

APPROVED

**SPRINGETTSBURY TOWNSHIP
PLANNING COMMISSION
DECEMBER 17, 2009**

MEMBERS IN

ATTENDANCE: Alan Maciejewski, Chairman
Mark Robertson
John Lutz

ALSO IN

ATTENDANCE: Jim Baugh, Director of Community Development
John Luciani, First Capital Engineering
Angela Liddick, Community Development Coordinator
Charles Rausch, Solicitor
Sue Sipe, Stenographer

NOT PRESENT: Mark Swomley
Charles Wurster

1. CALL TO ORDER:

A. Pledge of Allegiance

Chairman Maciejewski called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance.

2. ACTION ON THE MINUTES

A. NOVEMBER 19, 2009

The minutes of November 19, 2009 were tabled due to lack of a quorum.

3. BRIEFING ITEMS - None

4. ACTION ITEMS

A. SD-09-02 Michael & Charlene Harvey

Jason Snyder
Joe Brown

This plan is proposing a residential subdivision of 6 lots. Included in this plan are street widening and stormwater management. The applicant is requesting waivers of street lights and sidewalks. This property is located in an R-7 zoning district and all properties created will meet the current requirements of the Zoning Ordinance.

This plan is presented as an Action item. It was presented as a Briefing item at the May 21, 2009 meeting.

The Applicant is requesting a recommendation of Approval from the Planning Commission to the Springettsbury Township Board of Supervisors for the following Waivers:

1. Waiver of SALDO (289-13.A) Final plans; specifications. Applicant shall draw the plan at a scale of 1"=30' for clarity.

2. Waiver of SALDO (289-26.B) Monuments. Applicant shall install two (2) concrete monuments in sight distance due to the limited size of subdivision and number of existing shared property corners.
3. Waiver of STORMWATER (281-5.f(2)) Seepage beds, pits or trenches shall not be permitted for any development for more than five lots, without prior approval of the Township. Applicant shall not install due to a negligible increase in stormwater volume and no existing storm sewer in the area for connection.
4. Waiver of STORMWATER (281-7.A(4)b) Future peak flows – 25 – 50 – and 100-year storm. Applicant shall not meet this requirement due to the peak runoff rates being very low and 50% peak runoff rate reduction not being practical.

The following Outstanding Items may be considered as Conditions of Approval:

1. SALDO (289-11.C.9) Preliminary plans; specifications. Applicant shall have the cover sheet signed and sealed prior to recording.
2. SALDO (289-12.C) Final plans; procedure. Applicant shall provide a cost estimate for review.
3. SALDO (289-24) Feasibility report on sewer and water facilities. Applicant must complete the sewer module or exemption.
4. SALDO (289-38.C) Performance requirements. Applicant shall provide the required improvements cost estimate for review.
5. SALDO (289-49) Recreation dedication. The amount of land required to be provided for public recreational purposes for single-family, detached, residential subdivisions or land development plans shall be a minimum of 0.02 acres per lot or dwelling unit.
6. SALDO (289-76) Fees. All legal, engineering and administration fees must be paid before the recording of the final plan.
7. STORMWATER (281-5) The plan and report accompanying all land development and subdivision plans shall be sealed (and signed) by a professional engineer.
8. STORMWATER (281-11.A) Performance guarantee. Applicant must describe how the installation of required stormwater management facilities will be guaranteed.
9. General Comment #20.
The proposed curb shown on Sheet S-3 on Whiteford Road is into the street, whereas the SW inlets upstream and downstream are behind (landward of) the extension of the curbing. Applicant must submit a waiver for this.

Mr. Snyder provided background on the project noting this is a subdivision consisting of two acres, bounded by Whiteford Road on the north side and 11th Avenue on the south side. They are proposing 4 lots, one of which is on the back towards 11th Avenue, and another lot on Whiteford Road. This includes another small lot along Whiteford Road, which Mr. Snyder noted the driveway of Mr. Harvey's neighbor is on that property so he is going to give her that piece of land.

Mr. Snyder noted in regards to recreation dedication that they have been approved by the Township to pay a fee in lieu of the recreation area.

Mr. Snyder indicated that he performed all percolation tests in 2008 which are in the stormwater report. An additional test was conducted on December 8 which had to be stopped due to surface water running into the hole.

It was noted that the perc test would need to be rescheduled to confirm and witness it prior to the Board of Supervisors meeting.

Discussion was held regarding the request for a waiver for curbs, sidewalks and street lighting. It was recommended that a condition be placed to specify a six-month note be added to the plan.

In regards to street lights, Mr. Snyder provided photos of the elevations, noting there are overhead electric lines in the neighborhood. He noted that Met Ed would install street lights at no cost to the Township, with a monthly fee and Met Ed would be responsible for maintenance. He also noted if a sidewalk was installed in the future a pedestrian street lighting system could be installed at that time.

Mr. Snyder provided photos of the lots from several different viewpoints.

It was noted the request for the traffic waiver was satisfactory.

Mr. Snyder indicated they meet the requirements for the fire hydrant as set forth in a YAUFRR letter of October 14.

Discussion was held regarding widening of 11th Avenue and Whiteford road to a 26 ft. cartway width. Mr. Snyder stated that Mr. Harvey would agree to the widening, if necessary but that as a highway engineer he does not support intermittent widening of roadways. He noted they have provided off street parking. Mr. Snyder pointed out from the aerial photo there is a consistent cartway width on both 11th and Whiteford. It was recommended that the applicant meet with Mr. Luciani and Mr. Lauer regarding this matter.

Mr. Snyder stated the maintenance plan is represented on Sheet #3 and has been resolved.

In regards to the downspouts and infiltration overflow, Mr. Snyder noted they are shown on the drawing set as Infiltration B and P and they are adding a "T" as an overflow. He further noted all infiltration structures are tied to a driveway trench drain, which is the overflow because it is the highest point in the system that can allow water out. Mr. Luciani confirmed this is resolved.

It was noted the pre development bypass peak flow is the same as post development and has been resolved. Mr. Baugh stated he would get this updated by the next meeting to reflect current conditions.

Mr. Snyder indicated they have a copy of the planning module which was requested on the list.

It was noted the applicant would need to return at a future meeting with resolution on the discussed issues.

5. WAIVERS – None

6. OLD BUSINESS – None

7. OTHER BUSINESS

A. Wayfinding Signage

Mr. Baugh stated this is a new signing program that provides signs to point out historical locations. Mr. Baugh reiterated that the County is asking for a letter of support from the Township. This was presented in October and at that time the Planning Commission asked for additional time to review. Upon discussion by the Commission it was decided to endorse the program and send the letter of support. However, comment was made regarding receiving notification of how many signs would be placed and at what locations.

8. ADJOURNMENT

CHAIRMAN MACIEJEWSKI ADJOURNED THE MEETING AT 7:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Secretary

/ses

APPROVED

**SPRINGETTSBURY TOWNSHIP
PLANNING COMMISSION
NOVEMBER 19, 2009**

MEMBERS IN

ATTENDANCE: Alan Maciejewski, Chairman
Mark Robertson
Mark Swomley
Charles Wurster

ALSO IN

ATTENDANCE: Jim Baugh, Director of Community Development
John Luciani, First Capital Engineering
Angela Liddick, Community Development Coordinator
Charles Rausch, Solicitor
Sue Sipe, Stenographer

NOT PRESENT: John Lutz

1. CALL TO ORDER

A. Pledge of Allegiance

Chairman Maciejewski called the meeting to order at 6:15 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance.

2. ACTION ON THE MINUTES

A. SEPTEMBER 17, 2009

MR. ROBERTSON MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE MEETING MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 17, 2009 AS PRESENTED. MR. SWOMLEY SECONDED. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.

B. OCTOBER 15, 2009

MR. WURSTER MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE MEETING MINUTES OF OCTOBER 15, 2009 AS PRESENTED. MR. ROBERTSON SECONDED. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.

3. BRIEFING ITEMS - NONE

4. ACTION ITEMS

A. LD-09-02 – Capital Self Storage Expansion

Chairman Maciejewski recused himself due to his wife's employment at Capital Self Storage.

Todd Wilson, Alpha Consulting Engineers

Mr. Wilson provided background information noting Mr. Wilson stated that Capital Self Storage is located at the site of the former Coca Cola plant located at 2611 East Market Street, west of Northern Way. The existing building is 39,000 sq. ft. and contains 492 self-storage units. The applicant plans to remove the existing building in the back and construct five additional storage buildings with 350 storage units. In addition the owner would construct paved accesses around the side of the building. He proposes

a stormwater management area in the back and a stormwater management pond that would also function to infiltrate for DEP standards and would collect and manage all the runoff for the additional development on the site. There are no proposed utilities expansions. Landscaping is proposed in the back to meet the requirements of 15 ft. There is existing fence the runs along the property line.

Mr. Wilson provided photos showing existing vegetation to the east of the site. He noted a change from the briefing last month was in regards to landscaping along Northern Way. A survey crew updated the existing vegetation between Northern Way and the development. He noted they met with Staff last week and reduced comments to 3 technical comments on stormwater. They will be upgrading the lighting plan.

Mr. Wilson referred to the seven waivers. In regard to curbing, there is existing curbing along Market Street and curbing that comes into the two existing entrances into the site. They are asking for relief from sections of curbing associated with the expansion. The justification for this is that they can grade the site to divert stormwater to the detention basin to the on-site storm sewer system without using curb to direct storm water. There is a security fence that will run behind the edge of payment and would guide traffic throughout the site.

Mr. Wilson stated that the request for the waiver for the landscaping buffer in the front is due to the building being located within the front setback along Market Street. There is 25 ft. provided between the curb and the front of the building. There are six parking stalls located in front of the building which are used for new customers to access the office. There is no adequate room for additional landscape because of maintaining those parking spaces. A landscape strip was added when renovations were done to the building front and sides.

Discussion was held regarding the landscaping. Mr. Baugh noted that as a compromise they are recommending in the center, one strip on one side and then on the other side. Also on the left drive two small beds on either side. It was noted this will be a condition and recommended that the applicant present a plan to the Staff prior to the Board of Supervisors meeting.

MR. SWOMLEY MOVED WITH REFERENCE TO LAND DEVELOPMENT PLAN LP-09-02, CAPITAL SELF STORAGE EXPANSION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE PRELIMINARY/FINAL PLAN TO THE TOWNSHIP BOARD OF SUPERVISORS WITH THE FOLLOWING WAIVERS:

- 1. WAIVER OF SALDO (289-35) LANDSCAPE BUFFER PLANTINGS ALONG ARTERIAL STREET. APPLICANT DESIRES NOT TO INSTALL ANY BUFFER YARD IN THE FRONT OF THE BUILDING DUE TO SPACE CONSTRAINTS. STAFF RECOMMENDS ONLY A PARTIAL WAIVER WITH THREE LANDSCAPING ISLANDS LOCATED ALONG THE FRONT OF THE BUILDING. MODIFICATION OF LANDSCAPING AND BUFFER PLANTINGS AS PROPOSED BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION PER THE EXHIBIT OR SIMILAR TO BE PROPOSED BY THE APPLICANT AND DISCUSSED WITH THE STAFF.**
- 2. WAIVER OF SALDO (289-10) REQUIREMENT FOR SUBMISSION OF A PRELIMINARY PLAN.**
- 3. WAIVER OF SALDO (289-13.A) PLAN SCALE – REQUIRED 1”=50. THE APPLICANT SHALL SUBMIT PLANS AT A SCALE OF 1”=40”.**
- 4. WAIVER OF STORMWATER (281-7.A.7) DESIGN CRITERIA; STORMWATER MANAGEMENT FACILITIES. APPLICANT SHALL DESIGN THE MINIMUM BASIN BOTTOM SLOPE TO 0% IN ORDER TO PROMOTE INFILTRATION.**
- 5. WAIVER OF STORMWATER (281-7.A.2) DESIGN CRITERIA; STORMWATER MANAGEMENT FACILITIES. APPLICANT SHALL ASSUME MEADOW CONDITIONS ONLY IN THE AREAS NOT CURRENTLY DEVELOPED.**

- 6. WAIVER OF SALDO (289-31.A) CURBS AND GUTTERS – REQUIREMENT TO PROVIDE CURBS ALONG STREETS AND ACCESS DRIVES WITHIN THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT. DEVELOPER PROPOSES NOT TO INSTALL CURBS ALONG THE ACCESS DRIVE WITHIN THE DEVELOPMENT BECAUSE THERE IS NO CURBING ON SITE. DEVELOPER PROPOSES TO DRAIN OVERLAND RUNOFF DOWN THE CENTER LINES.**
- 7. WAIVER OF STORMWATER (281-7.A.9) MAXIMUM PERMITTED SIDE SLOPES WITHIN STORM WATER BASINS. DEVELOPER PROPOSES TO INSTALL SIDE SLOPES OF 3:1 AND FENCE ENTIRE AREA AROUND BASIN.**

SECONDED BY MR. WURSTER. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.

Discussion was held regarding the Conditions. Mr. Luciani stated he had no additional comments and was satisfied with the conditions as presented. It was noted that Conditions #4, #5, #6, #7 and #8 were administrative conditions to be addressed prior to submission to the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Robertson asked if there was anyone in attendance who had an interest in the plan. Hearing none he called for a motion.

MR. SWOMLEY MOVED WITH REFERENCE TO LAND DEVELOPMENT PLAN LD-09-02, CAPITAL SELF STORAGE EXPANSION, TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE PRELIMINARY/FINAL PLAN TO THE TOWNSHIP BOARD OF SUPERVISORS WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

- 1. ZONING (325-116.L) DESIGN STANDARDS. APPLICANT SHALL ADDRESS THE LIGHTING OF ALL DRIVEWAYS AND DEMONSTRATE THAT THEY WILL BE LIGHTED TO IDENTIFY AND PROVIDE SAFE ACCESS.**
- 2. ZONING (325-151) EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROL. APPLICANT MUST SUBMIT APPROVED E&S PLANS.**
- 3. ZONING (325-155.A) LIGHT AND GLARE. APPLICANT MUST SUBMIT A LIGHTING PLAN THAT MEETS THE MINIMUM FOOT CANDLE REQUIREMENTS.**
- 4. SALDO (289-11.A.5) PRELIMINARY PLANS; SPECIFICATIONS. APPLICANT MUST INCLUDE THE NAME, SEAL AND SIGNATURE OF THE REGISTERED SURVEYOR ON THE FINAL PLANS.**
- 5. SALDO (289-12.A.5(C)) FINAL PLANS; PROCEDURE. APPLICANT MUST SUBMIT YORK COUNTY CONSERVATION DISTRICT COMMENTS.**
- 6. SALDO (289-13.A) FINAL PLANS; SPECIFICATIONS. APPLICANT MUST SUBMIT THE FINAL PLAN ON MYLAR AS WELL AS A PDF COPY OF THE RECORDED PLAN.**
- 7. SALDO (289-38.C) PERFORMANCE REQUIREMENTS. FINANCIAL SECURITY SHALL BE SECURED TO THE TOWNSHIP WITHIN 90 DAYS OF CONDITIONAL APPROVAL OF THE PLAN. THE AMOUNT OF FINANCIAL SECURITY TO BE POSTED FOR THE COMPLETION OF THE REQUIRED IMPROVEMENT SHALL BE EQUAL TO 110% OF THE COST OF COMPLETION ESTIMATED AS OF 90 DAYS FOLLOWING THE DATE SCHEDULED FOR COMPLETION BY THE DEVELOPER.**
- 8. SALDO (289-76) FEES. ALL ENGINEERING, LEGAL AND/OR ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS WILL BE PAID PRIOR TO APPROVAL OF THE FINAL PLAN.**

9. **STORMWATER (281-5) PLAN AND REPORT REQUIREMENTS. THE PLAN AND REPORT ACCOMPANYING ALL LAND DEVELOPMENT AND SUBDIVISION PLANS SHALL BE SEALED BY A PROFESSIONAL ENGINEER.**
10. **STORMWATER (281-11.A.2) FINANCIAL GUARANTEES AND MAINTENANCE. IN LIEU OF COMPLETION OF THE INSTALLATION OF THE REQUIRED STORMWATER MANAGEMENT FACILITIES, THE TOWNSHIP SHALL ACCEPT DEPOSIT WITH THE TOWNSHIP OF FINANCIAL SECURITY IN AN AMOUNT EQUAL TO 110% OF THE COST OF SUCH FACILITIES.**
11. **STORMWATER (281-19.D) REQUIREMENT FOR EROSION & SEDIMENT CONTROLS. APPLICANT MUST SUBMIT COPIES OF PERMITS AND APPROVALS FROM DEP OR THE COUNTY CONSERVATION DISTRICT.**
12. **STORMWATER (281-20.E) POST CONSTRUCTION STORMWATER RUNOFF CONTROLS FOR NEW DEVELOPMENT AND REDEVELOPMENT. APPLICANT MUST SUBMIT COPIES OF ANY NECESSARY PERMITS FOR REGULATED EARTH DISTURBANCE FROM DEP OR THE COUNTY CONSERVATION DISTRICT.**
13. **GENERAL COMMENT. THE BASIN OUTFALL MUST BE RAISED A MINIMUM OF TWO FEET ABOVE THE BOTTOM OF THE CHANNEL.**

SECONDED BY MR. WURSTER. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.

5. WAIVER RECOMMENDATIONS - None

6. OLD BUSINESS – None

7. OTHER BUSINESS

A. Town Center Plan Recommendation – Marion Hull – Planning Consultant

Ms. Hull stated that this public meeting is required under the MPC for presenting the Town Center Plan. She noted this is the first major update to the zoning ordinance in SALDO since they were adopted in 2007. This includes an approach to address the tree and planting lists in the SALDO.

Marion addressed the following points:

- The process began in 2008 and has been overseen by a Steering Committee.
- Community meetings were held in January and June to get feedback from the community on the direction of the project.
- The project study area for the Town Center plan encompasses approximately ½ of the township and includes commercial and/or public areas.
- The commercial core includes Eastern Boulevard, Gateway 83 near the interchange and the eastern boundary at East Market Street.
- Not anticipating any changes of retail, entertainment and restaurant office uses, but a more attractive streetscape with stronger internal vehicular and pedestrian connections. On Market Street, evaluate how to make pedestrians safer with the potential to provide bicycle access.
- Zoning changes would be minimal in terms of overall ordinance changes – proposed changing the zoning in the area of neighborhood commercial historic to mixed use.
- It was pointed out the importance of not planting any trees that bear fruit in these areas so not to have a problem with parked vehicles.
- Signage –the current Zoning Ordinance is adequate for the Town Center signage. Several changes included prohibiting pole signs inside the Town Center area, which are not allowed in mixed use

areas currently. Also, allowing taller monument signs – bottom of the sign could be much higher, six ft. off the ground and the top of the sign could be as much as 18 ft. off the ground.

- Address vehicle related uses – all auto related uses must conform to the design standards, i.e., a building that needs to have setbacks the same as other buildings. Auto sales – would be required to have some interior display space – a show room with a minimum footprint of 3000 sq. ft.

Ms. Hull reviewed Zoning and SALDO amendments noting this is the first significant update since 2007.

- Changes include clarification of domestic pets versus kennel operations.
- Mass substitution for the definition of the different types of streets and access ways in the Zoning Ordinance, making it consistent with the SALDO.
- Signage for non-residential uses, i.e., churches, community uses, clubs, etc. Limited to 16 sq. ft. as currently exists in the R-1. Also signage standards for the neighborhood commercial district being small scale. Increasing signage to 5% of the building coverage in the neighborhood commercial. This is significantly less than in the mixed-use district which is 20%.
- Broader definition of land development and to address storm water issues triggering land development to go through the storm water planning process. The addition of 3500 sq. ft. of impervious coverage commercial building additions of 1000 sq. ft. or more. Also a new access way or driveway onto an arterial or collector street to manage traffic.
- A proposal to limit new residential lots with direct access to arterial or collector streets.
- The definition of a residential driveway and its minimum and maximum widths.

Discussion was held regarding the tree lists which were reviewed, i.e., how many trees are there, how to determine which ones are the best, etc. It was concluded they would like to focus on native trees, which have the best survival rates. The SALDO will include determining the number of plant choices, size and location needs. A native plant list was requested from Penn State Extension and from a local environmental advisory committee. General recommendation is to take a look at the EAC list to make sure they are going to work in suburban environments and use some favorites from the current list – combine them and shorten the list.

Ms. Hull stated next steps will be to incorporate the changes decided upon, clean up the tree issues this week to get back to the township next week. The rush is in order to hold the public meeting on January 14; it will need to be presented to the County and other parties by November 30, which starts the 45-day review. If all goes well, adoption by the end of January and finish up final edits to get it back to the Township in February 2010.

Ms. Hull stated that the next phase of the Ordinance would be to introduce language for regulating alternative energy uses.

8. ADJOURNMENT

CHAIRMAN MACIEJEWSKI ADJOURNED THE MEETING AT 7:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Secretary

/ses

APPROVED

**SPRINGETTSBURY TOWNSHIP
PLANNING COMMISSION
OCTOBER 15, 2009**

MEMBERS IN

ATTENDANCE: Alan Maciejewski, Chairman
Mark Robertson
Mark Swomley
John Lutz
Charles Wurster

ALSO IN

ATTENDANCE: Jim Baugh, Director of Community Development
John Luciani, First Capital Engineering
Nicole Ehrhart, Solicitor
Sue Sipe, Stenographer

1. CALL TO ORDER:

A. Pledge of Allegiance

Chairman Maciejewski called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance.

2. ACTION ON THE MINUTES

A. JUNE 18, 2009

MR. LUTZ MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE MEETING MINUTES OF JUNE 18, 2009 AS PRESENTED. MR. SWOMLEY SECONDED. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.

B. SEPTEMBER 17, 2009 – TABLED

3. BRIEFING ITEMS

A. LD-09-02 – Capital Self Storage

Mr. Maciejewski recused himself.

Todd Wilson, Alpha Consulting Engineering

Mr. Wilson stated that Capital Self Storage is located at the site of the former Coca Cola plant located at 2611 East Market Street, west of Northern Way. The existing building is 3900 sq. ft. and contains 492 self storage units. The applicant plans to remove the existing building in the back and construct five additional storage buildings with 350 storage units. Total building square footage would be approximately 39,000 sq. ft. In addition the owner would construct paved accesses around the side of the building. He proposes a stormwater management area in the back with a stormwater management pond that would also collect and manage all the runoff for the additional development on the site. There are no proposed utility expansions. They are proposing landscaping in the back to meet the requirements which is 15 ft. green areas with landscaping. There is existing fence along the property line, which would be maintained and a gate would be added within the existing fence to access the hydrant at the request of the fire chief.

Additional information was noted:

- A traffic study was done to document traffic generation.
- At the Market Street location there is a right in and right out.
- The applicant received a zoning variance from the Zoning Hearing Board for minimum lot size due to the site being 5½ acres.
- There is a 5 foot buffer requirement a grass area but no significant planting.
- They are planning preservation to the stormwater along the tributary to Mill Creek that runs along the east side of the property so no one builds within those areas.

Discussion was held regarding parking along Market Street. Mr. Wilson indicated the parking in the front is existing non-conforming. They are not expanding the parking, but in an effort to be permitted to continue the existing parking, they will modify their landscaping plan.

