

**MANHEIM TOWNSHIP
PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES
Wednesday
May 16, 2012**

A meeting of the Manheim Township Planning Commission was held on Wednesday, May 16, 2012 at 6:30 p.m. The following members were present: Mr. Cory Rathman; Mr. Jeffrey Sturla; Mr. Donald Reed; Mrs. Stacie Reidenbaugh; Mrs. Anita Blumenstock and Mr. Ian Hodge. Mr. Michel Gibeault was absent. The following Township staff was present: Mrs. Lisa Douglas and Mrs. Shannon Sinopoli.

Roll Call

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

Minutes

Mr. Rathman asked for a motion on the March 21, 2012 Planning Commission meeting minutes.

On a motion by Mr. Sturla, seconded by Mr. Reed it was recommended to approve the March 21, 2012 meeting minutes.

Motion Approved 6-0.

Conditional Use Application

1. **Belmont - Conditional Use Application** - Planned Commercial Development I - Fruitville Pike - Zoned R-3; I-2; D-R Overlay & T-1 Natural Resources Overlay; Historic Overlay

Present representing this Conditional Use application was Mr. Matthew Crème, Nikolaus & Hohenadel; Mr. Alex Piehl, RGS Associates; Mr. Greg Richardson, Traffic Planning and Design and Mr. Tim Cassidy, Bernardon Haber Holloway.

The applicants presented a Power Point presentation of the overall proposed project which consists of Tract 1 and 2 located along Fruitville Pike and south of Route 30.

Mr. Piehl indicated that Tract 1 is located on the western side of Fruitville Pike and Tract 2 is located on the eastern side of Fruitville Pike.

Mr. Piehl advised that the northern access point, which is the existing intersection at

Red Rose Commons, will be improved and expanded and that a new southern access/intersection to service both Tracts 1 & 2 is being proposed which would be signalized.

Mr. Piehl indicated that the mansion on Tract 1 is proposed for adaptive reuse to include apartments and retail use, while the remainder of the tract would house a bank and a potential new fire station to replace the existing Southern Manheim Township Fire Station building/location.

Mr. Piehl noted that there is an existing PennDOT stormwater basin at the northwestern corner of Tract 2 which the applicants are working towards integrating into the overall project.

Mr. Piehl indicated that Tract 2 would consist of a mix of shops, retail uses, restaurants along the main access and that public transportation and pedestrian connections would be provided.

Mr. Piehl advised that the commercial center will be destination stores consisting of 10,000 square feet gross floor area or more.

Mr. Piehl indicated that the mixed-use building at the southwest corner of Tract 2 will consist of retail spaces on the first floor level and then 3 stories of apartments above the retail space. Mr. Piehl indicated that there would be 132 apartments in the mixed use building.

Mr. Piehl advised that within the residential buffer area, or residential transition area, located between the commercial uses and the existing Glen Moore neighborhood, there would be 10 single family detached dwellings proposed and 66 townhouse dwelling units.

Mr. Cassidy presented the perspective architectural features of the project of the areas in and around the central green space which would include such uses as restaurants, boutiques and similar smaller retail shops with proposed pedestrian linkages to other areas of the center.

Mr. Cassidy indicated that the commercial center building will consist of architectural breaks or features every 25-feet to help break up the appearance of one long building. Mr. Cassidy stated that the height of the commercial center will vary from 30-32 feet in the front and 24-28 feet in the rear of the building.

Mr. Cassidy present an architectural drawing of what the mixed use building may look like which consists of 3 stories of apartment units above retail use on the first floor.

Mr. Richardson discussed traffic and indicated that a traffic impact study was conducted and meetings with the Township Engineer and PennDOT have occurred. Mr. Richardson advised that there were 14 intersections that were included in the study, both in Manheim Township and the City of Lancaster.

Mr. Richardson indicated that the primary entrance/intersection to the site, where the existing signal is for Red Rose Commons, will consist of widening and adding turning lanes and the secondary access/intersection to the south will be signalized and will also include designated turning lanes.

Mr. Richardson advised that they are working through the Township comments and are in the process of revising the traffic impact study to indicate what other improvements may be necessary at the intersections which have been studied.

Mr. Crème indicated that at this time, the applicants would like to ask the Planning Commission to table any recommendations this evening as they will be back in June with more detail as to how they are in compliance.

