

APPROVED

**SPRINGETTSBURY TOWNSHIP
PLANNING COMMISSION
NOVEMBER 10, 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. BRIEFING ITEMS – None

3. ACTION ITEMS

A. LD-16-02 Aldi Expansion

Ms. Fieldhouse provided a recap of the project indicating Aldi's, located on Wolf Road and Northern Way is proposing a 2900 sq. ft. expansion to the Wolf Road side of the store. The front of the store is on Northern Way. They are adding space for an additional aisle of goods and storage. It is not anticipated this will increase the offering of goods in their store for customers. She noted the Board of Supervisors approved the waiver for traffic impact study at their October 27 meeting, as recommended by the Planning Commission. This development is also in the Town Center Overlay. A master plan and conditional use was approved.

Ms. Fieldhouse outlined the waivers listed in the plan summary that were obtained by the applicant as part of the process. Included with the waivers but not listed on the summary was a waiver to §325.204 – a development contained between 15,000 sq. ft. and 50,000 sq. ft. of gross floor area shall be provided with a public plaza containing not less than 500 sq. ft. This was also approved by the Board of Supervisors. She noted the township engineer provided a revised comment letter dated November 8, 2016, with several outstanding issues:

1 - Before the plans are approved, hard copies will be submitted to First Capital Engineering.

2 - There is no sheet #230 – they renumbered the plans so the comment letter did not address the new numbering.

3 – The cost estimate will be added – Ms. Fieldhouse indicated she will coordinate that with the township engineer and the applicant.

4 – The location of the detectable warning surface is shown on the plan on sheet 200. On that same sheet a company monument is proposed, which will be delineated on the plan. They are only able to place one concrete marker. All of their other property corners are either in a street or directly over top of a sanitary sewer infrastructure.

5 – Questioning the location of the onsite lighting. Sheet 200 shows it in one place and sheet 220 shows it in another. That will be worked out between the developer and the township engineer. This was agreeable with the Planning Commission.

6 – Will make sure pedestrian scale street lights are included in the performance bond.

7 – Ms. Fieldhouse noted she will coordinate with the developer for the cover sheet to make sure the waivers listed are identified as a previous part of the conditional use process and not part of the subdivision and land development Ordinance.

8 - The cover sheet will be changed to give Springettsbury Township access to the storm water easements.

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

MR. ROBERTSON MOVED TO RECOMMEND TO THE TOWNSHIP BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVAL FOR WAIVER REQUESTS FOR LD 16-02 ALDI'S:

- S.289-10 – PRELIMINARY PLAN PROCEDURE
 - S.289.13.A – PLANS DRAWN ON MYLAR AT A SCALE OF 50 OR 100' TO THE INCH
 - S.289.41. J. – ACCESS DRIVES MAX ALLOWABLE IS 35'
- SECONDED BY MR. WURSTER. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY PASSED.**

MR. ROBERTSON MOVED TO RECOMMEND TO THE TOWNSHIP BOARD OF SUPERVISORS CONDITIONS FOR LD-16-02 ALDI'S AS STATED IN THE LETTER FROM THE TOWNSHIP ENGINEER DATED NOVEMBER 8, 2016. SECONDED BY MR. WURSTER. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY PASSED.

4. WAIVER RECOMMENDATIONS - None

5. OLD BUSINESS – None

6. NEW BUSINESS

Market Street and Mt. Zion Road Rezoning Conversation

Ms. Fieldhouse explained the timeline and what has occurred over the course of the past months,

indicating that in May of 2015 a developer came to the Department of Community Development and asked the Board of Supervisors to consider a rezoning of approximately 12 parcels from N-C and R-1 high density to R-1 high density, Neighborhood Commercial. The developer's proposal was to rezone 12 parcels in zoning districts to H-C with the Town Center Overlay. At the May 28 BOS meeting the Board requested the Planning Commission to look into it and discuss. The proposal was also sent to the York County Planning Commission for review. Their comments included:

- The proposal was not consistent with the Township's comprehensive plan and that the proposal would create an island of H-C which was surrounded by R-1 high density and N-C uses with spot zoning.
- The Town Center Overlay location was not consistent because it is meant for gateways into the Township.
- The proposal was not compatible with the surrounding high density residential and N-C uses.
- The impact to existing traffic circulation is an issue.