It was recommended that the applicant review the Township's Town Center Plan in an effort to provide landscaping that conforms to that concept.

Discussion was held regarding lighting on the buildings. Mr. Wilson indicated a photometric chart was submitted, but they will be providing a revised lighting plan.

Mr. Wilson stated they are requesting seven waivers:

- Three are stormwater waivers.
- Preliminary plan waiver.
- Waiver on scale – showing it at 40:100.
- Waiver on curbs as it relates to the existing condition in the front of the building due to the existing fence.
- Waiver for buffer yard along Market Street.

B. LD-09-03 – York County Rail Trail

Casey Deller, CS Davidson

Mr. Deller indicated he was representing the York County Rail Trail Authority to present the plan for the northern extension of the Rail Trail Phase II. He provided the following background on the overall goal of the project and how it ties into the piece within Springettsbury Township:

- The Rail Trail is a 21.1 mile section that runs parallel to the Codorus Creek and the existing rail line from the Maryland line and extends north to the downtown York area, at the intersection of Philadelphia Street and Pershing Avenue.
- The overall northern extension proposes to extend the trail from York City 5½ additional miles north along the creek into East Manchester Township and tie into the existing trails at John Rudy Park.
- There is a section of trail extending from Chris Park down to the tie in where this project would be ending in Manchester Twp., currently under construction.
- The section of trail that this plan proposes would start at the southern side of the Route 30 Bridge which lies at the municipal boundary between Springettsbury and Spring Garden Twp. It extends north approximately 3 miles along the creek corridor to the bridge over Mundis Mill Road.
- The trail will be composed of a mixed surface either trail dust or asphalt and possibly sections of concrete, depending on where the trails lies in relation to the levee system and the 100 year flood plain.
- Some of the necessary permits are in hand or close to obtaining. They are working with the Army Corp of Engineers on the joint permit. Once the stormwater consistency letter is received from the Township, it will be submitted to the Army Corp.
- They are waiting on the HOP permit to be obtained through PennDOT.
- They received the permit from the Conservation District.
- Mr. Deller pointed out the Route 30 Bridge and the Spring Garden/Springettsbury Township line on the plan. They are proposing to add a parking lot off of Loucks Mill Road, at the location of an

existing driveway entrance which goes out onto a level grass area with a small stormwater management area.

- The trail will continue from the parking lot, go underneath the Route 30 Bridge and continue north through the entire corridor on the southern or eastern side of the creek and on top of the levee. Some grading will need to be done to make the area wider.
- They anticipate continuing the trail along the creek corridor to the Mundis Mill Bridge, underneath the bridge and then zigzag up to the grade of the bridge. A pedestrian walkway would be built across the bridge and tie into the trail sections in Manchester Township.

Discussion was held regarding the property acquisition. Mr. Deller noted they have attempted to work out an agreement with the residents living in the subdivision at that location by offering to compensate them for right-of-way easements along their property. It was determined it was not economically feasible to meet the requests of the residents. The only other option was to take the land from them through eminent domain which the Rail Trail Authority refused.

Mr. Deller explained the following details of the alternative proposal, noting they want to assure they are meeting the requirements of the Township:

- At the bend in the creek traveling north, they are proposing to leave the creek corridor coming up through the new S&A home subdivision, across the berm of their stormwater basin and up to Sheridan Road. The trail would continue to travel northeast along Sheridan Road utilizing the existing sidewalk to the existing traffic light at Mundis Mill Road, utilizing the structures that are in place there – the pedestrian crossing signals, push buttons and handicap ramps, coming across Mundis Mill Road and onto the Carter property.
- Rather than turning and running parallel to Mundis Mill Road it was determined to travel onto Mr. Carter's property. Traveling northwest on the right hand side from the road surface there is a steep 1:1 slope embankment that is tree covered. They are proposing to come into Mr. Carter's property and run the trail at the toe of the slope on the inside of his property and not disturb the existing tree line, rather than having the pedestrian traffic along the busy Mundis Mill Road. He noted they have had ongoing discussions with the Township about the feasibility of that concept as well as conversations with Mr. Carter in order to meet his needs, and have worked out that portion so everyone is comfortable with the proposal.
- This design leaves open the possibility of constructing the switch back should this portion of trail and these properties ever come open to the possibility of putting the Rail Trail back along the corridor.

In discussing stormwater management, Mr. Deller noted they have an infiltration pit running parallel with the parking lot on the eastern side and would be modifying the grading slightly to get the necessary storage volume for storm water management in this area.

Mr. Deller indicated they met with some of the residents along Sheridan Manor to discuss their concerns with not impacting the properties, with no encroachment onto the properties and safety of anyone using that sidewalk using the trail.

Mr. Deller discussed the plans in regards to the 8 ft. wide trail section to be constructed just inside the right-of-way line within the narrow corridor of right of way between the existing curb line and the right of way line. In order to accomplish that they had to encroach into the grass strip between the curb and the sidewalk. He noted although the Township had concerns about that concept they also recognized the difficulty of the situation. This was discussed with the Rail Trail Authority and York County Parks to determine how to get this section of trail through there. It was determined to use the existing 4 foot sidewalk stretch along Sheridan Road, while contemplating how users will react to the variances in width along that stretch with bikers, walkers, runners and horses. To deal with those issues the following was determined:

Horses – are permitted in John Rudy Park, they are not permitted in Chris Fields. They will cut off the use of horses where the trail deviates away from the creek. That will be the mandatory turn around point for horses.

Bikers, walkers, runners – while maintaining the 4 foot section of sidewalk, put up ample signage and any other controls that the Rail Trail uses at other locations that clearly require all bikers to dismount. They will have to walk their bikes down this section of Sheridan Road to Mundis Mill Road or they will have the option to enter the roadway and ride on the roadway, as permitted by the motor vehicle code.

In discussion the sanitary sewer system in the area, Mr. Deller indicated there will be a Memorandum of Understanding that states should any sections of the sanitary sewer system need repaired the Township and their staff has access to repair the lines and do maintenance upkeep. All they are required to do is backfill and compact over top of the sanitary sewer lines as they would in any other case. It would be the Rail Trail's responsibility to reconstruct any of the trail or fence where the work was done. Also to provide adequate gates so the Township can access the sanitary sewer lines at all of the different access points.

It was noted the hours for the Rail Trail are 8 am to dusk and this is posted at all parking lots and road crossings. All of the Rail Trail regulations are posted on signage either in the parking lot or on the actual road crossing gates.

The waiver requests were reviewed:

1 - Preliminary plan requirement – Mr. Deller stated they fall in line with previous rulings on the need to do a preliminary plan and come back with a final plan.

2 – Traffic impact plan – Mr. Deller noted there are two points of concern with the project. The first is the driveway to the parking lot off of Loucks Mill Road south of Route 30. They will be working extensively with PennDOT submitting traffic information to them. The other concern is the crossing of Mundis Mill Road. They are also working with PennDOT in that area to determine how to get through the guide rail on the northern side of Mundis Mill Road, and how to get people across Mundis Mill Road so that when they cross they are not immediately faced with a left hand turn and congestion at that location. Also consulting with PennDOT with regard to the crossing signals, the push buttons, and making sure everything is handicapped accessible.

3 and 4 - They would be requesting a waiver of installing the sidewalk along the section of Loucks Mill Road from Route 30 to the Township line.

5 and 6 – Buffer landscaping along the parking lot off of Loucks Mill, as to whether that buffer landscaping is necessary based on the existing vegetation that is between Loucks Mill and the parking lot and the fact that topographically the parking lot lies down in a hole and is surrounded on all sides either by embankment.

7 – Parking lot lighting since the trail closes at dusk. All other parking areas along the Rail Trail are not lit. It is recommended to not have the parking lot lit after dark to discourage usage for other reasons rather than access to the Rail Trail.

Two other waiver requests deal with storm water management. Mr. Deller stated they have a plan in place to adequately address storm water recognizing that this project is different and the requests strictly relate to the trail section itself.

4. ACTION ITEMS – None

5. WAIVERS - None

6. OLD BUSINESS – None

7. NEW BUSINESS

A. PA Wayfinding Signage Program

Mr. Baugh stated that the York County Planning Commission is asking the Township to submit a letter in support of implementation of the wayfinding signage program. A sample letter was provided and attached was a list of frequently asked questions about the program. Mr. Baugh reviewed the questions as listed on the sheet.

Discussion was held regarding the program. It was decided that additional information as well as criteria for the location of the signs was needed to make a decision.

The program was tabled for the next meeting in order to obtain additional information and further discuss.

8. ADJOURNMENT

CHAIRMAN MACIEJEWSKI ADJOURNED THE MEETING AT 8:10 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Secretary

/ses

APPROVED

**SPRINGETTSBURY TOWNSHIP
PLANNING COMMISSION
SEPTEMBER 17, 2009**

MEMBERS IN

ATTENDANCE: Alan Maciejewski, Chairman
Mark Robertson
Charles Wurster

ALSO IN

ATTENDANCE: Jim Baugh, Director of Community Development
John Luciani, First Capital Engineering
Angela Liddick, Community Development Coordinator
Nicole Ehrhart, Solicitor
Sue Sipe, Stenographer

NOT PRESENT: Mark Swomley
John Lutz

1. CALL TO ORDER:

A. Pledge of Allegiance

Chairman Maciejewski called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance.

2. ACTION ON THE MINUTES

A. JUNE 18, 2009

THE JUNE MINUTES WERE TABLED FOR NEXT MONTH.

3. BRIEFING ITEMS

A. SD-07-04 – Ridge View Heights

Attorney Stacey MacNeal
Josh George, Engineer
Carl Dahlmyer, Owner's Representative

Attorney MacNeal stated this plan was presented some time ago for a variance request and briefing item. This is a 10 lot subdivision consisting of single family homes on the south side of Deininger Road. It will be served by public water and public sewer. The lots range in the area of one acre, however lot #2 is approximately four acres due to the shape of the existing property. Attorney MacNeal indicated that have been working with Township Staff on stormwater management design which will be individual on-lot basins. This has been determined to be the best solution for insuring effective storm water management on this site. There is a note on the plan dealing with the maintenance of the basins. She noted there is one outstanding issue referenced by Comments 65, 74 and 75 on the tracking sheet all pertaining to Deininger Road. She noted they will need further direction prior to going to the Supervisors. Deininger Road does not meet current Township standards in several ways. It is a narrow road, does not meet width standards and does not have an appropriate crown on the road. This is considered a super-elevated roadway due to the north side of the roadway being built along side the mountain. Currently all the stormwater coming down the mountain runs off to the south side of the roadway. Also at the location of the property, very minimum longitudinal slope exists.

Mr. George explained the issue of the longitudinal slope showing it on the drawing. He noted the high point along Deininger Road is approximately in the middle of their site and there a flat portion of the road. Because it is super elevated in that same area, the slope from north to south towards the property allows the water to sheet flow across the road, even though the road is flat.

Attorney MacNeal indicated this plan is proceeding under the old Ordinances. She referred to the previous subdivision and land development Ordinance section relating to proposed street systems which addresses the correct street layout. She pointed out the problem they have is that their proposed improvements go to the center line of the road, and the width is not an issue. She indicated they will do whatever they can do to improve their half of the roadway. However, they are concerned with the issue of correcting the crown without doing work on the Township side of the roadway, since if the other side of the roadway is not corrected, it will end up with discrepancies between the one side of the roadway and the other. Their thought on what would be the best solution for Deininger Road (approximately 1500 ft. of road frontage) would be to design for the whole length of the roadway – they would do their half and the Township would do their half.

Mr. George indicated that the plans show proposed improvements on the developer's side of the road and the proposed improvements that the Township would need to make to coordinate with those improvements to bring the roadway in accordance with Township specifications.

Attorney MacNeal indicated they have been advised that the Township does not have Deininger Road on their budget for this improvement. She noted not going with this option would cause discrepancies in height of approximately 6" on the one side of the paving versus the other side.

Mr. George showed three different cross sections on the drawing along the 1500 feet of roadway frontage. The first one is Station 2 closest to Mt. Zion road. He noted in order to get a 1% longitudinal slope along the existing roadway without effectuating a change at the center line of the roadway in elevation, is to match as closely as possible the existing roadway geometry. However, there is no true geometry on that road, as it has been built up over the years and paved in different ways. The closest match is what is on the design plans and at Station #2 the proposed grade center line is lower than the existing grade approximately 4 inches. Mr. George stated there are two options to effectively connect back to the Township side of the road – one is the option recommended by the Township engineer. The other one is what is shown on the design plans, which would indicate the Township coming in and reconstructing the north side of the road to match the design and construction that the developer will do on the south side.

Attorney MacNeal explained the condition without any work done on the other side of the road, noting it is 4 inches higher on the top one. She pointed out going slightly further down the road to the second cross section from Station 2 to Station 5 from the proposed roadway creates a situation where it is substantially above the existing level of the other side of the roadway. She stated that was an unacceptable situation that they would not do. In working with the Township for approximately a year on how to address this issue, they have arrived at three possible options.

Option #1 – The possibility of blending the roadway without redoing the whole other side of the road. There are some practical concerns but they were willing to investigate it with the Township. She noted this option is what Staff recommended at the Developer's meeting in early August. Staff had indicated that they would find it acceptable as long as it was no more than 6% of blending down. However, she noted there are problems when this was evaluated down that 1500 ft. of lane.

Mr. George explained what happens to the north side of the roadway when using the 6%, noting their side would be at the 2% cross slope and the Township side would be 6% back to some point along the existing road. Within 300 feet of roadway length on the Township side of the road it goes from a positive 6% to a negative 6% which is not an acceptable traffic condition and not a safe condition for the traveling public. From Station 5 to Station 10 it is 500 ft. down the road and it goes back to where it started. Consequently there would be approximately 800 ft. where it is not a safe condition and it was concluded that was not the way to proceed.

Option 2 Attorney MacNeal indicated they would be willing to do the work if the Township would reimburse them for half of the cost of the improvement. She noted they could do it less expensively because they would not need prevailing wage and no bids.

Option #3 Attorney MacNeal stated that assuming the Township is not willing to put any money into Deininger Road at this time, the best option would be to provide the best interim roadway possible now and pay a contribution to the Township for the future work. They would widen and do cross sectional alignment with the crowning work.

Mr. George stated they would match the elevation of the existing center line of the road and build everything from their side to the 2% cross slope, but would not change the longitudinal slope along the road. He noted that would be the only effective way to do half of the road construction by starting at the center line elevation.

Attorney MacNeal indicated they would need a waiver from alignment for longitudinal slope, as well as a waiver for curbing. The longitudinal slope works right now and sheets water off because there is no curb. If a curb is placed, there is the potential for ponding in areas. They would put in a swale and then put the sidewalk on the other side of the swale. She noted they would pay a contribution to the Township to effectuate those further improvements when the Township was ready to do the whole roadway. This option would provide the best interim improved safe roadway as well as pay their appropriate share of the future improvements recognizing that at some point the whole roadway will brought up to standards.

Discussion was held by the Board as to whether it would be the responsibility of the Township to finish the other side of the road. Attorney Ehrhart indicated it is not the responsibility of the Township to correct the road. The Board would need to decide if they meet the requirements of the Ordinance. She further noted the Township is not required to do anything to this road even as a result of the applicant's development. That was the reasoning behind Staff's recommendation as this is not budgeted.

Discussion was held regarding the monetary contribution from applicant in lieu of doing the improvements, and what would be the decided amount.

Attorney MacNeal stated they did not have a projected figure, and that the Supervisors would need to determine if the figure is sufficient for their contribution.

Attorney Ehrhart also indicated there is an issue with regards to installation of the sewer. She noted there is some discrepancy between engineers on whether that can be done without disturbing the other side of the road. If that occurs when the developer is putting in their sewer, the applicant would have to rebuild the road and then the whole road issue would become moot.

It was agreed by the Board that a reliable figure for the monetary contribution would need to be submitted by the applicant in order to determine if that is a viable option.

Discussion was held regarding the applicant's request for a curb variance. The Board determined that whatever is deemed required, it will be subject to the six month wavier notification. The other issue discussed was how will the water drain from one side of the street to the other and where will it go with curbs.

Discussion was held in regards to where the water is going behind the properties. Mr. George stated that the stormwater design was to mimic the existing conditions while recognizing the fact of adding impervious area. He noted the ideal situation to minimize the downstream impact is not to have a single basin that has a large pipe coming out and forces all that water to one point, but to spread it out across the site as much as possible. They had proposed the individual storm water management basin for each lot as shown on the drawing. The basins are designed to accommodate the runoff that is created by the impervious surface from the house and the driveway, and they are behind the house at least 20 feet and designed to hold water back while allowing the possibility to infiltrate and recharge into the ground. He noted they did percolation testing at the site and got very low results to no percolation. Consequently

they created a bio retention facility where the bottom of basin is a stone sand soil mix which will allow water to percolate down and then plant the facility with vegetation conducive to a wetter environment. They will have volume above that elevation. There is also volume from the ground level up to the top of the embankment that would hold a typical storm water runoff and manage back to the existing rate of controls. There is a six inch diameter pipe coming out of each basin going downhill to allow the overflow. This design allows the water to be spread out across the whole site as much as possible to minimize any concentrated flows.

Mr. George showed the property line on the drawing in proximity to the closest neighboring property.

Attorney Lobach was in attendance representing the adjacent property owners Mr. & Mrs. Shiding. He explained that they own the property immediately to the south and downgrade of this site. He noted two concerns of the Shidings – one in regards to surface water and the other to ground water. They are concerned about the seepage basins being maintained and remaining undisturbed. The surface water would be the most impacted if any failure occurred. The Shidings are looking for some mechanism and help from the Township, whereby they would also be able to enforce the maintenance obligations to be undertaken in the event of a demonstrable failure of this system. With respect to ground water, Attorney Lobach stated it needs to be clear that the Shidings and their neighbors downstream are on private water supply systems in the form of wells. A disturbance in this area could create problems with the wells. That issue needs to be addressed by a notice on the plans so that any future developer, contractor, or owner is aware of the downstream wells, and is admonished to take all appropriate precautions to protect the ground water supply.

B. SP-09-03 Willow Street SD

Casey Deller, CS Davison
John Woodard

Mr. Deller stated this is a residential subdivision sketch plan. The property is located at the corner of North Sherman Street and Church Street, and is approximately 3 acres. He showed the location on the drawing, noting it is generally an open meadow. On the north side of the property is Willow Street, which is a 15 ft. wide private alley. On the south side is an unnamed, unpaved alley, 15 feet wide, which provides access to the residential houses on North Sherman Street. The property is in the R-7 small lot single family residential district. They are proposing 16 semi- attached residential units, in a short section of street coming off of Church Street to a cul-de-sac with curbs and sidewalks that provides access to the 16 units surrounding that street. There was discussion regarding other options providing access to different housing configurations over the years. Mr. Deller stated that construction on this street optimizes the use of the property, gives the best access and is least intrusive to all the neighbors in the immediate area. There is public sewer and public water within Church Street which they will access. Adjacent to the private alley on the south side is a swale that comes down to a 42" pipe that crosses under Sheridan/Church Road and then ties into an existing storm sewer that flows eastwardly downhill. They would be connecting to that storm sewer system. The open area will be used for storm water management, most likely a typical stormwater basin. With the size of the lots there is not a lot of room to do stormwater other than underground seepage pit for the roof water. They also have an open space in this general area. With the cul-de-sac at the end of the street it makes this section of ground very narrow. It is also the piece of ground where most of the existing trees are located. They are not planning any improvements for the open space but will leave it as is to be used by the future residents of this subdivision for recreational purposes.

Mr. Deller explained the status of Willow Street which is the alley to the north. Currently there is a maintenance document recorded in the Courthouse that requires these 6 landowners as well as the owner of this tract of ground to be solely responsible for the maintenance upkeep of Willow Street. He noted they have introduced themselves to the neighbors and their proposal is that if the owner of this tract and all of these residents are removed from the requirement for maintenance and upkeep of the alley, they will then forfeit their right to access from that alley. Mr. Deller stated there was an option of the plan that had

expansion of Willow Street to full Township standards and provided improvements to the driveways of all those houses facing back to Willow Street. He noted the residents have indicated they do not want this and they do not feel it is in our best interest as the landowners. If they were going to build this road it would be of comparable costs to improving this section of alley except that there are utility poles in this area that would need to be relocated. There are also grade concerns. Mr. Deller stated they felt this is a better option to build the neighborhood to the specifications that the residents are going to be expecting.

Mr. Deller discussed the issue of curb and sidewalk around the exterior of the property. He noted they are proposing curb and sidewalk along the eastern edge of the property. They have met with Staff and it is their interpretation that a section of Church Street is the only frontage where they would be required to provide curb and sidewalk since the other areas are private alleys.

Mr. Deller indicated that each one of the units is approximately 1200 sq. ft. which is the largest they could allow. The lots on the northern side are as small as 4500 sq. ft. up to 8600 sq. ft. The Ordinance permits up to 40% lot coverage which determined the size of the lots and units.

Mr. Deller noted the length of the cul-de-sac is 395 sq. ft. to center. None of the properties will have access to the alleyways. The property line lies along the edge of the alley on the north side. He noted their property abuts the physical alley and there is a right of way. They are proposing some landscape screening along the back side to shield the neighbors' view.

In regards to recreational requirements, Mr. Deller indicated they would be proposing to pay the fee in lieu of for the lots. The intent of the open space is to make that for the residents and not open to the public.

Discussion was held regarding traffic concerns, specifically at the intersection of Church Street on the bend in the road. It was noted that sight distance would need to be evaluated as part of the traffic study.

4. ACTION ITEMS – None

5. OLD BUSINESS – None

6. NEW BUSINESS

A. Update on Town Center Plan

Mr. Baugh provided an update on the Town Center plan with a PowerPoint presentation for Marion Hull, who was unable to attend. Mr. Baugh noted that the Town Center and Gateway Plan is an extension of the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Baugh highlighted the following:

- Presented the project study areas noting that Eastern Gateway is at the Hellam border. The Western Gateway is at Mt. Rose off Route 83 and the Town Center encompasses the Lowes and Wal-Mart in that general area. There is also the Eastern Boulevard section.
- The objective is to maintain the diverse retail and encourage more intensive development which will later require structured parking.
- Gateway 83 not likely to see major changes, but perhaps the potential for a theater and/or expansion of office use.
- Zoning in the area of the new Giant Gas station on Market Street is proposed to be rezoned from Neighborhood-Commercial-Highway to Mixed Use.

- Signage – Recommending going away from pole signs and going back to monument signs and signs on the buildings. Prohibit distracting moving message signs, as well as signs that are internally lit.
- Efforts to create more of a streetscape environment with buildings closer to the street.
- One of the things also considered in the zoning is going into design standards. Other zoning considerations would be design regulations for the town center – Eastern Boulevard and Gateway 83, to balance those with certain guidelines placed.
- Looking at building orientation and making it pedestrian friendly.
- Looking at parking lots - actually putting the buildings in the parking lot to create an atmosphere of walking around these places. Parking would have to be high rise because of space.
- Traffic calming would be accomplished by making it a higher intensity. In the center of those areas a market – art shows, vegetable sales, activities for various groups.
- Eastern Boulevard is shown as already set up for what they are trying to accomplish, providing median and landscape areas.
- Sidewalk is against the curb to have the aesthetics but also the safety.
- Provide more character of the neighborhood. Streetlights similar to old lamplighters.
- Gateway 83 – looking at signage, streetscape and sidewalks, etc.