Mr. Rathman indicated that he expressed previous concerns and he understands the importance of the project and he would hope to have future conversations with the applicants in order to try and get this project into better compliance with the ordinance.

Mr. Rathman stated that the Planning Commission has worked together with other applicants in the past on large projects such as Planned Residential Developments and a Planned Commercial Development in order to make it a win-win project and he hopes that the applicants for the Belmont project will also be willing to work with the Planning Commission.

Mr. Sturla reiterated Mr. Rathman's comments and advised that several planning members were around back when the original Planned Commercial Development use was first proposed and its inception at which time the Planning Commission worked through its progress by providing the Township and the developer a win-win situation that allows for flexibility, however, this also requires a lot of collaboration from both sides.

Mr. Reed questioned the access to the mixed use building and questioned whether or not the back of Building K has any visual breaks in the building wall.

Mr. Cassidy pointed out two access locations into the mixed use building lot. Mr. Cassidy stated that the rear of Building K will be provided with small offsets.

Mr. Sturla questioned the size of Building K.

Mr. Piehl advised 135,300 square feet.

Mr. Reed questioned whether or not any roadway improvements were proposed for the Fruitville Pike/Dillerville Road intersection.

Mr. Richardson answered no, not at this time.

Mr. Reed questioned whether or not PennDOT was ok with the developer not doing anything at that intersection.

Mr. Richardson advised that they are still looking into it.

Mr. Reed questioned whether or not there were any proposed traffic improvements going north from the site on Fruitville Pike at Route 30/Route 283.

Mr. Richardson answered no, just Chester Road and some signal timing changes. Mr. Richardson indicated, however, that there will be a right turn lane added along northbound Fruitville Pike at Roseville Road.

Mr. Sturla asked if the studied intersections were compliant with the levels of service.

Mr. Richardson answered no and indicated that they are revising the study to see what it would take to meet those levels of service.

Mr. Reed questioned who would be responsible for the upkeep and maintenance of the existing cemetery plot.

Mr. Crème advised that the applicants do not own the cemetery parcel and that according to county records, the ownership has been lost. Mr. Crème advised that they are planning on leaving the cemetery untouched, but will provide a parking area for any visitors or for maintenance thereof. Mr. Crème advised that if the cemetery is not being maintained, then the applicants will maintain it, but the cemetery is not a part of the Planned Commercial Development and not a part of this application.

Mrs. Blumenstock questioned the distance between the smaller shops around the center green and the commercial center and number of parking spaces between the commercial center and main street, specifically in two areas.

Mr. Piehl indicated that in one area this distance is 400 feet and 27 parking spaces and in the other area it is 350 feet and 24 parking spaces.

Mrs. Blumenstock questioned as to whether or not the area behind the commercial center was for loading and if tractor trailers would be coming around to the back of the building.

Mr. Crème answered yes.

Mrs. Blumenstock questioned how much light pollution the townhomes behind the commercial center might get.

Mr. Piehl indicated that they are providing a heavy buffer of trees between the commercial component and the residential component in an effort to eliminate any light pollution.

In reference to Building K, Mrs. Blumenstock asked for an example of a similar sized store in the area.

Mr. Piehl indicated that the Target at the Shoppes at Kissel Village would be similar in size as Building K.

Mr. Hodge questioned the apartment units in the mixed building.

Mr. Cassidy indicated that there would be a mix of 1-2 bedroom apartments consisting of between 800-1150 square feet in size.

Mrs. Reidenbaugh questioned whether or not there were any pedestrian connections with the existing Glen Moore neighborhood in order to bring those residents safely into the site.

Mr. Piehl indicated that originally they were going to make a connection through an existing right-of-way strip along the eastern portion of the tract, however, an existing floodplain exists in that area. Mr. Piehl indicated however that sidewalk is being proposed along the entire frontage of the site.

Mrs. Reidenbaugh asked if the sidewalk would extend down to Maple Lane which would be the first road connection to the Glen Moore neighborhood.

Mr. Piehl indicated that since the applicants do not own those properties along Fruitville Pike and have no control over those properties, the sidewalk could not be extended down to Maple Lane.

Mr. Crème indicated that there is the possibility for a connection in a future phase.

Mrs. Reidenbaugh questioned how many of the 14 roadway intersections do not meet service standards.

Mr. Richardson said 9 of the 14.

Mrs. Reidenbaugh questioned how many of those intersections were going to be improved with this project.

