

APPROVED

**SPRINGETTSBURY TOWNSHIP  
PLANNING COMMISSION  
AUGUST 20, 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. JULY 16, 2015**

**APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FOR JULY 16, 2015 WAS DEFERRED FOR CORRECTIONS.**

**3. BRIEFING ITEMS - None**

**4. ACTION ITEMS**

**A. LD-15-02 U-Gro Final Land Development Plan**

Dave Madary, Derck & Edson Associates,  
Phil Hollinger, U-Gro Learning Centre

Project Narrative: This plan proposes to expand the size of the existing day care facility. This expansion is predicted to increase the occupancy from 24 to 28 staff and from 117 to 149 children. A total of eight waivers have been requested.

Plan Background: This project was presented to the Planning Commission at their meeting in June. The plan was revised and resubmitted to address the regulations. Review of the revised plan has resulted in the following comments:

#### Waivers

1. Preliminary Plan (289-10) The ordinance requires that a preliminary plan be submitted when there are improvements proposed for dedication to the Township, when a PaDOT HOP is necessary, when recreation land is to be dedicated, when on-lot sewer or water will be used or when the project has multiple phases. As this project does not meet any of these criteria, it would not appear that a Preliminary Plan is required and therefore a waiver of the Preliminary Plan process is not necessary.
2. Plan Scale (289-13.A) The ordinance requires that a scale of 1':50' be used. Given the small size of the site, the applicant is requesting to utilize a larger scale to enhance legibility.
3. Sidewalks (289-32.A) The ordinance requires that sidewalk be installed on both sides of all streets in subdivisions and land developments. The applicant has requested a waiver because the use is existing and is served by a private access drive and not a public street.
4. Curbs (289-41.J.5) The ordinance requires the provision of curbing along the access drive. The applicant is requesting that the drive remain uncurbed to promote the conveyance of overflow from offsite runoff.
5. Landscaping (289-35.B.2.a.2) The ordinance requires that the predominant trees within a buffer established for the primary purpose of screening be evergreen. The applicant is requesting relief from this requirement due to security concerns.
6. Landscaping (289-35.D.3) Due to the limited width of the buffer yard area, installation of a wall or fence is required. The applicant is requesting to provide a fence in lieu of a wall due to space limitations.
7. Traffic Impact Study (289-21) The applicant has provided a trip generation study in lieu of the required traffic impact study to demonstrate that there will be no negative impact on the surrounding transportation network as a result of the proposed expansion.
8. Storm Water Management (281-15.B.1.h) The ordinance requires that the basin bottom slope be a minimum of 4%. The applicant is proposing to utilize the basin bottom to establish a BMP required to address storm water quality issues.
9. Storm Water Management (281-15.C.3.A, B, C) The ordinance establishes a maximum loading ratio for infiltration areas. The applicant has indicated that the proposed design meets the intent by providing for an overflow in the event of heavy runoff.

#### Administrative Issues

1. SALDO (289-12.A.5.a) Provide approval letter from York County Planning Commission.
2. SALDO (289-23.D.2.c) Easements Show the SWM easements for Swale-1, the Basin, and the existing swale at the west end of the property on all pertinent plan sheets.
3. Revise the cost estimate in accordance with correspondence from the Township Engineer's office dated August 12, 2015.
4. Complete all pertinent seals and signatures.
5. Revise the font size on sheet C-704 to be larger and more legible.
6. Show the second front setback along Eberts Lane.

#### Design Issues

7. SALDO (289-35.C) The landscaping plan is deficient by 13 shrub plantings in the buffer yard. Extend the buffer yard plantings the length of the property along US Route 30.

