disrepair and have been up for sale for a long time with no buyer interest or restoration interest. Mr. Reed questioned how long do you continue to allow for the deterioration to continue before the county or the historical society steps in and does something.

Mr. Harris indicated that it should be Manheim Township's responsibility to go out and protect these structures. Mr. Harris stated that they should be shut down via codes and then at minimum boarded up.

Mr. Hershey, in speaking of the former Mayer Tobacco Barn, indicated that a demolition permit was granted for the razing of the barn, however, the Historic Preservation Trust wanted to preserve it.

Ms. Deb Frantz, representing the Manheim Township Historical Society indicated that she has been trying to save the Stoner House for years, which is a 1750 Stone Farm house that her great grandmother was born in. She said luckily they were successful at preserving the Stoner House, but during the time she was fighting to save it, she started to question the Township's responsibility for preservation in light that no one cared to save this house, even though it was Township owned. Ms. Frantz stated that it should not be a big battle to preserve these treasured historic properties.

Mr. Vincent Kneizys, 1653 Leona Avenue, expressed his concerns regarding the traffic impact south of Route 30 and when looking at the situation today and what is possible tomorrow with the revised

Zoning Ordinance. Mr. Kneizys stated that if the property across from the Red Rose Commons gets developed into residential, there will be much more traffic and he doesn't want to see that happen.

Mr. Kneizys stated that Manheim Township is slow to look at historic properties and felt that the documentation needs to be beefed up and suggested that the planning members take another look at historic consideration.

There was no further public comment.

Mr. Gibeault stated that this draft ordinance will again be reviewed and discussed by the Planning Commission at the October 19, 2011 Planning Commission meeting.

On a motion by Mr. Sturla, seconded by Mr. Reed it was recommended to table a recommendation of the proposed Zoning Ordinance.

Motion Approved 6-0.

The public hearing is currently scheduled for November 14, 2011.

Conditional Use Request

1. The Crossings at Conestoga Creek - Planned Commercial Development – Conditional Use request - Harrisburg Pike and Farmingdale Road - Zoned I-1.

Mr. Michael Gibeault announced that he would be abstaining from the discussions of this Conditional Use application and turned the gavel over to Mr. Rathman.

Present representing this Conditional Use Request was Mr. Tom Smithgall and Mr. Steve Evans, High Real Estate Group; Mrs. Caroline Hoffer, Barley-Snyder; Mr. Joel Young and Mr. Jeri McClune, Rettew Associates; and Mr. Eric Mountz, Traffic Planning & Design.

Mr. Smithgall indicated that there was a prior conditional use application which was approved in 2007 for a much larger Planned Commercial Development (PCD) project, however, since that time and the down turn of market conditions, this new request is for a plan that significantly reduces the project size from 650,000 square feet of commercial space to 211,000 square feet with 258 apartments included and a hotel.

Mr. Young presented several conceptual site plan illustrations of the project including the overall development concept which includes 211,000 square feet of retail; 75,000 square feet of hospitality; 258 apartments; 49 acres of open space and a main street concept which would allow for a lot of community opportunities with gathering areas, etc.

Mr. Young indicated that this proposal is significantly less intense than the previous proposal and is 7 acres less in impervious coverage.

Mr. Young discussed the site circulation plan for traffic throughout the development along with the accesses from Harrisburg Pike and Farmingdale Road. Mr. Young also identified the pedestrian areas and the location of a proposed pedestrian trail which would wrap around and thru the entire development.

Mr. Young presented conceptual plan drawings for the proposed landscaping; lighting; wetland and stream improvements; details as well as architectural design concepts.

Mr. Reed questioned the large parking lot in the center of the development and indicated that the ordinance calls for smaller parking areas.

Mr. Smithgall indicated that the prior project also had large parking areas, and stated that they are no longer proposing 650,000 square feet of retail and with the proposed parking area; the landscaping will be staggered so that it doesn't actually appear as large as it looks on the site plan.

Mr. Sturla raised concern regarding the possibility that the 211,000 square foot building gets constructed and then nothing else that would screen the building and large parking area from Harrisburg Pike. Mr. Sturla questioned as to what safeguards may be put into place that would guarantee construction doesn't just stop at the large retail building and nothing else gets built.

Mrs. Hoffer indicated that there are a range of use regulations in the ordinance that the applicant would have to comply with.

Mr. Sturla indicated that he would feel more comfortable if there were certain amounts, or percentages of other structures/uses that would have to be built along with the large retail building as a guarantee.

Mr. Smithgall indicated that in order to pull one permit (the first permit), the applicant has to do all the roadway improvements that are shown on the roadway improvement plan and they certainly would not want to complete all of the roadway improvements for just one structure.

Mr. Mountz presented a brief overview of the Traffic Impact Study, which was noted to be relatively similar to the previous study.

Mr. Mountz presented the roadway improvement plans and indicated that all of the previous proposed improvements remain with the exception of the Single Point Urban Interchange (SPUI) and the right turn lane onto Farmingdale, for which a compromising alternative is being proposed.

Mr. Mountz indicated that the hotel and restaurant traffic wanting to head west would exit thru the Toys R Us property by means of a shared access agreement and that an added left turn lane is proposed at the egress of the Toys R Us site.

Mr. Mountz indicated that the Dillerville Road and President Avenue intersection with Harrisburg Pike is currently being 100% financed thru the county for intersection upgrades and that the applicants intend to work together with the county and PADOT to make the project a reality.

Mr. Mountz indicated that upon completion of all the roadway improvements the overall delay along Harrisburg Pike will be reduced by 45% and the overall delay at the Manheim Pike/Route 30 intersection will be reduced by 58%.

Mr. Rathman indicated that the PCD Ordinance states that the development shall be primarily retail and questioned the magnitude of the residential component which appears to be 50% of the development.

Mr. Rathman indicated that he is also concerned with the main street concept and the proposed corridor being described as a main street when it seemingly dumps into a large parking lot. Mr. Rathman indicated that the traffic pattern as shown on the drawings does not appear to be a main street, nor does the proposed location of the buildings provide that main street intent.

Mr. Rathman suggested dispersing parking and avoiding large parking lots.

Mr. Smithgall indicated that the old plans had large parking lots as well.

Mr. Rathman indicated that unlike the previous plan where parking lots were split and behind buildings, this proposal consists of one large sea of parking out front.

Mr. Sturla also had concern with the giant sea of parking, however, indicated that this may be as good as it gets for this particular site as long as a streetscape is provided to screen the parking from the public roadway. Mr. Sturla reiterated again his reason for wanting some type of guarantee that the proposed buildings, closest to Harrisburg Pike, are built, preferably in sequence with the large building and parking lot.

Mr. Sturla, in referring to the main street feel, suggested that the applicants carry the main street thru to the back of the project site by way of architectural design instead of what appears to be a standard strip mall look.

Mrs. Reidenbaugh questioned whether apartments are being proposed to be located over any of the retail component.

Mr. Smithgall answered no.

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

On a motion by Mr. Reed, seconded by Mrs. Hollinger it was recommended to table this Conditional Use Request.

Motion Approved 5-0, with Mr. Gibeault abstaining.

The public hearing is currently scheduled for November 14, 2011.

Public Comment

None.

Adjournment

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

Motion approved 6-0 and the meeting adjourned at 9:35 p.m.

The next Regular Planning Commission meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, October 19, 2011 at 6:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Shannon L. Sinopoli