Mr. Baugh indicated it is anticipated the draft overlays and zoning changes will be completed between now and October. In October/November it will be reviewed with the Steering Committee and then in November at the Planning Commission meeting, which will have a public meeting and then review the plan overlay Ordinance changes for recommendation. Following that will be a 45-day waiting period and then in February 2010 adoption.

7. ADJOURNMENT:

CHAIRMAN MACIEJEWSKI ADJOURNED THE MEETING AT 7:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Secretary

/ses

APPROVED

**SPRINGETTSBURY TOWNSHIP
PLANNING COMMISSION
JUNE 18, 2009**

MEMBERS IN

ATTENDANCE: Mark Robertson, Acting Chairman
Mark Swomley
Charles Wurster
John Lutz

ALSO IN

ATTENDANCE: Jim Baugh, Director of Community Development
John Luciani, First Capital Engineering
John Holman
Nicole Ehrhart, Solicitor
Sue Sipe, Stenographer

NOT PRESENT: Alan Maciejewski

1. CALL TO ORDER

A. Pledge of Allegiance

Acting Chairman Robertson called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance.

2. ACTION ON THE MINUTES

A. MAY 21, 2009

MR. SWOMLEY MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE MEETING MINUTES OF MAY 21, 2009 AS PRESENTED. MR. WURSTER SECONDED. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.

3. WAIVER RECOMMENDATIONS – NONE

4. BRIEFING ITEMS - NONE

5. ACTION ITEMS

**A. LD-05-18 Market Street Commons Add on Lots
SD-05-13**

Jerry Stahlman
Tim Pasch

This lot subdivision and land development plan proposes to develop three lots along Commons Drive between Market Street and Eastern Boulevard. Two of the lots are in the Commercial-Highway District and one is in the Apartment-Office District under the old ordinances. The development of the Apartment-Office parcel will consist of 30 townhouses (single family attached). The development of the Commercial-Highway parcels will consist of a 1,500SF retail sales building on one lot and 247 mini-storage units on the second lot. Included in this plan are the required buffering, landscaping, sidewalks, street lights, interior lighting and a request to re-locate an existing Township Sanitary Sewer line to go around the proposed retail store.

Plan Background: This project is presented as an action item. It was first submitted to the Township on December 27, 2005 and is being reviewed under previous ordinances. It was presented as a briefing item on November 20, 2008 as well as on February 19, 2009 at which meeting Waivers recommendations were made.

The following Waivers were recommended for approval by the Planning Commission at the February 19, 2009 meeting:

1. SALDO (§289-15.F) Traffic Impact Study.
Applicant proposes to submit an updated trip generation letter in lieu of a full Traffic Impact Study.
2. SALDO (§289-64.D) Design standards.
The finished elevation of proposed streets shall not be more than one foot below the regulatory flood elevation.

The following Outstanding items may be Conditions of Approval:

1. (§289-11.B) Preliminary plans; specifications.
Applicant shall provide final approved plans on Mylar and an electronic copy of the recorded set.
2. (§289-29.C) Performance requirements.
Applicant shall provide bonding prior to the recording of the final plan.
3. (§289-40) Recreation dedication.
Applicant shall pay an associated recreation fee due to Lot 18 showing 30 dwelling units.
4. General Comment: Sanitary sewer easement on Lot 16 shows a building within the easement.
Please correct to keep all structures out of the easement right-of-way.
The existing features plan indicates a 25 ft. wide sanitary sewer easement and 12" ESTCP going through middle of lot 16. The land development plan indicates a new re-located 30' wide sanitary sewer easement. Township must agree to move easement or developer must move building on Lot 16. Developer to explore possibility of straightening out the pipe more versus the 90deg turns.
5. (§289-68.E) Fees.
Applicant shall pay all legal, engineering and/or administration fees prior to approval of final plans.

Mr. Stahlman stated they have worked with Staff and the Township Engineer to address the outstanding comments listed on the tracking sheet. He noted the last tracking sheet dated June 10 from First Capital Engineering shows no outstanding comments remaining. Mr. Stahlman reviewed the outstanding conditions.

Mr. Luciani commented on Condition # 4 that there is no legal mandate for the applicant to vacate their sewer line, since they have the rights to it.

Mr. Stahlman indicated this condition was discussed last week at the developer's meeting and they have agreed to review it to determine how to adjust the alignment. He discussed the plan to realign how the line will run and will tie in to the sewer easement.

Acting Chairman Robertson asked if there was anyone in attendance who had an interest in the plan. Hearing none he called for a motion.

MR. SWOMLEY MOVED WITH REFERENCE TO LAND DEVELOPMENT PLAN LD-05-18 AND SUBDIVISION PLAN SD-05-13, MARKET STREET COMMONS ADD ON LOTS, TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE PRELIMINARY PLAN TO THE TOWNSHIP BOARD OF SUPERVISORS WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

1. **SALDO (§289-11.B) PRELIMINARY PLANS; SPECIFICATIONS.**

APPLICANT SHALL PROVIDE FINAL APPROVED PLANS ON MYLAR AND AN ELECTRONIC COPY OF THE RECORDED SET.

2. **SALDO (§289-29.C) PERFORMANCE REQUIREMENTS. APPLICANT SHALL PROVIDE BONDING PRIOR TO THE RECORDING OF THE FINAL PLAN.**
3. **SALDO (§289-40) RECREATION DEDICATION. APPLICANT SHALL PAY AN ASSOCIATED RECREATION FEE DUE TO LOT 18 SHOWING 30 DWELLING UNITS.**
4. **GENERAL COMMENT: SANITARY SEWER EASEMENT ON LOT 16 SHOWS A BUILDING WITHIN THE EASEMENT. PLEASE CORRECT TO KEEP ALL STRUCTURES OUT OF THE EASEMENT RIGHT-OF-WAY. THE EXISTING FEATURES PLAN INDICATES A 25 FT WIDE SANITARY SEWER EASEMENT AND 12" ESTCP GOING THROUGH MIDDLE OF LOT 16. THE LAND DEVELOPMENT PLAN INDICATES A NEW RE-LOCATED 30' WIDE SANITARY SEWER EASEMENT. TOWNSHIP MUST AGREE TO MOVE EASEMENT OR DEVELOPER MUST MOVE BUILDING ON LOT 16. DEVELOPER TO EXPLORE POSSIBILITY OF STRAIGHTENING OUT THE PIPE MORE VERSUS THE 90DEG TURNS.**
5. **SALDO (§289-68.E) FEES. APPLICANT SHALL PAY ALL LEGAL, ENGINEERING AND/OR ADMINISTRATION FEES PRIOR TO APPROVAL OF FINAL PLANS.**

SECONDED BY MR. WURSTER. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.

B. LD-07-08 Heritage Hills Expansion

Keith Good, Calabrese-Good Architects
Stacey MacNeal, Attorney

This plan is proposing an expansion of the hotel facility, waterpark & parking areas. The construction will include an additional 119 hotel rooms, 3 level parking deck, waterpark located above the parking deck and conference rooms. A developer's agreement and PennDOT HOP will be required. This plan is being reviewed under previous ordinances.

Plan Background: The preliminary plan was recommended for approval on December 18, 2008 and subsequently approved by the Board of Supervisors on January 8, 2009. Due to changes made post-approval, the plan is presented as an action item with all associated changes to the plan provided. The plan was first received to the Township on May 29, 2007 and is therefore under previous Township ordinances.

Variations were granted from the Zoning Hearing Board as Case Z-07-12 on August 2, 2007 to allow:

1. Allow construction within a steep slopes area

Variations were granted from the Zoning Hearing Board as Case Z-07-22 on December 6, 2007 to allow:

1. Allow commercial parking in an R-2 zoning district;
2. Allow the building length to exceed 200 feet.

The Applicant is requesting a recommendation of Approval from the Planning Commission to the Springettsbury Township Board of Supervisors for the following Waivers:

1. SALDO (§289-11.A.) Preliminary Plans; specifications. [withdrew 12/09/08] REQUESTED 4/24/09 - Applicant is requesting a waiver of preliminary plan due to the preliminary plan already having been approved and the revised plan is completed to a level required of a final plan.

2. SALDO (§289-11.B.19) Preliminary plans; specifications [BOS approved 1/8/09]
Applicant proposes to provide location of street layouts within 400 feet based on GIS information but not right-of-way widths and cartway widths. The site is extremely large and to show streets within 400 feet of the property is not beneficial to review of the proposed development.
3. SALDO (§289-13.A.19) Final plans; specifications. [BOS approved 1/8/09]
Applicant proposes to install iron pins in lieu of concrete monuments on the greens of the golf course only. Concrete monuments would be detrimental to the function of the existing golf course greens. These corners are located along the new property line with direction S15° 13' 29"E at a length of 31.52'.
4. SALDO (§289-15.F.3) Environmental impact studies. [BOS approved 1/8/09]
Applicant proposes to allow PennDOT to complete their study and subsequent road improvement design. These improvements will reach far beyond the scope of this project.
5. SALDO (§289-26.C) Landscaping and buffer yards. [BOS approved 1/8/09]
Applicant proposes to provide residential buffer yards to screen the building and parking lot areas only but not screen the golf course. The existing golf course and associated landscaping provide aesthetics beyond screening. Additionally, there is no development proposed on the golf course as part of this project.
6. SALDO (§289-27) Streetlights. [BOS DID NOT approve 1/8/09]
Applicant proposes to allow existing streetlights to remain until the PennDOT widening occurs. In the meantime, the streetlights have been designed to meet township standards and are included in the escrow cost estimate. Streetlights currently exist to light the street. Additionally, the PennDOT widening project scheduled for 2009-2010 would disrupt the location of the streetlights.
7. SALDO (§289-32.A.3) Proposed street system. [BOS DID NOT approve 1/8/09]
Applicant proposes to install a new traffic signal and turning lanes per the recommendation of the traffic study. PennDOT is planning to widen Mount Rose Avenue as part of its funded improvement plan in the 2009-2010 timeframe. Any improvements would be removed as part of their widening project.
8. SALDO (§289-32.I) Proposed street system. [BOS approved 1/8/09]
Applicant proposes to allow three (3) driveways to remain but convert the westernmost drive to emergency access only. Two drives are necessary for vehicular access to the two parking lots. The third access shall remain as an emergency access as requested by the Fire Marshall.
9. Stormwater (§281-7.A.) OR 26-107 Surface detention and retention basins. Waiver requested under old Stormwater Ordinance. Submitted on December 20, 2007. [BOS approved 1/8/09]
Applicant proposes to use the rationale method in lieu of the TR-55 method for designing the stormwater management facilities as the size of the developed area is much smaller than the areas that the TR-55 method was developed for.

The following Outstanding items may be Conditions of Approval.

1. SALDO (§289-10.A.2.c) Preliminary plans; procedure.
Applicant shall provide a copy of the letter of adequacy from the York County Conservation District.
2. SALDO (§289-11.C.7) Preliminary plans; specifications.
Applicant shall provide a copy of the letter of adequacy from the York County Conservation District and a copy of the approved NPDES permit.
3. SALDO (§289-12.A.2.b) Final plans; procedure.
Applicant shall provide a copy of the letter of from PennDOT.
4. SALDO (§289-11.B.25) Preliminary plans; specifications.
Applicant shall sign plans before they can be recorded.
5. SALDO (§289-12.C) Final plans; procedure.
Applicant shall provide financial guarantee prior to final approval of plan.
6. SALDO (§289-12.I) Final plans; procedure.
Applicant shall enter into a developer's agreement for Mt. Rose Avenue road and signalization improvements, installation of streetlights, and road widening of MT Rose Avenue.

7. SALDO (§289-13.A) Final plans; specifications.
Applicant shall provide final plans on Mylar as well as an electronic copy.
8. SALDO (§289-15.F.4) Environmental impact studies.
Applicant shall submit a PennDOT HOP for the required for Mt. Rose Ave. improvements.
9. SALDO (§289-29.C) Performance requirements.
Applicant shall provide bonding upon approval of final plan.
10. SALDO (§289-68.E) Fees.
Applicant shall pay all legal, engineering, and administrative fees prior to recording final plan.
Stormwater (§281-11.A.1) Performance guarantee. No subdivision or land development requiring the installation of stormwater management facilities shall be finally approved unless the applicant shall have completed the installation of such facilities as required by this article.
Applicant shall provide a current surety bond prior to final approval of plan.
11. Stormwater (§281-11.A.1) In lieu of completion of the installation of the required stormwater management facilities, the Township shall accept deposit with the Township of financial security in an amount equal to 110% of the cost of such facilities. Reasonable and accurate cost estimate is required.
Applicant shall provide a current surety bond prior to final approval of plan.
12. Stormwater (§281-19.C) Provide a copy of the NPDES permit.
Applicant shall provide a copy of the approved NPDES permit.
13. General Comments. Has the right-of-way for the sanitary sewer relocation been approved?
Please provide copy of signed agreement.
Applicant shall provide a copy of the signed sanitary sewer relocation agreement.

Mr. Good indicated there are two changes to the plan since it was presented as a preliminary plan. One is regarding the parking deck which had three levels of parking with the waterpark situated on top of it. In evaluating costs and other issues on the project, and to improve the aesthetics of the project, the waterpark was moved down to grade level. The parking deck was expanded with more levels to accommodate the required parking for the project. Mr. Good compared the revised drawing with a rendering showing the original design with the waterpark on top of the parking garage.

Mr. Good stated the other change was made to the storm water, noting they were controlling the stormwater in the existing pond which is located in York Township. Because there were so many differences between the two ordinances of the Township with regard to storm water, they have revised the control area of the storm water and are locating it underneath the parking lot with a large infiltration bed. The storm water all flows the same around the site.

Mr. Good noted they have worked through the modifications with the staff. The updated tracking sheet shows no outstanding comments. They worked with First Capital on the new storm water designs.

Discussion was held regarding the following items:

- Lighting plan - It was noted that glass is set back in the center of the roof and the lighting is aimed downward.
- Mr. Good noted that they are analyzing an option to have one of the water tubes coming out of the water park building, which is well within the building setback and will not project into the right of way. This would be an enclosed tube which would be painted the same color of the façade. Not a definite at this point, since cost may be an issue.
- Parking to accommodate all activities on the site. Mr. Good indicated in the current parking plan they have sufficient parking to accommodate all those needs being a concurrent event. He further noted once this plan is approved they have a reverse subdivision plan so there will be more parking on site since the York Township property has a large amount of parking which will be combined with this lot. Breakout of the mandated spaces:
Hotel - 223

Knickers Pub - 64
Ironwoods – 24
Meeting rooms – 349
Golf/Snowtubing – 108
Driving range – 20
Residents – 4
Total required spaces 842 – they are showing 779.

It was noted a variance was obtained from the Zoning Hearing Board for the additional 63 spaces.

- Traffic – Discussion was held regarding the PennDOT improvements anticipated which includes a signal at Plymouth Road with the removal of the light at Chambers Road. Mr. Good indicated the developer’s agreement includes their plan in the event the improvements are not done. Attorney MacNeal explained the terms and conditions of the developer’s agreement.
- Concerns were expressed about public safety with existing on site residual lighting which will be in place until new streetlights are installed at the time of the PennDOT improvements.

Mr. Good stated that Wavier #1 is at the recommendation of Staff due to the two modifications made on the plan as previously noted above.

Attorney Ehrhart indicated the developer’s agreement is not signed but is in final draft form. The last part being discussed is definition of registered guests in regard to water park restriction. They are planning to present it at the Board of Supervisors at the same time as the plan is presented. She noted it is listed as a condition.

MR. SWOMLEY MOVED WITH REFERENCE TO LAND DEVELOPMENT PLAN LD-07-08, HERITAGE HILLS, TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE PRELIMINARY/FINAL PLAN TO THE TOWNSHIP BOARD OF SUPERVISORS WITH THE FOLLOWING WAIVER:

1. SALDO (§289-11.A.) PRELIMINARY PLANS; SPECIFICATIONS - APPLICANT WILL SUBMIT A PRELIMINARY/FINAL PLAN.

SECONDED BY MR. WURSTER. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.

MR. SWOMLEY MOVED WITH REFERENCE TO LAND DEVELOPMENT PLAN LD-07-08, HERITAGE HILLS, TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE PRELIMINARY/FINAL PLAN TO THE TOWNSHIP BOARD OF SUPERVISORS WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

- 1. SALDO (§289-10.A.2.C) PRELIMINARY PLANS; PROCEDURE.
APPLICANT SHALL PROVIDE A COPY OF THE LETTER OF ADEQUACY FROM THE YORK COUNTY CONSERVATION DISTRICT.**
- 2. SALDO (§289-11.C.7) PRELIMINARY PLANS; SPECIFICATIONS.
APPLICANT SHALL PROVIDE A COPY OF THE LETTER OF ADEQUACY FROM THE YORK COUNTY CONSERVATION DISTRICT AND A COPY OF THE APPROVED NPDES PERMIT.**
- 3. SALDO (§289-12.A.2.B) FINAL PLANS; PROCEDURE.
APPLICANT SHALL PROVIDE A COPY OF THE LETTER OF FROM PENNDOT.**
- 4. SALDO (§289-11.B.25) PRELIMINARY PLANS; SPECIFICATIONS.
APPLICANT SHALL SIGN PLANS BEFORE THEY CAN BE RECORDED.**
- 5. SALDO (§289-12.C) FINAL PLANS; PROCEDURE.**

APPLICANT SHALL PROVIDE FINANCIAL GUARANTEE PRIOR TO FINAL APPROVAL OF PLAN.

6. **SALDO (§289-12.I) FINAL PLANS; PROCEDURE.**
APPLICANT SHALL ENTER INTO A DEVELOPER'S AGREEMENT FOR THE MT. ROSE AVENUE ROAD AND SIGNALIZATION IMPROVEMENTS, INSTALLATION OF STREETLIGHTS, AND ROAD WIDENING OF MT. ROSE AVENUE.
7. **SALDO (§289-13.A) FINAL PLANS; SPECIFICATIONS.**
APPLICANT SHALL PROVIDE FINAL PLANS ON MYLAR AS WELL AS AN ELECTRONIC COPY.
8. **SALDO (§289-15.F.4) ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STUDIES.**
APPLICANT SHALL SUBMIT A PENNDOT HOP FOR THE REQUIRED FOR MT. ROSE AVE. IMPROVEMENTS.
9. **SALDO (§289-29.C) PERFORMANCE REQUIREMENTS.**
APPLICANT SHALL PROVIDE BONDING UPON APPROVAL OF FINAL PLAN.
10. **SALDO (§289-68.E) FEES.**
APPLICANT SHALL PAY ALL LEGAL, ENGINEERING, AND ADMINISTRATIVE FEES PRIOR TO RECORDING THE FINAL PLAN.
11. **STORMWATER (§281-11.A.1) PERFORMANCE GUARANTEE. NO SUBDIVISION OR LAND DEVELOPMENT REQUIRING THE INSTALLATION OF STORMWATER MANAGEMENT FACILITIES SHALL BE FINALLY APPROVED UNLESS THE APPLICANT SHALL HAVE COMPLETED THE INSTALLATION OF SUCH FACILITIES AS REQUIRED BY THIS ARTICLE.**
APPLICANT SHALL PROVIDE A CURRENT SURETY BOND PRIOR TO FINAL APPROVAL OF PLAN.
12. **STORMWATER (§281-11.A.1) IN LIEU OF COMPLETION OF THE INSTALLATION OF THE REQUIRED STORMWATER MANAGEMENT FACILITIES, THE TOWNSHIP SHALL ACCEPT DEPOSIT WITH THE TOWNSHIP OF FINANCIAL SECURITY IN AN AMOUNT EQUAL TO 110% OF THE COST OF SUCH FACILITIES. REASONABLE AND ACCURATE COST ESTIMATE IS REQUIRED.**
APPLICANT SHALL PROVIDE A CURRENT SURETY BOND PRIOR TO FINAL APPROVAL OF PLAN.
13. **STORMWATER (§281-19.C) PROVIDE A COPY OF THE NPDES PERMIT.**
APPLICANT SHALL PROVIDE A COPY OF THE APPROVED NPDES PERMIT.
14. **GENERAL COMMENTS. APPLICANT SHALL PROVIDE A COPY OF THE SIGNED SANITARY SEWER RELOCATION AGREEMENT.**

SECONDED BY MR. WURSTER. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.

6. OLD BUSINESS - None

7. NEW BUSINESS

Mr. Luciani stated the Township is in the process of performing testing of a new LED lighting system in the park area that would reduce energy with a new type of LED bulb.

ADJOURNMENT

ACTING CHAIRMAN ROBERTSON ADJOURNED THE MEETING AT 6:50 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Secretary

/ses

APPROVED

**SPRINGETTSBURY TOWNSHIP
PLANNING COMMISSION
MAY 21, 2009**

MEMBERS IN

ATTENDANCE: Alan Maciejewski, Chairman
Mark Robertson
Mark Swomley
Charles Wurster
John Lutz

ALSO IN

ATTENDANCE: Jim Baugh, Director of Community Development
John Luciani, First Capital Engineering
Nicole Ehrhart, Solicitor
Sue Sipe, Stenographer

1. CALL TO ORDER:

A. Pledge of Allegiance

Chairman Maciejewski called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance.

2. ACTION ON THE MINUTES

A. MARCH 19, 2009

MR. WURSTER MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE MEETING MINUTES OF MARCH 19, 2009 AS PRESENTED. MR. LUTZ SECONDED. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED. (MR. ROBERTSON ABSTAINED.)

B. APRIL 16, 2009

MR. ROBERTSON MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE MEETING MINUTES OF APRIL 16, 2009 AS PRESENTED. MR. LUTZ SECONDED. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.

3. BRIEFING ITEMS

A. SP-09-01 – Carter Farm

Eric Johnston

Bill Carter

Mr. Johnston stated that Mr. Carter has approximately 125 acres along Mundis Mill Road which adjoins the Central School and he is reconfiguring his lots for estate planning purposes. Mr. Johnston referred to a drawing which shows the existing 3 houses and the two tracts. Initially Mr. Carter was not planning to build an additional house or subdivide any lots. Mr. Johnston indicated that they have met with Staff several times and discussed the Mundis Mill Road widening improvements. Mr. Carter has approximately 1500 ft. of frontage along Mundis Mill Road. Recently Mr. Carter met with Jeff Shue, the engineer for the Rail Trail in regards to a proposal for widening and connecting the trail which included Mr. Carter providing an easement along Mundis Mill in the vicinity of the existing embankment. He noted there is a steep drop off approximately 25-30 ft. from Mundis Mill Road. The proposal is that Mr.

Carter would provide a pedestrian easement to the Rail Trail along the 1500 ft. frontage so that it would connect at the bridge.

Mr. Johnston indicated they are looking for feedback on their waiver of curb widening and side improvements along the 1500 ft. frontage so that Mr. Carter can provide the easement and the pedestrian link is achieved with the Rail Trail connection.

