

APPROVED

**SPRINGETTSBURY TOWNSHIP
PLANNING COMMISSION
APRIL 16, 2015**

MEMBERS IN

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

ALSO IN

ATTENDANCE: Trisha Lang, Director of Community Development
John Luciani, First Capital Engineering
Christopher King, 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, 2015

MR. ROBERTSON MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE MEETING MINUTES OF MARCH 19, 2015 AS AMENDED. MR. WURSTER SECONDED. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.

3. BRIEFING ITEMS - None

4. ACTION ITEMS

A. LD-14-06 Candlewood Suites Hotel

Jim Snyder, Snyder, Secary & Assocs.

Project Narrative: This plan involves the development of a vacant lot located at the current stub of Saturn Way. The proposed development includes a 4-story 85 room hotel as well as excess parking to be utilized by the adjacent landowner (LCBC).

Plan Background: This project remains unchanged from the plan last reviewed by the Commission at their meeting on February 19, 2015. Since that time, the applicant has provided additional time for the Township to take action on the plan and the Township staff, engineer and solicitor met with the consultant, existing and future land owners, as well as their traffic engineer and legal counsel. As a result of that meeting, the applicant wishes to present new information to the Commission related to the paving standard and removal of the cul-de-sac on Saturn Way. In addition, the applicant has provided a copy of

the 1988 Highway Occupancy Permit issued by PA DOT for the AESYS access drive.

Based on this new information, 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 ARTICLE IV Section 289-13.A Plan Scale. The applicant is requesting that the plan be permitted to be drawn at a scale of 1"=30' rather than the 1"=50' or 1"=100' which are the only options permitted by the ordinance. The lot is approximately 4 acres in size and the larger scale allows the plan to be placed on a single sheet in a legible manner.
2. SALDO ARTICLE VI Section 289-41.K.3. Provision of a turnaround for cul-de-sac/loop streets. The applicant is proposing to establish a 24' wide Emergency Access Easement to allow for the turnaround of emergency vehicles within the parking lot of the proposed hotel in order that the existing cul-de-sac can be eliminated. In addition, the applicant is willing to design a portion of this access to the Township street standards and to provide an agreement that includes the intent to make the landowner responsible for any damage to the paving within the parking lot which will not meet the Township street standard.

The following outstanding items may be considered conditions of approval:

ADMINISTRATIVE ISSUES

The applicant has acknowledged the need to comply with the following before recording the plan:

1. SALDO (§289-12)

(C) Final plans; procedure. Applicant shall provide financial security for completion of the proposed improvements. Page 2 of 2

(L) Final Plans; procedure. Applicant shall pay to have the plan recorded in the Office of the Recorder of Deeds of York County within 90 days of plan approval.

(M) Applicant shall provide all information and revisions to comply with the conditions of approval established by the Board of Supervisors prior to recording the plan.

2. SALDO (§289-35.E.2.) Landscaping and buffer yards. Applicant shall make arrangements acceptable to the Township for the property's long-term landscape maintenance.

3. SALDO (§289.13.A) Final plans; specifications. Applicant shall submit the plan on Mylar for recording in addition to submitting a pdf of the approved plan.

4. Provide evidence of receipt of approval of the sanitary sewer planning module.

5. Provide a copy of all proposed agreements that address O&M issues associated with Saturn Way and the multiple easements (sanitary sewer, storm drainage, storm water management, and access) shared with LCBC, AESYS, and Lot #3. It is noted that the existing Declaration of Cross Access Easement and Storm Water Easements established in 2010 currently limits the use of Saturn Way to the lots containing LCBC uses and the proposed hotel, with specific language that identifies that the drive "may not be extended to serve property adjoining" these lots. This language is inconsistent with the reservation of the 50' wide public street right-of-way located within the hotel site. Any new agreement will need to revise this language accordingly.

6. SWMO (§281-23)The landowner/developer shall be responsible for providing as-built plans of all SWM BMPs shown on the approved plan. Such plans shall be consistent with all criteria established in §281-23.A-D.

DESIGN ISSUES

The applicant has requested modifications related to these items.

