

APPROVED

**SPRINGETTSBURY TOWNSHIP
PLANNING COMMISSION
JUNE 20, 2019**

MEMBERS IN

ATTENDANCE: Tim Staub, Chairman
Charles Stuhre
Paula Musselman

NOT PRESENT: Mark Robertson
James Tanzola

ALSO IN

ATTENDANCE: John Luciani, First Capital Engineering
Jessica Fieldhouse, Community Development Director
Charles Rausch, Solicitor
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. ACTION ON THE MINUTES

A. MAY 16, 2019

MR. STUHRE MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE MEETING MINUTES OF MAY 16, 2019 AS AMENDED. MS. MUSSELMAN SECONDED. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.

3. BRIEFING ITEMS

A. Traffic Plan Update – McMahan and Associates

Natasha Manbeck, McMahan & Associates

Ms. Manbeck stated she is assisting with the transportation plan for the Township. She noted part of the scope of work was to provide an update focusing on ordinance recommendations related to identifying policies to be put in place to achieve the vision in the transportation plan and in the comprehensive plan. Ms. Manbeck provided draft recommendations they developed to date. She indicated the Township and the Planning Commission would need to evaluate the recommendations to determine how they will move forward to develop specific ordinance language with an adoption process. She identified the goals for the ordinance update fall into several categories, i.e., general updates noting out of date references, plans or concepts, also to address key issues raised by Staff or by members of the Steering Committee. The focus is to bolster multi-modal or bicycle pedestrian transit elements of the ordinance.

Ms. Manbeck reviewed pages 2, 3 and 4 of the Traffic Impact Study Requirement and Alternative

Transportation Plan. She referred to the handout provided to the Planning Commission and outlined the following recommendations:

Traffic Impact Study Requirement and Alternative Transportation Plan:

- Make it more specific and spell out steps to give clarity.
- Push and require review of bicycle, pedestrians and transit infrastructure .
- Document the existing pedestrian infrastructure and future conditions as to what may be proposed both along roadways as well as internal sites.

Future Conditions Analysis:

- To be more consistent with PennDOT requirements which will assist the Township to get the desired standards. Suggestions on how to structure requirements for the future conditions analysis by still using level of service as the main requirement but also looking at alternative transportation plans.
- Details were provided on the alternative transportation plan which is appropriate for certain zoning districts and land development types.

Roadway Design:

- They prepared an updated functional classification map for roadway design parameters.

Multi-modal infrastructure requirements:

- Stronger ordinances related to bicycle, pedestrian infrastructures such as trails, or paths, on road bicycle facilities. Those are items to be added into the SALDO ordinance, giving some design requirements and consistency for the township.

Parking and off-street parking requirements:

- Suggesting establishing parking maximums to obtain the appropriate parking for a development.

Emerging trends for future:

- Electric vehicles and charging associated with them.
- Ride sharing and transportation on demand.
- Connected autonomous vehicles and how some of these emerging trends may be addressed now with smaller elements in the ordinance and keep in mind for the future.

Ms. Manbeck noted they have identified numerous priority or improvement corridors and will have typical sections for those corridors and also concept plans to implement those sections on some segments. Staff has indicated that currently what is in the ordinance is working so there were no specific changes.

4. ACTION ITEMS

A SD-19-03 York County Complex – Pleasant Acres

Jason Wolf, C.S. Davidson

Ms. Fieldhouse indicated the plan was presented as a briefing item at the April 18 meeting. The County is proposing to subdivide a portion of their lot which houses the nursing home and the county annex as closing the loop on their sale to Premiere Health. She noted waivers being required and the improvements being provided. The County is requesting seven waivers - most are for the installation of additional infrastructure improvements on Pleasant Acres Road. The