Mr. Johnston explained that the plans on the second sheet show they are proposing to create a third lot with the additional proposal. The three houses were identified where they exist on the property and are connected with access drives and currently being used as a horse farming operation. Mr. Johnston provided photos to give an idea of the lay of the land and where the sidewalk currently ends at the Central School. He explained the concept of the bridge area showing the existing Mundis Mill Road parkway and the existing cross section of the roadway. He noted their proposal is if they can come to terms with the pedestrians would that be satisfactory, in order to avoid doing curbing and widening along Mundis Mill Road.

Discussion was held regarding the ramifications of the proposal. It was noted that the applicant will need to provide documentation from the Rail Trail Authority with their formal proposal.

B. SD-09-02 Michael & Charlene Harvey

Jason Snyder

Michael Harvey

Mr. Snyder indicated they are seeking comments on the plan. He noted they have been working with the Township Engineer to resolve the outstanding comments.

Discussion was held regarding the following items:

- Roadway widening and curb and sidewalk in the 11th Avenue neighborhood. Mr. Snyder stated there currently is no sidewalk within 1200 ft. of that neighborhood in any direction. The neighborhood is essentially islands surrounded by Sherman Street and Route 30. He indicated there are no drainage improvements on 11th Avenue at this time and widening the street would put the gutter line 3 feet further out potentially causing a ponding situation at the bottom of the hill. Mr. Snyder stated they are looking for support for not installing the curb and the road widening, noting the entire neighborhood has been established for approximately 50 years and has a consistent cartway width.
- Storm drainage - Mr. Snyder stated they are proposing to design an infiltration system that would be acceptable to the Township Engineer. He noted there is no storm sewer to connect to and they can not put an infiltration basin on the property. Mr. Snyder indicated that perc tests revealed a sufficient perc rate.
- Location of monuments. Mr. Snyder indicated they are proposing two monuments since the neighboring properties have obstructions, i.e., fences, trees, and they would not be able to physically set additional monuments. He noted Buchart-Horn surveyed the property. A diagram was presented showing the location of proposed property corners.
- Street Lights - Mr. Snyder indicated they are requesting a waiver of street lights in the neighborhood. The Planning Commission noted in the interest of public safety this would not be supported.
- Steep slopes area – Mr. Snyder noted there is a man made steep slope created when the road was cut in 50 years ago. Then when the water main was extended through, the bank was cut back. Mr. Snyder indicated they are intended to grade in through the slope. A report will be submitted to the Township Engineer.

- Traffic – Mr. Snyder indicated they are proposing not submitting an entire traffic study since if all traffic leaves the development and goes to Route 30 it would amount to a .2% increase in traffic. Discussion was held regarding the sight distance from the driveways. It was decided that the applicant provide a modified waiver for traffic study which would include a trip generation report supplemented with a sight distance at each entrance.

C. SD-05-08 Orchard Hills Phase IV Revised – Mtn. Laurel Lane

Jim Barnes, James Holley & Assocs.
Gary Lefever, Conewago Contractors

This plan is a revision to a previously recorded subdivision plan, SD-05-08, for Orchard Hills, Phase IV. The plan proposes to revise the existing stub street to a cul-de-sac at the southernmost point of Mountain Laurel Lane. This stub street was constructed on the premise that it would be a temporary condition in 2003, however it still exists today. Stub streets are not permitted in accordance with the SALDO.

The cul-de-sac will be incorporated into the previously approved plan under current SALDO requirements and will impact residential lots 96 & 97.

The plan is presented as a Briefing Item and may be moved to Action as a Preliminary Plan. It was received by the Township on April 24, 2009. No zoning variances or waivers are required.

Mr. Barnes noted this is a revised final subdivision plan for two lots to develop a permanent cul-de-sac at the end of Laurel lane. He noted that they are taking land from two lots #96 and #97 and adding it to the public street right of way. There are two small pieces left over from the public right of way that would be joined to the 2 lots.

MR. ROBERTSON MOVED TO RECOMMEND REVISED SUBDIVISION PLAN SD-05-08, ORCHARD HILLS PHASE IV (MOUNTAIN LAUREL LANE) BE MOVED FROM A BRIEFING ITEM TO AN ACTION ITEM. SECONDED BY MR. SWOMLEY. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.

MR. ROBERTSON MOVED WITH REFERENCE TO REVISED SUBDIVISION PLAN SD-05-08, ORCHARD HILLS PHASE IV (MOUNTAIN LAUREL LANE) TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE PRELIMINARY/FINAL PLAN TO THE TOWNSHIP BOARD OF SUPERVISORS. SECONDED BY MR. SWOMLEY. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.

4. ACTION ITEMS

A. SD-09-01 KVM Springettsbury SD

Mike Jeffers, Kinsley Construction

The location of the property is the area north of Pleasant Valley Rd and east of the Metso Minerals Office Bldg. This plan is proposed to subdivide Tax Map parcels KI-12 and KI-43A creating three (3) separate lots. Parcel KI-12 (proposed lot #1), where the office building is being constructed, will be reduced from 17.9 acres to 9 acres. A new parcel will be created east of parcel KI-12 (proposed lot #3) for future development and will be 7.8 acres. The remaining lands will form parcel KI-43A (proposed lot #2) which will consist of 58.3 acres. The plan also does not propose any new construction on the new lots.

The Applicant has requested several waivers mainly related to the construction standards associated with the improvements. They are requesting that they be deferred until land development plans are submitted for development of the parcels.

The plan is presented as an Action Item for the Preliminary Plan. It was received by the Township on February 23, 2009. The Planning Commission was briefed at its regular meeting on March 19, 2009. No zoning variances were required.

The Applicant is requesting a recommendation of Approval from the Planning Commission to the Springettsbury Township Board of Supervisors for the following Waivers:

1. SALDO § 289-10. Preliminary Plans, Procedure.
Applicant is not proposing any new improvements and the subdivision is being done to move property lines. Any required improvements and reports will be required when the property is further developed. Applicant's proposed alternative to the waiver is to provide the necessary items/requirements at the time when a preliminary and/or final plan is submitted for Triplet Springs or when the neighborhood commercial lot is developed.
2. SALDO § 289-11. Preliminary Plans, Specifications.
Applicant is not proposing any new improvements and the subdivision is being done to move property lines. Any required improvements and reports will be required when the property is further developed. Applicant's proposed alternative to the waiver is to provide the necessary items/requirements at the time when a preliminary and/or final plan is submitted for Triplet Springs or when the neighborhood commercial lot is developed.
3. SALDO § 289-13A.23. Landscaping Plans.
Applicant is not proposing any new improvements and the subdivision is being done to move property lines. Any required improvements and reports will be required when the property is further developed. Applicant's proposed alternative to the waiver is to provide the necessary items/requirements at the time when a preliminary and/or final plan is submitted for Triplet Springs or when the neighborhood commercial lot is developed.
4. SALDO §289-21. Traffic Impact Studies.
Applicant requests to provide Traffic Impact Study upon submission of the Triplet Springs Revised LDP which would include traffic counts for all three lots shown on this plan.
5. SALDO §289-27. Streets, -31.A. Curbs and Gutters, -32.A. Sidewalks, -34. Fire Hydrants, -35. Landscaping, -36. Streetlights.
Applicant is not proposing any new improvements and the subdivision is being done to move property lines. Any required improvements and reports will be required when the property is further developed. Applicant's proposed alternative to the waiver is to provide the necessary items/requirements at the time when a preliminary and/or final plan is submitted for Triplet Springs or when the neighborhood commercial lot is developed.

The following Outstanding items may be Conditions of Approval.

1. SALDO (§289-12.C) Guarantee.
Before the recording of the final plan, the BOS shall be assured by means of a proper completion guarantee as provided in 289-38.
2. SALDO (§289-13.A) The final plan shall be drawn in ink on 4] Mylar sheets (sheet size 24 inches by 36 inches) at a scale of either 50 feet to the inch or 100 feet to the inch and shall be submitted electronically in a PDF format. The final plan shall include all specifications shown under §289-11 for a preliminary plan, in addition to the following information:
Applicant shall provide final plans on Mylar as well as PDFs of the final recorded set.
3. SALDO (§289-16) Steep slope impact studies. All plans involving lands that possess slopes exceeding 15% shall require the preparation of a statement by an engineer licensed by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Applicant shall provide steep slope study upon submission of the Land Development Plan.

4. SALDO (§289-17) Wetlands impact study.
Applicant shall provide wetland impact study upon submission of the Land Development Plan.
5. SALDO (§289-20) Archaeological resource impact study.
Applicant shall provide archaeological resource impact study upon submission of the Land Development Plan.
6. SALDO (§289-38.C.4) Bonding for required improvements.
Applicant shall bond or set the eighteen (18) concrete monuments prior to the recording of the final plan.
7. SALDO (§289-76) Fees.
Applicant must pay all engineering, legal, or administrative costs prior to recording of the plan.

Mr. Jeffers stated the intent of the plan is to shrink the lot where they are building the office building, as well as create the lot beside it so it is ready for future use.

Chairman Maciejewski asked if there was anyone in attendance who had an interest in the plan. Hearing none he called for a motion.

MR. SWOMLEY MOVED WITH REFERENCE TO SUBDIVISION PLAN SD-09-01, KVM SPRINGGETTSBURY, TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE PRELIMINARY PLAN TO THE TOWNSHIP BOARD OF SUPERVISORS WITH THE FOLLOWING WAIVERS:

1. SALDO (§289-11.A.) PRELIMINARY PLANS, SPECIFICATIONS
APPLICANT SHALL SUBMIT THE PLAN AS A PRELIMINARY/ FINAL SUBDIVISION PLAN.
2. SALDO (§289-21.) TRAFFIC IMPACT STUDIES.
APPLICANT WILL DEFER PROVIDING A TRAFFIC IMPACT STUDY TO THE LAND DEVELOPMENT PHASE OF THIS PROJECT OR WHEN THE TRIPLET SPRINGS PLAN, SD-07-06, IS APPROVED.
3. SALDO (§289-27.) STREETS AND APRONS
APPLICANT WILL DEFER THE WIDENING ALONG PLEASANT VALLEY ROAD TO THE LAND DEVELOPMENT PHASE OF THE PROJECT.
4. SALDO (§289-31.) CURBS AND GUTTERS.
APPLICANT WILL DEFER THE INSTALLATION OF CURBS AND GUTTERS ALONG PLEASANT VALLEY ROAD TO THE LAND DEVELOPMENT PHASE OF THE PROJECT.
5. SALDO (§289-32.) SIDEWALKS.
APPLICANT WILL DEFER THE INSTALLATION OF SIDEWALKS ALONG PLEASANT VALLEY ROAD TO THE LAND DEVELOPMENT PHASE OF THE PROJECT.
6. SALDO (§289-34.) FIRE HYDRANTS.
APPLICANT WILL DEFER THE INSTALLATION OF A FIRE HYDRANT ALONG PLEASANT VALLEY ROAD TO THE LAND DEVELOPMENT PHASE OF THE PROJECT.
7. SALDO (§289-35.) LANDSCAPE AND BUFFERS YARDS.
APPLICANT WILL DEFER THE INSTALLATION OF LANDSCAPE AND BUFFER YARDS TO THE LAND DEVELOPMENT PHASE OF THE PROJECT OR WHEN THE TRIPLET SPRINGS PLAN, SD-07-06, IS APPROVED.
8. SALDO (§289-36.) STREETLIGHTS.
APPLICANT WILL DEFER THE INSTALLATION OF STREET LIGHTS ALONG PLEASANT VALLEY ROAD TO THE LAND DEVELOPMENT PHASE OF THE PROJECT.

SECONDED BY MR. WURSTER. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.

MR. SWOMLEY MOVED WITH REFERENCE TO SUBDIVISION PLAN SD-09-01, KVM SPRINGGETTSBURY, TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE PRELIMINARY PLAN TO THE TOWNSHIP BOARD OF SUPERVISORS WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

- 1. SALDO (§289-11.B) PRELIMINARY PLAN; SPECIFICATIONS: MYLAR. APPLICANT SHALL PROVIDE FINAL PLANS ON MYLAR MATERIAL AND ALSO PROVIDE A PDF ELECTRONIC COPY OF THE RECORDED PLAN.**
- 2. SALDO (§289-12.C.) FINAL PLANS PROCEDURE: GUARANTEE. BEFORE THE RECORDING OF AN APPROVED FINAL PLAN, THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS SHALL BE ASSURED BY MEANS OF A PROPER COMPLETION GUARANTEE AS PROVIDED IN SALDO(§289-38), PERFORMANCE REQUIREMENTS.**
- 3. SALDO (§289-26) MONUMENTS: APPLICANT SHALL SET OR BOND THE EIGHTEEN (18) CONCRETE MONUMENTS AT THE PROPERTY CORNERS PRIOR TO THE RECORDING OF THE FINAL PLAN.**
- 4. SALDO (§289-68.E) FEES: ALL ENGINEERING, LEGAL, RECREATION OR ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS WILL BE PAID PRIOR TO THE RECORDING OF THE FINAL PLAN.**

SECONDED BY MR. WURSTER. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.

B. LD-07-11 84 Locust Grove Road LD

(Mr. Wurster recused himself from the discussion and motion.)

Tim Bieber, Nutech Design

This land development plan was filed with the Township prior to the adoption of the current ordinances; therefore the previous ordinances will be used. This project is proposing to redevelop an abandoned lot that once housed a parking area and structure to an office building. The building is to be 1496 sf. and one-story with associated parking, landscaping, buffering and road dedication to the Township along Locust Grove Road. Stormwater management is to be installed as underground storage basins below the parking lot.

The plan is presented as an Action Item under the previous ordinances. It was filed with the Township on June 29, 2007 and the Planning Commission was briefed on September 18, 2008.

The Applicant appealed to the Zoning Hearing Board on February 7, 2008 as case Z-08-02, the zoning officer's determination that the existing parking lot was abandoned and can no longer be considered a parking lot. The ZHB placed the decision on hold pending the Applicant and Township submitting legal briefs. Instead Variances were granted at the April 2, 2009 as Case Z-09-03 for the following:

1. ZONING §325-80.N to allow a reduction in a property line crossing the ROW from 40 ft. to 31 ft.
2. ZONING §325-80.X to allow parking in the front yard setback.
3. ZONING §325-91 to allow dumpsters to be located in the front yard setback.
4. ZONING §325-80.Q not to require that a lighting plan be submitted.
5. ZONING §325-80.P not to provide the required 2.0 foot candles pertaining to site lighting.

The Applicant is requesting a recommendation of Approval from the Planning Commission to the Springgettsbury Township Board of Supervisors for the following Waivers:

1. SALDO (§289-11.A) Preliminary plan; specifications.
Applicant proposes to submit a preliminary/final plan.

*****Twp Staff will not support due to a PennDOT HOP being required*****

2. SALDO (§289-11.B) Preliminary plan; specifications-scale of 1-in =50-ft or 1-in =100-ft.

Applicant proposes to provide drawings at a scale of 1-in = 20-ft for clarity.

3. SALDO (§289-15.F) Environmental impact studies-traffic.
Applicant proposes not to provide a traffic impact study due to the number of employees.
4. SALDO (§289-32.I.3 (a)) Proposed street system; minimum of 40-ft from access drive to the street ROW line.
Applicant proposes a driveway entrance that will be 32-ft from the future Right-of-Way line after its dedication is made to the Township.
5. STORMWATER (§281-7.B) Outflow determination; meadow conditions.
Applicant proposes to use predevelopment ground cover conditions, not meadow conditions.

The Applicant is requesting a recommendation of Approval from the Planning Commission to the Springettsbury Township Board of Supervisors for the following Modifications:

1. SALDO (§289-26.C) Landscape and buffer yards; streetscape buffer yard.
Applicant proposes not to install a landscape wall because of sight triangle concerns associated with the Locust Grove & Stoneridge Roads intersection.
2. STORMWATER (§281-7.G) Design criteria; stormwater management facilities, min bottom slope.
Applicant proposes to provide a bottom slope of 0%; not 4% for the sub-surface stormwater management facility.
3. STORMWATER (§281-7.I) Design criteria; stormwater management facilities, min side slope.
Applicant proposes to provide vertical side slopes, not 4H:1V in the sub-surface management facility.

The following Outstanding items may be Conditions of Approval:

1. SALDO (§289-10.A.2.b) Preliminary plan procedures; PennDOT HOP.
Applicant shall obtain a PennDOT HOP for the improvements along Locust Grove Road (SR 2013) to include accessible curb ramps that are in accordance with the latest PennDOT, RC-67M Standards and Strike-Off letters.
2. SALDO (§289-11.B.) Preliminary plan specifications; Mylar material.
Applicant shall submit the final plan on Mylar and a PDF electronic copy of the final recorded plan.
3. SALDO (§289-12.A.2.d) Filing; affected public utilities.
Applicant shall submit copies of the response letters from the public utilities.
4. SALDO (§289-26.) Landscaping and buffer yards.
Applicant shall re-position the RP and SC trees outside of the 15 ft. utility easement (see section 289-39) required for the electric service line for the abutting lot that cuts across the property.
5. SALDO (§289-26.E.3) 18-mo Maintenance Bond.
At the Township's discretion, the applicant may be required to escrow sufficient funds for the maintenance and/or replacement of the proposed vegetation during and 18-month period.
6. SALDO (§289-29.C) Financial security.
Such written guarantee shall be secured to the Township by one of the following forms (of this section) of financial security in an amount of 110% of the cost of the completion of the required improvements as of 90 days following the date scheduled for completion by the developer.
7. SALDO (§289-39) Utility Easement. A minimum 15 ft. utility easement shall be provided for utility lines intended to service abutting lots.

Applicant shall provide a 15 ft. utility easement for electric service line for the abutting lot cutting across property at the southwestern corner.

8. SALDO (§289-68.E) Fees.
All engineering, legal or administrative costs will be paid prior to approval of the final plan.
9. STORMWATER (§281-5.D.1.) All stormwater management controls must be shown on the plan and described in a narrative report. More detail should be included in the report narrative. System dimensions should be added to the plan view on Sheet C-3.
Applicant shall perform another perc test and witnessed by the Township Engineer.
10. GENERAL. Ordinances referenced in the Environmental Impact Report should correspond with the updated 12-15-2005 Zoning & SALDO Ordinance sections.
Applicant shall provide a report on the effects the subsurface infiltration bed will have on the carbonate geologic formations.
11. GENERAL. Depressed curb/sidewalk detail not in accordance with RC-67M standards.
Applicant shall revise drawing to reflect sidewalk installed across driveway with appropriate RC-67M accessible curb ramps.

Mr. Bieber stated in regard to the requested waiver of preliminary plan the HOP is before PennDOT for the widening of Locust Grove Road. At the time that is approved they would represent for final approval.

Chairman Maciejewski asked if there was anyone in attendance who had an interest in the plan. Hearing none he called for a motion.

MR. LUTZ MOVED WITH REFERENCE TO LAND DEVELOPMENT PLAN LD-07-11, 84 LOCUST GROVE ROAD, TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE PRELIMINARY PLAN TO THE TOWNSHIP BOARD OF SUPERVISORS WITH THE FOLLOWING WAIVERS:

1. SALDO (§289-11.B) PRELIMINARY PLAN; SPECIFICATIONS-SCALE OF 1-IN =50-FT OR 1-IN =100-FT. APPLICANT SHALL PROVIDE DRAWINGS AT A SCALE OF 1-IN = 20-FT FOR CLARITY.
2. SALDO (§289-15.F) ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STUDIES-TRAFFIC. APPLICANT WILL NOT PROVIDE A TRAFFIC IMPACT STUDY DUE TO THE NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES BEING LESS THAN 5.
3. SALDO (§289-32.I.3 (A)) PROPOSED STREET SYSTEM; MINIMUM OF 40-FT FROM ACCESS DRIVE TO THE STREET ROW LINE. APPLICANT SHALL INSTALL A DRIVEWAY ENTRANCE THAT WILL BE 32-FT FROM THE FUTURE RIGHT-OF-WAY LINE ONCE DEDICATED TO THE TOWNSHIP.
4. STORMWATER (§281-7.B) OUTFLOW DETERMINATION; COEFFICIENT, C APPLICANT SHALL USE PREDEVELOPMENT GROUND COVER CONDITIONS, NOT MEADOW CONDITIONS.
5. SALDO (§289-26.C) LANDSCAPE AND BUFFER YARDS; STREETSCAPE BUFFER YARD. APPLICANT WILL NOT INSTALL A LANDSCAPE WALL BECAUSE OF SIGHT TRIANGLE CONCERNS ASSOCIATED WITH THE LOCUST GROVE & STONERIDGE ROADS INTERSECTION.
6. STORMWATER (§281-7.G) DESIGN CRITERIA; STORMWATER MANAGEMENT FACILITIES, MIN BOTTOM SLOPE. APPLICANT SHALL PROVIDE A BOTTOM SLOPE OF 0%; NOT 4% FOR THE SUB-SURFACE STORMWATER MANAGEMENT FACILITY BECAUSE OF THE USE OF UNDERGROUND STORAGE CONTAINERS.
7. STORMWATER (§281-7.I) DESIGN CRITERIA; STORMWATER MANAGEMENT FACILITIES, MIN SIDE SLOPE. APPLICANT SHALL PROVIDE VERTICAL SIDE SLOPES, NOT 4H: 1V IN THE SUB-SURFACE MANAGEMENT FACILITY BECAUSE OF THE USE OF UNDERGROUND STORAGE CONTAINERS.

SECONDED BY MR. ROBERTSON. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.

MR. LUTZ MOVED WITH REFERENCE TO LAND DEVELOPMENT PLAN LD-07-11, 84 LOCUST GROVE ROAD, TO DENY WAIVER FOR SALDO (§289-11.A) PRELIMINARY PLAN SPECIFICATIONS.

SECONDED BY MR. ROBERTSON. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.

