

APPROVED

**SPRINGETTSBURY TOWNSHIP  
PLANNING COMMISSION  
SEPTEMBER 15, 2016**

**MEMBERS IN**

**ATTENDANCE:** Alan Maciejewski, Chairman  
Mark Robertson  
Charles Wurster  
Charles Stuhre  
Tim Staub

**ALSO IN**

**ATTENDANCE:** John Luciani, First Capital Engineering  
Jessica Fieldhouse, Community Development Director  
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. AUGUST 18, 2016**

**MR. STAUB MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE MEETING MINUTES OF AUGUST 18, 2016 AS PRESENTED. MR. WURSTER SECONDED. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**3. BRIEFING ITEMS**

**A. LD-16-06 Advent Lutheran Church – 1775 E. Market Street**

John Snyder, RGS

Ms. Fieldhouse presented a summary indicating there are four lots involved with this preliminary/final subdivision. She pointed out Lot #1 and Lot #2 which were previously purchased with the intent of adding parking, however, the sentiment of neighbors in the surrounding area was negative and precluded the church from moving forward with that plan. She noted Lot #3 will remain parking adjacent to Lot #1. The newly acquired Lot #4 currently has a residential dwelling. This plan proposes a building expansion of approximately 400 sq. ft. to provide access from the parking lot into the church and also another similar size canopy for pick up and drop off next to the access. To allow for this change, drive aisles and parking spaces are being eliminated resulting in 8 parking spaces in Lot#1 removed. This necessitates the house

to be demolished on Lot #4 and a new 9 space parking lot will be built with the appropriate landscaping, storm water management facilities and a storm drainage easement which will also be extended to Lot #3. Ms. Fieldhouse noted they had previously approved the church for a special exception to allow for the parking lot on Lot #4 which gave the church permission to build a parking area on a lot other than where the primary use is located. The special exception was received in April 7, 2016. In addition, the Zoning Hearing Board granted a variance to the church to allow for parking in the front yard for Lot #4 due to the fact they have frontage on East Philadelphia Street and North Oxford Street, as well as North Hills Road. The variance specifically allowed for a 20 ft. setback changed to a 4 ft. setback on E. Philadelphia St. and a 20 ft. setback changed to a 9 ft. setback on North Oxford Street. All with the condition that the parking lot can never be rented or leased for a commercial purpose.

Ms. Fieldhouse indicated the plan was reviewed during a developer's meeting on September 6, 2016 at which time the Township Engineer's comments were reviewed with the church representative. In addition, the plans were reviewed by the YAUFRR who had no comments, the Police Department also had no comments, as well as the York County Planning Commission had no comments. She noted they received a comment response from RGS on September 13 with several revisions to the land development plan. She reviewed their resubmittal and RGS was able to take care of the outstanding items. The only items left are from First Capital Engineering for review and finalization of the storm water facilities. She noted there are several street lighting issues to be reviewed by First Capital.

Ms. Fieldhouse reviewed the waiver requests:

- §289.15 Environmental Impact Study,
- §289.13A Plan scale 1"=30' scale
- §289.32.A and §289.31.A for sidewalk and curbing. There is partial sidewalk on E. Philadelphia Street on both the north and south sides. There is curbing that extends down. The sidewalks in this area are approximately 3 ft. not the 4 ft. required. There is no curbing on North Hills Road. The justification provided in the waiver request for the sidewalk is that the church does not require sidewalk being extended down to North Hills Rd. in order to get their pedestrians safely to the church. The sidewalk stops both north and south of the same point. Across the street from this intersection is the I-83 interchange 83.
- Waiver request for approximately a 20 ft. buffer yard. The waiver request may need to be changed since there may be an issue with a required wall.

Mr. Snyder stated that Advent church is over 100 years old. The issue is there is no handicap access to the building. He noted the plan is to build an addition to allow accessibility for their aging populations as well as handicapped people, which will cause the loss of existing parking and require the need for the additional parking. Mr. Snyder explained the need for the 5 waiver requests.

- Environmental impact study – the lots are all paved. There are no environmental issues located on any of them, including no wetlands or steep slopes, archeological resources, etc.
- Plan scan – they have it at 30' scale so it is easier to read and review.
- Sidewalks – the sidewalk stops midway to the point of the new entrance for the parking lot. They do not feel it is a necessity to add sidewalks along North Hills Road.
- Curbing both on the street and in our parking lot. The proposed parking lot has an underground stormwater system so water runs off the side of the macadam into a swale. If curbing is added at that location it will prevent getting the water into the trench drain without putting in those structures and would create additional maintenance. The waiver for the curbing is for that section as well as the 8" curbing since there is no 8" curbing anywhere on

the public streets to tie into it.

- Landscaping buffer yards – they initially requested a waiver of the width. With gaining the variances for the setback they only have 7.28 feet from the edge of the property to the parking lot. It is substandard compared to the 20 ft. minimum. He noted that it has been determined by Staff that a 3 ft. high street wall may be necessary to conform to the ordinance.