Mr. Richardson said 2.

Mr. Richardson indicated that in addition, the applicants will be paying an impact fee of around \$3.6 million.

Mr. Sturla stated that, as with all developments applicants are required to do roadway improvements AND pay impact fees and that paying impact fees is not in-lieu-of any required roadway improvements.

Mr. Sturla indicated that a Planned Commercial Development needs to be looked at holistically and not a development where we can pick and choose things. Mr. Sturla advised that one thing we require is architectural understanding and an integrated plan, not individual sections. Mr. Sturla indicated that this presentation shows a complete separation of a strip mall from the main street area. Mr. Sturla indicated that he is encouraged by this site as it is the centerpiece of Manheim Township and is very important; however, there are a lot of things that need to be looked at.

Mr. Cassidy advised Mr. Sturla to refer to the binders that the planning members received which will show elevations for all buildings and architectural building renderings.

Mr. Sturla indicated that this Planned Commercial Development was presented to us this evening as four separate and different elements and a Planned Commercial Development is supposed to be cohesive and have design integration.

Mr. Rathman asked for public comment.

Mr. Ray Gerhart questioned whether or not there were any connections out to Lititz Pike, either pedestrian or vehicle connections.

Mr. Crème answered no.

Mr. Larry Pulkrabek, 230 Eshelman Road indicated that he is associated with various groups and after hearing comments from these groups he understands this site to be the last site in the Township to really say "This is Lancaster County". Mr. Pulkrabek stated that there are four groups involved in this project that aren't working together. Mr. Pulkrabek stated that this project consists of apartments and townhouses which means that there will be kids living and playing in this development and

questioned whether or not consideration has been given to kids and families or just to shoppers.

Mr. Pulkrabek indicated that there is a large swamp by the Red Rose Commons shopping center and is concerned with this project dumping more stormwater into the swamp.

Mr. Pulkrabek advised that traffic is a huge issue and that there is already tons of traffic on Fruitville Pike, and Fruitville Pike has always been a problem.

Mr. Pulkrabek stated that we have one chance at this site and we have to do it right.

Mr. John Hershey noted the historic resources on the Belmont property and questioned whether or not the southern access has to be in a precise location as is shown on the application or if it could be shifted farther south in an effort to avoid disruption of the barn, perhaps by utilizing the existing farm access.

Mr. Rathman indicated that Mr. Hershey's question should be directed to the Township Traffic Engineer.

Mr. Crème indicated that there is continuing discussion concerning relocating the barn.

Mr. Hershey indicated that the new ordinance did capture protecting natural resources, and there are lots of qualities that define this site, such as the quarry, but nothing is being protected.

Mr. Hershey indicated that the new ordinance completely lacks any protection for historic preservation.

Mr. Rathman questioned whether Mr. Hershey was speaking directly about this project or the ordinance as a whole.

Mr. Hershey indicated that he was broadly speaking about strengthening historic preservation in the ordinance.

Mrs. Douglas indicated that during the updates to the Zoning Ordinance, there was discussion regarding creating a committee or group to look at the possibility of amending the ordinance specifically with regards to historic preservation.

Mr. Reed advised that the Hess family has not made any repairs or improvements on any of the structures on the Hess property (Belmont) in over 45-years.

Mr. Roy Baldwin indicated that, as a member of the Manheim Township Path Committee, he is bothered that there is no pedestrian access proposed to the east and is also bothered by the excuses as to why that connection cannot happen.

Mr. Baldwin indicated that the path committee's goal is to provide non-motorized opportunities to commercial centers, schools and parks and that in the past they have been able to accomplish this goal throughout the Township, even obtaining right-of-way from PennDOT along Route 222 which is unheard of.

Mr. Baldwin stated that in this situation, with the floodplain, we've had cases where bridges have been built or even floating bridges were utilized. Mr. Baldwin encouraged the applicants to make that connection somehow.

Mr. Rathman reiterated that collaborate effort is a must and that he is very optimistic to have future conversations with the applicants regarding the development of this site.

On a motion by Mr. Reed, seconded by Mr. Hodge, it was recommended to table this Conditional Use application.

Motion Approved 6-0.

Public Comment

There was no public comment.

Adjournment

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

Motion approved 6-0 and the meeting adjourned at 8:10 p.m.

The next Regular Planning Commission meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, June 20, 2012 at 6:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Shannon L. Sinopoli