MR. LUTZ MOVED WITH REFERENCE TO LAND DEVELOPMENT PLAN LD-07-11, 84 LOCUST GROVE ROAD, TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE PRELIMINARY PLAN TO THE TOWNSHIP BOARD OF SUPERVISORS WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

- 1. SALDO (§289-10.A.2.B) PRELIMINARY PLAN PROCEDURES; PENNDOT HOP. APPLICANT SHALL OBTAIN A PENNDOT HOP FOR THE IMPROVEMENTS ALONG LOCUST GROVE ROAD (SR 2013) TO INCLUDE ACCESSIBLE CURB RAMPS THAT ARE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE LATEST PENNDOT RC-67M STANDARDS AND STRIKE-OFF LETTERS.**
- 2. SALDO (§289-11.B.) PRELIMINARY PLAN SPECIFICATIONS; MYLAR MATERIAL. APPLICANT SHALL SUBMIT THE FINAL PLAN ON MYLAR AND A PDF ELECTRONIC COPY OF THE FINAL RECORDED PLAN.**
- 3. SALDO (§289-12.A.2.D) FILING; AFFECTED PUBLIC UTILITIES. APPLICANT SHALL SUBMIT COPIES OF THE RESPONSE LETTERS FROM THE PUBLIC UTILITIES.**
- 4. SALDO (§289-26.) LANDSCAPING AND BUFFER YARDS. APPLICANT SHALL:
 - 1. RE-POSITION THE TREES OUTSIDE OF THE 15- FT. UTILITY EASEMENT (SEE SALDO § 289-39) REQUIRED FOR THE ELECTRIC SERVICE LINE FOR THE ABUTTING LOT THAT CUTS ACROSS THE PROPERTY.**
 - 2. BE REQUIRED TO ESCROW SUFFICIENT FUNDS FOR THE MAINTENANCE AND/OR REPLACEMENT OF THE PROPOSED VEGETATION DURING AND 18-MONTH PERIOD.****
- 5. SALDO (§289-29.C) PERFORMANCE REQUIREMENTS; FINANCIAL SECURITY. BEFORE THE RECORDING OF AN APPROVED FINAL PLAN, THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS SHALL BE ASSURED BY MEANS OF A PROPER COMPLETION GUARANTEE AS PROVIDED IN THIS SECTION.**
- 6. SALDO (§289-39) UTILITY EASEMENT. A MINIMUM 15 FT. UTILITY EASEMENT SHALL BE PROVIDED FOR UTILITY LINES INTENDED TO SERVICE ABUTTING LOTS. APPLICANT SHALL PROVIDE A 15 FT. UTILITY EASEMENT FOR ELECTRIC SERVICE LINE FOR THE ABUTTING LOT AT THE SOUTHWESTERN CORNER.**
- 7. SALDO (§289-68.E) FEES. ALL ENGINEERING, LEGAL OR ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS WILL BE PAID PRIOR TO RECORDING OF THE FINAL APPROVED PLAN.**
- 8. STORMWATER (§281-5.D.1.) PLAN AND REPORT REQUIREMENTS; PERCOLATION TESTING. APPLICANT SHALL PERFORM ANOTHER PERCOLATION TEST THAT WILL BE WITNESSED BY THE TOWNSHIP ENGINEER.**
- 9. GENERAL.
 - 1. APPLICANT SHALL PROVIDE A REPORT ON THE EFFECTS THE SUBSURFACE INFILTRATION BED WILL HAVE ON THE CARBONATE GEOLOGIC FORMATIONS.**
 - 2. APPLICANT SHALL REVISE DRAWING TO REFLECT SIDEWALK INSTALLED ACROSS DRIVEWAY WITH APPROPRIATE RC-67M ACCESSIBLE CURB RAMPS.****

MR. ROBERTSON SECONDED. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.

5. OLD BUSINESS - None

6. NEW BUSINESS

Township Solicitor Ehrhart passed out the revisions to the flood plan ordinance which must be adopted by the Township before August for flood plain insurance. She noted the model ordinance was followed from FEMA in order to impose the new regulations and add them to the Ordinance. The revised Ordinance

was submitted to the State for their review and comment. Att. Ehrhart noted they are now submitting it to both the Springettsbury Planning Commission as well as the York County Planning Commission for review and recommendation. This will then be presented at the Board of Supervisors public hearing on June 25.

It was noted that since the Township Engineer has already reviewed the flood plain maps and submitted his professional opinion that the decision could be made for adoption.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY MR. ROBERTSON TO RECOMMEND TO THE TOWNSHIP BOARD OF SUPERVISORS ADOPTION AND APPROVAL OF THE SPRINGETTSBURY TOWNSHIP ZONING FLOOD PLAIN ORDINANCE AMENDMENT. SECONDED BY SWOMLEY. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.

Mr. Jim Baugh was welcomed as the new Zoning Officer.

7. ADJOURNMENT

Chairman Maciejewski adjourned the meeting at 7:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Secretary

/ses

APPROVED

**SPRINGETTSBURY TOWNSHIP
PLANNING COMMISSION
APRIL 16, 2009**

MEMBERS IN

ATTENDANCE: Alan Maciejewski, Chairman
Mark Robertson
Mark Swomley
Charles Wurster
John Lutz

ALSO IN

ATTENDANCE: Harish Rao, Director of Community Development
John Holman, Township Manager
John Luciani, First Capital Engineering
Angela Liddick, Community Development Coordinator
Nicole Ehrhart, Solicitor
Sue Sipe, Stenographer

1. CALL TO ORDER:

A. Pledge of Allegiance

Chairman Maciejewski called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance.

2. ACTION ON THE MINUTES

A. MARCH 19, 2009

It was noted that approval of the March 19 minutes will be held until the May meeting.

3. BRIEFING ITEMS - None

4. ACTION ITEMS - None

5. WAIVERS RECOMMENDATIONS - None

6. OLD BUSINESS

A. Mr. Rao indicated the Pennsylvania Financial Disclosure Forms need to be returned to him by May 1st.

7. NEW BUSINESS

A. Mr. Rao indicated that the next Town Center Steering Committee Meeting will be held on Wednesday, April 22, 2009 at 6:00 PM to be held in the Springettsbury Conference Room. The meeting will be chaired by Mr. Maciejewski.

B. Video – “Public Official Liability”

C. Training Session with Matt Montgomery, First Capital Engineering

Mr. Montgomery explained the following process for the engineering plan review:

The first audit is for the Zoning Ordinance, Home Owner Ordinance and construction and materials specifications.

Contact is maintained with the design engineers throughout the process fielding questions or interpretations of project accomplishment.

The first step to successful planning is a general overview to read through plans and check for errors. If it is the first submission a site visit is made to ensure the plan accurately reflects what is in the field. If it is not the first submission, a review is conducted of previous submissions, developers meeting notes, tracking sheets and comp letters.

Review of the zoning Ordinance includes building setbacks, plan requirements, lot coverage, lot size and lot frontage.

Lots located in the flood plain carry stricter regulations than those that are not in the flood plan. The purpose is to help reduce flood damage and also minimize any public damage and costs.

The purpose of reviewing the steep slope overlay is to help maintain and preserve the natural conditions and evaluate the stability of the soil, which helps reduce erosion and results in facilitation of streams and avoidance of deterioration of public property.

A close look is given to parking. The design engineer must balance the lot between the building size, the required parking and also the landscape and buffer areas. There are also supplemental regulations, such as accessory use allowances that vary from project to project. Zoning issues are addressed by either developer revisions or variance requests sent to the Zoning Hearing Board.

The SALDO review takes a look at the different plan review requirements. Each stage of the plan review carries different information and documentation that is required to be shown and submitted. The first step is to identify plan type, i.e., subdivision vs. land development plan, sketch, and preliminary or preliminary/final plan.

With most submissions environmental impact studies are required, which address wetlands, traffic impacts, and historic sites. Improvement specifications deal with items such as curbs, gutters, monuments, storm sewers, and landscaping.

SALDO contains various design standards for construction which includes items such as street dimensions and access drive requirements. Landscaping separates developments from different zoning districts as well as the public eye.

Bonding – all developers are required to submit 2 different types of bonds - a performance bond and a maintenance bond. Performance bond requires the developer to bond all required improvements to plan codes, including streets, walkways, curbs, gutters, street lights, fire hydrants, shade trees, storm sewers and sanitary sewers.

Storm water ordinance is reviewed. It is important to look pre and post development conditions and attempt to recreate the model that the designers developed. Most of the requirements in this ordinance are based on the relationship between the pre and post development flow. The Ordinance calls for 50% reduction in the post development flow for the 25, 50 and 100 year storms. This means that any increase in runoff due to the development of the 25, 50 and 100 year storms, prior to any additional detention/retention needs to be reduced by 50%. On top of the reduction requirements are specific water quality conditions which are best manager practices. It is also important to analyze every aspect of the storm water management system, including basins, sewage outlook structures, pipe slopes, pipe flows, coverage and inlets.

Springettsbury Township has its own set of construction material specifications which help control faulty construction and assure for quality of its product. Construction material specifications include guidance for different construction procedures as well as standard details for products which can be satisfied. It is

important to review the trends against these specifications to insure that all the processes and products that are specified are in compliance with these ordinances and township standards. For most projects it is important to coordinate with outside agencies. The conservation district will always review erosion and sedimentation control by NPDES permit applications. Whenever a state road is involved, PennDOT is also involved. Other agencies include York Area United Fire and Rescue, Township code officials and the police department.

The following questions were discussed:

Coordination with the York County Planning Commission specifically as it relates to comments for traffic review.

Misunderstandings between developers as to what occurred at staff meeting and what they were expecting when they present to the Zoning Hearing Board. The process was explained from the time the developer submits the plans to the township and the staff. The developer is given a tracking sheet which has three options for each specific comment – resolved, outstanding or waiver.

The general rule for outstanding comments is the applicant is allowed five, however, they can only be minor issues, such as signatures, Mylar or bonding, in order for the plan to be submitted to the Board of Supervisors.

It was noted that Tuesday staff meetings are held the week prior to the Planning Commission meeting. Plans the Planning Commission receives are the submissions that were received at the Tuesday meeting. The tracking sheets may be updated since that past Tuesday meeting. So the confusion comes in – sometimes the developer will put a plan up there that has been revised since that last submission. Decisions are not to be based off the displayed plan because First Capital has not reviewed that revised plan. They have updated the tracking sheets. Minutes are not taken at the Tuesday Staff meetings. The developer is advised on the sign in sheet - these are informal there are no minutes taken – no decisions made. The developer is made aware the plans for the Planning Commission submitted prior to that meeting is what the Planning Commission will review and what is presented at the meeting. The comments are based on the briefing summary. That is why there may be a discrepancy because the brief may look different than the plan. If it is not reflected on the brief or the tracking sheet nothing was agreed to.

The final decision on a plan is made by the Planning Commission.

A question was raised on the meeting announcements. Mr. Holman confirmed the newspaper announcement and the agenda is posted a week prior to the meeting and that all legal obligations are met for advertising.

Discussion was held regarding the use of escrows that the developer must pay upfront for the cost of the Township Engineer and the Township Solicitor reviews. This does not apply to the Zoning Hearing Board – there are no escrows for zoning. The developer pays a filing fee when they apply. The engineer and solicitor bill their time directly to the developer.

A question was raised regarding making sure that the developer's plan that is shown on the screen at the meeting is not a different plan. It was noted the developer is required to submit their file one day in advance of the meeting. Mr. Rao noted they review it at that time. He advised to check the date on the plan vs. the date the applicant is using. What is put on the screen should agree with what is on the brief and tracking sheet. If it does not match up then it can be assumed that Staff has not discussed or agreed to anything that is shown on the screen. It was reiterated that the tracking sheet and briefing summary reflect staff discussion of the plan and revision. It does not address any revised plan.

It was confirmed that any changes to the agenda or the meeting will be communicated to the Planning Commission members by email.

ADJOURNMENT

CHAIRMAN MACIEJEWSKI ADJOURNED THE MEETING AT 7:20 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Secretary

/ses

APPROVED

**SPRINGETTSBURY TOWNSHIP
PLANNING COMMISSION
MARCH 19, 2009**

MEMBERS IN

ATTENDANCE: Alan Maciejewski, Chairman
Charles Wurster
John Lutz

ALSO IN

ATTENDANCE: Harish Rao, Director of Community Development
John Luciani, First Capital Engineering
Angela Liddick, Community Development Coordinator
Nicole Ehrhart, Solicitor
Sue Sipe, Stenographer

NOT PRESENT: Mark Robertson
Mark Swomley

1. CALL TO ORDER:

A. Pledge of Allegiance

Chairman Maciejewski called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance.

2. ACTION ON THE MINUTES

A. FEBRUARY 19, 2009

MR. WURSTER MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE MEETING MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 19, 2009 AS PRESENTED. MR. LUTZ SECONDED. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.

3. WAIVER RECOMMENDATIONS – None

4. BRIEFING ITEMS

A. SD-09-01 – KVM Springettsbury SD

Mike Jeffers, Kinsley

Mr. Jeffers indicated the purpose of the plan is to readjust the property line for the Metzco office building project.

Mr. Jeffers pointed out the property line as it current exists on the drawing. He noted the change in the boundary line affects two different zones in the R-10 and Commercial zones. They will be requesting several waivers due to the fact they are not proposing any construction for preliminary plan procedures, landscaping plan and environmental impact study.

They received comments from First Capital Engineering and will address them prior to re-presenting.

Discussion was held regarding the following:

- How the readjusted property line will affect Triplett Springs.
-
- The layout of the property in accordance with traffic issues.

- A note will be added to the plan in regards to a cross access easement with Lot #2.

It was clarified that although the property line will disappear, the zoning line will remain the same.

5. ACTION ITEMS

A. LD-09-01 Chipotle Mexican Grill

Tiffany Clapper

Ken Hornbeck

This plan is proposing a new 2200-sf Chipotle Mexican Grill restaurant on Parcel C at the York Town Center Shopping Center. The restaurant will have a cooking area and a dining area. A total of 27-parking spaces, 2-handicap spaces and 2-motorcycle spaces will be provided along with some landscaping and on-site interior lighting.

This plan is presented as an Action item for Preliminary / Final Plan. The plan was initially submitted to the Township on January 26, 2009. It was before the Planning Commission as a Briefing item at the February 19, 2009 meeting.

The Zoning Hearing Board granted 3-variances and 1- special exception to the property owner, York Town Center as Case Z-05-05 on April 7, 2005 to allow:

- Variance from §1901.5, parking facilities required by land use, commercial, public, institutional, industrial,
- Variance from §1903.19 landscaping islands installed at every 10 contiguous spaces, with the condition that the landscaping on the site not be allowed to be less than if the full number of landscape islands were installed,
- Temporary variance from §1706.12.g. Landscape strips installed along common lot lines.
- Special exception pursuant to §1903.3 to permit parking spaces on a lot other than that containing the principal use, with the condition that prior to occupancy of the buildings the consolidation of the lots is completed.

The Applicant is requesting a recommendation of Approval from the Planning Commission to the Springettsbury Township Board of Supervisors for the following Waiver(s):

1. *SALDO (§289-15) Environmental impact study.*
Applicant proposes to use the Environmental Impact Study that was done as a part of the overall York Town Center Land Development Plan in 2005.
2. *SALDO §289-16) Steep slope impact study.*
Applicant proposes to use the Steep Slope Impact Study that was done as a part of the overall York Town Center Land Development Plan in 2005.
3. *SALDO (§289-17) Wetlands impact study.*
Applicant proposes to use the Wetlands Impact Study that was done as a part of the overall York Town Center Land Development Plan in 2005.
4. *SALDO (§289-18) Hydrological impact study.*
Applicant proposes to use the Hydrologic Impact Study that was done as a part of the overall York Town Center Land Development Plan in 2005.
5. *SALDO (§289-19) Historic resource impact study.*
Applicant proposes to use the Historic Resource Impact Study that was done as a part of the overall York Town Center Land Development Plan in 2005.

6. *SALDO (§289-20) Archeological resource impact study.*
Applicant proposes to use the Archeological Resource Impact Study that was done as a part of the overall York Town Center Land Development Plan in 2005.
7. *SALDO (§289-21) Traffic Impact Study.*
Applicant proposes to use the Traffic Impact Study that was done as a part of the overall York Town Center Land Development Plan in 2005.
8. *SALDO (§289-22) Public facilities and services impact study.*
Applicant proposes to use the Public Facilities and Services Impact Study that was done as a part of the overall York Town Center Land Development Plan in 2005.
9. *SALDO (§289-23) Environmental condition assessment.*
Applicant proposes to use the Environmental Condition Assessment that was done as a part of the overall York Town Center Land Development Plan in 2005.
10. *SALDO (§289-24) Feasibility report on sewer and water facilities.*
Applicant proposes to use the Feasibility Report that was done as a part of the overall York Town Center Land Development Plan in 2005.

The following Outstanding items may be Conditions of Approval.

1. *ZONING (§325-116.U)* In addition to the off-street parking space required above, any building erected, converted or enlarged for any nonresidential use shall provide adequate off-street areas for loading and unloading of vehicles. The minimum size loading space shall be 50-ft in depth, 12-ft in width, with an overhead clearance of 14 feet. Applicant shall label loading zone on sheet C2.0.
2. *ZONING (§325-120.D)* Each site shall be screened with a six-foot masonry, wood stockade fence or basket weave fence. Other types of fencing may be permitted as approved by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors. Landscaping with shrubbery and trees is encouraged for all dumpster screening and may be required if materials other than those listed above are used. Note #6 on Sheet C1.0 references the Architectural Plan for dumpster fencing detail but there is no detail shown on the Architectural Plan. Applicant shall revise fencing detail for dumpster screen as it exceeds six-foot maximum height requirement or request a variance.
3. *SALDO (§289-76)* All engineering, legal or administrative costs will be paid prior to approval of the final plan. Applicant shall pay all fees prior to approval of plan.
4. *SALDO (§289-13.A)* The final plan shall be drawn in ink on Mylar sheets (sheet size 24 inches by 36 inches) at a scale of either 50 feet to the inch or 100 feet to the inch and shall be submitted electronically in a PDF format. Applicant shall provide final plan on Mylar.
5. *SALDO (§289-38.C)* Such financial security shall be secured to the Township within 90 days of conditional approval of final plan. The amount of financial security to be posted for the completion of the required improvement shall be equal to 110% of the cost of completion estimated as of 90 days following the date scheduled for completion by the developer. Applicant shall provide financial security.
6. All references in the General Site Notes to the requirements of York County shall be revised to read the requirements of the Springettsbury Township Construction and Materials Specifications. Applicant shall revise Water Construction note.
7. Provide size and detail of proposed grease trap. Applicant shall provide detail for grease trap to include more dimensions, capacity, and manufacturer.

Ms. Clapper indicated they have addressed the comments from First Capital and resubmitted the plans. She noted the existing conditions of the site and the site plan have remained the same.

Discussion was held regarding traffic movement and pedestrian movement in the vicinity of the proposed restaurant, as it related to the installation of stop bars and a crosswalk at the intersection.

Mr. Hornbeck stated they will commit to making a 3 way stop at the intersection with stop bars approaching from Concord Road. There will also be a stop bar as cars exit Chipotle and another stop bar across the front of the adjacent shops. A cross walk will be aligned in front of the stop bar at the intersection. This will be monitored and re-evaluated if necessary.

It was noted that since this is not reflected on the present plan it would be recommended as a condition of approval.

Chairman Maciejewski asked if there was anyone in attendance who had an interest in the plan. Hearing none, he called for a motion.

MR. WURSTER MOVED WITH REFERENCE TO LAND DEVELOPMENT PLAN LD-09-01 CHIPOTLE MEXICAN GRILL TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE PRELIMINARY/FINAL PLAN TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS WITH THE WAIVERS LISTED ON PAGE 3 OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION PLAN SUMMARY DATED MARCH 19, 2009. SECONDED BY MR. LUTZ. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.

MR. WURSTER MOVED WITH REFERENCE TO LAND DEVELOPMENT PLAN LD-09-01 CHIPOTLE MEXICAN GRILL TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE PRELIMINARY/FINAL PLAN TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS WITH THE CONDITIONS 1 –8, LISTED ON PAGE 4 OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION PLAN SUMMARY DATED MARCH 19, 2009, AS WELL AS THE CONDITION THAT A CROSSWALK BE INSTALLED ON THE NORTHEAST SIDE OF THE INTERSECTION IN CONJUNCTION WITH A THREE-WAY STOP, DEFINED BY STOP SIGNS AND STOP BARS. SECONDED BY MR. LUTZ. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.

7. OLD BUSINESS – None

8. NEW BUSINESS- None

ADJOURNMENT

CHAIRMAN MACIEJEWSKI ADJOURNED THE MEETING AT 6:30 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Secretary

/ses

APPROVED

**SPRINGETTSBURY TOWNSHIP
PLANNING COMMISSION
FEBRUARY 19, 2009**

MEMBERS IN

ATTENDANCE: Alan Maciejewski, Chairman
Mark Robertson, Vice Chairman
Mark Swomley
Charles Wurster
John Lutz

ALSO IN

ATTENDANCE: Harish Rao, Director of Community Development
John Luciani, First Capital Engineering
Angela Liddick, Community Development Coordinator
Nicole Ehrhart, Solicitor
Sue Sipe, Stenographer

1. CALL TO ORDER:

A. Pledge of Allegiance

Vice Chairman Robertson called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance.

2. ACTION ON THE MINUTES

A. JANUARY 15, 2009

MR. LUTZ MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE MEETING MINUTES OF JANUARY 15, 2009 AS PRESENTED. MR. WURSTER SECONDED. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.

3. WAIVER RECOMMENDATIONS

A. LD-05-18 Market Street Commons Add-On Lots

Jerry Stahlman

Mr. Stahlman stated this is a continuation of the waiver requests presented at the January meeting. He noted at that time the waiver request for requirement of a traffic study was tabled. He reiterated the reasoning for the request as related to the trip generation report for the add on lots in lieu of the traffic study, as outlined in the minutes of January 15, 2009.

Mr. Stahlman provided copies of the updated trip generation report, which included a letter from the ELA group who produced the updated report. He reviewed the details of the report comparing the current trip generation summary for 2009 with the trip generation from 2006. Mr. Stahlman pointed out that the current traffic volume is actually less than it was in 2006. His client is requesting the Board to accept this updated traffic report in lieu of providing a complete traffic study.

Mr. Pasch discussed the option of building a cul-de-sac in the vicinity of Hoss's as a way to alleviate traffic on Market Street.

Discussion was held regarding possible options for addressing the intersection.

MR. MACIEJEWSKI MOVED WITH REGARD TO SALDO (§289-15.F) THAT THE REQUIREMENT FOR TRAFFIC STUDY NEEDS TO BE SUBMITTED FOR THE LAND DEVELOPMENT AND THEREFORE, THE WAIVER REQUEST IS DENIED. MR. LUTZ SECONDED. MOTION FAILED (4 NAYS).

MR. WURSTER MOVED WITH REGARD TO SALDO (§289-15.F) REQUIREMENT FOR TRAFFIC STUDY TO BE SUBMITTED FOR THE LAND DEVELOPMENT - THE APPLICANT PROPOSES NOT TO PROVIDE A TRAFFIC STUDY. SECONDED BY MR. SWOMLEY. MOTION CARRIED (1 OPPOSED).

Discussion was held regarding the second waiver request submitted. Mr. Stahlman stated this waiver request involves the section in the Ordinance regarding flood plain water levels on the proposed development. He noted on Hoss's part of this road the FEMA map shows the 100-year flood plain, which was associated with the box culvert. According to DEP the length of the box culvert had to be limited and the amount of excavation involved adjacent to be minimized. This was accomplished by the applicant with the result that the permit was granted and a copy was provided to the Township. The FEMA map shows Market Street in a 100-year floodplain.

MR. SWOMLEY MOVED WITH REGARD TO SALDO §289-64.D - REQUIREMENT TO HAVE ALL FINISHED STREETS NOT TO BE MORE THAN ONE FOOT BELOW THE REGULATORY FLOOD ELEVATION, TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE WAIVER REQUEST. SECONDED BY MR. WURSTER. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.

4. BRIEFING ITEMS

A. LD-09-01 – Chipotle Mexican Grill Restaurant

Tiffany Clapper , Project Architect

Ms. Clapper indicated that Chipotle is a fast, casual restaurant proposing to develop at pad site C at 2801 Concord Road. Currently the pad site is under development and there is curbing and storm drains, in filled with grass. Mr. Clapper presented the proposed site plan, which showed a building 2200 sq. ft. with an outside patio for exterior seating. They will develop parking with landscaping. The dumpster pad will be screened with masonry split faced in colors that match the building. Ms. Clapper presented a depiction of the building, which is efface and a standard prototype. Seating capacity in the interior is 44, with 26 exterior seats.

