

**SPRINGETTSBURY TOWNSHIP  
PLANNING COMMISSION  
DECEMBER 19, 2002**

**MEMBERS:** Larry Stets, Vice-Chairman Present  
Mark Robertson, Secretary Present  
Randy Meyerhoff Present

**ALSO PRESENT:** Andrew Stern, Director of Economic Development  
John Luciani, First Capital Engineering  
Charles Rausch, Solicitor  
Susan Sipe, Stenographer

**NOT PRESENT:** Alan Maciejewski, Chairman

**1. CALL TO ORDER:**

**A. Pledge of Allegiance**

Mr. Stets, Vice Chairman, called the meeting to order at 6 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance.

**2. ACTION ON THE MINUTES:**

**A. November 21, 2002**

**MR. ROBERTSON MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE MEETING MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 21, 2002 AS WRITTEN. MR. MEYERHOFF SECONDED. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

Mr. Stets announced that Mr. Larry Gibbs has resigned from the Planning Commission and the Board will be taking names for a replacement in the near future.

**3. ACTION ITEMS:**

**A. SD 02-12 Fieldstone Manor 2**

Mr. Jerry Stahlman, Stallman and Stahlman, Inc.  
Mr. Tim Pasch, Developer

Mr. Stern reported that the purpose of this plan was to add 12 lots to the previously approved 13 lot Fieldstone Manor plan off Locust Grove Road. The plan was introduced in October 2002. Mr. Stern referred to the packet which included 3 pages of comments from Mr. Luciani. Mr. Stern indicated that Staff is recommending that this plan be tabled until the outstanding items are resolved.

Mr. Stahlman indicated that one of the issues is the fact that this plan supports a single cul-de-sac with a length of 720 feet. Mr. Stahlman noted that the ordinance states that generally cul-de-sacs should not exceed 600 feet, unless the topography warrants otherwise. Mr. Stahlman stated that the main issue is about connecting the street, which was discussed at a previous meeting.

Mr. Stahlman referred to the waiver requests before the Planning Commission which included the size of the slope of the detention basin, in addition to sidewalks out on the main highway. They are listed on the plan. Mr. Stahlman indicated that they are now asking for a new waiver request as a point of clarification concerning widening Locust Grove Road. Mr. Stahlman indicated that they have a PennDOT permit for the upper entrance and in their review, PennDOT indicated they are not accepting the additional right of ways to be added to the public road. However, they

were able to get PennDOT to accept an additional ten feet to that right of way for the upper street and they submitted the current plan to be consistent with the additional 10 feet to that right of way. Mr. Stahlman indicated that a statement was attached to their request which is taken from PennDOT's review indicating they are not accepting this right of way. Mr. Stahlman also noted that if the street is widened they have several outparcels along that area which will create jogs out into the current street. Mr. Stahlman indicated they are therefore asking the Planning Commission to support their request for a waiver to widen Locust Grove Road, from the end of the radius as noted on the plan, providing an additional 10 feet to the current right of way. He noted that although the ordinance indicates an additional 20 feet, they are proposing 10 feet since that is what PennDOT has agreed to.

Mr. Stets indicated he interpreted this to mean that they intended to put the sidewalks and radius in as though the road would be improved.

Mr. Stahlman indicated yes and reiterated that PennDOT's criteria is to go from the center line back 17 feet to establish the curb line, so they would have a concrete curb to come around to that point to meet their requirements.

Mr. Stahlman discussed their proposed plan regarding the need to connect the streets. Mr. Stahlman noted that at the last meeting Staff had recommended that they look into looping the street. Mr. Stahlman noted they did not feel that looping the street would serve any purpose other than having a street in the event that there was an emergency that would prevent access to the cul-de-sac. However, they did come up with an alternative that would allow for emergency access. This plan proposes to provide an access easement between the two streets that would be specifically an emergency access. Access by the public would be prohibited and they would put a sidewalk down through the center of it so that these two sidewalk systems would be tied together and the public could walk between the cul-de-sac if they so chose. They would pave the cartway which emergency vehicles would use. The 30-foot wide cartways would have hollow openings, be structurally sound to support a fire truck or emergency vehicle, and allow grass growth. Mr. Stahlman said this plan was being offered as a compromise to provide emergency access. Signs would be placed on it indicating "for emergency access only". This would also be included in the homeowner's association contract so that it would not be used for other purposes.

Discussion ensued regarding the rationale for the ordinance regarding the length of the cul-de-sac.

The consensus of the discussion indicated that the Planning Commission was not satisfied with the proposed concept, and felt that rather than having the applicant asking for modifications from the length of the cul-de-sac they should be asking for a modification from the street design that would meet the needs of the Township and resolve the issues.

