

APPROVED

**SPRINGETTSBURY TOWNSHIP  
PLANNING COMMISSION  
JANUARY 20, 2022**

**MEMBERS IN**

**ATTENDANCE:** Tim Staub, Chairman  
Mark Robertson  
Charles Stuhre  
James Tanzola  
Paula Musselman

**ALSO IN**

**ATTENDANCE:** Randall Heilman, Director of Community Development  
John Luciani, First Capital Engineering, Interim Zoning Officer  
Shane Rohrbaugh, Solicitor (Zoom)  
Abby Gibb, Communications Manager  
Sue Sipe, Stenographer

**1. CALL TO ORDER:**

**A. Pledge of Allegiance**

Chairman Staub called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance.

**2. REORGANIZATION**

**MR. TANZOLA MOVED TO RECOMMEND THE FOLLOWING SLATE OF OFFICERS FOR 2022:**

**CHAIRMAN – TIM STAUB  
VICE CHAIRMAN – MARK ROBERTSON  
SECRETARY – CHARLES STUHRE**

**SECONDED BY MR. ROBERTSON. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY PASSED.**

**3. ACTION ON THE MINUTES**

**A. DECEMBER 16, 2021**

**MR. TANZOLA MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE MEETING MINUTES OF DECEMBER 16, 2021 AS AMENDED. MR. STUHRE SECONDED. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**4. BRIEFING ITEMS**

**A. Wyndham Pointe Apartments**

Thomas Nehilla, Esquire, Barley Snyder

Attorney Nehilla indicated this case is a continuation from the December meeting. He stated last month they presented to the Board of Supervisors to discuss increasing the density factor for the Neighborhood-Commercial District. He noted the Supervisors recommended the applicant present to the Planning Commission. Subsequently discussion ensued at the December meeting as to whether to increase the density factor. Attorney Nehilla noted a draft of the text amendment was informally submitted to increase the density factor from the current 30 to 37 with a potential increase from 30 to 40 density factor.

Attorney Nehilla referred to the Planning Commission request at the last meeting which was to develop an understanding of what the impact would be, noting the Neighborhood-Commercial District is split in two parts – northern and southern. The southern part is fairly well built out and not currently available. On the northern side there are three lots which are vacant totaling 17.15 acres. He referred to the memo he sent to the Planning Commission members which included a synopsis of the total lot coverage numbers: 3 lots a 7.76 acre – 3.2 acre – 6.11 acre = 17.5 total

He noted the Ordinance provides the following:  
3 bedrooms have a density factor of 4  
2 bedroom – density factor of 3  
1 bedroom – density factor of 2

Increasing the density factor from 30 to 37 as noted on page two of his memo would provide for a total density factor increase of 7 for 1 acre which would allow for 1 additional 3-bedroom unit, 2 additional bedrooms would allow 3 additional 1bedrooms per acre. Two additional 2 bedroom and 3 additional 1 bedroom.

Increasing it from 30 to 40 on a one acre would provide for a total density factor increase of 10 which would allow for 2 additional 3 bedrooms, 3 additional 2 bedrooms or 5 additional 1 bedrooms.

The density factor is determined pursuant to the current ordinance and attributable to the total 17.5 acres which is available at this time. This would yield an available density factor of 514.5 under the Ordinance of 30 density factors.

If the density factor was increased to 37 the amendment would allow for overall density factor on the 17.5 of 634.55. If the density factor was increased to 40 such an amendment would allow for the density factor for the 17.5 acres to go to 686. That is the available density factors any developer coming in would be able to work with to divide.

If the amended density factor is 37 there is an increase in what is currently allowed which would provide an additional 120 density factors. If it is increased to 30 that would allow 30 more 3 bedroom units, 40 more 2 bedroom units or 60 more 1 bedroom units.

If amended to a density factor of 40 there would be an increased density factor over what is currently allowed which would be 171.5. That increase would allow for 42 more 3 bedroom units, 57 more 2 bedroom units and 85 1 bedroom units.

Attorney Nehilla stated this illustrates a worst-case scenario for a developer who would potentially buy all that acreage and indicated they were only going to build 3-bedroom units, which would impact the area with schools, traffic, etc. Those calculations do not

take into account a typical bedroom mix.

A more typical bedroom mix for a similarly situated project as theirs, would be 35 1 bedrooms, 60 2 bedrooms and 5% 3 bedrooms. Based on that typical mix, if the ordinance is amended to allow for 37 density factors per acre, 42 of the allowable 120 density factors would be attributable to 1 bedroom units, 72 would be attributable to 2 bedrooms and 6 would be attributable to 3 bedrooms. That available density factor would then equate to 21 1 bedrooms, 24 2 bedrooms and 1 3 bedroom for a total in a typical mix increasing the density factor to 46 units overall.