Ms. Clapper indicated the outdoor patio would have railing installed around the seating, with umbrellas and outdoor heaters in the colder season. The patio furniture is moveable and the railing would enclose the entire patio. No alcohol is served inside or out. The outdoor patio is the same elevation as the main entrance. Lighting will be in conformance with the remainder of the mall. Hours of operation are 11 am to 10 pm, seven days a week.

Traffic flow was discussed. Mr. Hornbeck indicated they are working through traffic scenarios to determine the optimal conditions for traffic flow.

Mr. Andrew Gailey, Construction Manager for Chipotle indicated that this restaurant has been in existence for 5 years and has grown to 800 restaurants throughout the country.

5. ACTION ITEMS

A. LD-08-09 Yorkshire Elementary School

Casey Deller, C.S. Davidson

This plan is being proposed for the construction of a new elementary school to replace the existing, outdated Yorkshire Elementary School. The school property is located on two separate parcels in the R-7, Residential Zoning District and the other in the N-C, Neighborhood-Commercial Zoning District. A recently approved subdivision plan (SD-08-08) consolidated both parcels into one and eliminated portions of Third Ave and Maywood that were never dedicated to the Township.

The school and ball fields will be flip-flopped from their present locations. The building will be constructed of two-stories totaling just under 60,000-s.f and will house a gym, cafeteria, library and 22 classrooms (comprised of regular classrooms, special education classrooms, computer classrooms, art and music classrooms) and 9 small group instruction spaces. The building is intended to house up to 350 Kindergarten through Second Graders (K thru 2). There are 85 parking spaces of which 5 are handicap accessible. A bus loop and a service drive to the building storage and kitchen area will be provided.

The plan is presented as an Action Item for the Preliminary Plan. It was received by the Township on June 23, 2008. The Planning Commission was briefed on September 18, 2008. At the December 18, 2008 Planning Commission meeting, only 3 of 4 requested waivers were recommended for approval to the Springettsbury Township Board of Supervisors.

The Applicant has requested the following Waivers for this plan.

1. Waiver of SALDO (§289-11.A.) Preliminary Plan specifications-preliminary v. final.
2. Waiver of SALDO (§289- 41.B) Proposed street system-Max Number of Access Drives 2 per street
3. Waiver of STORMWATER (§281-7.A.2) Design criteria-runoff coefficient, C.
4. Waiver of STORMWATER (§281-7.A.7) Minimum bottom slope design
5. Waiver of SALDO (§289-32) Sidewalks.

Planning Commission Action- December 18, 2008

The following Waivers were recommended for approval to the Township Board of Supervisors:

1. Waiver of SALDO (§289- 41.B) Proposed street system-Max Number of Access Drives 2 per street. Applicant shall provide 3-access driveways (2-bus + 1-automobile) per street.
2. Waiver of STORMWATER (§281-7.A.2) Design criteria-runoff coefficient, C. Applicant shall use actual or existing conditions, instead of the required meadow conditions for the stormwater runoff variable, C.
3. Waiver of STORMWATER (§281-7.A.7) Minimum bottom slope design. Applicant shall use a 1% bottom slope, instead of the required 4%.

The following Waiver was tabled:

1. Waiver of SALDO (§289-11.A.) Preliminary Plan specifications-preliminary v. final.

Mr. Deller indicated they were requested to add to the plan notes clarifying the construction details. He noted the plan is the same as what was previously submitted. They are requesting several additional waivers as a result of the plan review process and are asking for a conditional plan approval.

Mr. Luciani indicated they have worked out the stormwater plans.

Mr. Deller reviewed the waiver requests.

Mr. Deller stated that the first waiver is for proposed street system, property line radius of 50 feet. He noted that there is an access off Maywood Road that goes into the school to the existing parking lot and the driveway. The street ends there. They have added a cul-de-sac at the end of Maywood Road to the plan. Rather than being directly on the end of the road it was offset on the other side of the property so that the cul-de-sac remains entirely on their property. The waiver is regarding right of way around the cul-de-sac. The Ordinance requires a 50 ft. right of way. They are requesting a modification for the distance down to 41 ft. due to having a 40 ft. cul-de-sac with 40 ft. radius. The 41 feet would allow the curb and everything behind to be included with the right of way. The reduction in right of way will also lend itself to dealing with winter maintenance of the cul-de-sac, which will be provided by the school.

Mr. Deller noted the next waiver request is regarding sidewalk. The Ordinance requires sidewalk to be placed on both sides of the street around the cul-de-sac. They are proposing in lieu of putting sidewalk around the end of the cul-de-sac, to build sidewalk down their side of Maywood Road into their site. The sidewalk would come across the landscape island and become a cross walk through the parking area and tie into their internal sidewalk system. This would provide the connectivity for pedestrians as required by the comp plan. They are also proposing to add a 6-month note on the plan for sidewalk the entire way around the cul-de-sac.

The last waiver request is in regard to plan sheet size. They are requesting a waiver for a sheet size of 30 by 42.in order for it to be visible.

Mr. Luciani indicated that he was satisfied with the waiver requests.

Mr. Deller stated they are requesting the waiver of the preliminary plan requirement in order to meet the construction completion time to ensure the building will be open for students in late summer of 2010. In an effort to address comments and conditions from the last meeting, they have completed the construction cost estimates and will have financial security in place. They have also completed the developer's agreement, which has been executed by the school and was submitted to the Township. Mr. Deller noted they have done all of the items that would be required moving through the final plan stage.

Mr. Deller reviewed the conditions.

Vice Chairman Robertson asked if there was anyone in attendance who had an interest in the plan. Hearing none he called for a motion.

MR. LUTZ MOVED WITH REFERENCE TO LAND DEVELOPMENT PLAN LD-08-09, YORKSHIRE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL, TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE PRELIMINARY PLAN TO THE TOWNSHIP BOARD OF SUPERVISORS WITH WAIVERS 1 – 4 AS NOTED ON PAGE 2 OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE PLAN SUMMARY REVISED FEBRUARY 19, 2009. SECONDED BY MR. WURSTER. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.

MR. LUTZ MOVED WITH REFERENCE TO LAND DEVELOPMENT PLAN LD-08-09, YORKSHIRE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL, TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE PRELIMINARY PLAN TO THE TOWNSHIP BOARD OF SUPERVISORS WITH CONDITIONS 1 – 11 AS NOTED ON PAGES 2 AND 3 OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION PLAN SUMMARY DATED FEB. 19 2009. SECONDED BY SWOMLEY. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.

B. LD-08-12 Yale Electric Supply Center

Casey Deller, C.S. Davidson

This plan is proposing a new commercial facility to sell and supply wholesale electrical items to mostly local contractors. The proposed building will be approximately 20,000-sf and will include storage, office and retail space. The 6.5-acre parcel is configured with a panhandle and is unique due to its on-site constraints of sanitary sewer easements, meandering unnamed tributary, stormwater easements and approximately 917 feet of road

frontage along Industrial Highway & 64 feet of road frontage along Memory Lane. 35-parking spaces are proposed to be constructed along with 15 additional spaces that will be required at a later date.

Included are required approvals for: PennDOT HOP, PaDEP/ USACOE joint permits for stream crossing and YCCD E&S /NPDES.

The plan is presented as an Action Item for the Preliminary Plan. It was received by the Township on August 25, 2008. The Planning Commission was briefed at their regular meeting on September 18, 2008. Waivers were considered at the October 16, 2008 meeting but were not acted upon. No zoning variances were required.

The Applicant has requested the following Waivers:

1. SALDO (§289-31.) Curbs and gutters.
2. SALDO (§289-32.) Sidewalks.
3. SALDO (§289-35.) Landscape and buffer yards.

The following outstanding items may be Conditions:

1. ZONING (§325-43.C.) Coverage. Not less than 15% of the lot shall be landscaped with a vegetative material. This landscaping shall include shrubs, ornamental trees and shade trees to be placed to enhance the appearance of the building and parking area.
Applicant shall demonstrate on the plans how they are meeting the requirements of this section.
2. ZONING (§325-115.B.1) An agreement on a form furnished by the Township shall be submitted setting forth the proposed initial parking.
Applicant shall provide an agreement form for the proposed initial parking.
3. ZONING (§325-115.B.2) Land developer shall include language on the plan to indicate the existence of this agreement.
Applicant shall provide language indicating existence of initial parking agreement on cover sheet.
4. ZONING (§325-115.B.4) The residual (one minus intensity factor) parking must be shown on the plan as a note that shall be binding on all heirs, owners, successors in title, etc., as a recordable instrument, indication that upon six-month notice the owner shall complete the full amount of parking as shown in the recorded layout of the land development plan.
Applicant shall provide residual parking note on plans.
5. SALDO (§289-11.B.1.) Preliminary plan shall be drawn on Mylar at a scale of not more than 1" = 100'.
Applicant shall provide final approved plan on Mylar.
6. SALDO (§289-11.B.5.) Name, seal, and signature of PA registered surveyor and/or PE.
Applicant shall sign and seal plans and reports upon final approval.
7. SALDO (§289-12.K) Developer's agreement needed for the intersection improvements to include pre-emption, battery backup, and generator/utility transfer assembly.
8. STORMWATER (§281-5) The plan and report accompanying all land development and subdivision plans shall be sealed by a professional engineer.
Applicant shall sign and seal plans and reports upon final approval.
9. STORMWATER (§281-19) Requirement for erosion and sediment controls.
Applicant shall provide copy of Adequacy Letter from YCCD.
10. STORMWATER (§281-20) Post-construction stormwater runoff controls for new development.

Applicant shall provide documentation from YCCD determination. As an MS4 community, Springettsbury Township will evaluate the plan for PCSWM measures to address water quality if YCCD does not.

11. STORMWATER (§281-5.C) Final Topography. The plan now shows a pedestrian crossing of the unnamed tributary to Mill Creek just upstream of Memory Lane.
Applicant shall provide a copy of the approved DEP/Corps Joint Permit.
12. Construction & Material Specs: Improvements to Industrial Hwy and Memory Lane signal required per section 02890--- pre-emption, battery backup, generator/utility transfer assembly.
Applicant shall provide a copy of the PennDOT signal plan.
13. General Comment: Applicant shall address the following regarding vegetated filter strips: 1) the permanent seeding requirements on Sheet C4.00,
2) Note 38 on the Cover Sheet should be repeated on Sheet C4.00,
3) Clarify the lawn seeding shown in the Table on Sheet C7.00 to be used for the filter strips and show on Sheet C4.00.

Mr. Deller indicated that the property is on the southeastern corner of Industrial Highway and Memory Lane, next to Eastern Market and the back side of Lowes. The property is bisected by two tributaries to Mill Creek - one on a northwestern course and one on the southwestern course that meet at the point of the panhandle of the property continuing to the west into an existing culvert under Memory Lane. Also bisecting the site running parallel to those two streams are Township sanitary sewer mains meeting at the same point. Yale Electric proposes to build their commercial retail facility here primarily serving contractors and parts distribution. It will house a warehouse area, showroom with a large contractors desk and some internal offices in the middle.

Mr. Deller stated there would be one access coming off of Industrial Highway with parking along the west side of the building and along the north side of the building. There is access around the entire building, with a loading dock area in the back. The largest trucks coming into the proposed facility will be standard box trucks. Mr. Deller explained the truck access.

Mr. Deller indicated that the panhandle piece of ground was a point of emphasis in previous discussions. He noted the Ordinance requires improvements along the entire frontage of the property and this plan proposes curbs and sidewalks tying into the existing culvert crossing Industrial Highway, extending all the way to the intersection and coming to the point where it crosses the stream. They are proposing to build a footbridge across the stream, ending up with a stub section of sidewalk to get from the termination of the footbridge back onto ground and to the property line.

Mr. Deller stated they are requesting four waivers:

1. Curbs and gutters - They are proposing to tie the existing curb line directly into the face of the culvert. The waiver is necessary since they are not physically building curb and would be a modification to tie into the existing concrete structure in lieu of building curb.
2. Sidewalks - The Ordinance requires building 4 ft. wide, 4-inch thick concrete sidewalks along the entire frontage of the property. They are proposing as a modification to build the footbridge spanning the open stream channel, which will be a wooden structure, well lit, with maintenance by the property owner.
3. This waiver refers to the same section as sidewalks and refers to the required 4-foot grass strip between the curb and the sidewalk. In order to stay out of the majority of the guide rail and out of the path of the existing traffic light base and pole, they will need to encroach into the 4-foot grass area.
4. Landscape buffer yards - The waiver request is for relief of the requirement to install landscaping along the section of the panhandle which is separated from the main course of the physical property by the existing culvert and is already well vegetated in that area.

The applicant, Mr. Robert Croneheim, stated they would need to make a determination if the project will be financially feasible due to the difficulty of the property shape. He noted it is a 6-acre piece of property, with approximately 2½ acres of usable land. Added to the expense will be the expectation to improve the signalization at the corner.

Discussion was held regarding the requirement for street trees. Mr. Deller indicated 10 trees are proposed, five to be located in the front of the building and five others intermittently through the site. This would include five cherry trees and five pin oaks located within the front section of street and seven others are located within the internal portion of the property. It was recommended by the Planning Commission that the applicant compromise and provide 15 trees to meet 50% of the requirement. . Mr. Croneheim stated he had no objection. Mr. Rao will meet with the applicant to provide direction on the location of the trees.

Discussion was held regarding stormwater drainage, which is being sheeted off the field. Mr. Deller noted there are existing channels which cut down through the property that they are tying into.

Discussion was held regarding the improvements to traffic signalization. It was clarified that this would be a condition of approval and not a waiver request. Discussion was held as to what the applicant would need to provide in the way of improvements. Mr. Rao will address this with the applicant.

Mr. Deller reviewed the conditions as outlined on the plan summary of February 19.

Vice Chairman Robertson asked if there was anyone in attendance who had an interest in the plan. Hearing none he called for a motion.

**MR. WURSTER MOVED WITH REFERENCE TO LAND DEVELOPMENT PLAN LD-08-12 YALE ELECTRIC, TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE PRELIMINARY PLAN TO THE TOWNSHIP BOARD OF SUPERVISORS WITH WAIVERS 1 - 3 AS NOTED ON PAGE 3 OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE PLAN SUMMARY OF FEBRUARY 19, 2009.
WAIVER #4 - THE APPLICANT SHALL INSTALL A BUFFER YARD ALONG THE FRONTAGE OF INDUSTRIAL HIGHWAY SHARED WITH THE PROPOSED BUILDING AND THEN 50% OF REQUIRED TREE SCAPE FROM THAT POINT OVER TO MEMORY LANE.
SECONDED BY MR. LUTZ. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

MR. WURSTER MOVED WITH REFERENCE TO LAND DEVELOPMENT PLAN LD-08-12, YALE ELECTRIC, TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE PRELIMINARY PLAN TO THE TOWNSHIP BOARD OF SUPERVISORS WITH CONDITIONS 1-12 AS PRESENTED ON THE PLAN SUMMARY DATED 2/19. SECONDED BY MR. SWOMLEY. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.

6. OLD BUSINESS – None

7. NEW BUSINESS - None

ADJOURNMENT

VICE CHAIRMAN ROBERTSON ADJOURNED THE MEETING AT 9:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Secretary

/ses

APPROVED

**SPRINGETTSBURY TOWNSHIP
PLANNING COMMISSION
JANUARY 15, 2009**

MEMBERS IN

ATTENDANCE: Alan Maciejewski, Chairman
Mark Robertson
Mark Swomley
Charles Wurster
John Lutz

ALSO IN

ATTENDANCE: Harish Rao, Director of Community Development
John Luciani, First Capital Engineering
Angela Liddick, Community Development Coordinator
Nicole Ehrhart, Solicitor
Sue Sipe, Stenographer

1. CALL TO ORDER:

A. Pledge of Allegiance

Chairman Maciejewski called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance.

B. 2009 Planning Commission Board Reorganization of Officers

MR. ROBERTSON PRESENTED THE FOLLOWING SLATE OF OFFICERS FOR 2009:

**ALAN MACIEJEWSKI - CHAIRMAN
MARK ROBERTSON – VICE CHAIRMAN
MARK SWOMLEY – SECRETARY**

SECONDED BY MR. LUTZ. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.

2. ACTION ON THE MINUTES

A. DECEMBER 18, 2008

MR. ROBERTSON MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE MEETING MINUTES OF DECEMBER 18, 2008 AS AMENDED. MR. SWOMLEY SECONDED. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.

3. WAIVER RECOMMENDATION

A. LD-05-18 Market Street Commons Add-On Lots

Jerry Stahlman, Stahlman & Stahlman
Timothy Pasch

Mr. Stahlman stated the following waivers are being requested:

1) SALDO (§289-64.D) Requirement to have all finished streets not to be more than 1 foot below the regulatory flood elevation.

2) SALDO (§289-15.F) Requirement for a traffic study to be submitted for the land development.

Mr. Stahlman reviewed the request for waiver of the traffic impact study indicating that when Market Street Commons at the location of the Turkey Hill was being constructed, a traffic impact study was done and it was determined that improvements would be necessary which included widening Eastern Boulevard and redoing the intersection at Eastern Boulevard and Stoneridge Road. They realigned the intersection by removing a section of it and installed a traffic light at Cinema Drive. Mr. Stahlman stated that the traffic impact study was done with the anticipation that all of these improvements would be long term and would satisfy this entire corridor. He noted there are three additional lots on which were not part of the original traffic study. Mr. Stahlman provided photos showing the improvements in the add-on sections. He noted Hoss's had widened the entrance all the way to a stream crossing. A permit was obtained in order to do the stream crossing, since Mr. Pasch is proposing a cul-de-sac coming off Eastern Boulevard Mr. Stahlman presented photos and exhibits of the following:

- Photo #1 shows the location of the apartment complexes which are on Commerce Drive. He pointed out where the curb and sidewalk with handicapped ramp had been installed, and noted they stabilized the stone base.
- Photo #2 shows the upper entrance.
- Photo #3 shows the extent to which the boulevard was widened and the location of the storm water facilities. Mr. Stahlman noted the improvements were accelerated in order for the Township to complete the repaving.
- Photo #4 shows the widening done by Hoss's. Mr. Stahlman noted there are no additional improvements needed in that area.
- Photo #5 shows the section that is already completed.

Mr. Stahlman indicated at the time they originally submitted the add-on lots, a trip generation letter was done which they believed satisfied the intent of the comment on the checklist. He noted the letter outlines six uses for the site - apartments (along Eastern Boulevard), mini warehouses, the development in the middle, and specialty retail 1500 sq. ft. closest to East market Street. At that time there was also a specialty retail office building and another apartment building of 3000 units which is no longer part of the building envelope. It was the Township's recommendation at that time that no traffic study was required because the trip generation was submitted. Mr. Stahlman indicated there is sufficient evidence to substantiate less traffic now because there are fewer lots on those two parcels.

Discussion was held that because the trip generation letter was originally done in 2006, it will need to be reissued to show updated traffic counts in accordance with PennDOT.

It was noted that the applicant would need to establish that the original traffic study, based on the original proposed development, vs. the development that actually took place showing the traffic study numbers, resulted in reduced traffic flow.

Mr. Rao noted that during the last meeting with the applicant the trip generation letter was not brought to their attention and they had not recently reviewed it.

It was decided to table the waiver requests until such time as the Township Engineer and Staff have an opportunity to review it.

It was noted the second waiver request would be reviewed when the case is ready to be presented.

4. BRIEFING ITEMS

A. LD-07-11 – 84 Locust Grove Office (Mr. Wurster abstained from the discussion.)

Tim Bieber, NuTech Design

Mr. Bieber stated this is a small office project on the corner of Locust Grove and Stoneridge Road. The lot is small – 1/3 acre and presents challenges in making it into something commercially viable. The case was presented to the Zoning Hearing Board to request an existing area to be used for parking which once was a bituminous parking area. The Zoning Officers ruled it should not be considered an existing parking lot. It was suggested that counsel for the applicant submit legal briefs stating their position to be reviewed with the Township solicitor. In the interim Mr. Bieber stated they have looked at other methods as evidenced by the plan presented. Mr. Bieber noted the difference shown on the plan is a smaller building 1,496 sq. ft. which is a result of additional right of way being provided along the two frontage roads. With a smaller building, less parking is required which enabled them to move the parking lot back further away from Locust Grove Road. This will be presented to the Zoning Hearing Board. Mr. Bieber indicated they are also asking for the Board's recommendation on the waiver requests.

Discussion was held regarding concern about how the property is laid out. Mr. Bieber stated that due to the small lot size there is no way to change the layout of the building envelope. He further noted the property has two frontages. This was formerly a residential lot.

Waiver Recommendations for LD-07-11:

- 1) SALDO (§289-11.A) Requirement to submit a preliminary plan prior to submitting a final plan.
Applicant proposes to submit Preliminary/Final Plan.
- 2) SALDO (§289-13.A) Requiring plans to be submitted at a scale of either 1"=50' or 1"=100'.
Applicant proposes to provide drawings scale of 1" = 20' for clarity.
- 3) SALDO (§289-15.F) Submittal of a Traffic Study
Applicant proposes not to provide a traffic study due to the small size of the project.
- 4) SALDO (§289-32.I.3a) Access drives shall not cross a street ROW line within 40 feet of the intersecting street R/W line.
Applicant proposes a driveway that crosses 32' from the future ROW and 42' from the current ROW; this is a slight increase from the existing access location.
- 5) SALDO (§281-7.B) Requiring pre-development ground cover conditions as "meadow".
Applicant proposes pre-development ground cover conditions shall be taken as present conditions.
Discussion was held regarding concentrating the plantings in a smaller area. Mr. Bieber indicated that sight triangles take up approximately a third of the site so they are providing landscaping where possible along the adjoining properties outside of the sight triangles. Also because of the reduced buffer yard size, a wall would be required.
- 6) SALDO (§289-26.C) Requiring a streetscape buffer yard.
Applicant proposes to not install a landscape wall because of sightline concerns associated with the roadway intersection. In addition, the Applicant is dedicating ROW.
Discussion was held regarding concern with parking cars in the sight triangle. Mr. Bieber indicated this was necessary since there is no other place to park.
- 7) SALDO (§281-7.G) Requiring minimum bottom slope of detention basins to be 4 percent in unpaved areas and 1% in paved areas. (Surface chambers, 0 percent slope).
Applicant proposes to provide a bottom slope of 0% in the sub-surface management facility.
- 8) SALDO (§281-38.H) Prohibiting stormwater runoff from other than single-family dwelling to discharge onto a cartway.
Applicant proposes to allow stormwater runoff onto Locust Grove Road since there is no piping or inlets in this vicinity.

Mr. Beiber stated since there is no storm drainage system it is impossible to avoid run off on to the cartway. Currently it flows along Locust Grove Road down to the apartment complex and there is a drainage way from there. He noted they will be able to comply up to the 50 year storm. There is a portion that will run out on to both Stoneridge and Locust Grove Road. He noted there is a storm sewer system in the vicinity of the site. Discussion was held regarding concern as to hazards for homeowners down to the end of the street and whether or not the storm water is sufficiently designed to handle the runoff from the property. Mr. Beiber stated in support of the waiver request less water will be put out then is currently there now.