reason the improvements have been requested is because of the existing developed condition of Pleasant Acres Road with the building against the roadway and then where existing utilities are installed. As a result the County is proposing to provide additional improvements of curbing and sidewalk and crosswalks along a portion of Pleasant Acres Road leading down the County owned access drive. There were several comments from the Planning Commission at the last meeting where they asked to look into the parking area along a portion of Heindel Road where there is very little separation for those existing parking lots. It was suggested by the Planning Commission to look into defining that access point and curbing along the roadway. Ms. Fieldhouse indicated she spoke to the police department which indicated they have not had any issues in the past. Staff discussed it would be more appropriate to handle any kind of separation or installation of additional improvements on Heindel Road as part of a future land development plan. One of the outstanding items was to have the township engineer look into making Heindel Road one-way and the possibility of a traffic study. The township engineer was provided with traffic counts from the County Planning Commission in order to review and draw conclusions from those numbers.

Mr. Wolf stated this is a two lot subdivision. In association with Ms. Fieldhouse's comments, he noted they added signage at the intersection of Pleasant Acres Road and also down at Access Drive A – the unnamed road in front of the annex which cuts through the owner's property. Mr. Wolf noted at the last meeting they did not have the stormwater management component fully calculated and shown on the plan. At this time they have five different BMPs as part of the current plan which will be accommodating all of the improvements in relation to the sidewalk improvements which go through the site. He noted they are still proposing the one-way road for Heindel Road.

Chairman Staub called for a motion.

MR. STUHRE MOVED IN THE CASE OF SD 19-03 YORK COUNTY COMPLEX – PLEASANT ACRES SUBDIVISION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE SEVEN WAIVERS AS WELL AS COMPLETION OF ALL OUTSTANDING COMMENTS FROM THE TOWNSHIP ENGINEER:

S.289-10 PRELIMINARY PLAN

S.289- 31 CURBS

S.289-32 SIDEWALKS

S.289-35 LANDSCAPE AND BUFFER YARDS

S.289-36 STREET LIGHTS

S.289-41 STREET WIDENING

S.289-41.J.8 OFF STREET PARKING

SECONDED BY MS. MUSSELMAN. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY PASSED.

B. SD-19-01 Stone Ridge Commons

Bob Sandmeyer, Site Design Concepts

Ms. Fieldhouse indicated the applicant has both a subdivision and a land development plan. The subdivision involves six lots and they are fixing numerous errors that were in the previous subdivision. She noted detail was provided on the waivers in the briefing. Part of the development is taking a portion of lot JJ-55 which is owned by Marie Stine. The majority of her property is located on the north side of Eastern Boulevard. On the south side of Eastern Boulevard is a small triangle of property which is part of Marie Stine's lot. This portion of the lot

will be subdivided into the overall larger portion which causes curbing and sidewalk to be required on both sides of the street. She indicated the applicant is requesting a waiver of curbing and sidewalk on the north side of Eastern Boulevard due to the existing topography of the area.

Mr. Sandmeyer confirmed Ms. Fieldhouse's comments on the subdivision plan. He noted the reason they are purchasing the small triangle of property is for the density issues of the land development plan and also to clean up the lot. They are taking the three lots that were previously owned by Tim Pasch as well as the residential lot on the east side. The house was torn down and his client has purchased those properties.

Mr. Sandmeyer referred to the waiver requests specifically the Marie Stine property with the deferment of waivers and the improvements along that property. He explained how the subdivision was created when Eastern Boulevard was developed; noting Mrs. Stine's property is not part of the subdivision. The applicant does not have to do any improvements – it would be offsite and only would need to occur on the applicant's side that is being added to their property. Ms. Fieldhouse asked for confirmation since she indicated that is not the way it is presented in the briefing.

Upon consultation it was confirmed the lands of Marie Stine located JJ-55 on the plan which is on the south side of Eastern Boulevard and is an approximate ¼ acre, are not part of the subdivision.

Mr. Sandmeyer referred to the waivers as stated in the briefing, noting for a majority they are asking for a deferment to the land development plan.

Chairman Staub called for a motion.