8. Provide an explanation of how the roof drainage from the unmanaged portion of the roof remains unmanaged in the proposed condition
9. Quantify the total discharge flowing to the PennDOT culvert in the pre and post-construction conditions to verify that the site runoff meet the discharge criteria of Springettsbury Township
10. SWO Provide an infiltration facility appropriate amended soils specification. The specification shall include the particle size break down as an abundance of silt and clay size particles will decrease the infiltration capacity of the basin.
11. SWO (281-10.L) Provide dewatering calculations for the basin to verify that the criteria of the section are met. The pictures provided do not adequately show the water level because the existing vegetation is obscuring the pond bottom.
12. SWO (281-15.C.3) The loading ratio describes the ratio of impervious drainage area to infiltration area, or the ratio of total drainage area to infiltration area. In general, the following loading ratio guidelines are recommended:
  - a. Maximum impervious loading ratio of 5:1 relating impervious drainage area to infiltration area
  - b. A maximum total loading ratio of 8:1 relating total drainage area to infiltration area. Maximum impervious loading ratio of 3:1 relating impervious drainage area to infiltration area for karst areas.

Mr. Madary stated the case was presented as a briefing several months ago and since then they have been working with Staff and First Capital Engineering and have resolved the majority of issues discussed during their review.

Mr. Hollinger provided an overview of the project, indicating that U-Gro Learning Centers is a family owned business existing for 42 years. He noted there are 11 early learning and child care centers in Central PA. They serve approximately 1200 families and over 1400 children five days a week. They are closely tied to York school system. They are proposing to renovate and expand their oldest facility built in 1997 located at 1321 North Sherman Street. The intention is to add additional indoor play space which will serve approximately 30 additional children, going from a population of 120 to 150.

Mr. Hollinger provided a photo of their center in Lancaster which is what they hope to achieve at the York facility. The second photo shows the addition of what the indoor play space will look like. The third photo provided a view from the southwest looking northeast. The fourth photo showed the view from east to west looking over the addition to the classroom plus the addition of the indoor play space. The last photo illustrates the proposed new playground equipment.

Mr. Madary stated they hope to be ready to begin construction this fall for spring occupancy.

It was determined that the request for the preliminary plan waiver was not needed since this is the final plan. It was noted the applicant would need to adjust their drawing to remove the waiver request.

Discussion was held concerning the applicant's waiver request for curbing and sidewalk. It was noted zoning ordinance §325-116.P requires if there is a request for a curb not to be installed there must be some type of vehicle control, either a fence or bush delineating the access drive. Mr. Hollinger indicated the request for the waiver is to allow conveyance of runoff. He also noted the shared access drive is owned by the U-Haul storage facility behind the U-Grow property.

Mr. Hollinger also indicated the waiver for sidewalks was requested since there are no offsite sidewalks to connect to the adjacent property and U-Gro does not want to encourage pedestrian traffic away from the site by installing short sidewalks.

Discussion was held regarding the first waiver for landscaping. It was noted the Ordinance requires that predominant trees within a buffer zone established for primary purposes of screening should be evergreen. The applicant is requesting relief from this requirement due to security concerns.

It was noted that at the time of the initial development of U-Gro an existing tree line was illegally removed. Mr. Hollinger stated at the time of construction they were not aware they had to have permission to take the trees down. The applicant was asked to explain what landscape buffering they are proposing in lieu of evergreens. Mr. Hollinger indicated the coverage would consist of groundcover and shrubs, everything except the size of the trees since that was a security concern.

It was determined by the Planning Commission that installing new trees would not be a security risk. It was also noted that Bradford pear trees were the trees initially removed. It was recommended that the applicant modify their waiver and plant deciduous trees instead of evergreens.

The second landscaping waiver request was discussed. It was noted the applicant is requesting to provide a fence in lieu of a wall due to space limitations. Mr. Luciani determined this meets with the intent of the buffer and is a justification for a waiver.

Discussion was held regarding design issues #8 and #9. It was noted there is a portion of the shed roof that allows water to run down to the access road and is intercepted in a swale and runs to the west side of the property. Mr. Madary indicated two-thirds of the building runs to the existing basin, just a piece in the middle runs out to the street. In the proposed condition they will be picking up all but one-fourth of that building which will be a substantial improvement. Mr. Luciani indicated they will need to review the unmanaged area to make sure it all gets to the basin.