Ms. Fieldstone indicated the Board denied this zoning request from the developer and asked that the Township Planning Commission consider a rezoning in this area, by taking a more global approach.

The Planning Commission met along with the township engineer at three meetings to discuss the rezoning. The concluding proposal decided upon included the rezoning of 23 parcels from the N-C to C-H with Town Center Overlay. It rezoned parcels from R-1 including 4 parcels from Springetts Manor from R-1 high density to H-C with Town Center Overlay. She pointed out the 41 parcels on the map which would not change in zoning but would have the Town Center Overlay applied to it from a global redevelopment perspective. Two public hearings were held over the summer with the Board of Supervisors to vet this proposal and it was also sent to the York County Planning Commission.

Ms. Fieldhouse reviewed the ensuing York County Planning Commission comments to the revised proposal:

- The rezoning to C-H is inconsistent with the Township Comprehensive plan, the Town Center Overlay and surrounding uses and zoning districts.

From the graphics shown on the screen. Ms. Fieldhouse noted the Township's comp plans shows the properties immediately adjacent to Mt. Zion and Market Street as being mixed use future land uses. Other comments from the York County Planning Commission was the proposal created a large number of non-conformity uses, including Springetts Manor. It would create an increase in traffic volumes with major concern of pedestrian traffic from a safety standpoint and overall they felt that mixed use would be more compatible with the existing zoning designations in the area and future development.

The Board denied the Planning Commission's rezoning at their August meeting and then asked the Planning Commission to reevaluate and come up with another proposal.

Ms. Fieldhouse reviewed Staff recommendations for rezoning, noting there are 13 parcels identified in the highlighted area (pointed out on the map) which mimics the initial proposal by the developer from a sizing standpoint. It does not include Springetts Manor or does not extend north past the property owned by Springetts Manor. She indicated the rezoning proposal to be submitted to the Board would take 13 properties, 12 of which have options applied and one is owned by Columbia Gas, rezone them from N-C to mixed use with the Town Center Overlay. She noted from a transition standpoint the uses are more consistent with N-C with a natural progression and intensity to N-C, mixed use, then H-C. Mixed use still allows for residential uses

and multi-family. The mixed use zoning district would phase out single residential development which is appropriate in this particular area because of the traffic between the intersection at Market Street and Mt. Zion. This would foster an amalgamation of the properties to join them all together, in an attempt to eliminate the occurrences of vehicles getting out into the stream of traffic so close to the intersection. Mixed use will limit the intensity of the number of dwelling units that need to be done but will also provide a diverse list of uses that can be developed. Adding the Town Center Overlay will help mix those uses with Springetts Manor and will also provide flexibility for the Board of Supervisors to get the development they would like to see. This is also consistent with the Comp Plan as noted by the comments of the York County Planning Commission. Ms. Fieldhouse stated there is no development proposal on the table for this tract of land right now.

Discussion was held regarding the proposed new boundaries. It was noted when the rezoning issue initially addressed one of the major areas were the lots north of the western drive of Springetts Manor extending to Industrial Highway. At that time it was determined there should be consistency between Industrial Highway and Market Street. Also, as noted on the proposed area, Lots 20 and 21 are not included and it was not determined if the developer has options on those. (Ms. Fieldhouse indicated he does not have options on Lots 20 and 21.)

It was also discussed that the area behind Lots 14 through 21 would possibly have an access way onto Industrial Highway in which case it may make the development of that northern stretch more feasible, since vehicles would not have to back out onto Mt. Zion. It was noted the ingress is getting worse and that was part of the consideration to extend it.

Ms. Fieldhouse stated it was recommended those issues would not be part of this rezoning effort, but would be studied and addressed with the uPlanning Commissioning Comprehensive Plan update in 2017.