Discussion was held regarding the buffer yard requirements. It was noted this is a Type 1 buffer and the requirement would differ based on the width that is available. The ordinance allows for 10 ft. wide to a 35 ft. width with a 30” berm and 40” masonry wall. Because of the limited space the determination would need to be made as to what is appropriate for the area in terms of buffering and lighting the parking lot with the adjacent residential homes.

Mr. Snyder stated the property is only 50 ft. wide so adding one row of parking and a drive aisle to the lot will not leave much space left. He noted they maintained the setback and the buffer yard along the neighboring residents which is why they had to reduce the front yard setback by way of the variance. He noted they have agreed to place the landscaping plantings in accordance with the ordinance as well as the required number of trees. He further noted the church does not have the funds to put in a wall for nine parking spaces that would only be used Sunday mornings. The discussion with the Zoning Hearing Board was to not install parking lot lighting since it is around that residential area. There are two street lights on either end of Philadelphia Street at the intersections, so additional lighting was determined not to be necessary.

Ms. Fieldhouse confirmed part of the testimony for the Zoning Hearing Board discussion was that the applicant and the Zoning Hearing Board agreed that no internal parking lot lighting would be done as part of this plan because of how close the parking lot is to the residential homes.

Mr. Snyder requested to have the plan moved to an Action Item because they are trying to get the parking lot built so they can build the accessibility and because they are running out of time with the PennDOT paving season.

Discussion was held regarding sidewalks. It was noted there are no curbs and sidewalks on North Hills Road from Market Street to Philadelphia St. It was also noted the neighbor to the right has a six foot fence running to the edge of the roadway.

Mr. Snyder indicated they have maintained the 10 ft. setback from the macadam to the property line. They will have a row of landscaping buffering between that fence and their parking lot. Additionally they placed the drive aisle closest to the residential neighboring lot so there would not be light glare if anything would happen to the fence. Mr. Snyder noted there will be sidewalk from where the entrance will be for the new parking lot, which is where the existing sidewalk stops on both sides of Philadelphia Street.

Mr. Snyder stated as part of the revised plan they are providing handicapped ramps at the North Oxford intersection with E. Philadelphia Street.

Discussion was held regarding the stormwater easement area. It was noted the drawing does not show landscaping along that area. Mr. Snyder stated they are not required to have landscaping because they are not improving that area. He pointed out the existing storm water basin noting there was never an easement dedicated so as a result of this plan they will be dedicating the easement.

Ms. Fieldhouse stated she has coordinated with the Township solicitor because of the changes to

Lot #1, noting they are not changing Lot #2 or #3 except to add the easement on Lot 3. She noted it is a non-conforming parking lot already with regards to interior landscaping for the parking lot islands. It is less than a 25% addition or expansion of the use and less than a 50% expansion of the building. The zoning ordinance states it is a non-conforming use and can remain that way. Because of that the applicant is not required to make any of the improvements they would be required to per the determination of the zoning officer.

Mr. Snyder confirmed the plan was submitted to the Conservation District.

Chairman Maciejewski read the waiver requests as stated on the letter from RGB Associates dated September 12, 2016, attached.

**MR. STAUB MOVED TO RECOMMEND THE PLAN BE MOVED TO AN ACTION ITEM WITH THE CONDITION THAT THE ISSUE WITH STORMWATER MANAGEMENT BE RESOLVED PRIOR TO PRESENTATION TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS. SECONDED BY MR. WURSTER. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY PASSED.**

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

**MR. ROBERTSON MOVED IN THE CASE OF LD-16-06 ADVENT LUTHERAN CHURCH TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO THE TOWNSHIP BOARD OF SUPERVISORS FOR THE WAIVERS IDENTIFIED IN THE LETTER FROM RGB ASSOCIATES DATED SEPTEMBER 12, 2016. MR. STUHRE SECONDED. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY PASSED.**

**MR. ROBERTSON MOVED IN THE CASE OF LD-16-06 ADVENT LUTHERAN CHURCH TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE PLAN WITH THE CONDITION OF RESOLVING ALL OUTSTANDING ISSUES IDENTIFIED ON THE TOWNSHIP ENGINEER'S LETTER DATED AUGUST 18, 2016 PRIOR TO THE SUPERVISORS MEETING. MR. STAUB SECONDED. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY PASSED.**

**B. SD-16-04 Monica Martin Subdivision**

Jim Barnes, James Holley & Associates

Ms. Fieldhouse stated this is a small subdivision on North Findlay Street. 45 N. Findlay Street is the home at the corner. 39 North Findlay Street is the home towards the other side. 41 and 43 will be the lots created by this small subdivision.

The subdivision was submitted by the property owner, Monica Martin, who is working with Holley & Associates. The plan was presented to Staff at a Township Developer's meeting on September 6, 2016. First Capital Engineering provided comments which were submitted to the Planning Commission. The comments were addressed with a revision of the plan. The primary items related to driveway profiles, sanitary sewer profiles and some of the utilities yet to be added to the plans.