Discussion was held concerning the landscape buffer proposed along Route 30. There was concern that circulating headlights from the U-Gro parking lot would go into oncoming traffic on Route 30 based on the elevations. Mr. Madary indicated there is a landscape buffer proposed along that line which would be at least 3-4 feet tall with the addition of the deciduous trees. He indicated they will plan to install higher shrubbery in that section.

In regards to fire apparatus accessibility, it was determined vehicles would access the eastern end of the U-Gro building by way of Eberts Lane or come into the site through the storage facility. It was also noted the building is sprinklered.

Mr. Madary indicated they are anticipating presentation for the September Board of Supervisors meeting. They hope to begin construction at the end of October/beginning of November. The construction cycle is 5 months. They will be continuously operating the school through the construction phase.

A reassessment of the design issues indicated the following:

7. Landscaping plans – they will add larger trees and use the fence.
8. Outstanding – A calculation is needed to determine how much water is flowing to the swale to quantify it and confirm it is large enough to contain it.

9. Outstanding (connected to 8)
10. Outstanding – Mr. Madary indicated the detail on the plan currently shows the top soil ratio used on all of their projects. The reviewers were looking for additional notes related to providing an amended soil specification.
11. Okay
12. Okay

Waivers:

- #1 - Removed since this is the final plan
- #2 through 9 stand

Administrative issues all stand open.

Mr. Madary expressed concern with the timing for investigation of Design issues #8 and 9 and also the fact they are unsure how to proceed with resolution of the unmanaged water from one-fourth of the building. Mr. Swomley noted he would explain the situation to the Board of Supervisors.

Chairman Maciejewski asked if there was any public comment. Hearing none he called for a motion.

**MR. ROBERTSON MOVED WITH REFERENCE TO LAND DEVELOPMENT PLAN LD-15-02, U-GRO BUILDING ADDITION, TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL ON THE REQUESTED WAIVERS 2 THROUGH 9 AS LISTED ON THE PLAN SUMMARY. SECONDED BY MR. WURSTER. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY PASSED.**

**MR. ROBERTSON MOVED WITH REFERENCE TO LAND DEVELOPMENT PLAN LD-15-02, U-GRO BUILDING ADDITION, TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE FINAL LAND DEVELOPMENT PLAN SUBJECT TO SATISFACTORY COMPLETION OF ADMINISTRATIVE ISSUES 1 THROUGH 6, DESIGN ISSUES 8 THROUGH 10 AS LISTED ON THE PLAN SUMMARY, AND THE ADDITION OF CHANGE TO THE LANDSCAPING BUFFER AS DISCUSSED IN THE MEETING AND AS REVIEWED AND APPROVED BY STAFF PRIOR TO THE MEETING. IN ADDITION, THE ADMINISTRATIVE AND DESIGN ISSUES MUST BE CORRECTED AS MUCH AS POSSIBLE PRIOR TO THE SEPTEMBER BOARD OF SUPERVISORS MEETING. MR. WURSTER SECONDED. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY PASSED.**

**B. SD-15-02 Whiteford Road Subdivision**

Attorney Jeffrey Esch McCombie, McNees, Wallace & Nurick  
Rick Castronio, Project Engineer, Alpha Consulting

Project Narrative: This plan proposes the subdivision of an existing 4.18 acre developed parcel into three separate lots. Each lot will contain one of the existing structures on the site. While the proposed property lines respect the individual structures, all of the existing shared infrastructure (lighting, parking, storm water management, and access) will indiscriminately cross the proposed boundaries.

Plan Background: The applicant has secured a variance for the encroachment of the existing structures on lots #1 and #2 in the rear yard setback and for the encroachment of the existing structure on lot #1 in the front yard setback along Route 30. The review of the formally submitted subdivision plan resulted in the following comments:

Waivers:

Preliminary Plan (289-10.A.2.b) The provisions of this section of the ordinance call for submission of a preliminary plan when there are improvements proposed for dedication to the Township, when a PaDOT HOP is necessary, when recreation land is to be dedicated, when on-lot sewer or water will be used or when the project has multiple phases. As this project does not meet any of these criteria, it would not appear that a Preliminary Plan is required and therefore a waiver of the Preliminary Plan process is not necessary.