7. SALDO (§289-41.A.5) Dead end streets shall be provided a turnaround at the closed end. The applicant submitted a request for modification of this requirement.

Mr. Snyder indicated the plan was previously presented and action was taken at the February 19 meeting with several items. He noted they met with Staff recently to work out issues relative to the AESYS driveway, at which time it was determined that they have a valid permit and the cross access easement that connects to their site is in place and valid. This is reflected in Staff's most recent report. Mr. Snyder stated a draft of the cross access easement between LCBC and Lot #3 was circulated for review by the township solicitor. He noted it includes cost sharing and various improvements in the infrastructure as well as making the Township a third party to that agreement so it cannot be arbitrarily removed. It also adds validity to the agreement relative to the indemnity if the waiver for the cul-de-sac removal is approved. Mr. Snyder indicated in regards to the last point regarding the cul-de-sac removal, there was concern about additional paving in the street extension. Consequently, they have worked out what portions of that road would logically be removed to Township street standards. This is reflected on the exhibits submitted.

Discussion was held regarding signage. It was noted the applicant will include an exhibit to illustrate the directional signage on the site to provide direction entering the site off of North Hills Road.

Mr. Snyder provided clarification on the traffic issues:

- (1) The issue on Industrial Road with cars that prematurely enter the left turn lane and block movement had no bearing on their project.
- (2) Relative to the AESYS driveway - Mr. Snyder confirmed that a permit exists which they have provided a copy. He noted it is within the volume classification of that driveway and analysis was provided to the Township.
- (3) The cross easement that goes from the AESYS property to the LCBC site – Mr. Snyder referred to the Commission's former motion which stated that AESYS needed to be part of that cross easement agreement. Mr. Snyder indicated it was determined that the present easement which allows for that is in place, is valid and the township solicitor agreed with that position.

It was noted there was another discussion about the level of service and whether or not the applicant had brought it to the attention of PennDOT. Mr. Snyder stated they provided additional information regarding the level of service which overall is a level of service "A", and the left turn movement is level of service "E". He noted this is due to several vehicles that leave the site and attempt the left hand turn during the p.m. peak hour. Mr. Snyder further stated vehicles have the ability to leave the site either by going right or if there is any queuing it is on their site and not actually queuing onto the public road. He noted it is an existing condition which they are not materially adding to because there are only a small number of vehicles from their site during the peak hour. Also, when LCBC is active they block that exit off and vehicles can only go right during their peak period, providing cones and constables for enforcement.

Mr. Snyder stated in regard to PennDOT the determination was that if they have a valid HOP there is no change of classification of that permit, subsequently there is nothing to submit to PennDOT. PennDOT does not weigh in on any of those situations unless they request a permit or are making some improvement in the right-of-way.

Mr. Jon Seitz from TRG indicated a traffic study was performed for the Candlewood Suites site and along with that they scrutinized the crash pattern accident statistics from 2008 through 2013. Mr. Seitz stated during that five year period there were no accidents at the AESYS driveway or at the right- in/right-out driveway. They had also performed a supplemental analysis using statistics from the former Saturn dealership in that location comparing it to the 85 room hotel and the LCBC church during the p.m. peak hour. Mr. Seitz noted when adding the church and the hotel together the result was 74 vehicles. The car dealership was 66 vehicles, which resulted in not a perceptible difference in traffic. Furthermore, he noted they performed a level of service analysis at the intersection of Route 30 and North Hills Road which determined an overall level of service "A" with a level of service "E" exiting if using PennDOT

criteria. Mr. Seitz stated they meet the PennDOT criteria and would not be required to provide any additional mitigation. They feel with this magnitude of traffic between LCBC and the Candlewood Suites it is comparable to what was there previously and would be compatible with how it was designed. Solicitor King stated part of the discussion indicated because there are no changes with respect to PennDOT and what is required, they looked at it from the Township's perspective when the next steps are taken with the AESYS property.

Discussion was held regarding the level of Service "E"- during the p.m. peak hour. It was suggested to restrict left turn movements from 3-6 P.M., Monday-Friday to alleviate safety concerns for hotel guests and the church.

