

APPROVED

**SPRINGETTSBURY TOWNSHIP
PLANNING COMMISSION
SEPTEMBER 21, 2017**

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
Raphael Caloia, Assistant Planner
Peter Haldeman, 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. AUGUST 17, 2017

MR. STUHRE MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE MEETING MINUTES OF AUGUST 17, 2017 AS PRESENTED. MR. ROBERTSON SECONDED. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.

BRIEFING ITEMS

A. Re-Zoning East Philadelphia Street

Alex Snyder
Seth Predix

Ms. Fieldhouse stated the Township received a request from Predix Properties, LLC on July 28, 2017 for consideration of rezoning at 2309 E. Philadelphia Street. At their August 24th meeting the Board of Supervisors voted to send the request to the Planning Commission for review and input.

She noted the request was also submitted to the York County Planning Commission for review at

their October 17 meeting. She indicated Staff will advertise the case for the October meeting and will also send out notice to the adjoining property owners.

Mr. Snyder stated the proposed property is currently owned by Emanuel Christian Fellowship Church but it is being leased to another entity. Currently there are accessibility issues that prevent it from being feasible – it was originally a school. Mr. Predix is in the business of redeveloping under-utilized properties in the vicinity of the city and is proposing to turn this school into 12 unit apartments. Due to the accessibility issues they believe it would be more appropriate to rezone it as Mixed-Use where it could serve as a buffer from the neighboring property.

Ms. Fieldhouse indicated for multi-family units the limitations for the site would be based on the density factor which acts as a multiplier. She noted it is limited to 30 units an acre. This is a two-acre parcel resulting in an allowable 60 units, which is based on the variety of bedrooms chosen.

Discussion was held and the consensus of the Planning Commission was they have no objection to the plan being proposed.

B. LD-17-02 Toyota of York

Robert Sandmeyer, Site Design Concepts

Mr. Sandmeyer indicated they met with Staff regarding the waivers and the project in general. He indicated they have also addressed the majority of Mr. Luciani's comments.

He noted there are six waiver requests:

S.289-10 –Submittal of Preliminary Plan to go directly to final.

S.289-13. A. – Plan scale is to be at either 1"=50' or 1"=100'
Applicant is requesting to use a 1" to 30' scale to make it more legible.

S. 289-32 Sidewalks - The applicant is requesting a waiver to construct sidewalks on Memory Lane. In addition, the applicant is asking for a modification to construct sidewalks along only a portion of Whiteford Road.

Discussion was held as to where the existing sidewalk exists. Mr. Sandmeyer noted it really is not a waiver since the property along Route 30 is not theirs – it is land owned by PennDOT. He pointed out on the plan where their property ends. It was determined the waiver would be withdrawn in this case.

S-289-35C – Installation of a streetscape and buffer yards – the applicant is requesting a modification to the Township's buffer yard requirements. A car dealership depends upon the visual connection that passing motorists make as they drive by. The applicant is requesting to plant the required landscaping within the site and not as buffer yards along the site's Whiteford Road property line. Buffer yard 2 is required along Whiteford Road. The applicant is proposing the plantings required for a 50' buffer yard (5 street trees and 10 shrubs per 100 LF). This equals 22 trees and 43 shrubs. Staff suggests that the planting scheme used reflect whatever buffer yard size would have realistically been constructed had the site not been a car dealership, i.e. are the buffer yard plantings of a 50' buffer yard versus a 30' buffer yard appropriate.

Ms. Fieldhouse stated they will coordinate with the applicant to verify that all the appropriate internal landscaping has been accomplished.

S.289-31 Curbs - Applicant is requesting a waiver to the Township Construction and Materials Specifications to construct 6” curbs as opposed to 8” curbs. Mr. Sandmeyer stated the ordinance requires 8” throughout the entire site – they would like to install 6” curb reveal height in their site in private property areas, however, will install 8” outside the property. It is detailed on the plans where it is transitioned.