Discussion then ensued regarding the idea of a paved driveable road at least 22 ft wide.

Mr. Stern advised the applicants to come to a staff meeting to resolve this matter.

Mr. Stets thanked Mr. Stahlman and Mr. Pasch for their presentation.

## **B. LD-02-13 Penn State Investments 2430 East Market Street**

Mr. Jim Barnes, James Holley & Associates, Engineers

Mr. Stern indicated this is a plan to place a 2640 square foot freestanding bank in the parking lot of the property. There are numerous notes and Staff recommended that it be tabled. There is also some other development with the plan and the neighboring property, which will be presented at the next Zoning Hearing Board scheduled in January. Mr. Stern pointed out that there are two zoning comments from the Township Engineer. The first one related to the amount of parking, however, Mr. Stern indicated that the note in the Township Engineer's letter was incorrect. The retail parking requirements are based on net floor area so if they only have "x" number of spaces then that determine the net floor area that they would be permitted to use in the building, so this is

not a violation of the ordinance. The second note, (Zoning Ordinance Note #5 in Mr. Luciani's memo) related to the private road becoming a public road from Market Street to Eastern Blvd. Mr. Stern felt that this issue should be addressed after the development is finalized, since doing it now would require changes to the plan.

Mr. Stets asked Mr. Barnes to give an update as the situation stands currently.

Mr. Barnes referred to Mr. Luciani's letter regarding the parking lot lighting standards. Mr. Barnes indicated that they are not proposing to do anything with the light standards that are present. He noted they had been there since the building was built in the 60's. Mr. Barnes also noted that they had contacted PennDOT regarding the offset driveways that would access Market Street. He noted the drawings were modified to make sure that nothing would be done to any of the driveways within the PennDOT right-of-way.

Mr. Stets asked if the items noted would be resolved by the next meeting.

Mr. Barnes indicated that he did not think it could be done due to the holidays.

**MR. ROBERTSON MOVED TO TABLE LD-02-13 PENN STATE INVESTMENT, 2430 EAST MARKET STREET. MR. MEYERHOFF SECONDED. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

Mr. Stets noted that Mr. Barnes needed to give Mr. Stern a time extension to the Planning Commission in order for them to make a decision.

#### **C. SD-02-14 Orchard Hills - Phase I**

##### Mr. Jim Barnes, James Holley & Associates, Engineers

Mr. Stern indicated that the preliminary plan was approved on March 28, 2002. The applicant then returned last month for briefing for the final plan for Phase I of this project which is going to have 27 residential units. They have also, based on a Staff comment, added one of the recreational areas to Phase I, and Mr. Barnes met with the Recreation Director and Mr. Stern. Mr. Stern noted it was discussed at the recreational meeting on Monday. They are working out what amenities will be at the site which is indicated in the letter from John Luciani dated December 12. Most of the items appear to be housekeeping items, and Mr. Stern noted that he recommended that the Planning Commission approve the plan with the five items noted in his memo which included a waiver from surveyor's statement format, waiver from stormwater basin depth, waiver from showing existing features map, condition on the execution of development agreement for transportation improvements which was discussed during the preliminary phase. Also conditioned upon resolution of all outstanding issues addressed in Mr. Luciani's letter of December 12 prior to submission to the Board of Supervisors

Mr. Barnes stated his only comment referred to Item #6 in Mr. Luciani's letter regarding a cross section every 100 ft. Mr. Barnes indicated that it was his thought that the intent of the ordinance for providing cross sections had to do with the fact that if a development that had different classifications of streets, a minor street and a collector street, that putting a cross section on the plans that shows the difference between the construction and the width of the two streets. He did not feel that particular section of the ordinance meant that a cross section is required every 100 feet of all streets. Mr. Barnes noted that the plans were submitted at the Hellam Township staff meeting today, and he would provide Mr. Stern with comments from that staff meeting since he felt that someone from Springettsbury Township should contact Hellam Township.

Mr. Luciani commented that the sewer pipe across old Orchard Road is close to the edge of the right of way and he was not sure which Township it was in.

Mr. Barnes indicated that the sewer pipe is in Springettsbury Township and the depth is 6 feet from the center of the road, so it is within the existing sewer right of way. He did not feel that was an issue.

Vice Chairman Stets called for a motion for waiver requests for SD-02-14 Orchard Hills - Phase I.

