

APPROVED

**SPRINGETTSBURY TOWNSHIP  
PLANNING COMMISSION  
SEPTEMBER 20, 2012**

**MEMBERS IN**

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

**ALSO IN**

**ATTENDANCE:** Jim Baugh, Director of Community Development  
John Luciani, First Capital Engineering  
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 16, 2012**

**MR. STUHRE MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE MEETING MINUTES OF AUGUST 16, 2012 AS PRESENTED. MR. WURSTER SECONDED. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**3. ACTION ITEMS – None**

**4. BRIEFING ITEMS**

**A. LD-12-05 – The Goddard School**

Dave Weihbrecht, Advantage Engineering Services

Mark Sather

Lena Patel, Owner

Mr. Weihbrecht indicated they submitted the plan for the Goddard School on Lot #9 of the Market Street Common Subdivision. The 2.28 acre property is pad ready and all improvements that were part of the parent subdivision are in place, including utilities. The access drive has already been constructed. Next month they will be asking for recommendations for approval for the land development plan of the project. There are no major issues remaining. The application includes two waiver requests. The first one is for storm water management. Mr. Weihbrecht explained when the original Market Street Common subdivision was submitted the Ordinance did not include a contingency for post construction water quality up to a 2-year storm. In addition, the original lot anticipated a 22,500 sq. ft. building and parking lot containing 86 parking spaces. The total impervious coverage on that lot would be approximately 90,000 sq. ft. The Goddard School project will only use approximately 1/3 of that space, since they are not paving as much as the original project projected.

The second waiver request is for the traffic impact study. Mr. Weihbrecht indicated because he was unable to find a copy of the prior approved traffic impact study, he justified the waiver on the fact that

going back to the 22,500 sq. ft. building with 86 parking spaces, they are proposing an 8,600 sq. ft. building with 41 parking spaces, seven of which are in excess of what the code requires.

Mr. Luciani was of the opinion that the square footage of the Goddard School would generate less traffic and did not see an issue with that waiver.

Mr. Weihbrecht provided background on the Goddard School indicating that it is an established day care center. The maximum number of children they can accommodate at full capacity is 132.

Ms. Patel provided the following information:

- The staff will not be more than 20 at full capacity. The number of caregivers is mandated by Pennsylvania law to be 20 maximum. 10 children per care giver.
- The hours of operation are 7 a.m. to 5:30 p.m.
- The facility will care for general pre-school age children as well as infants.
- 20 students at a time are allowed outside.
- There are separate play areas for preschool and toddlers.

Mr. Weihbrecht stated there will be a steel fence – 5 ft. tall. The spacing of the pickets is 3” vs. what the code allows. There are four mangates to allow access in and out and they are equipped with alarm.

In regards to stormwater, they have an approved plan. Mr. Weihbrecht indicated the existing NPDES that covers this property is good until Fall 2013. He indicated he submitted an E&S plan to York County. Because it is an existing permit and they are grandfathered in, they do not have to meet the water quality requirements. Since they will have 31,000 sq. ft., the actual volume of the water decreases less than what was allowed in the permit, and were not required to do volume controls for the 2 year storm under the NPDES.

Mr. Weihbrecht stated there is a landscape lighting plan on Sheet 7. The revised plans will include plans to illuminate the entrance with all photometrics required, as well as the screen planting requirement along the front that must be included.

There are no fire and rescue evaluations at this time. However, it is known they will be covered by the Fire Department.

There will be no buses entering the property and only box truck deliveries.

Trash pick-up will be on the weekends.

## **B. York County Prison Admissions Center**

### Ben Craddock, C.S. Davidson

Mr. Craddock indicated the York County Prison is proposing to build a new addition on the prison property to improve admissions process and security for general population prisoners and INS prisoners. There are two separate drop off locations – one for the INS prisoners and one for the general population. There is new fencing so that the different loadings can have separate security around them. There will be no additional employees. They are not proposing additional beds, so the inmate population will remain the same. They are at capacity now with 2500 inmates.

Mr. Baugh stated the purpose of the presentation was to provide a briefing and identify issues of concern in order for the applicant to address them prior to the final presentation of the plan.

Mr. Craddock stated that they are reviewing the driveway to be utilized for the new addition. He noted it has been reviewed by TRG and they have made recommendations. They will be making the driveway

one way in. The prison currently has 3 driveways. After this project is done, two of them will be one way in with no exit, and there will only be one exit from the area. He noted this is being presented as one of the requested waivers, since the ordinance only allows two driveways.

Mr. Craddock clarified the location of the proposed addition at the request of the Planning Commission.

Discussion was held regarding the traffic pattern within the property and traffic in the general area.

Mr. Craddock indicated they were given a calculation based upon other prison regulations which compares to what is in the Zoning Ordinance. They analyzed it using the numbers provided by Mr. Baugh for a comparable prison and came up with approximately 100 extra spaces. To evaluate parking spaces, they used an adult day care as a comparison which they felt was conservative noting this resulted in 17 extra parking spaces.

Discussion was held regarding water consumption for the prison. Mr. Craddock referred to water for fire protection, noting the York Water Company is not able to supply the volume necessary resulting in a proposal for an above ground water tank. Concern was expressed by the Board as to the proposed location of the water tank. Mr. Craddock indicated they had a mechanical engineer review it to determine the most appropriate site. He noted the tank is 35 ft. high, 25 ft. in diameter. It will be set behind the screening, which is a berm with trees. York Water Company's recommendation is to provide fire flow for the entire prison instead of the one building, consisting of one continuous loop.

Discussion was held regarding the aesthetics of the property. Concern was expressed regarding traffic pattern with the location of the proposed addition in the area outlined.

Concern was expressed about Davies Drive opening. The Board was of the opinion this will change the dynamics of the surrounding area causing a traffic problem. The Board proposed consideration of moving the proposed building to the north side to avoid the traffic issues.

Mr. Craddock stated they are trying to determine how to address the traffic issues, noting the analyst determined a right or left turn lane would not solve the traffic issue.

Discussion was also held regarding the bus stop location which had been determined in the past to be a safety hazard, as well as pedestrians walking on Concord Road.

The Board reminded the applicant that the day trailers must be removed from the property.

**5. ZONING & WAIVER RECOMMENDATIONS – None**

**6. OLD BUSINESS – None**

**7. NEW BUSINESS – None**

**8. OTHER BUSINESS– None**

**9. ADJOURNMENT**

**CHAIRMAN MACIEJEWSKI ADJOURNED THE MEETING AT 7:10 p.m.**

Respectfully submitted,

Secretary

/ses