Attorney Carolyn Hoffer, representing the hotel, stated their position in terms of the total amount of cars is the hotel is it is a very low traffic generator. She agreed that ideally improvements on North Hills Road would make it easier, however, the hotel has no authority to modify operations from the AESYS driveway and they are anxious to get started on the project.

Raj Parekh, Hotel Manager, in answer to a question regarding the hotel's target market and clientele, indicated the hotel accommodates extended stays for business guests.

Discussion was held regarding the traffic issues with various suggestions on how to address them from a safety standpoint. One suggestion would be to place internal signage on the LCBC property to restrict access to the cross easement between LCBC and AESYS.

Mr. Snyder indicated they would be agreeable to internal signage. They already are planning a sign at the entrance to direct vehicles to turn at the correct entrance for the hotel.

Mr. Tim Barley from LCBC stated they would find it acceptable to have an internal sign that says between those hours right out only from Saturn Way. He noted the sign would not be on the AESYS property and would not affect AESYS traffic.

Mr. Snyder stated they will add a detail on the plan as well as notes about the signage which will be reflected in the agreement between the parties.

Discussion was held regarding Waiver #2. It was noted that if Waiver #2 is granted Condition #7 will not be necessary.

It was also noted that Condition #5 is a holdover from the last meeting and will be covered by the internal signage proposed.

Chairman Maciejewski asked if there was anyone in attendance who had an interest in the plan.

Mr. Mike Snyder

Mr. Snyder noted he has a business on North Hills Road. Mr. Snyder referred to a meeting held at his business at which traffic improvements specifically for his entrance were discussed. In attendance were Keith Gillespie, Mr. Seitz and PennDOT representatives. Mr. Snyder expressed his concerns about the current traffic issues from a safety standard and his frustration with the fact that none of the improvements have been acted upon to date.

Mr. Snyder also indicated discussion was held regarding the idea for placing rumble strips on that area of the roadway which would slow traffic down in the center turn lane. Mr. Luciani clarified that PennDOT would not permit rumble strips in the through lane since cars are allowed in that lane. Rumble strips can

only be placed in prohibited drive areas.

In regards to Mr. Snyder's traffic concerns, it was noted that the Township is still working on the HOP and as soon as it is obtained they can work through the next steps to get the improvements built.

MR. SWOMLEY MOVED WITH REFERENCE TO LAND DEVELOPMENT PLAN LD-14-06, CANDLEWOOD SUITES HOTEL, TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE WAIVERS IDENTIFIED AS 1&2 ABOVE. MR. ROBERTSON SECONDED. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY PASSED.

MR. SWOMLEY MOVED WITH REFERENCE TO LAND DEVELOPMENT PLAN LD-14-06, CANDLEWOOD SUITES HOTEL, TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE FINAL PLAN WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

1. SALDO (§289-12)

(C) FINAL PLANS; PROCEDURE. APPLICANT SHALL PROVIDE FINANCIAL SECURITY FOR COMPLETION OF THE PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS. PAGE 2 OF 2

(L) FINAL PLANS; PROCEDURE. APPLICANT SHALL PAY TO HAVE THE PLAN RECORDED IN THE OFFICE OF THE RECORDER OF DEEDS OF YORK COUNTY WITHIN 90 DAYS OF PLAN APPROVAL.

(M) APPLICANT SHALL PROVIDE ALL INFORMATION AND REVISIONS TO COMPLY WITH THE CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL ESTABLISHED BY THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS PRIOR TO RECORDING THE PLAN.

2. SALDO (§289-35.E.2.) LANDSCAPING AND BUFFER YARDS. APPLICANT SHALL MAKE ARRANGEMENTS ACCEPTABLE TO THE TOWNSHIP FOR THE PROPERTY'S LONG-TERM LANDSCAPE MAINTENANCE.

3. SALDO (§289.13.A) FINAL PLANS; SPECIFICATIONS. APPLICANT SHALL SUBMIT THE PLAN ON MYLAR FOR RECORDING IN ADDITION TO SUBMITTING A PDF OF THE APPROVED PLAN.