Landscaping and Buffer Yards (289-35) The provisions of this section require that a Buffer Yard 2 be located between Lot #1 and its frontage along Route 30. The applicant has suggested that this requirement did not exist at the time that the project was originally constructed and that no buffer between Route 30 and Lot #1 is needed. Staff notes that although Route 30 serves as the frontage for Lot #1, it is the rear of the building that can be viewed from this arterial street.

#### Administrative Issues

1. Indicate the purpose and ownership of the one-story utility building located on lot #1, near the Susquehanna Bank
2. Label street names on all plan sheets
3. Label and dimension right-of-way and cartway widths on all plan sheets
4. Indicate the purpose of the concrete pad at the west end of the parking island on Lot #1.
5. Deeds for all lots shall reference the agreement between Susquehanna Bank and the Township for a traffic impact study after ten years. A plan note shall also be added to identify this agreement.
6. SALDO (289-26.A) Monuments shall be cut stone or concrete with a minimum size of six inches by 30 inches. Monuments must be so placed that the scored or marked point coincides exactly with the point of intersection of the lines being monumented. They must be set so that the top of the monument or marker is level with the surface of the surrounding ground. Monuments must be marked on top with a copper or brass dowel.
7. SALDO (289-26.B) Location of monuments. 1) At the intersection of lines forming angles in the boundaries of the subdivision. 2) At the intersection of street lines. 3) At changes in alignment of the street
8. SALDO (289-36) Streetlights shall be required to be installed in all subdivisions and land developments in all zoning districts and shall be in accordance with Township Construction and Engineering Specifications.
9. ZO (325-114.B) Off-street parking and loading space as required in this section shall be provided for all new buildings and structures and for additions to existing buildings or structures. The word "addition," as used above, shall include any alterations intended to enlarge or increase capacity by adding or creating dwelling units, floor area or seats.
10. ZO (325-116.L) Detailed plans identifying parking lot lighting shall be provided. These plans shall include the location and type of light standards, fixture and illumination specifications. The illumination of the parking or building area shall be restricted to the property of the applicant and shall not cause or create any glare, reflection or illumination upon any roadway or adjoining property. It will be necessary to address the lighting of all driveways to demonstrate that they will be lighted to identify and provide safe access. Light standards of a

low silhouette type are suggested for the adequate lighting driveways. Light standards of this type identifying driveways may be erected within five feet of the street right-of-way and shall not exceed ten feet in height. All other light standards and fixtures shall not exceed thirty feet in height and shall not be located in the public right-of-way.

11. ZO (325-116.N) Parking lot interior landscaping. All surface parking lots of 20 spaces or more shall have shade trees with a minimum caliper of 2.5". One shade tree per 12 spaces is required in planting islands, where space permits, or diamonds evenly spaced throughout the parking lot.
12. ZO (325-116.P) All parking lots shall be curbed. For infiltration and water quality purposes, curbing may be eliminated if the developer can show approved and accepted methods of water quality and infiltration techniques being in place. In cases where curbing is eliminated, another method of vehicle control shall be employed. The Township Engineer should determine the applicability of the infiltration and water quality techniques proposed. Bituminous curbing is not acceptable.
13. ZO (25-117.B) A shared parking agreement which involves a contractual agreement between users is required. A shared parking agreement allows users an opportunity, if they choose, to redesign parking lots to be more efficient in serving multiple users. This may consist of making new curb cuts between parking lots, restriping lots, or redesigning internal traffic circulation and pedestrian walkways. It is noted that all shared infrastructure should be addressed with the creation of cross easements and the creation and recording of associated agreements for ownership, rights of access and maintenance.

Attorney McCombie indicated they presented at the Planning Commission meeting in June as a briefing item. The proposed project is for a 3 lot subdivision plan at the location of 2900-2960 Whiteford Road. The plan does not propose any improvements or additions. The site includes the existing Susquehanna Bank as well as Lumber Liquidators and a vacant building. Attorney McCombie indicated they were granted two variances from the Zoning Hearing Board in June.