S. 289-36. Street Lights - Applicant is requesting to waive the requirement of street light installation along Whiteford Road. Currently two pedestrian street lights would be required per the ordinance.

Upon discussion the Planning Commission recommended the streetlights be installed.

MR. WURSTER MOVED IN THE CASE OF LD-17-02 TOYOTA OF YORK TO RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS THE FOLLOWING WAIVER REQUESTS:

289-10 – SUBMITTAL OF PRELIMINARY PLAN BE WAIVED

289-13. A – PLAN SCALE AT 1” TO 30’

289 -24 - FEASIBILITY REPORT ON SEWER AND WATER FACILITIES TO BE WAIVED

289-31 CURBS – MODIFICATION WAIVER - APPLICANT IS REQUIRED TO SPECIFY WHERE THE CURBS WILL BE LOCATED ON THE PLAN

289-35C BUFFER YARDS AS PRESENTED SUBJECT TO THE APPLICANT MEETING THE OVERALL SITE COVERAGE REQUIREMENTS OF THE TOWNSHIP

289-36 STREET LIGHTS – DO NOT RECOMMEND APPROVAL

SECONDED BY MR. ROBERTSON. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY PASSED.

C. LD-17-03 693 North Hills Road

Tom Scully, Alpha Consulting Engineers
John Murphy

Mr. Scully indicated the property at 693 North Hills Road is south of LCBC Church and the recently constructed Candlewood Suites Hotel. There are 28 acres. He noted since the late 1940’s this site had an industrial use which expanded over the years. There is 2.4 acres of impervious with buildings currently. They are proposing to redevelop the site with a one-story distribution warehouse consisting of 352,000 sq. ft. There are two driveways off North Hills Road which would be utilized for this site, in addition to the shared access with Saturn Way.

He noted there is a flood plain with a creek on the site and utilities which they are not altering. The passenger traffic and visitor entrance would be on the north side near Saturn Way. Truck traffic to the docks would be on the south side using the other existing access. There would be potential flow around the building, but traffic would be segregated. Mr. Scully pointed out there are existing ball fields which are no longer used. There is an intermittent change channel which slices through the site and between the buildings with some pipes, which they are proposing to relocate to the outside of the site. This will require a joint permit with DEP and the Army Corp of Engineers. He noted they had a pre-application meeting with DEP to determine segregating the site in order to redevelop internally. They are proposing approximately 15 acres of

impervious which is an increase of 2.6 acres. There would be 188 parking spaces in the visitor area. They received sewer comments from Buchart-Horn and First Capital Engineering comments.

They requested six waivers/modifications:

- Modification of 289-10 preliminary plan - to file the preliminary and final plans together
- Waiver for 389-13. A plan scale - to submit site plans at a scale of 1 inch = 60 feet
- Waiver for 289-32. A Sidewalks - to construct sidewalks only to the north of their southern access drive. They are proposing sidewalks for 582 feet which would extend to the LCBC Church. However, the topography drops off as the road is going up over the creek, resulting in not enough physical space for the sidewalk
- Waiver for 289-41. J. (5). Curbs in access ways –to forgo curbs in particular sections of the access drive to allow stormwater to flow.
- Stormwater Management Ordinance waiver for 281-12. A. (1) Volume Controls - seeking relief on the volume control requirements on the ordinance and instead implement water quality controls. Mr. Scully indicated they are meeting the rate of runoff control but they have done 18 soil pits and only five of them are favorable for infiltration at the level necessary. Because there is limestone bedrock and fill they are proposing water quality measures with vegetation.
- Waiver for 281-15. B. (1). (h) minimum bottom slope - Applicant is requesting to have the bottom slopes of their basins as little as 0.5% instead of the required 4% minimum

Discussion was held as to the usage for the facility, as to whether it would be a single user or multiple tenants. Mr. Scully indicated he did not know at this point since a user has not been identified for the building.