If the density factor goes to 40, 60 would be available to the 171-density factor attributable to 1 bedrooms, 103 would be attributable to 2 bedrooms and 9 would be attributable to 3 bedrooms. That attributable density factor would equate to 30 1 bedroom units, 34 2 bedroom units and 2, 3 bedroom units to give a total of another 66 units overall that acreage.

Allowing the density factor to go to 37 would ultimately yield an increase of 46 units overall mixed with 1, 2 and 3 bedrooms. Going to 40 that would result in 66 units.

He noted they used the “real world mix” which is the typical mix they have been seeing, with the most demand for 1 and 2 bedrooms which are used by younger professionals and younger families starting out and also more senior citizens who are downsizing.

Discussion was held regarding parking and storm water as well as impact on the area as it relates to the school district and traffic. It was expressed that it was not determined the project was of a significant nature to cause an impact.

Mr. Staub stated it helps their argument and the Board’s understanding as to whether or not 37 to 40 is significant. He indicated the density factors put provisions in place to reduce the amount of larger size bedroom facilities. His question was whether there should be some language in the text amendment to state there must be at least two different types of bedroom mixes in the ordinance due to their concern over the 3 bedrooms. He questioned if they should suggest adding another layer to protect the Township and also how this relates to the other districts and whether districts will request this as well.

Other discussion included:

- The Township does not need any more commercial properties right now due to many buildings sitting empty.
- There is a need for rental units because there is a low amount of housing with a high demand.
- It was determined there is not a big difference between 37 and 40 density factors and the Supervisors were not opposed to going to 40.

Mr. Heilman stated he would like to bring this back to the Board of Supervisors with a recommendation on their agenda for the February 10<sup>th</sup> meeting.

**CHAIRMAN STAUB MOVED TO RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF**

**SUPERVISORS APPROVAL OF THE TEXT AMENDMENT TO INCREASE THE DENSITY FACTOR TO 40, WITH THE SUGGESTION THAT A FAIR SHARE HOUSING ANALYSIS BE INCORPORATED AS PART OF THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN TO DETERMINE IF THE TOWNSHIP IS PROVIDING SUFFICIENT APARTMENTS WITH APPROPRIATE SIZES NEEDED. SECONDED BY MR. ROBERTSON. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY PASSED.**

Chairman Staub recommended Attorney Nehilla develop a spreadsheet to provide a comparison to delineate the components of the analysis for the Board of Supervisors.

**B. LD-2021-004 - 3750 East Market Street, Market Industrial LLC**

Bob Sandmeyer, Site Design Concepts

Mr. Sandmeyer stated this project was previously presented from several other engineering firms and developers. He indicated the project is to develop the parcel and build a new larger industrial facility. The proposed building is 287,000 sq. ft. on the 15-acre site, with 153 pedestrian car parking spaces; 38 Loading docks with 45 tractor trailer parking spaces will be located on the west side. He noted there is a flood plain on the site. There are three access points – one on East Market Street and two on Innovation Drive.

Mr. Sandmeyer noted at this point there are no clients or leasees for the building so they do not know what the use will be. Waivers were listed on the plan summary. He noted they are doing a PennDOT permit for the driveway which will be improved. They are adding the standard curbs and sidewalks on both frontages, along with street lighting on Market Street. There are existing street lights on Innovation Drive.

Stormwater management for the site will include underground stormwater chamber systems underneath the parking lots. This is due to the flood plain location as noted on the plan.

Mr. Heilman indicated the previous two applications for this property are in the process of being withdrawn.

Discussion was held regarding adding a turn lane into the first driveway which is to be determined. A question was raised about an emergency exit on Innovation Drive. Mr. Sandmeyer indicated there are no plans for an emergency exit, noting they have two access drives on Innovation Drive, but they are leaving the rear site as is. Their research and property deed and easements are not part of this property.

Discussion on turning templates – the general plan for circulation is all trucking will be Market Street access only. The drive around the rear of the building which is the south end to Innovation is for the employee vehicles only.

They are confident they can get a truck into the site and will have documentation at their next submittal for the truck turning templates.

Mr. Staub questioned signage on Innovation Drive to indicate no outlet. It was noted

there is a bridge which is on the paved road which goes over the Kreutz Creek tributary before their site. A question exists as to whether the applicant would be responsible for doing stream bank remediation along Kreutz Creek on their property.

Mr. Sandmeyer stated this is a non-issue for the applicant since the stream is not on their property and there is no right of way for that driveway. He also noted his client is erecting a fence around the entirety of the site for security purposes.

Solicitor Rohrbaugh pointed out on the street view there is a sign indicating no outlet and further down the road there is another sign.

In regards to waivers of street trees, Mr. Sandmeyer stated they meet the requirements, with one request in the waiver for landscape buffering along the west property line. He noted this is a modification due to not being able to place the full density of plants at that location since there are existing evergreens and plants as shown on the exhibits. Mr. Sandmeyer confirmed they are adding as much buffering as possible against the adjacent residential area, without affecting flood plain issues. The rest of the site meets ordinance requirements.