Discussion was held regarding ADA requirements. It was noted the plan does reflect the ADA spaces, however, they were not sure if all ADA plans are up to date as a result of creating lot lines. It was determined that since they are not adding to the building which would require additional parking spaces, the site is considered existing non-conforming which would negate the need for additional handicap spaces.

In regards to lighting plans it was noted that Lot #3 was in compliance. Mr. Castranio indicated that the foot candle and illumination study which was done for the Susquehanna Bank meets lighting requirements. Future development on Lots 1 and 2 will require that the lighting is in compliance with the zoning ordinance.

Discussion was held regarding the waiver request for landscaping and buffer yards. Mr. Castranio indicated there is only five feet from where the Route 30 right-of-way is to the access drive which is a recorded document. The easement between all the lots extends onto Route 30. In addition he noted that Met Ed has a power right-of-way and they do not think they would be allowed to put a wall or structure within that right-of-way.

Administrative Issue #1 was discussed regarding an existing one-story utility shed on the site. Mr. Castranio explained that is an electrical building which served the former Pfaltzgraff building. He noted when Susquehanna Bank demolished the building instead of trying to relocate it, they built a maintenance shed around it. He noted it controls the lighting to all of the lots.

Discussion was held regarding whether an easement would be required. Mr. Castranio indicated because the lots are all currently owned by one party an easement cannot be done. Consequently, they developed a declaration of easements and maintenance which will be recorded with the plan and will allow accessibility to drive on each other's parking lot. He further noted the electricity is being shared and everyone maintains their own lots. Ms. Lang noted a copy of the document was received today.

The administrative issues were assessed as listed noted above:

1. The ownership of the one-story building will be reflected in the agreement with the utilities and cross access agreement.
2. Label street names on all the plan sheets – that has been done. Sheet 3 was the only one that was not shown.
3. Also not shown on Sheet 3 – that has been amended to Sheet 3.
4. Indicate the purpose of the concrete pad – noted that was an old dumpster pad which has been added to the existing conditions plan.
5. Deeds for all lots shall reference the agreement – plan notes shall be added to identify this agreement. Mr. Luciani clarified in each deed there is a requirement to evaluate traffic. At the end of 10 years or prior to that a study would be conducted paid for by the owner of the property to determine whether traffic warrants are met at the intersection of Galleria and Whiteford Road, necessitating the installation of a traffic light. He noted at this time the three lots would be obligated to share the costs. Attorney McCombie stated the way the agreement is currently drafted is the agreement is between the developer and the Township and it runs with the land. What they would like to do with the subdivision instead of having the agreement run with the other two lots, is have it only run with the Susquehanna Bank lot and whoever is the owner when year 10 arrives would be the one that pays for the traffic signal. (The effective date for the 10 year plan was determined to be February 28, 2013. Discussion was held as to the tracking mechanism to determine when the 10 years comes to term. It was noted that a database with a document retrieval system should be put in place.)
- 6 and 7 – relating to the installation and location of concrete monuments on the site. This has not yet been accomplished and will be a condition.
8. It was noted that the streetlights were installed with the Susquehanna Bank plan so it is no longer an issue.
- 9,10,11,12 related to future expansion. It was reiterated that presently the site is an existing non-conforming use so these were removed.
13. The shared parking agreement will be referred to the township solicitor for review.

It was noted that Waiver #1 for Preliminary Plan was removed since this is the final plan.

Chairman Maciejewski asked if there was any public comment. Hearing none he called for a motion.