4. PROVIDE EVIDENCE OF RECEIPT OF APPROVAL OF THE SANITARY SEWER PLANNING MODULE.

5. (REMOVED)

6. SWMO (§281-23)THE LANDOWNER/DEVELOPER SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR PROVIDING AS-BUILT PLANS OF ALL SWM BMPS SHOWN ON THE APPROVED PLAN. SUCH PLANS SHALL BE CONSISTENT WITH ALL CRITERIA ESTABLISHED IN §281-23.A-D

7. (REMOVED)

ALSO, SIGNAGE INTERNAL TO SATURN WAY DIRECTING TRAFFIC DURING PEAK HOURS OF MONDAY-FRIDAY 3 P.M. TO 6 P.M.. DETAILS TO BE WORKED OUT BETWEEN THE DEVELOPER AND THE TOWNSHIP ENGINEER. SECONDED BY MR. ROBERTSON. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY PASSED.

5. WAIVER RECOMMENDATIONS - None

6. OLD BUSINESS

A. Revised Version of Delay of Demolition Regulations

Steve Smith from the Historic Preservation Committee provided a copy of the yearly report submitted to the Board of Supervisors. He noted the last two sheets are the current list of the 101 most historically significant properties in Springettsbury Township. The report also provides the criteria used to

determine historic property. Mr. Smith indicated this list was established by the Board of Supervisors in 2001 and has been used by the Historic Preservation Committee since that time. Mr. Smith referred to the reference ID's on the list noting any property listed below 100 was on the original list from 2001 and has remained on the list. Any property with a number above 100 has been added within the last two years.

Mr. Smith stated there has been discussion about using restrictive covenant which he has been researching with the properties listed. He did not think there was any property within the Township that has restrictive covenant at this time. However, they have a list of several people in the Township who would like to have a restrictive covenant on their property. He noted they will be holding a seminar on that topic presented by Attorney Chris Ryder, a recent Board member of Historic York, to help homeowners understand the process.

Mr. Smith indicated the list of 101 is currently on the Springettsbury Township website. They are working on providing a photo and a story for each property listed on the website.

Mr. Smith also reported they are researching 1860 properties to determine what are the oldest properties and to evaluate if they are historic. He noted there are currently four properties listed on the National Historic Register.

Discussion was held regarding the evaluation process to determine if a property is historically significant. Ms. Lang indicated a letter is sent to the property owner to request an evaluation of the property. She noted the evaluation is conducted by Mr. Terry Downs who makes a recommendation to the Historic Preservation Committee to decide if it should be added to the list.

Ms. Lang also noted they are in the process of identifying the owners on the list and giving them the option to decide if they want to continue to be on the list and participate in the plaque program which recognizes their historic property. Depending on the feedback and responses, they will determine the go-forward strategy particularly of the plaque program.

Ms. Lang spoke in terms of the proposed ordinance language indicating at the last meeting she presented an edited version which applied a particular time frame between applying for a demolition permit and releasing that permit to the applicant. In determining additional parts, there was a concern about demolition by neglect. Consequently, she added verbiage in the proposed ordinance to provide for delay of demolition for a property that is going to come down and also language to insure maintenance or restoration to the property. She indicated there currently is stringent maintenance language in the code of ordinances and noted when applying this to vacant structures, the difficulty is it looks at the safety of its inhabitants and when there are no inhabitants it may not apply.

Attorney King indicated if the Township is going to impose a waiting period for the demolition process, it needs to be identified in the ordinance from a legal standpoint.

Discussion was held regarding the 90 day waiting period which is initiated when a property owner applies for a demolition permit. Ms. Lang indicated she would add language to the ordinance to make it clear what the purpose of the delay is and steps to be taken during that 90 day period.

Ms. Lang indicated she will make the necessary adjustments to the proposed ordinance. They will continue to work on the list to obtain acknowledgement from the property owners and also setting up the meeting to discuss deed restrictions.

7. NEW BUSINESS – None

8. ADJOURNMENT

CHAIRMAN MACIEJEWSKI ADJOURNED THE MEETING AT 8:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Secretary

sas