

APPROVED

**SPRINGETTSBURY TOWNSHIP
PLANNING COMMISSION
JULY 18, 2013**

MEMBERS IN

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

ALSO IN

ATTENDANCE: Trisha Lang, Zoning Officer
Angela Liddick, Deputy Zoning Officer
John Luciani, First Capital Engineering
Seth Springer, 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. JUNE 20, 2013

MR. ROBERTSON MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE MEETING MINUTES OF JUNE 20, 2013 AS PRESENTED. MR. WURSTER SECONDED. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.

3. BRIEFING ITEMS – None

4. ACTION ITEMS

A. LD-12-01 – B-Way (Revision)

Robert Sandmeyer, Site Design Concepts

Project Narrative: This land development plan is currently under construction. It was approved by the Board of Supervisors at their June 28, 2012 regular meeting and presented as an action item for revisions that are necessary to the landscaping and sidewalk location.

Mr. Sandmeyer stated they presented the revision to the land development plan last month. He reviewed the plan, indicating they are removing the street trees so they can relocate the sidewalk with a 4 foot grass strip and a 4 foot sidewalk. Previously, the sidewalk was shown as weaving in and out of the property due to existing street trees. Although the property owner tried to save them, it was decided not to due to safety issues and liability of having the public next to the building. The plan was consequently revised showing the 4 foot sidewalks and the 4 foot grass strip as well as several other items as a result of the engineer's review. He noted stop signs and stop bars were added at the three existing accesses.

Discussion was held regarding the type of tree proposed for the landscaping which is a Austrian Pine. It was suggested that another type of tree should be selected since it was noted that type of tree is not a hardy tree. Mr. Sandmeyer indicated he would speak to the owner in that regard.

It was noted that the existing trees will be removed since they are in the clear sight triangle. There is a label on the plan that identifies the trees being removed.

Discussion was held regarding the surfacing of the parking lot which appears to have been graded. Concern was expressed that the hard rains have washed away the silting and there has been no coverage of any kind put on that grading. Mr. Sandmeyer stated that is part of the process because it does go into the temporary sediment basin or a trap, and after the paving is done they will put the top soil down after everything else is completed. He noted that currently they are converting the temporary basin into a permanent basin and that is when they will start to complete the process.

Chairman Maciejewski called for a motion.

MR. ROBERTSON MOVED WITH REFERENCE TO LAND DEVELOPMENT PLAN LD-12-01, B-WAY, TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE REVISED FINAL PLAN WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

- 1. ZONING (325-151) EROSION & SEDIMENT CONTROL. APPLICANT SHALL PROVIDE A COPY OF REVISED E & S CONTROL PLANS, IF APPLICABLE.**
- 2. SALDO (289-12.C) FINAL PLANS; PROCEDURE. APPLICANT SHALL PROVIDE A REVISED SECURITY ESTIMATE TO INCLUDE THE NEW LANDSCAPING, SIDEWALK CONSTRUCTION AND STOP BARS/SIGNS.**
- 3. SALDO (289-13.A) FINAL PLANS; SPECIFICATIONS. APPLICANT SHALL SUBMIT FINAL PLANS ON MYLAR MATERIAL.**
- 4. SALDO (289-13.B.5) APPLICANT SHALL ADDRESS ANY COMMENTS RECEIVED FROM YCPC.**
- 5. SALDO (289-12.A) FINAL PLANS; PROCEDURE. APPLICANT SHALL SUBMIT A PDF VERSION OF THE FINAL PLAN.**
- 6. SALDO (289-32.A) SIDEWALKS. APPLICANT SHALL REVISE PLANS TO INCLUDE A 4 FOOT WIDE GRASS STRIP BETWEEN THE CURB & SIDEWALK.**
- 8. GENERAL COMMENTS. APPLICANT SHALL ADDRESS ALL GENERAL COMMENTS AS NOTED IN FIRST CAPITAL ENGINEERING'S LETTER DATED JULY 9, 2013. (ATTACHED)**

MR. STUHRE SECONDED. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY PASSED.

5. NEW BUSINESS

A. Discussion of Projects in the Town Center Overlay

Ms. Lang, Zoning Officer, provided a review of upcoming plans for the Township. She provided a large scale view of the Town Center Overlay noting it encompasses a large area of the Township. She noted the sites they are reviewing include a vacant tract on Industrial Highway and two redevelopments both on Northern Way at different intersections.

A photo was provided of the two proposed bank properties, one located at Market Street and Northern Way, the other one at Eastern Boulevard and Industrial Highway. Both corner properties are in the Town Center Overlay. The idea is to establish a sense of place by providing signature buildings on corner lots. Ms. Lang noted that banks and gas stations prefer corner lots and tend to build a building that is insubstantial in terms of height or bulk. In this case, both properties have requested to be set back further from the right-of-way or cartway of these two corridors than what is permitted by the Town Center regulations.

Ms. Lang provided a close up of the First Capital Federal Credit Union and the Integrity Bank site. She also provided an aerial view of the property called Springetts Commons, as well as an aerial view of that

site. The First Capital Federal Credit Union plan was before the Zoning Hearing Board seeking a variance to be allowed to provide a drive through as part of the bank.