**MR. ROBERTSON MOVED WITH REFERENCE TO SD-15-02 WHITEFORD ROAD SUBDIVISION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF WAIVER FOR LANDSCAPING AND BUFFER YARDS (289-35) AS LISTED ON THE PLAN SUMMARY. SECONDED BY MR. STUHRE. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY PASSED.**

**MR. ROBERTSON MOVED WITH REFERENCE TO SD-15-02 WHITEFORD ROAD SUBDIVISION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS: #5, #6, #7 AS LISTED ON THE PLAN SUMMARY. IT WAS NOTED THAT #13 WILL BE REVIEWED BY THE TOWNSHIP SOLICITOR. SECONDED BY MR. STUHRE. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY PASSED.**

### C. York Container Re-Zoning Request

Ms. Lang indicated the applicant requested that she represent them. She noted this is the same request for re-zoning that was presented to the Planning Commission previously. Since the last time they presented, Staff was suggesting they eliminate a part of the R-1 land and add the G-I parcel. Ms. Lang referred to the map attached to her memo, indicating the existing developments on 0-8, 18A and 18 are the R-1 pieces that were part of the re-zoning request. They discussed adding what is labeled as Parcel 22, but decided against it since it would require resubmission to York County Planning Commission. Consequently a recommendation was made to include only removal of R-1 and not include this piece. Upon further discussion with the applicant, they indicated they were concerned about what could be done due to the fact that this was a separate zoning district. They indicated they always wanted to include it and it was part of their proposal. York County Planning Commission did not agree that was included. The application was subsequently withdrawn. York Container revised the submission to include Parcel 22 and eliminate the end of the R-1 as noted previously. Ms. Lang stated it will go before the York County Planning Commission at their August meeting. In making those changes they have revised their previous recommendation which was to leave out the G-I Parcel 22 so that is included in the actual request. Part of the difficulty the applicant is having is that they believe this Parcel 22 is not a separate parcel. Their deed information indicates it is all part of their parent tract.

**MR. SWOMLEY MOVED IN THE YORK CONTAINER RE-ZONING REQUEST TO RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS THAT 18, 18A AND 22 BE RE-ZONED TO FLEXIBLE DEVELOPMENT, CONDITIONED UPON THE EXTENSION TO MARKET STREET REMAINING R-1 AND THAT THE METES AND BOUNDS DESCRIPTION BE ENTERED ON THE DEED. SECONDED BY MR. WURSTER. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY PASSED.**

### D. Spring Lane, LLC Re-Zoning Request

Attorney Jeffrey Lobach, Barley Snyder  
George Bullard, Principal of Spring Lane, LLC  
John Snyder, Developer, RGS  
Jason Wheeler, Engineer, Traffic Planning & Design

Solicitor King recommended that the spot zoning issue which was brought up by the York County Planning Commission as to deciding the legal ramifications has not yet been determined. He advised the Planning Commission with respect to the entire project to consider if it makes sense from a planning standpoint.

Attorney Lobach indicated they have been working with Staff for over a year on the site which is located at the corner of Mt. Zion Road and classified as a major arterial road, and East Market Street, classified as a minor arterial road. He noted the tract is slightly over 12 acres, with approximately 17 buildings of different types. Under the Township's comprehensive plan it is in the primary commercial-industrial corridor and it is designated in the primary growth area. Attorney Lobach reviewed the properties noted there are 12 tax parcels. Properties of note include:

- 3405 East Market Street, a former residential building now mostly office and partly residential
- 3323 East Market Street owned by Riceville Builders, which is multi-family residential.
- 3321 East Market Street - multifamily residential.
- 3311 East Market Street - parcels 30 and 31 is the Modernaire Motel

Attorney Lobach indicated the property is served with a small amount of sidewalk now installed on the Mt. Zion Road. There are no sidewalks on East Market Street. The current zoning is Neighborhood-Commercial. He noted they have requested the zoning map be amended to change the classification from N-C to Commercial-Highway with the Township's Town Center Overlay on top of the zoning classification. The permitted uses now under the N-C zoning are oriented towards residential uses. Uses range from single-family detached housing to some commercial, some office and the motel is not permitted. C-H would permit the motel and would permit more retail which they determine is the best use of the property.

Attorney Lobach noted the Town Center Overlay imposes certain amenities and neighborhood connections, of which they are aware of the design and cost constraints and additional approvals.