MR. STUHRE MOVED IN THE CASE OF SD-19-01 STONE RIDGE COMMONS TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE FOLLOWING WAIVERS:

- SD-289-10 PRELIMINARY PLAN**
- SD-289-13.A PLAN SCALE**
- SD-289-26 CONCRETE MONUMENTS**
- SD-289-31 CURBS**
- SD-289-32 SIDEWALKS**
- SD-289-41 PROPOSED STREET SYSTEM**

IT WAS DETERMINED THE LANDS OF MARIE STINE LOCATED JJ-55 ON THE PLAN WHICH IS ON THE SOUTH SIDE OF EASTERN BOULEVARD AND IS APPROXIMATELY ¼ ACRE, ARE NOT PART OF THE SUBDIVISION. SECONDED BY MS. MUSSELMAN. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY PASSED.

C. LD-19-04 Stone Ridge Commons

Bob Sandmeyer, Site Design Concepts

Ms. Fieldhouse stated the developer is proposing two units of apartment buildings totaling 34 units. She pointed out the location of Building A and Building B. Building B will have its own stormwater management. Building A will tie into the existing stormwater management for the overall Pasch subdivision. She noted there are four waivers. There was a fifth waiver to request a waiver to put in a crown in Stone Ridge Road. In coordination with Staff the developer will provide the 3" crown via an overlay for the extent of their project. Consequently the fifth waiver

was removed.

Mr. Sandmeyer stated there have been no significant changes and the detailed plans will be submitted to the Township. He noted Township public works has inspected what is the old section of Stone Ridge Road and have agreed that the base is satisfactory. Therefore, the applicant will mill that road section and add an overlay to gain the 3” crown. Mr. Sandmeyer stated they have withdrawn their waiver for installing curb and sidewalk on the north edge of Eastern Boulevard and will install it down to their property line.

Discussion was held at the last briefing meeting to connect the sidewalk to the back half of the shopping center. Mr. Sandmeyer noted that piece of sidewalk will be added.

Discussion was held concerning a pedestrian cross walk being placed on Stone Ridge Road. It was noted an additional ADA ramp will be required.

Chairman Staub called for a motion.

**MR. STUHRE MOVED IN THE CASE OF SD-19-04 STONE RIDGE COMMONS TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE FOLLOWING WAIVERS:
SD-289-10 PRELIMINARY PLAN
SD-289-13.A PLAN SCALE
SD-289-21 TRAFFIC IMPACT STUDY
SD-289-35.C BUFFER YARDS
COMPLETION OF ALL OUTSTANDING COMMENTS BY THE TOWNSHIP ENGINEER. ALSO CONSIDERATION BY THE APPLICANT FOR A PEDESTRIAN CROSSWALK ALONG STONE RIDGE ROAD.
SECONDED BY MS. MUSSELMAN. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY PASSED.**

D. CU-2019-01 East York Apartments

Joshua George, Snyder, Secary and Assocs.

Ms. Fieldhouse stated the plan was submitted in January 2019 as a conditional use running on a concurrent path of a land development plan submitted by NetSource, LLC. The parcel is located at 2810 East Market Street off East Market Street and South Northern Way located by Arby’s and Wendy’s and behind the Mr. Clean carwash. The central issue is the traffic situation as was discussed with the Planning Commission in February. A traffic study is being requested so the Township can understand the extent of the traffic issues that are currently ongoing and the developer is of the opinion those are not something they created. The applicant needs to determine where they stand with their modification to the Town Center Overlay requirement that requires a traffic study per the ordinance for them to move forward with the project. They are looking for an approval of the conditional use.

Mr. George reiterated their goal is to receive a recommendation for approval of the conditional use so they can proceed to a conditional use with the Board of Supervisors. He indicated the project is 32 apartment units located on two acres of land. It is surrounded by existing development. The property is zoned Mixed-Use. The apartment use is permitted by right; however, because it is in the Town Center Overlay it requires a conditional use approval from the Township. Mr. George stated as part of the conditional use they are requesting nine modifications, as detailed on the handout provided by Ms. Fieldhouse. He reviewed the

following:

1. §325-199.F.2 – Modification to the front yard maximum setback of 50 feet

Only have frontage on South Northern Way, no frontage along East Market Street. This modification only applies to the South Northern Way portion and is required because the actual frontage is approximately 100 ft. wide. In order to develop the site they are unable to place the buildings within the first 50 ft. He anticipates the actual setback to be in the 160-170 ft. range.