In regards to photometrics, Mr. Sandmeyer confirmed they will have a lighting plan with the next submittal.

### **C. 2021-0006 Eastern Blvd. Plaza, Conditional Use Application**

#### Joshua George, Landworks Civil Design

Mr. George indicated this plan is a conditional use application for a small addition at the Eastern Blvd. Plaza and Haines Road. They are proposing a 9200 sq. ft. retail building on the northeast corner of the property directly adjacent to the York Traditions bank on Eastern Blvd. Currently the site is unused parking. He noted this center was renovated with façade improvements approximately 10 years ago. He noted there are approximately 350 existing parking spaces which will remain after the addition. There are no tenants at this time for the proposed retail building. This is in the mixed-use zoning district and as part of the Town Center Overlay, they are proposing the necessary elements with a public plaza in front of the building and expanded sidewalks in the portion of the site where the building is located. They are not proposing to redevelop the entire sidewalk system around this property because it is a corner lot with existing sidewalk both on Eastern Blvd. and on Haines Road. He noted there are no proposed changes to the access drives. There is minimal curb work necessary at the northeast corner of the access drive to tie the proposed curbing into the existing curb. Public water and sewer is on the site. He provided conceptual elevation drawings of what the building will look like.

Mr. Heilman indicated the application will be presented to the Board of Supervisors at their meeting on February 10.

Mr. Tanzola pointed out when driving behind the various malls, the back of the buildings look unsightly aesthetically. He asked Mr. George if there any thought to making the back of the building look more appealing.

Mr. George stated there is no truck access behind the proposed building and all loading would be done from the side on the southern end. There is a sidewalk proposed in the back of the building to allow access so it would look better.

Mr. George indicated the developer is MDR Eastern Plaza, LLC the owner of the plaza.

Chairman Staub suggested adding a pedestrian access to the main center and down to Kingston Road. He pointed out although there is pedestrian access at the business on the other side coming into the plaza off of Haines Road, there is no pedestrian access going in at Kingston Road.

Mr. George stated they are showing sidewalk along the frontage of their building which will allow pedestrians to get farther into the site.

Chairman Staub indicated he looked at the ordinance to determine whether they require the plaza to be facing the street and did not see anything which stipulated that. He suggested placing the plaza in the middle to create a more functional space with landscaping between the street and the building, making it more accessible to pedestrians.

Discussion was held suggesting further development in the parking area alongside Wild Ginger, noting there is an abundance of overparking spaces on the plaza.

It was noted this was an area which flooded over the summer, consequently measures would need to be taken to help reduce stormwater on the site.

Mr. George stated they have a slight reduction in impervious with this project, but it is not a significant reduction. He noted there is a 30-inch pipe which runs underneath the shopping center and goes out towards the intersections of Eastern Boulevard and Haines Road, which carries significant off-site water.

Regarding stormwater, Mr. George noted their intention is to connect to the existing facilities as needed to make the development work. While they are not proposing any significant management aspects, they will have a small underground facility to manage the runoff from this redevelopment. The scope of this project does not merit significant overall stormwater improvements to the project site.

Ms. Musselman pointed out due to changes developing in this area with older people moving out and younger people moving in at Haines Acres, Kingston Park, etc. it should be very pedestrian friendly. She pointed out daycare centers, churches, etc. in the immediate area which will make it walkable so an addition of a coffee shop, ice cream shop, etc. would help to bring people into the area.

**MR. ROBERTSON MOVED TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS FOR 173-50 CONDITIONAL USE FOR EASTERN BOULEVARD PLAZA SHOPPING CENTER AS PRESENTED AND WITH COMMENTS MADE DURING THE MEETING. SECONDED BY MR. TANZOLA. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY PASSED.**

As requested by Mr. Heilman, the following clarification of the comments to be presented to the Board of Supervisors at their upcoming meeting were noted:

- Retrofitting the shopping center to get more use out of it – this shopping center is 50% overparked.
- Concern about rear access and providing screening.
- Concern about pedestrian connectivity to the existing shopping center through the parking lot and to Kingston Road.
- Increasing walkability to the site.
- The plaza contemplating it more relatable to the site and not necessarily the street.

Public Comment:

(Dakota) - Requested bike parking at the site.

Mr. George stated that could be incorporated into the plan.

**5. ACTION ITEMS - None**

**6. WAIVER RECOMMENDATIONS - None**

**7. INFORMATIONAL**

- A. Chairman Staub requested a list of active plans and their standing to be listed on the agenda.
- B. Chairman Staub reported the bonding requirements will change from 10% of the total project cost to only 10% of the remaining costs.

**8. NEW BUSINESS - None**

**9. ADJOURNMENT**

**CHAIRMAN STAUB ADJOURNED THE MEETING AT 7:45 P.M.**

Respectfully submitted,

Secretary

/ses