Ms. Fieldhouse noted this is 8,000 sq. ft. lot subdivided down the middle to create two attached single family homes with lot sizes of approximately 3800 sq. ft. There is public water and public

sewer in the street. There are two waiver requests submitted with this plan:  
Waiver of §289.13.A.5 for the plan scale - because of the small site 1':10' is shown.  
Waiver §289.36 Installation of streetlights – which will not be required since it was determined a streetlight is in close proximity.

Ms. Fieldhouse stated the plan was reviewed by Fire, Police, and Public Works. Comments were received from the York County Planning Commission. The applicant is aware there will be a recreation fee associated with this development and sewer tapping fees.

Mr. Barnes indicated he had nothing to add.

It was noted that stormwater will need to be resolved.

A question was raised in regards to buildings shown on the plan are set back further than the 25 ft. requirement. Mr. Barnes indicated the reason is they had to provide two off-street parking spaces in order to get the parking spaces where the driveway is not directly against the structure so they set the structure back slightly. He point out that although it does not align with the two homes on either side, it does not sit in front.

It was also commented the driveway is accessing the street where most of the homes in the area have a sidewalk out to the street. Although there are sidewalks, there is no pedestrian right to the street which is uncharacteristic of the neighborhood.

**4. ACTION ITEMS - None**

**5. WAIVER RECOMMENDATIONS - None**

**6. OLD BUSINESS – None**

**7. NEW BUSINESS**

**A. Comprehensive Plan**

Ms. Fieldhouse indicated at the September 8 Board of Supervisors meeting Supervisor Nace gave Staff the go ahead to start the RFP Consultant Process for the Comprehensive Plan. She created a proposed timeline to determine the timing for selecting a consultant to walk through the Comprehensive Plan process to be around January 1. Her goal is to have the process for the Ad Hoc Steering Committee pulled together, a selection criteria for the October Planning Commission meeting and also an RFP to be sent out in the packet for the Planning Commission's review. Following the October meeting, the Board of Supervisors can review and approve the RFP at their meeting on October 27. Advertising will be scheduled in November, allowing approximately six weeks for the consultants to get the peer response packages back. In the meantime work can begin to select the membership of the Steering Committee to be in place by the time the RFP packages come back in mid-December. She will then have selected individuals from the Steering Committee review the packages, rate them and then have someone selected by around the sixth of January. She asked for the Planning Commission feedback to determine if this is a doable schedule to move forward.

Chairman Maciejewski recommended extending the work an additional month so rather than December 15 extend it to January 15.

**B. Schedule for Review of Market Street and Mt. Zion Road Rezoning**

Ms. Fieldhouse provided the presentation that was developed for the Board of Supervisors. She provided an update on the Board's decision. She indicated the Board reviewed the recommendation from the Planning Commission for the rezoning as it was proposed in meetings conducted in March, April and May, The information was sent to the York County Planning Commission and they submitted their comments in July. The first public hearing was held in July with the Board of Supervisors. It was an informational session with time allowed for public comment. They already had a second follow up public hearing scheduled which provided for a 30 plus day or so window to receive additional 3<sup>rd</sup> party comments. The comments received from the York County Planning Commission were not in favor of the rezoning. They felt that the Town Center Overlay was not appropriate for the heavy flow of traffic that currently exists on Mt. Zion Road and that the Commercial-Highway zoning proposed did not mesh well with the existing uses including the Springetts Manor Apartments which created a non-conforming use.

Ms. Fieldhouse indicated what swayed it for the Board was the fact that there were approximately 13 written responses to the rezoning either in the form of an editorial or written responses from residents – all of them negative. In addition there were signs that residents had put up. It was determined through this that the rezoning plan was not well received by the residents in that area and the proposal was rejected by the Board with the recommendation to take it back to the Planning Commission for re-evaluation.

Discussion was held regarding next steps. Ms. Fieldhouse suggested options for rezoning primarily going to Mixed Use rather than H-C, which would allow family development as well as commercial activities, such as restaurants, financial institutions and retail going above the size of 3000 sq. ft. She suggested that Mixed Use would lessen the intensity but would still work with the residents in the area.

Discussion was held regarding the re-zoning, the general area and residential areas, as well as traffic issues. It was agreed that the public needs to have a better understanding of what the Township is trying to accomplish in that area.

Ms. Fieldhouse suggested that the Planning Commission conduct a work session in October and invite the public to make it more of a transparent process.

The Planning Commission was in agreement with holding a public work session. Ms. Fieldhouse stated she would work with everyone's schedule to arrive at a date in October for the session.

**8. ADJOURNMENT**

**CHAIRMAN MACIEJEWSKI ADJOURNED THE MEETING AT 7:40 P.M.**

Respectfully submitted,

Secretary  
/ses