Chairman Maciejewski invited public comment:

Alexandra Thomas – 59 Mt. Zion – Parcel 21

Ms. Thomas indicated on the strip of land next to Parcel 22 which originally was supposed to be the right of way, they opted to move the right of way to the opposite side of parcel 20, so 20 and 21 are effectively an island with this proposed rezoning. She stated because they are directly impacted by this they reached out to the developer and to the apartment complex to do everything they can to make sure they are not completely put on an island because they were advised that it would be spot zoning. They looked into whether they could buy that parcel of land from the apartments and subdivide it to bridge the gap and help the scenario to make a more fluid area. She noted the apartments are willing to make that a more uniform area and consistent without having a strip of land in between. However, the developer has no interest in doing that and does not feel that he needs to make it a consistent area between roadways or a consistent access

Steven Smith – 9636 Pleasant Valley Road

Mr. Smith stated in talking to residents of Springetts Manor, they have several concerns. Springetts Manor was built before zoning existed in the Township. The buildings are up against the property line. They were concerned about who determines where the property line is to determine what type of buffering is in place, since they do not want a parking lot or commercial building up against the complex. Also, with considering the type of buffering between apartment

buildings and the parking lots there was concern about potential light pollution into the development. They were also concerned if the whole area was rezoned into mixed use in the residential area the developer would not have to add buffering.

It was noted by the Planning Commission whatever would be developed there, the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors would be looking at that situation very closely and would work with the developer to assure they are adhering to the Ordinance. Also, as part of the development plan the developer would have to show the existing facilities immediately adjacent to their property to scale.

Alexandra Thomas – 59 Mt. Zion Road

Ms. Thomas noted at the time last year it was C-H and it was turned down for various reasons. There is concern that this developer has made an investment and would like to develop something. The Township feels they need to put some type of control in place. She recommended to apply the Town Center Overlay, which she felt would give more control over what is developed there. She indicated she owns parcel 21, and was concerned if this is rezoned mixed use with Town Center Overlay it will minimize her resale value because it does not meet the minimum lot size requirement. She felt if the developer cannot address the spot zoning issue, they should not be going forward with it. She suggested an intermediate solution while working out the Comp Plan was to apply a Town Center Overlay.

Bradley Walthimeyer – 59 Mt. Zion Road

Mr. Walthimeyer voiced his concern that the developer initially proposed a grocery store but now appears to have no plan and is not invested in the area and does not care how it affects this area.

Chairman Maciejewski stated the Commission is committed to determining what is the best use of this land for both the residents, the Township and the developer and trying to make sure whatever recommendation is decided upon is compatible with the existing area but at the same time not make the zoning too restrictive to the developer who has to limit what he can develop there.

Ms. Fieldhouse suggest a potential solution to extend the mixed use up to the south side of Eisenhower and capulate the strip owned by Springetts Manor and Lots 20 and 21. She was not in favor of rezoning Springetts Manor to mixed use because consideration of the buffer yard is important.

Resident - 51 Mt. Zion Road

Resident felt it was already an area that is not residential and noted the number of businesses already in the area. She was concerned about speed of vehicles.

It was reiterated by the PLANNING COMMISSION that they are trying to make a fair balance between what the developer is allowed to do and what to do with the existing neighborhood as it is currently. Also looking forward 10-15 years in the future to address traffic concerns.

Discussion was held as to the decision to be made and the recommendation to be submitted to the Board of Supervisors based on what was heard from the residents and discussed. The PLANNING COMMISSION felt they wanted to have a final review and evaluation of the

concerns and facts presented before making a recommendation.

MR. ROBERTSON MOVED TO RECOMMEND TO TABLE THE MOTION ON THE REZONING UNTIL THE NOVEMBER 17 MEETING. SECONDED BY MR. WURSTER. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY PASSED.

7. ADJOURNMENT

CHAIRMAN MACIEJEWSKI ADJOURNED THE MEETING AT 7:55 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Secretary

/ses