**MR. ROBERTSON RECOMMENDED APPROVAL OF SUBDIVISION 02-14 ORCHARD HILLS - PHASE I WITH THE FOLLOWING WAIVERS:**

- **WAIVER FROM STORM WATER BASIN DEPTH TO ALLOW 9.5 FEET AND 6.5 FEET.**
- **WAIVER FROM SHOWING EXISTING FEATURES MAP**

**( It was noted that the waiver regarding the surveyor's statement format was an error and was removed.)**

**MR. MEYERHOFF SECONDED. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

Vice Chairman Stets called for a motion in the form of a recommendation to the Township Board of Supervisors for SD-02-14 Orchard Hills - Phase I.

**MR. ROBERTSON MOVED TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF SD-02-14 ORCHARD HILLS - PHASE I WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:**

- **CONDITIONED ON EXECUTION OF THE DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT FOR TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENTS. IT IS UNDERSTOOD AND AGREED THAT THE DEVELOPER HAS VOLUNTEERED TO MAKE A CONTRIBUTION OF \$38,000 TO THE SPRINGETTSBURY TOWNSHIP TO BE USED FOR IMPROVEMENTS AT THE INTERSECTION OF WITMER ROAD AND OLD ORCHARD ROAD.**
- **CONDITIONED ON THE RESOLUTION OF ALL OUTSTANDING ISSUES ADDRESSED IN JOHN LUCIANI'S LETTER OF DECEMBER 12, 2002 PRIOR TO SUBMISSION TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS.**

**MR. MEYERHOFF SECONDED. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**D. SD-02-15 York Silica Sand**

Mr. Jim Barnes, James Holley & Associates, Engineers

Mr. Stern reported that the purpose of this plan is to subdivide the York Silica Sand property along the industrial medium density residential zoning district line. The residential side would then be developed for the Woodcrest Land Development plan, and the industrial side would remain as the current use for quarrying and related uses. Mr. Stern referred to a letter dated December 12 from John Luciani, which was distributed to the Board. Staff recommended approval of this plan with a waiver from preliminary plan submission, waiver from showing all manmade features, waiver from showing streets within 400 feet, waiver from providing a buffer yard between the zones and on condition of resolution of all John Luciani's items dated December 12, 2002. Mr. Stern noted for those in the audience this plan was not for the subdivision of the houses, but to subdivide York Silica land into two pieces. Upon approval, the next item on the agenda would be to take the residential piece and discuss the housing development.

Mr. Barnes noted he had a concern regarding one of the waivers. He noted that what they are proposing is a two lot subdivision. They are not proposing it as part of the subdivision construction activity, but to provide a piece of ground at this point. Mr. Barnes said that as was indicated previously, the industrial zoned land would be transferred to Kinsley, and they in turn will be obtaining their own mining permit. That site would not be manned by any individual. It would be checked on occasion, but it would just be for material to be placed there and used when needed. Under subdivision land development the C-5 curb is needed on the plan, as it is a part of the perimeter description. The 30-foot easement should be on the plan. He said that looking at the left lower hand corner right above the cord block there is an indication of a 30 foot easement center on the swale. That issue was already addressed. In regard to sewage planning, no one currently mans the site presently and there is no permitted operator so there isn't a need for sewage facilities. There are none presently. It is basically a construction site and the owner wants to continue its function as a quarry.

Discussion was held regarding the property line along the industrial piece of land.

Mr. Barnes indicated that the property line did get moved but the reasoning was that part of the mining permit indicated a 300 foot setback and buffer, and it was Kinsley's position that they would like to be responsible for that buffer rather than just letting it go right down that zoning boundary line because of that requirement to move the line so that they have control over the 300 foot, and they will maintain it.

A question was raised concerning the buffer between zones also.

Mr. Barnes indicated that that would be the responsibility of the developer of the residential property.

Mr. Luciani stated that he took an aerial photograph of the area off the Internet and tried to scale it, although the graphics were not very clear and he could not get good definition. He noted he was unable to determine where the quarry ends and where the woods begin which is why he wanted the limits of the quarry defined by the permit. (The Board members examined the graphic).

Mr. Stets questioned Mr. Barnes on how they determined the limits of the quarry. He noted that they would need to see that before approval would be granted.

Mr. Barnes confirmed that the limits of the quarry would be shown on the plan.

Mr. Luciani referred to his letter of December 12. He noted Item 5 was regarding the sewer plan. Item 6 is regarding an issue that was raised about an area of land that was still in the ownership of Gary and Robin Boll. It appeared that there was no physical access from Marion Road without going through Mr. Boll's property, meaning that there is no physical access to Lot #2. So the developer needs to show access to Lot #2.