Attorney Lobach referenced the surrounding neighborhoods noting the neighborhood to the northeast is Springetts Manor Apartments. To the west is Lafayette Plaza and The Yorkshire House. To the south on the other side of Market Street and Eastern Blvd. is Village East Apartments. These are three of the largest high density housing projects in the Township. In the middle is the proposed site. In order to enable the residents from these areas to be able to walk to this area, he stated the applicant is prepared to master plan the entire site and develop it in an integrated fashion. This would include installing wide sidewalks and walkways that meet Township specifications and would also include landscaping and screening. He noted as well there are signage limitations, lighting requirements and requirements for public spaces. There are also architectural controls which address the façade and walls. Permitted uses include offices, public facilities and a farmers market. Everything else requires a conditional use. There are also parking and access requirements.

Attorney Lobach stated the plan at this stage is illustrative of businesses that could be at the site. He noted the only committed user is Lidl Grocery Store located at the far north end.

Attorney Lobach acknowledged they are at early stage to address traffic which he noted is a concern. Although they do not know the exact uses at this point it is hard to predict what traffic mitigations will be required, but they have already engaged with PennDOT. They have predicted trips based on projected uses would be approximately 4% at the AM peak hour and 8% in the PM peak hour.

Attorney Lobach reviewed other requirements, i.e., reverse subdivision approval, land development approval, as well as two requests for HOPs. They would also need to go to the Conservation District. They are focused on appropriate land use for the site. Attorney Lobach noted they are aware of opposition from the neighborhood and have respect for their views. He referred to comments about demolition of historic properties in this area, noting there are no plans for that area at this time.

Attorney Lobach referred to York County Planning Commission comments. He noted their analysis incorrectly shows Springetts Manor as medium density residential even though the comprehensive plan shows Springetts Manor as high density residential for the future use plan. The YCPC also commented that it could appear that spot zoning could be created. The 3<sup>rd</sup> comment referred to this parcel as not being a potential area for the Town Center Overlay. He

also referred to their comment about whether the re-zoning is compatible. Attorney Lobach stated the last YCPC comment concerned traffic which they have acknowledged will be more intense from what is currently there, but he stated they will mitigate the traffic in an attempt to improve the traffic situation. In response to a request for examples of how that would be accomplished, Attorney Lobach deferred to Jason Wheeler, TRG.

Mr. Wheeler explained they began the scoping process to determine what intersections would need to be studied in accordance with PennDOT and Township guidelines as well as for traffic impact studies. He noted traffic counts have not yet begun, however, using previous counts done at the intersection of Route 24 and Route 462 they have projected with full build out of this site it would represent approximately 4% of the AM traffic and about 8% of the PM peak hour traffic at the Market Street – Mt. Zion Road intersection. They are also considering mitigating traffic by condensing multiple driveways into four driveways.

Mr. Wheeler indicated as part of the traffic study they will be assessing the adjacent intersections specifically along the Rt. 24 corridor. They will be reviewing traffic signal timings to determine traffic optimization. This may involve some escape lanes and turn lanes. They are currently proposing two full movement access points and two limited movement driveways to each of the roadways in that area. The traffic impact study will evaluate whether or not those are safe conditions and whether further restrictions need to be made. He indicated PennDOT has agreed to allow access to driveway configurations as currently proposed before going into any further restrictions.

It was noted there was some discussion with PennDOT concerning the possibility of having a signalized access opposite Bloomingdale Avenue which may help alleviate some of the traffic at Mt. Zion and East Market Street by diverting it through Eastern Boulevard. Mr. Wheeler noted they would have to go through a rigorous process evaluating whether a traffic signal would work in that location.

Chairman Maciejewski asked if there was any public comment. He reviewed the rules for speaking in a limited time frame.

#### Lisa Shahid – 73 Mt. Zion Road

Ms. Shahid indicated she lives a few hundred feet from where the entrance would be on Mt. Zion Road and has resided there 21 years. She expressed traffic concerns and this development creating a dangerous traffic situation. She was also not in favor of additional shopping areas.