Mr. Beiber noted that discussion was held at Staff review, regarding an inlet which would be for overflow runoff. He indicated that Staff has suggested they make a provision and a condition that would require the applicant to widen the road or make improvements on Locust Grove Road to include connection into the storm sewer system. Mr. Beiber noted he has the ability to connect in should there be a system available.

Chairman Maciejewski called for a motion on the waiver requests.

MR. SWOMLEY MOVED WITH REFERENCE TO LD-07-11, 84 LOCUST GROVE OFFICE, TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE WAIVER FOR SALDO (§289-11.A) REQUIREMENT TO SUBMIT A PRELIMINARY PLAN PRIOR TO SUBMITTING A FINAL PLAN. APPLICANT PROPOSES TO SUBMIT PRELIMINARY/FINAL PLAN. SECONDED BY MR. ROBERTSON. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED. (MR. WURSTER ABSTAINED.)

MR. SWOMLEY MOVED WITH REFERENCE TO LD-07-11, 84 LOCUST GROVE OFFICE, TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE WAIVER FOR SALDO (§289-13.A) REQUIRING PLANS TO BE SUBMITTED AT A SCALE OF EITHER 1"=50' OR 1"=100'. APPLICANT PROPOSES TO PROVIDE DRAWINGS SCALE OF 1" = 20' FOR CLARITY. SECONDED BY MR. ROBERTSON. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED. (MR. WURSTER ABSTAINED.)

MR. SWOMLEY MOVED WITH REFERENCE TO LD-07-11, 84 LOCUST GROVE OFFICE, TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE WAIVER FOR SALDO (§289-15.F) SUBMITTAL OF A TRAFFIC STUDY. APPLICANT PROPOSES NOT TO PROVIDE A TRAFFIC STUDY DUE TO THE SMALL SIZE OF THE PROJECT. SECONDED BY MR. LUTZ. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED. (MR. WURSTER ABSTAINED.)

MR. SWOMLEY MOVED WITH REFERENCE TO LD-07-11, 84 LOCUST GROVE OFFICE, TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE WAIVER FOR SALDO (§289-32.I.3A) ACCESS DRIVES SHALL NOT CROSS A STREET ROW LINE WITHIN 40 FEET OF THE INTERSECTING STREET R/W LINE. APPLICANT PROPOSES A DRIVEWAY THAT CROSSES 32' FROM THE FUTURE ROW AND 42' FROM THE CURRENT ROW; THIS IS A SLIGHT INCREASE FROM THE EXISTING ACCESS LOCATION. SECONDED BY MR. LUTZ. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED. (MR. WURSTER ABSTAINED.)

MR. SWOMLEY MOVED WITH REFERENCE TO LD-07-11, 84 LOCUST GROVE OFFICE, TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE WAIVER FOR SALDO (§281-7.B) REQUIRING PRE-DEVELOPMENT GROUND COVER CONDITIONS AS "MEADOW". APPLICANT PROPOSES PRE-DEVELOPMENT GROUND COVER CONDITIONS SHALL BE TAKEN AS PRESENT CONDITIONS. THIS WILL BE CONSIDERED AS PAVED GRAVEL. SECONDED BY MR. LUTZ. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED. (MR. WURSTER ABSTAINED.)

MR. LUTZ MOVED WITH REFERENCE TO LD-07-11, 84 LOCUST GROVE OFFICE, TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE WAIVER FOR SALDO (§289-26.C) REQUIRING A STREETScape BUFFER YARD.

APPLICANT PROPOSES TO NOT INSTALL A LANDSCAPE WALL BECAUSE OF SIGHTLINE CONCERNS ASSOCIATED WITH THE ROADWAY INTERSECTION. IN ADDITION, THE APPLICANT IS DEDICATING ROW.

SECONDED BY MR. ROBERTSON. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED. (MR. WURSTER ABSTAINED.)

MR. ROBERTSON MOVED WITH REFERENCE TO LD-07-11, 84 LOCUST GROVE OFFICE, TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE WAIVER FOR SALDO (§281-7.G) REQUIRING MINIMUM BOTTOM SLOPE OF DETENTION BASINS TO BE 4 PERCENT IN UNPAVED AREAS AND 1% IN PAVED AREAS. (SURFACE CHAMBERS, 0 PERCENT SLOPE).

APPLICANT PROPOSES TO PROVIDE A BOTTOM SLOPE OF 0% IN THE SUB-SURFACE MANAGEMENT FACILITY.

SECONDED BY MR. LUTZ. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED. (MR. WURSTER ABSTAINED.)

MR. LUTZ MOVED WITH REFERENCE TO LD-07-11, 84 LOCUST GROVE OFFICE, TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE WAIVER FOR SALDO (§281-38.H) PROHIBITING STORMWATER RUNOFF FROM OTHER THAN SINGLE-FAMILY DWELLING TO DISCHARGE ONTO A CARTWAY.

APPLICANT PROPOSES TO ALLOW STORMWATER RUNOFF ONTO LOCUST GROVE ROAD SINCE THERE IS NO PIPING OR INLETS IN THIS VICINITY, WITH THE CONDITION THAT THE INSTALLATION OF THE STORM WATER SYSTEM WOULD ALLOW FOR FUTURE CONNECTION, AS INDICATED BY A NOTE ON THE PLAN.

SECONDED BY MR. ROBERTSON. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED. (MR. WURSTER ABSTAINED.)

MR. ROBERTSON MOVED WITH REFERENCE TO LD-07-11, 84 LOCUST GROVE OFFICE TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF A WAIVER REQUEST FOR SALDO (§281-71)

REQUIRING MINIMUM SIDE SLOPES IN THE DETENTION BASINS - FOUR HORIZONTAL TO ONE VERTICAL. THIS DETENTION BASIN IS SUBSURFACE AND THERE IS NO SIDE SLOPE.

MR. SWOMLEY SECONDED. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED. (MR. WURSTER ABSTAINED.)

6. ACTION ITEMS

A. LD-08-02 Rite Aid/Jiffy Lube

Mark Heeb, DL Companies

This plan is proposing a new Rite Aid Pharmacy and Jiffy Lube as part of a redevelopment project of a blighted area. The proposed Rite Aid will be 14,673-sf footprint and the proposed Jiffy Lube will be a 2,055-sf footprint. A total of 67-parking spaces for the Rite Aid and 13-parking spaces for the Jiffy Lube will be provided along with buffering, landscaping and interior light. In addition, traffic improvements, Developers Agreement and the dedication of ROW will be included.

The associated subdivision plan, SD-08-02, was approved by the Township Board of Supervisors on November 19, 2008.

This plan is presented as an Action item for the Preliminary Plan. The plan was initially submitted to the Township on March 25, 2008. It was before the Planning Commission as a Briefing item for the F-D

Overlay. On November 14, 2007 it was discussed as a Briefing item with the Township Board of Supervisors for the F-D Overlay. The Planning Commission recommended approval to the Township Board of Supervisors for the F-D Overlay on September 18, 2007. Final approval for the F-D Overlay was given by the Township Board of Supervisors on November 14, 2007.

The Planning Commission was briefed at the October 16, 2008 regular meeting. It was presented as an Action item at the December 18, 2008 with the Planning Commission, with only the Waivers approved.

Variances were granted by the Zoning Hearing Board as Case Z-07-24 on January 3, 2008 to allow:

1. For the permitted use (pertaining to a drive through facility), non-conforming use, building square footage, setbacks, signage, parking and dumpster location.
2. Determination that the site has 3-frontyards and 1-rear yard.

The Applicant is requesting a recommendation of Approval from the Planning Commission to the Springettsbury Township Board of Supervisors for the following Waiver(s) and/or Modification(s):

- 1) SALDO (§289.35) Streetscape buffer yard, Buffer Yard Type II required along collector and/or arterial road.
Applicant proposes modification on the number of trees to install. Applicant will install the requisite number of shrubs and 66 trees, but does not have the space for 80 trees along E. Mkt St.
- 2) SALDO (§289-41.I.(6)(b)) Length of throat of access drive for a low volume driveway is 50 foot. Applicant cannot meet this requirement due to constraints of property, bldg layout, parking area. Applicant will provide this access drive as a right in / right out with an entrance 35 foot wide and 26 foot deep on E. Mkt St.

The following Outstanding items may be Conditions of Approval.

- 1) Zoning (§325-120.D.) Dumpster sites. Each site shall be screened with a six-foot masonry, wood stockade fence or basket weave fence.
Trash enclosure section and trash enclosure gate height details exceeds requirement.
- 2) Zoning (§325-155) Light and Glare. Provide lumens/foot candle drawing sht.
Entrances and exits to parking areas shall be lighted to a minimum of 2 footcandles at any point in the entrance/exit ways. Photometrics plan shows greater than 2 footcandles on residence property.
- 3) SALDO (§289-11.C.8) Documentation of inclusion in the Township's Chapter 94 report.
Zoning Officer shall research the Chapter 94 documentation.
- 4) SALDO (§289-12.H) Highway Occupancy Permits or proof of permit secured is necessary for access areas located off of state routes.
Applicant is awaiting response from PennDOT.
- 5) SALDO (§289-35.) Waiver requested (modification) for the amount of trees for the Type II requirements.
Shrub RM is not in the planting schedule. What replaced it? Buffer Yard Type II B-40 is 20 foot deep not 10 foot as shown in table.
- 6) SALDO (§289-45) Rite Aid building sanitary lateral shall not connect into manhole but rather the existing line. Additionally, a sampling manhole is needed at the Jiffy Lube building.
- 7) SALDO (§289-47.A.1.) Permit of unimpeded flow of natural watercourses or other existing drainage facilities.
Add note to drawings indicating maintenance of the unrestricted flow of water.
- 8) SALDO (§289-48.) Utility easements.
Utility easements should be applied where necessary. Missing stormwater easement on east side of property.
- 9) Stormwater (§281-5) The plan and report accompanying all land development and subdivision plans shall be sealed by a professional engineer.
PCSM report is not sealed and signed. Please submit sealed and signed cover page.
- 10) Stormwater (§281-5.D.1) All stormwater management controls must be shown on the plan and described in a narrative report. No narrative report has been submitted. The plans need to show

more details, including details, cross-sections, profiles of measures. The relationship between the existing topography and the proposed bottom, spillway, top, and the outlet structure and the corresponding proposed finished grade elevations must also be shown. A detail of the outlet structure shall be provided, including all pertinent construction requirements. While most of these issues have been addressed in the revised submission through a change in approach, details on the rain garden and its piping system are still needed. Also, the location of any and all rain gardens should be clearly identified in the plan views.

Show profile for I-3 to Det. Fac. There are discrepancies between I-3 inverts/values in Storm Structure Chart on Sheet C-102 and the 25-year pipe chart in the Report. Please clarify for consistency.

- 11) Stormwater (§281-11.A) A performance guarantee shall be provided unless the applicant shall have completed the installation of such facilities as required by the Stormwater Management Ordinance. In lieu of construction, the Township shall accept deposit of financial security in an amount equal to 110% of the cost of such facilities, in the form as provided in §289-29 of the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance.
Applicant shall submit cost opinion for review.
- 12) Stormwater (§281-19) No regulated earth disturbance activities within the municipality shall commence until approval by the municipality of an erosion and sedimentation control plan for construction activities. In addition, evidence of any necessary permits for regulated earth disturbance activities from the appropriate DEP regional office or the York County Conservation District must be provided to the municipality. The issuance of an NPDES construction permit [or coverage under the Commonwealth-wide General Permit (PAG-2)] satisfies this requirement. Please provide evidence of approval of this plan by YCCD.
PAG-2 approved for prior plan. Must submit proof of approval for revised stormwater detention plan.
- 13) Stormwater (§281-20) Post-construction stormwater runoff controls for new development and redevelopment must be provided. No regulated earth disturbance activities within the municipality shall commence until approval by the municipality of a plan that demonstrates compliance with Commonwealth water quality requirements after construction is complete. Please provide evidence of approval of this plan by DEP.
PAG-2 approved for prior plan. Must submit proof of approval for revised stormwater detention plan.
- 14) Stormwater (§281-5.D.1.c) Basins. A cross-section of the basin (rain gardens) showing the relationship between existing topography and the proposed bottom, etc. Please add the necessary details on all proposed rain gardens. Also, label them on the plan views where appropriate.
Details are needed for the rain garden overflow structures. Endwall EW-2 should be labeled on Sheet C-102.
- 15) Stormwater (§281-5.D.1.d) Schedule for installation of control measures and devices. In all cases, the proposed stormwater control devices must be completed prior to the creation of additional impervious area.
The Construction Sequence must be revised to show the installation of stormwater facilities prior to the construction of new buildings. On Sheet C-107B, work item 4 should precede items 1 and 2.
- 16) General Comment. Appendix 35.2 Soil Map should be re-stated. Delete “Department of” and say that NRCS has designated.
Correction was made on Page 35.2. It should also be changed on Page 5, §8.8 for consistency.
- 17) General Comment. On Page 19, Section 31.0 there is mention of clay dikes being installed, yet none appear in the drawings. Please resolve.
There is no clay dike detail in the plan set.
- 18) General Comment. Developer Agreement needed for traffic improvements.
Applicant shall enter into a developer’s agreement with the township.
- 19) General Comment. The detention facility is in impervious liner with a flowable concrete fill, yet lines running to the detention facility are not. The detail and inverts show Lines 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 and 16 to be full or partially full when the detention facility is functioning.

Applicant shall provide justification of design and it will given to the Director of Public Works for his review.

- 20) General Comment. Stormwater easements must be provided for the flow crossing the eastern side of the property.
Applicant shall show on drawings. (See page 6, §8.9 of report.)
- 21) General Comment. In the Stormwater Report, page 9, §14.0, the statement on impervious coverage is incorrect. It should read “proposed development will also be a commercial site and will increase the impervious area to 68.5%.”
Applicant shall correct the report.
- 22) General Comment. At the top of page 13, §18.0, there is an old and inaccurate statement regarding the discharge and flow reductions. Please correct to reflect the current plan and its impacts.
Applicant shall correct the report.
- 23) General Comment. On page 14, §24.0, and the maintenance note on Sheet C-102 there is a discrepancy. It also is repeated on page 18, §24.0. The notes on the plans should be revised to reflect the required weekly sweeping of paved areas by the owner. In fact, the notes from the report could be inserted almost intact into the plan set.
Applicant shall correct the plans.
- 24) General Comment. Also on page 18, §29.0, it states that the detention piping system should be inspected every 5 years or after a 100-year event. How will the owner know that a 100-year event has occurred? Please revise this section to be an easily measurable event (7” rainfall in 24 hours or something of that nature). The same note should be shown on Sheet C-102.
Applicant shall correct the plans.
- 25) General Comment. The last sentence on page 19, §31.0 is incomplete. Please add whatever was intended to make it whole.
Applicant shall correct the sentence.
- 26) General Comment. The statement on page 20, §32.0 still says that there will be no on-site detention. Please review and correct as appropriate.
Applicant shall correct the report.
- 27) General Comment. The primary outlet pipe is shown as 24” Ø CMP in report, but it is 15” Ø HDPE on plan. Show correct pipe size and type correctly and consistently in report and plan.
Applicant shall correct the report and plans.
- 28) Construction and Material. There are __ conditions on the Construction and Material Comments Tracking Sheets, dated, 12/10/08, that must be resolved prior to approval of the plan.
Applicant shall resolve all open tracking sheet comments.

PC Action – December 18, 2008

The Planning Commission at its regular meeting of December 18, 2008 Approved the following Waivers:

- 1) SALDO (§289-35.C) Landscaping and buffer yards- Streetscape buffer yard illustrations.
Applicant shall:
 1. Plant 66 of the 80 required trees along the frontages of East Market Street and Edgewood Road for a Type II Buffer, since the Applicant is dedicating right-of-way to the Township;
 2. Extend the shrub buffer along the northwest corner;
 3. Extend the Earth berm along the Edgewood & East Market Street.
- 2) SALDO (§289-41.I. (6) (b)) Proposed street system- Access drive throat length.
Applicant shall not provide a 50-foot long throat length at the East Market Street, but a 26-foot long throat length to be constructed as a right-in / right-out only.

The Planning Commission at its regular meeting of December 18, 2008 Tabled the following Conditions:

- 1) SALDO (§289-11.B.) Preliminary plans; specifications.
Applicant shall draw the final plan on Mylar and provide a PDF electronic copy of the final recorded plan.
- 2) SALDO (§289-12.C) Guarantee.

Before the recording of an approved final plan, the Board of Supervisors shall be assured by means of a proper completion guarantee as provided in SALDO §289-38, Performance requirements.

- 3) SALDO (§289-76) Fees
Applicant must pay all engineering, legal, recreation and/or administrative costs prior to the recording of the final plan.
- 4) A Developers Agreement shall be finalized and approved between the Applicant & Township.
- 5) A PennDOT HOP shall be obtained.
- 6) ZONING (§325-120.D.) Dumpster sites/waste collection areas- 6 feet height maximum.
Applicant shall revise the detail of the height of the trash enclosure to 6-feet.
- 7) ZONING (§325-155) Light and Glare.
Applicant shall correct the photometric plan so that entrances and exits to parking areas shall be lighted to a minimum of 2-footcandles. In addition, any lighting spillover onto the adjacent residence shall be less than 2- foot-candles.
- 8) SALDO (§289-35.) Landscaping and bufferyards.
Applicant shall correct the planting schedule for shrub RM; and revise Buffer Yard Type II B-40 as 20-feet deep, not 10-feet deep.
- 9) SALDO (§289-45) Sewage disposal requirements.
Applicant shall realign the Rite Aid building sanitary lateral so as to not connect into the manhole, but rather the existing line and add a sampling manhole at the Jiffy Lube.
- 10) SALDO (§289-47.A.1.) Storm drainage.
Applicant shall add a note to the drawings indicating maintenance of the unrestricted flow of water.
- 11) SALDO (§289-48.) Utility easements.
Applicant shall add utility easements where necessary; add a stormwater easement on eastern side of the property.
- 12) Stormwater (§281-5) Plan and report requirements.
Applicant shall:
 1. Sign, professionally seal, and submit a PCSM Report;
 2. Provide details for the rain garden overflow structures;
 3. Label Endwall EW-2 on Sheet C-102;
 4. Revise the Construction Sequence to show the installation of stormwater facilities prior to the construction of both new buildings;
 5. Sheet C-107B, work item 4 should precede items 1 and 2;
 6. Correct the discrepancies between I-3 inverts/values in the Storm Structure Chart on Sheet C-102 and the 25-year pipe chart in the Report.
- 13) Stormwater (§281-19.D) Requirement for erosion and sediment controls.
Applicant shall submit proof of revised PAG-2 approval based on the current stormwater plan (revised stormwater detention plan).
- 14) Stormwater (§281-20) Post-construction stormwater runoff controls for new development and redevelopment.
Applicant shall submit proof of revised PAG-2 approval based on the current stormwater plan (revised stormwater detention plan).
- 15) Applicant shall obtain a Letter of Adequacy and NPDES approvals.
- 16) Applicant shall revise or correct all the outstanding general comments as listed in the Township Engineers Tracking Sheet, dated December 10, 2008, prior to final approval.
- 17) Construction & Materials General Comments.
Applicant shall revise or correct all the outstanding Construction & Materials comments as listed in the Township Engineers Tracking Sheet, dated December 10, 2008, prior to final approval.

Mr. Heeb indicated they have revised and resubmitted the plan, which was reviewed by the Township Engineer and Staff, and addresses two remaining issues - landscaping on East Market Street and stormwater. The stormwater was resolved through the technical comments. There was no change in the design, they just cleared up some notations in the storm water report.

Mr. Heeb presented a version of the proposed redevelopment plan for the site, which reflected the change in the plan that occurs along East Market Street with not only berming but a revision of the landscape. The top exhibit shows the revision to the grading, the bottom exhibit shows the landscape that will go on top of the berm. Mr. Heeb indicated that from the surface of the pavement down where the Rite Aid parking is to the top of the plant material is over 8½ feet. He also noted they have added earth and berm with plant material on top so that it goes down to the public sidewalk. This was done to address the concern about headlights directed out onto the public street.

Mr. Rao concurred that the comments have been reviewed and addressed on the tracking sheet as identified on Page 7 and 8 of the Plan Summary.

Mr. Rao noted that the waiver shown on the briefing for plan scale is an additional waiver since the previous waivers were approved.

Chairman Maciejewski asked if there was anyone in attendance who had an interest in the plan, hearing none, he called for a motion.

MR. WURSTER MOVED WITH REFERENCE TO LAND DEVELOPMENT PLAN LD-08-02, RITE AID/JIFFY LUBE, TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE PRELIMINARY PLAN TO THE TOWNSHIP BOARD OF SUPERVISORS WITH THE FOLLOWING ADDITIONAL WAIVER:

1) SALDO (§289-13.A) FINAL PLAN; SPECIFICATIONS. APPLICANT SHALL USE A 1:30 PLAN SCALE FOR THE FINAL LAND DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR EASE OF READABILITY AND THE SMALL SIZE OF PROJECT.

SECONDED BY MR. ROBERTSON. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.

MR. WURSTER MOVED WITH REFERENCE TO LAND DEVELOPMENT PLAN LD-08-02, RITE AID/JIFFY LUBE, TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE PRELIMINARY PLAN TO THE TOWNSHIP BOARD OF SUPERVISORS WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

- 1) APPLICANT SHALL DRAW THE FINAL PLAN ON MYLAR AND PROVIDE A PDF ELECTRONIC COPY OF THE FINAL RECORDED PLAN.**
- 2) BEFORE THE RECORDING OF AN APPROVED FINAL PLAN, THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS SHALL BE ASSURED BY MEANS OF A PROPER COMPLETION GUARANTEE AS PROVIDED IN SALDO §289-38, PERFORMANCE REQUIREMENTS. SUBMIT A COMPLETE COST ESTIMATE FOR REVIEW AND COMMENT.**
- 3) APPLICANT MUST PAY ALL ENGINEERING, LEGAL, RECREATION, AND/OR ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS PRIOR TO THE RECORDING OF THE FINAL PLAN.**
- 4) A DEVELOPERS AGREEMENT SHALL BE FINALIZED AND APPROVED BETWEEN THE APPLICANT & TOWNSHIP.**
- 5) A PENNDOT HOP SHALL BE OBTAINED.**
- 6) SALDO (§289-35.) LANDSCAPING AND BUFFERYARDS. APPLICANT SHALL CORRECT THE PLANTING SCHEDULE FOR SHRUB RM.**
- 7) SALDO (§289-48.) UTILITY EASEMENTS. APPLICANT SHALL DELETE THE WORD "MANAGEMENT" FROM THE PASSAGE CONCERNING THE PIPE COMING OFF EAST MARKET STREET TOWARDS EASTERN BOULEVARD THIS PIPE IS FOR STORMWATER CONVEYANCE NOT MANAGEMENT AS OPPOSED TO YOUR STORMWATER MANAGEMENT EASEMENT AROUND THE UNDERGROUND AREA.**
- 8) STORMWATER (§281-19.D) REQUIREMENT FOR EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROLS. APPLICANT SHALL SUBMIT PROOF OF REVISED PAG-2 APPROVAL BASED ON THE CURRENT STORMWATER PLAN (REVISED STORMWATER DETENTION PLAN).**

- 9) **STORMWATER (§281-20) POST-CONSTRUCTION STORMWATER RUNOFF CONTROLS FOR NEW DEVELOPMENT AND REDEVELOPMENT. APPLICANT SHALL SUBMIT PROOF OF REVISED PAG-2 APPROVAL BASED ON THE CURRENT STORMWATER PLAN (REVISED STORMWATER DETENTION PLAN).**
 - 10) **GENERAL COMMENTS. APPLICANT SHALL LIST WAIVERS ON SHEET 101-B.**
 - 11) **CONSTRUCTION & MATERIALS GENERAL COMMENTS. APPLICANT SHALL REVISE OR CORRECT ALL THE OUTSTANDING CONSTRUCTION & MATERIALS COMMENTS AS LISTED IN THE TOWNSHIP ENGINEERS TRACKING SHEET, DATED JANUARY 9, 2009, PRIOR TO FINAL APPROVAL.**
- SECONDED BY MR. ROBERTSON. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

B. LD-08-13 Courtyard by Marriott

Richard Helwig, Hoover Engineering
Chris Hoover, Hoover Engineering

This project is proposed to construct a four (4) story Courtyard by Marriott Hotel with 103-rooms. Included with this plan will be an associated parking lot, required landscaping, sidewalk and curbing. The proposed hotel will be developed on Lot #5 of the York Business Center property in Zoning District F-D, Flexible Development.