2. §325-200.C – Refuse areas shall not be located in front of proposed building

Mr. George pointed out the location of the proposed dumpster in conjunction with the front of the building. Due to the shape of the parcel and the need for the residents to get to the dumpster there is no reasonable place to put it behind the building and not enough land. It will be screened and enclosed.

3. §325-2--.F – Modification of the requirement of 10 ft. minimum height requirement of exterior lighting for pedestrian pathways

Mr. George pointed out on the plan where they are installing five Bollard style 4 ft. tall pedestrian lights. He indicated they are set up to provide light along the sidewalk without casting light far away.

Mr. George indicated there is a lighting plan as part of the land development plan set.

4, §325-202.A.5 – Waive the required 5 ft. wide grass strip along South Northern Way

Installation of the 5 ft. wide sidewalk would require the relocation of the existing sidewalk which is adjacent to the curb. They are proposing to leave the sidewalk in place.

5. §325-203 – Town Center Overlay street design standards for local street (waiver the required 5-foot wide grass strip along south Northern Way).

Same modification – two different sections of the ordinance that apply to the same area.

6. §3250-205.B – Modification to Streetscape Elements (Benches along streets)

Modification to allow the pedestrian benches to be placed in their public plaza due to the limited frontage of the property and because the plaza is internal to the development.

7. §325-205.C – Streetscape elements (street trees along South Northern Way)

Two street trees are required due to 100 feet of frontage. Because of the clear sight triangle at the intersection of the access drive at Northern Way, they are requesting to relocate the trees in the development.

8. §325.206.A – Perimeter landscape strip around parking lots within the Town Center Overlay.

The ordinance requires perimeter landscaping around parking lots. In the applicant's case the parking lot is flanked on two sides by the apartment buildings, consequently, the sidewalk and

parking butt against the building so there is no room for a perimeter landscape strip. The buildings act as the buffer on two sides of the parking area.

9. §325-207.C(1)(1) – Traffic Impact Study

Mr. George stated the proposed use is the least intensive traffic generation that is permitted. Based on traffic information provided by TRG, it was determined this is a low traffic generated use, resulting in 16 AM peak hour trips and 21 PM peak hour trips.

A main issue is the traffic created by the car wash. Existing traffic concerns related to the car wash property were deemed to not be the responsibility of the developer because they occur partially on property owned by the development. It was noted easement agreements were put in place between the car wash and the developer's predecessor which provide for ingress and egress over the portion of the property directly behind the car wash. The easement agreement says that they cannot impede traffic flow to the car wash and the car wash cannot impede the traffic flow to the developer's property.

They have asked for a modification to allow them to provide trip generation information in lieu of a full traffic impact study.

Discussion was held regarding traffic flows relating to the car wash.

MR. STUHRE MOVED IN THE CASE OF CU 2019-01 EAST YORK APARTMENTS TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE MODIFICATIONS 1 THROUGH 9 AS SHOWN ON THE SUMMARY LETTER PRESENTED BY STAFF AND IDENTIFIED ABOVE. SECONDED BY MS. MUSSELMAN. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY PASSED.

MR. STUHRE MOVED IN THE CASE OF CU-2019-01 EAST YORK APARTMENTS TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS AS PRESENTED. SECONDED BY MS. MUSSELMAN. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY PASSED.

4. **WAIVER RECOMMENDATIONS - None**
5. **OLD BUSINESS – None**
6. **NEW BUSINESS – None**
7. **ADJOURNMENT**

CHAIRMAN STAUB ADJOURNED THE MEETING AT 7:35 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Secretary

/ses