Ms. Lang pointed out that part of the emphasis of the Town Center Overlay is encouraging pedestrian activity. She noted when creating a driveway and accommodating vehicle turning movements as well as quick vehicles moving through the site, this tends to result in losing pedestrian comfort. She noted this plan will have a drive through since they have received relief. Also, since this is a redevelopment they will be adding onto the existing building not razing it entirely.

The second site is the Integrity Bank site also on a corner. The Town Center regulations suggest buildings should be pulled up tight to the corner without any parking in the front yard. Ms. Lang indicated Integrity Bank appeared before the ZHB and received approval to retain parking in the front yard since it currently exists on the property. She noted as a result of keeping that parking they cannot put the building where it's supposed to be, resulting in it being 84 feet off of the front boundary; 50 ft. is the maximum in the Town Center Overlay. The existing building is going to be razed – again accommodating both parking and transportation flow through the site with pedestrians taking a back seat. One of the efforts of the Town Center overlay was to try to raise the attention to both pedestrians and bicyclists in this corridor. There are several pieces of the zoning ordinance which talk about traffic calming and slowing traffic down. Ms. Lang stated that some of the decisions made through the design phase tend to work against the Town Center concept.

Ms. Lang noted the final site plan presented is for a currently undeveloped lot called Springetts Commons. The plan shows the type of uses they are anticipating, retaining a strip center and two outparcels that would be restaurants. In the rear of the property there is a potential for some form of assisted living or senior apartment housing. It is not yet known who would be doing that development. To conform to the Town Center Overlay concept, the buildings would need to be close to the road and the parking to the side or to the rear. She noted if the developer moves forward with the project as shown, it would require either variances or waivers of those requirements.

Ms. Lang stated the point of the Town Center Overlay is to encourage development where there might be outdoor eating on this corner instead of a parking lot or as part of the restaurants. There is a requirement in the Town Center Overlay for a public space. She noted some pieces of this design are not yet consistent with what the requirements are in the Town Center Overlay.

Ms. Lang provided literature on what is being done with outdated large retail shopping centers, referred to as gray fields. She noted these types of shopping centers are not the most profitable way to go anymore, and that commercial development is in need of a change.

Ms. Lang indicated the next two pieces she presented have to do with traffic and the distinction between pedestrians and cars. There is currently legislation in Pennsylvania looking at what is termed safe streets, also termed as complete streets. It involves the idea of creating sufficient space for pedestrians and bicyclists, which may result in reducing either size or the number of lanes for vehicles in the street and providing an area of safety for pedestrians. There is legislation in Pennsylvania that would look at making this a requirement in some areas. Many communities have adopted their own set of regulations. She stated it is a matter of changing the perspective of how we use our streets and divide them between pedestrians, cars and bicyclists.

Ms. Lang provided the Smart Growth document indicating it is a way of evaluating different projects to see if they meet some of the criteria that are part of the smart growth development. It was determined this is a useful tool to measure some of the projects that are in the packet to see how they stack up against the criteria in this document. She noted there are several elements of “Smart Growth”. She referenced a chapter which deals specifically with accessibility and mobility because the examples cited were commercial developments and did not have anything to do with affordable housing or some of the other pieces of “smart growth”. This document is available on the website.

Ms. Lang explained the final document is out of the Town Center plan adopted in 2010. She stated this document reviews some of the criteria and the vision for the Town Center, as well as ideas about what it might look like and the goals. It also provides information on what constitutes appropriate or desired types of commercial development and what looks like the standard development which is what the district is set up to try to avoid.

Discussion was held in regards to the proposed development for Springetts Commons:

- Want to be sensitive to what the retailers are going to need in light of the features on this property, i.e., a stream and railroad tracks.
- It was noted this property is on the edge of the Town Center. On either end pedestrian crossings are restricted and there is no pedestrian walkway currently.
- It was noted the area in general is land locked and traffic locked and therefore it would be difficult to force it to comply with all the components of a town center when it is not amenable to pedestrian traffic. Would have to be sensitive to that and make some compromises to be able to allow that development to happen and yet still retain some of the Town Center Overlay concept because of the location.
- It was noted that a form based design code has been used in other areas of the state. Att. Springer indicated he will provide some information to Mr. Luciani regarding this approach.
- Because this area is in a redevelopment mode, the Town Center overlay concept would need to be developed piece-by-piece, a task which could take years to come together. Ms. Lange expressed the need to make judicious decisions on each parcel to try to make the best connections. With regard to off-street parking, the more cars that are accommodated, the less pedestrians are inclined to walk in that area since the cars are moving too fast and the stores are too far away.
- Public Transportation issues were also discussed as to how the public will be able to circulate in the area.

6. OLD BUSINESS - None

7. OTHER BUSINESS – None

8. ADJOURNMENT

CHAIRMAN MACIEJEWSKI ADJOURNED THE MEETING AT 7:30 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Secretary

/ses