The plan is presented for the first time as an Action item. It was submitted to the Township on September 22, 2008. The Zoning Hearing Board granted Variances as Case Z-08-28 on December 4, 2008 from the following sections of the Zoning Ordinance:

1. § 325-124.H, Hotels and Motels. To allow the proposed parking areas to be located at 10- feet from Butterfly Commons Drive.
2. § 325-124.D Hotels and Motels- maximum 200-foot length. To allow the length of the hotel to be 250-feet.
3. § 325-124.G Access. To allow access onto a local road.

The Applicant is requesting a recommendation of Approval from the Planning Commission to the Springettsbury Township Board of Supervisors for the following Waiver:

- 1) SALDO (§289-35.) Provide buffer planting between street line and parking area.
 Applicant requests waiver due to the unique shape of the land and the configuration of the site layout.

The following Outstanding items may be Conditions of Approval:

- 1) Zoning (§325-92.C.2) Parking areas, access drives, and internal vehicular circulation areas shall be illuminated by zero cutoff fixtures.
 Provide zero cutoff fixtures on parking lot lights and show on detail.
- 2) Zoning (§325-155.A.) Parking areas shall be illuminated to an average of three footcandles. Entrances and exits to parking areas shall be lighted to a minimum two footcandles at any point in the entrance or exit way.
 Provide table that demonstrates average illumination requirements and adjust lighting to meet access drive requirements.
- 3) Zoning (§325-155.B.) Light spill over onto adjoining properties shall not exceed two footcandles at any point 10 feet or more beyond the property line.
 Show lighting photometrics at least ten feet beyond property lines.
- 4) SALDO (§289-13.A.) The final plan shall be drawn in ink on Mylar sheets of 24 x 36 -inches. Prior to signing, the final plan shall be submitted on Mylar.

- 5) SALDO (§289-13.B.5.) Documentation of inclusion in the Township’s Chapter 94 report. Provide documentation of inclusion in the Township’s Chapter 94 report.
- 6) SALDO (§289-13-B.7.F.) Such certificates, affidavits, endorsements or dedications.
 1. General Plan/Report Data block and surveyor block missing date line.
 2. Misspelled ‘ordinance’ in surveyor block.
- 7) SALDO (§289-16.A.) Steep Slopes. Delineate steep slopes on existing conditions plan and provide square footage. Show on grading plan as well and include as part of LDP set.
- 8) SALDO (§289-24.) Feasibility report on sewer and water facilities. Feasibility report on sanitary sewer and water facilities indicates attachments, please provide attachments.
- 9) SALDO (§289-38.C.4.) The amount of financial security to be posted for the completion of the required improvements shall be equal to 110% of the cost of completion estimated as of 90 days following the date scheduled for completion by the developer. Developer must meet all performance requirements before Final plan approval is given. Provide copy of cost estimate for review.
- 10) SALDO (§289-76) Fees. All engineering, legal, recreation or administrative costs will be paid prior to the recording of the final plan.
- 11) Stormwater (§281-19) Requirement for Erosion and Sediment Controls. Please provide FCE with evidence of YCCD approval of the E&S plans, along with a final version of the approved plan.
- 12) Stormwater (§281-19.C) NPDES construction activities permit will be required. Please provide FCE with a copy of the application for this permit and with a copy of DEP’s final approval. (See also §281-20.E) NPDES Boundary/Limit of Disturbance line shown on Sheet 5 of 10 does not match the line shown in the Legend and does not include the entire site to be disturbed.
- 13) General. Sheet 6 of 10.
 1. Please re-read your notes #19, 21, and 23 for consistency, language, and appropriateness.
 2. Reference to “Department’s” in note #19 should be expanded to read “Department of Environmental Protection’s” not “Department’s”.

It was noted that the waiver request for buffer plantings was withdrawn, since the applicant meets the Ordinance.

Mr. Helwig indicated they are proposing down lighting with shoebox design based on the Township Engineer’s review. They will add cut off shields to their design details to make sure they are installed on the fixtures as well.

Mr. Helwig presented the color rendering of the two hotels as they will appear on the site. The walking bridge was identified. Mr. Helwig noted that the façade for the courtyard is somewhat different from the prototypical model in other areas and indicated it could be altered if the Township desires to be more in harmony with the surrounding area.

Chairman Maciejewski asked if there was anyone in attendance who had an interest in the plan. Hearing none he called for motion.

MR. ROBERTSON MOVED WITH REFERENCE TO LAND DEVELOPMENT PLAN LD-08-13, COURTYARD BY MARRIOTT, TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE FINAL PLAN TO THE TOWNSHIP BOARD OF SUPERVISORS WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

- 1) **ZONING (§325-92.C.2) DESIGN STANDARDS. APPLICANT SHALL PROVIDE ZERO CUT-OFF SHIELD-TYPE FIXTURES ON PARKING LOT LIGHTS AND PROVIDE A DETAIL.**
- 2) **ZONING (§325-155.A.) LIGHT AND GLARE. APPLICANT SHALL:**

1. **PROVIDE A TABLE THAT DEMONSTRATES AVERAGE ILLUMINATION REQUIREMENTS;**
2. **ADJUST LIGHTING AT THE ACCESS DRIVE TO MEET THESE REQUIREMENTS.**
- 3) **ZONING (§325-155.B.) LIGHT AND GLARE. APPLICANT SHALL PROVIDE SHOW LIGHTING PHOTOMETRICS AT LEAST 10-FEET BEYOND THE PROPERTY LINES.**
- 4) **SALDO (§289-13.A.) FINAL PLANS; SPECIFICATIONS. APPLICANT SHALL HAVE FINAL PLANS DRAWN ON MYLAR MATERIAL AND SUBMIT A PDF OF THE FINAL RECORDED PLAN.**
- 5) **SALDO (§289-13.B.5.) FINAL PLANS; SPECIFICATIONS. APPLICANT SHALL PROVIDE DOCUMENTATION OF INCLUSION IN THE TOWNSHIP'S CHAPTER 94 REPORT.**
- 6) **SALDO (§289-13.B.7.F.) FINAL PLANS; SPECIFICATIONS. APPLICANT SHALL:**
 1. **GENERAL PLAN/REPORT DATA BLOCK AND SURVEYOR BLOCK MISSING DATE LINE.**
 2. **APPLICANT SHALL CORRECT THE SPELLING OF 'ORDINANCE' IN THE SURVEYOR BLOCK.**
- 7) **SALDO (§289-16.A.) STEEP SLOPES IMPACT STUDIES. APPLICANT SHALL:**
 1. **DELINEATE STEEP SLOPES ON EXISTING CONDITIONS PLAN SHEET.**
 2. **PROVIDE SQUARE FOOTAGES OF STEEP SLOPES.**
 3. **SHOW ON GRADING PLAN SHEET.**
 4. **INCLUDE STEEP SLOPE SHEET AS PART OF LD PLAN SET.**
- 8) **SALDO (§289-24.) FEASIBILITY REPORT ON SEWER AND WATER FACILITIES. APPLICANT SHALL PROVIDE THE ATTACHMENTS FOR THE FEASIBILITY REPORT ON SANITARY SEWER AND WATER FACILITIES.**
- 9) **SALDO (§289-12.C.) FINAL PLANS; PROCEDURE. BEFORE THE RECORDING OF AN APPROVED FINAL PLAN, THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS SHALL BE ASSURED BY MEANS OF A PROPER COMPLETION GUARANTEE AS PROVIDED IN SALDO §289-38, PERFORMANCE REQUIREMENTS.**
- 10) **SALDO (§289-76) FEES. ALL ENGINEERING, LEGAL, RECREATION, OR ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS WILL BE PAID PRIOR TO THE RECORDING OF THE FINAL PLAN.**
- 11) **STORMWATER (§281-19.D) HISTORIC RESOURCE IMPACT STUDIES. APPLICANT SHALL:**
 1. **OBTAIN LETTER OF ADEQUACY FROM YCCD APPROVAL OF THE E&S PLANS.**
 2. **PROVIDE A FINAL VERSION OF THE APPROVED E & S PLAN.**
 3. **OBTAIN NPDES APPROVAL FROM PA DEP.**
 4. **CORRECT THE NPDES BOUNDARY/LIMIT OF DISTURBANCE LINE AS SHOWN ON SHT 5 OF 10. IT DOES NOT MATCH THE LINE AS SHOWN IN THE LEGEND AND DOES NOT INCLUDE THE ENTIRE SITE TO BE DISTURBED.**
- 12) **PLEASE RE-CHECK YOUR GENERAL NOTES #19, #21 AND #23 FOR CONSISTENCY, LANGUAGE, AND APPROPRIATENESS ON SHEET 6 OF 10.**

MR. WURSTER SECONDED. MOTION CARRIED.

C. LD-08-14 Townplace Suites by Marriott

Richard Helwig, Hoover Engineering
Chris Hoover, Hoover Engineering

This project is proposed to construct a four (4) story Towneplace Suites by Marriott Hotel with 98-rooms. Included with this plan will be an associated parking lot, required landscaping, sidewalk and curbing. The proposed hotel will be developed on Lot #6 of the York Business Center property, located in the F-D Flexible Development District.

The plan is presented for the first time as an Action item. It was submitted to the Township on September 22, 2008. The Zoning Hearing Board granted Variances as Case Z-08-29 on December 4, 2008 from the following sections of the Zoning Ordinance:

1. § 325-124.H, Hotels and Motels to allow the proposed parking areas to be located 5-feet from the easement on Pearl Drive.
2. § 325-85, Overlay provisions to allow a 13% impact (over what is permitted, i.e. 30%) on the steep slopes precautionary area.
3. § 325-124.D Hotels and Motels- maximum 200-foot length. To allow the length of the hotel to be 250-feet.
4. § 325-124.G Access. To allow access onto a local road.

The Applicant is requesting a recommendation of Approval from the Planning Commission to the Springettsbury Township Board of Supervisors for the following Waiver(s):

- 1) SALDO (§289-32.A.) Sidewalks: Sidewalks shall be installed on both sides of all streets. Applicant proposes to put sidewalk on one side of Pearl Drive with marked pedestrian cross-walk areas.
- 2) SALDO (§289-41.I.7) Proposed street system. Applicant shall utilize a separation distance of 5-feet, not the 10-feet required for the parking area and Pearl Drive.

The following Outstanding items may be Conditions of Approval:

- 1) Zoning (§325-92.C.2) Parking areas, access drives, and internal vehicular circulation areas shall be illuminated by zero cutoff fixtures. Provide zero cutoff fixtures on parking lot lights and show on detail.
- 2) Zoning (§325-155.A.) Parking areas shall be illuminated to an average of three footcandles. Entrances and exits to parking areas shall be lighted to a minimum two footcandles at any point in the entrance or exit way. Provide table that demonstrates average illumination requirements and adjust lighting to meet access drive requirements.
- 3) Zoning (§325-155.B.) Light spill over onto adjoining properties shall not exceed two footcandles at any point 10 feet or more beyond the property line. Show lighting photometrics at least ten feet beyond property lines.
- 4) SALDO (§289-13.A.) The final plan shall be drawn in ink on Mylar sheets (sheet size 24 inches by 36 inches). Prior to signing, the final plan shall be submitted on Mylar.
- 5) SALDO (§289-13.B.5.) Documentation of inclusion in the Township's Chapter 94 report. Provide documentation of inclusion in the Township's Chapter 94 report.
- 6) SALDO (§289-16.A.) Steep Slopes. Delineate steep slopes on existing conditions plan and provide square footage. Show on grading plan as well and include as part of LDP set.
- 7) SALDO (§289-24.) Feasibility report on sewer and water facilities. Feasibility report on sanitary sewer and water facilities indicates attachments, please provide attachments.
- 8) SALDO (§289-38.C.4.) The amount of financial security to be posted for the completion of the required improvements shall be equal to 110% of the cost of completion estimated as of 90 days following the date scheduled for completion by the developer. Developer must meet all performance requirements before Final plan approval is given. Provide copy of cost estimate for review.
- 9) SALDO (§289-76) Fees. All engineering, legal, recreation or administrative costs will be paid prior to the recording of the final plan.
- 10) Stormwater (§281-5.G) Maintenance program. A maintenance program for all stormwater management facilities must be included. Specific examples of work should be included on the

plan. Note that there are no provisions shown in the plans to access the underground system to inspect or maintain it. Additional maintenance items are noted. Will access through the inlets to inspect and maintain be for remote equipment, or for human entry?

Please expand Note 4. on Sheet 4 of 10 to address human entry “in accordance with safety procedures for confined space entry”.

- 11) Stormwater (§281-11.A.2) Performance guarantee. In lieu of completion of the installation of the required stormwater management facilities, the Township shall accept deposit with the Township of financial security in an amount of 110% of the cost of such facilities. Please advise how this will be addressed by the applicant.
Performance guarantee will be provided to Township prior to Final Land Development Plan approval.
- 12) Stormwater (§281-19) Requirement for Erosion and Sediment Controls.
Please provide FCE with evidence of YCCD approval of the E&S plans, along with a final version of the approved plan.
- 13) Stormwater (§281-19.C) A DEP NPDES construction activities permit will be required for this development project.
Please provide FCE with a copy of the application for this permit and with a copy of DEP’s final approval. (See also §281-20.E) NPDES Boundary/Limit of Disturbance line shown on Sheet 5 of 10 does not match the line shown in the Legend and does not include the entire site to be disturbed.
- 14) Stormwater. Please provide FCE with a copy of the application to DEP (and the Corps of Engineers) for the footbridge crossing, including plans and calculations. See item # 47 below. Note that the stream has no official geographic name. It is an unnamed tributary to Mill Creek, known locally as Three Mile Run. 3 Mile Run Creek is redundant and not the accepted name. GP-7 does not appear to be appropriate for this site. DA is over 1 square mile. We believe Individual DEP permit will be required.
- 15) General. Pedestrian walking bridge over creek will require DEP Stream Crossing Permit. Awaiting copy of permit.
- 16) General. Sheet 6 of 10. Please re-read your notes #19, 21, and 23 for consistency, language, and appropriateness.
Reference to “Department’s” in note #19 should be expanded to read “Department of Environmental Protection’s” not “Department’s”.
- 17) General. Show required slopes on sidewalk and street in Sidewalk Section. There should be a detail including grass leading to the pedestrian stream crossing. No pedestrian bridge walkway detail provided as stated in the comment response letter. In the pedestrian sidewalk detail provided, the 3:1 slopes shown should be maximum not minimum for drainage.
Provide details of the pedestrian bridge.

Mr. Helwig addressed the sidewalk issue noting they are proposing sidewalk along the western side of Pearl Drive but not along the eastern side because of the existing trees and street lighting in that area. They can not fit a sidewalk along that side where the access drive, landscape wall and buffering is located.

Chairman Maciejewski asked if there was anyone in attendance who had an interest in the plan. Hearing none, he called for a motion.

MR. SWOMLEY MOVED WITH REFERENCE TO LAND DEVELOPMENT PLAN LD-08-14, TOWNEPLACE SUITES BY MARRIOTT, TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE FINAL PLAN TO THE TOWNSHIP BOARD OF SUPERVISORS WITH THE FOLLOWING MODIFICATION WAIVER:

- 1) SALDO (§289-32.A.) SIDEWALKS. APPLICANT SHALL INSTALL SIDEWALK ON THE WESTERN SIDE OF PEARL DRIVE WITH A MARKED PEDESTRIAN CROSS-WALK FROM THE HOTEL TO THE SIDEWALK. SECONDED BY MR. WURSTER. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

MR. SWOMLEY MOVED WITH REFERENCE TO LAND DEVELOPMENT PLAN LD-08-14, TOWNEPLACE SUITES BY MARRIOTT, TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE FINAL PLAN TO THE TOWNSHIP BOARD OF SUPERVISORS WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

- 1) **ZONING (§325-92.C.2) DESIGN STANDARDS. APPLICANT SHALL PROVIDE ZERO CUT-OFF SHIELD-TYPE FIXTURES ON PARKING LOT LIGHTS AND PROVIDE A DETAIL.**
- 2) **ZONING (§325-116.L.) PARKING LOT LIGHTING. APPLICANT SHALL PROVIDE PARKING LOT LIGHTING.**
- 3) **ZONING (§325-155.A.) LIGHT AND GLARE. APPLICANT SHALL:**
 1. **PROVIDE A TABLE THAT DEMONSTRATES AVERAGE ILLUMINATION REQUIREMENTS;**
 2. **ADJUST LIGHTING AT THE ACCESS DRIVE TO MEET THESE REQUIREMENTS.**
- 4) **ZONING (§325-155.B.) LIGHT AND GLARE. APPLICANT SHALL PROVIDE AND SHOW LIGHTING PHOTOMETRICS AT LEAST TEN FEET BEYOND PROPERTY LINES.**
- 5) **SALDO (§289-13.A.) FINAL PLANS; SPECIFICATIONS. APPLICANT SHALL PROVIDE THE FINAL PLAN ON MYLAR MATERIAL AND PROVIDE AN ELECTRONIC PDF COPY OF THE FINAL PLAN.**
- 6) **SALDO (§289-13.B.5.) FINAL PLANS; SPECIFICATIONS. APPLICANT SHALL PROVIDE DOCUMENTATION OF INCLUSION IN THE TOWNSHIP'S CHAPTER 94 REPORT.**
- 7) **SALDO (§289-16.A.) STEEP SLOPES IMPACT STUDIES. APPLICANT SHALL:**
 5. **DELINEATE STEEP SLOPES ON EXISTING CONDITIONS PLAN SHEET.**
 6. **PROVIDE SQUARE FOOTAGES OF STEEP SLOPES.**
 7. **SHOW ON GRADING PLAN SHEET.**
- 8) **SALDO (§289-24.) FEASIBILITY REPORT ON SEWER AND WATER FACILITIES. APPLICANT SHALL PROVIDE THE ATTACHMENTS FOR THE FEASIBILITY REPORT ON SANITARY SEWER AND WATER FACILITIES.**
- 9) **SALDO (§289-38.C.4.) PERFORMANCE REQUIREMENTS. APPLICANT SHALL PROVIDE COPY OF COST ESTIMATE FOR REVIEW PRIOR TO FINAL APPROVAL OF PLAN.**
- 10) **SALDO (§289-76) FEES. ALL ENGINEERING, LEGAL, RECREATION, OR ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS WILL BE PAID PRIOR TO THE RECORDING OF THE FINAL PLAN.**
- 11) **STORMWATER (§281-5.G) MAINTENANCE PROGRAM. APPLICANT SHALL PROVIDE REVISED NOTE 4. FOR HUMAN ENTRY PROCEDURES.**
- 12) **SALDO (§289-12.C.) FINAL PLANS; PROCEDURE. BEFORE THE RECORDING OF AN APPROVED FINAL PLAN, THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS SHALL BE ASSURED BY MEANS OF A PROPER COMPLETION GUARANTEE AS PROVIDED IN SALDO §289-38, PERFORMANCE REQUIREMENTS.**
- 13) **STORMWATER (§281-19.D) REQUIREMENT FOR EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROLS. APPLICANT SHALL:**
 1. **OBTAIN LETTER OF ADEQUACY FROM YCCD APPROVAL OF THE E&S PLANS.**
 2. **PROVIDE A FINAL VERSION OF THE APPROVED E & S PLAN.**
 3. **OBTAIN NPDES APPROVAL FROM PA DEP.**
 4. **CORRECT THE NPDES BOUNDARY/LIMIT OF DISTURBANCE LINE AS SHOWN ON SHT 5 OF 10. IT DOES NOT MATCH THE LINE AS SHOWN IN THE LEGEND AND DOES NOT INCLUDE THE ENTIRE SITE TO BE DISTURBED.**
- 14) **STORMWATER. PLEASE PROVIDE FCE WITH A COPY OF THE APPLICATION TO DEP (AND THE CORPS OF ENGINEERS) FOR THE FOOTBRIDGE CROSSING, INCLUDING PLANS AND CALCULATIONS. SEE ITEM # 47 BELOW. NOTE THAT**

THE STREAM HAS NO OFFICIAL GEOGRAPHIC NAME. IT IS AN UNNAMED TRIBUTARY TO MILL CREEK, KNOWN LOCALLY AS THREE MILE RUN. 3 MILE RUN CREEK IS REDUNDANT AND NOT THE ACCEPTED NAME. APPLICANT SHALL PROVIDE TOWNSHIP WITH CORRESPONDENCE FROM DEP CONFIRMING A GP-7 IS NOT REQUIRED OR SUBMIT FOR AN INDIVIDUAL PERMIT IF DEP DETERMINES IT IS WARRANTED.

- 15) **PLEASE RE-CHECK YOUR GENERAL NOTES #19, #21 AND #23 FOR CONSISTENCY, LANGUAGE, AND APPROPRIATENESS ON SHEET 6 OF 10.**
- 16) **GENERAL. SHOW REQUIRED SLOPES ON SIDEWALK AND STREET IN SIDEWALK SECTION. THERE SHOULD BE A DETAIL INCLUDING GRASS LEADING TO THE PEDESTRIAN STREAM CROSSING. NO PEDESTRIAN BRIDGE WALKWAY DETAIL PROVIDED AS STATED IN THE COMMENT RESPONSE LETTER. IN THE PEDESTRIAN SIDEWALK DETAIL PROVIDED, THE 3:1 SLOPES SHOWN SHOULD BE MAXIMUM NOT MINIMUM FOR DRAINAGE. APPLICANT SHALL PROVIDE DETAILS OF THE PEDESTRIAN BRIDGE IN THE LDP PLAN SET.**

SECONDED BY MR. ROBERTSON. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.

7. OLD BUSINESS – None

8. NEW BUSINESS

A. Town Center Plan Public meeting was held Wednesday, January 14, 2009.

9. ADJOURNMENT

CHAIRMAN MACIEJEWSKI ADJOURNED THE MEETING AT 8:40 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Secretary

/ses