Mr. Barnes looked at the plan with the Board members and noted that on the subdivision of Skylight Heights Section B the proposed developer of Lot #2 purchased Lot #7. He also noted that on the Skyline Heights plan there was an area that was reserved for a future street. The opinion was that if that area was not adopted by the Township within 21 years of the approval of this plan which was back in 1971 a need existed to go to both of the property owners to get approval to use it. The developer did not take that approach to purchase this other lot. The other item which Mr. Luciani referred to is the subdivision back in 1960 which actually was included in the Woodcrest package. The dedication was made for the continuation and the extension of Marion Road. Mr. Barnes pointed out the line and where it extended on the plan.

Mr. Luciani referred to the other issue of needing 100 foot of frontage and two ways of access to Lot #2.

A comment was raised from the audience by Mr. Don Eckert. Mr. Eckert asked on what basis would the Board determine that the parcel of land was dedicated, since he could not find any evidence that it was ever recorded in the courthouse; there was no record it was ever dedicated by the Township, and that it is no longer valid.

Mr. Stets indicated that the Planning Commission was not the forum in which to discuss that situation and the only requirement was that the Township issues needed to be satisfied before this plan is approved by the Supervisors. That should be a legal opinion, not an engineering opinion.

Discussion was held regarding the frontage for the lots. It was noted that each lot needed 100 feet of frontage and each lot would have to stand on its own.

It was felt that there were too many unresolved issues and the plan would need to be re-presented with an extension.

## **BRIEFING ITEMS**

### **LD - 02-16 Wood Crest Hill (York Silica Sand)**

Mr. Jim Barnes, James Holley & Associates, Engineers

Mr. Stern indicated this was the land development part of the previously discussed plan. He noted that it is for 151 new single family attached dwellings on 70 acres of land. It is a land development plan rather than a subdivision plan as these units will be condominiums; thus they will all be sharing a common property as opposed to their own individual properties. There are two medium density residential properties and as a briefing item, this is the first time the Planning Commission has seen the plan.

Mr. Stets noted the Planning Commission would not be taking comments from the audience on this plan since this is the first time they have seen it. When it comes back as an action item, he noted that the audience would be welcome to make comments.

Mr. Stern noted one correction under "General Comments". Instead of the wording "York County Planning Commission will not be reviewing this plan", it should read "York County Planning Commission has not reviewed this plan."

Mr. Barnes reported that they are proposing access off Marion Road and then access through a lot that has been purchased, which when added to the subdivision plan it becomes part of the development. What they had proposed was that the end of the public street would terminate right inside the property (shaded area on sheet #5) which would become the limits of the public street. Cartways within the development are access drives since there is no right of way associated with them. They would be sufficiently wide, the same width as the public streets within the area. The development would also have sidewalks throughout the development. A copy of the plan was provided to the Recreation Commission. Mr. Barnes noted that he has not had an opportunity to discuss with Dave Wendel the potential for dedicating land, which would actually be south lower access.

Other points discussed included:

- They are working on the possibility of a public park with the Recreation Board.
- Means of access to a public park would be determined by the Recreation Board. An easement could be provided over the portion of the drive that would be needed to get to the park.
- A minimum of three acres would need to be provided - 200ths of an acre per dwelling unit. Three acres of a recreation area for the on-lot park.
- The extension of the sanitary sewer would be from Eden Road, which is what drives the configuration of the number of units. What they will need to do is to phase the development. There is presently enough capacity on the current Chapter 94 report for 85 EDU's which means that 66 have to be added for the following year. They will identify 85 of these units as a Phase I and then the balance as Phase II.
- These units are for sale - probably in the \$170,000-190,000 price range. In the packets provided to the Board were floor plans for the various types of units that are proposed. The building designation chart that is on the plan and the abbreviations that are on each set of units reflect that particular floor plan.
- Issues on traffic study in regard to the possible need for a signal light.
- Discussion on the connection to the sewer line. The question was whether or not it goes into a pump station that gets upgraded or an extension of a gravity line. The pump station has

the capacity but it is old. The pump would need to be upgraded. The connection point is on Eden Road into the existing gravity sewer. Discussion with the developer indicated that, if the Township needed a contribution toward the upgrade of the pump station, they would negotiate an amount.

- There are a few steep slope areas. It is 15% for coverage in a steep slope area. Steep slopes were highlighted on the grading plan to show that the grading in the development itself would stay off of those 15% slopes. Grading is minimized around the buildings.
- Definition of street vs. access turn around for emergency vehicles.
- Captain Flohr reviewed plans as far as Orchard Road addresses.
- Need a turn around at Red Rock Road.
- Discussion of ordinance requiring sprinklers for all attached structures.

Vice Chairman Stets thanked everyone for their input.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

Vice Chairman Stets adjourned the meeting at 8:10 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Secretary

ses