#### Steven Smith – 3638 Pleasant Valley Road

Mr. Smith stated he was a member of the Historical Preservation Committee but was speaking as a resident. He expressed concerns about not needing another food store and questioned the traffic going in and out of the area. In regards to creating a Town Center Overlay he expressed concern that this would encourage people to walk from all directions in a heavily traffic area and felt it would present a safety hazard.

#### Barbara Ann DeLeon

Ms. DeLeon stated although she currently lives in Southern York County she grew up in Springettsbury Township and works at the Galleria Mall. She expressed concerns about adding another shopping area when there are currently numerous empty spaces in existing shopping

areas, including the Galleria Mall.

Chairman Maciejewski called for a motion. Since no motion was made, Chairman Maciejewski took precedence and made a recommendation that the Board of Supervisors do not approve the re-zoning proposal for Spring Lane LLC. He cited the conditions currently stated in the evaluation by the York County Planning Commission, as well as the intent of the comprehensive plan which is to limit the amount of commercial highway development which would initiate the beginning of additional C-H development in adjacent corners of Market Street and Mt. Zion Road. There was no second, consequently the motion failed.

Mr. Swomley indicated he was inclined to recommend approval for re-zoning to Commercial-Highway with the Town Center Overlay, for reasons that the Town Center Overlay is in keeping with what the Township was intending to accomplish and the businesses in the Market Street corridor are consistent with Commercial-Highway. In addition, the controls in place for each parcel to be redeveloped are highly regulated by the Township and sufficient to assure the character of the neighborhood is maintained.

Discussion was held regarding in contemplating a zoning change to the proposed area should consideration be given to change the zoning for all four corners, or at least extend the zoning to make a comprehensive plan for this intersection. It was determined that a strategic study of the entire intersection in terms of its zoning should be undertaken before making a decision on one corner. It was also pointed out that granting the re-zoning request does not compel the developer to develop as a Town Center it just gives the applicant the legal rights of H-C.

Discussion was also held regarding the inaccuracies cited on the comments from the York County Planning Commission.

**MR. SWOMLEY MOVED TO RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVAL FOR THE SPRING LANE, LLC RE-ZONING REQUEST FOR THE OUTLYING AREA CONSISTING OF 12 PARCELS TO COMMERCIAL- HIGHWAY WITH TOWN CENTER OVERLAY. MR. ROBERTSON SECONDED. MOTION PASSED 3/2. CHAIRMAN MACIEJEWSKI AND MR. STUHRE WERE OPPOSED.**

Discussion was held concerning ongoing traffic issues in the Township specifically related to the impact of the modifications on Route 24 and how that will affect traffic in the Market Street – Mt. Zion area. It was determined that a study of the four corners at the Market Street – Mt. Zion intersection be undertaken to investigate whether re-zoning those areas is warranted.

Discussion was also held regarding the need for a comprehensive plan to be developed specifically targeted for traffic issues. It was determined that a recommendation should be made to the Board of Supervisors in this respect.

**MR. ROBERTSON MOVED TO RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS THAT A STUDY BE CONDUCTED ON ALL FOUR CORNERS OF MT. ZION AND MARKET STREET INTERSECTION TO DETERMINE POTENTIAL RE-ZONING. MR. WURSTER SECONDED. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY PASSED.**

It was noted that funding would need to be provided to conduct the study.

In regards to a comprehensive plan for traffic, Mr. Swomley suggested that could be part of the comprehensive plan review which is coming up in the near future. He also noted that he requested the Township Manager to complete a study of the road systems in the Township to focus on options for future studies on traffic improvement.

**MR. ROBERTSON MOVED TO RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS TO HAVE A COMPREHENSIVE PLAN FOR TRAFFIC DEVELOPED WITH THE TIMING OF THE UPCOMING COMPREHENSIVE PLAN REVIEW OR EARLIER. SECONDED BY MR. WURSTER. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY PASSED.**

**5. WAIVER RECOMMENDATIONS - None**

**6. OLD BUSINESS – None**

**7. NEW BUSINESS – None**

**8. ADJOURNMENT**

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

Respectfully submitted,

Secretary

/ses