It was noted in the environmental report that preliminary work was done concerning ground contamination. Mr. Scully indicated they did not do that, it was done for the landowner by another consultant. He was not aware of those findings but noted the conclusion of the Phase 2 study showed anything that was found is within DEP's standards for the various compounds. The Planning Commission indicated they needed more information on this since the site was a former boiler manufacturer with the possibility of asbestos contamination.

Discussion was held in regard to the stormwater issues that have existed on the site, relating to the potential for flooding in the creek. Mr. Scully indicated the channel currently goes between the buildings and it is not very deep and is at building level. The swale is 8 ft. wide to the side and many feet deep resulting in a much deeper capacity than the current channel. He noted calculations were provided.

Discussion was held regarding traffic. Mr. Luciani indicated they will be using both existing driveways. He noted they met with PennDOT for a preapplication meeting and they are doing a traffic impact analysis as opposed to a traffic impact study which has not yet been submitted. It was noted there are serious traffic issues in this location. Mr. Murphy indicated they will be working with TRG and PennDOT to identify what improvements are necessary and how to resolve them. It was suggested by the Planning Commission that the focus also include North

Hills Road and Industrial Highway.

Additional discussion on road issues included:

- Potentially lengthening one of the double left turn lanes into North Hills Road.
- It was noted there is an existing easement with the church and the hotel.
- Discussion with the neighboring Caterpillar for the potential to punch a street through the back of the property to take advantage of the signal on Memory Lane. This would provide a highway to get to Route 30 to alleviate the traffic situation. It would also allow avoiding the railroad as well as the stream.

D. CU-17-01 Springetts Commons

Attorney Stacey MacNeal

Adam Anderson, Site Design Concepts

Jon Seitz, TRG

Rob Poet

Attorney MacNeal stated her client is under contract to purchase this property, as was noted when the sketch plan was presented in July. The property is located at the northwest corner of Industrial Highway and Northern Way. It is approximately 14 acres of land zoned Flexible Development with the Town Center Overlay. She noted their conditional use application for the zoning application has been filed. They have met with Staff on two separate occasions with this conditional use - once as a sketch plan at the end of May and then as a more substantial draft conditional use application package at the beginning of July and prior to the draft application to the Planning Commission at that time. Since then the applicant and their team took comments from the Planning Commission as well as Staff and incorporated those changes into the formal application which has now been submitted.

Attorney MacNeal indicated they are requesting three modifications:

- To allow minor revisions to the elevations for the proposed retail, office, restaurant buildings as long as in conformance with the Town Center Overlay.
- To allow increased access drive width from the ordinance maximum of 25 ft. to allow one of the main access drives to be up to 37 feet and the other access drive to be up to 35 ft. to accommodate multiple lanes going out and turning movements.
- To allow the transparency percentage for the ground floor of the assisted living facility. She noted the architect added window features on the residential garages to increase the percentage of transparency at ground level, but they are not yet up to the required minimal. However, the whole façade of the building does meet the minimum requirement.

Discussion was regarding the modification request to allow revisions to building elevations. It was noted under the one aspect if a modification was made that was different than the initial plan it would be brought to the attention of the Township. The current modification indicated the applicant is requesting to be allowed to make revisions to the building elevations when tenants are determined.

Attorney MacNeal pointed out there is some ambiguity in the procedures of the ordinance. She noted the ordinance addresses change of use and indicates that for certain limits on how much

residential vs. commercial exists, it can be mixed. Otherwise, there is no prohibition on changing from a restaurant to retail as long as they are both permitted. It specifically addresses other types of changes to the plan but refers to changes to the site layout of the plan. It does not seem to address architectural detail changes. This was discussed with Staff as to whether any type of architectural detail changes would have to come back for revision, unless the applicant asked for a modification to that process, i.e, an architectural detail change to one of the buildings and as long as they meet those requirements they would not have to come back through the conditional use process.

Ms. Fieldhouse noted because this is a general sketch plan there will be modifications to the layout to other items. Those modifications will need to be presented to the Board. It will be the Board's decision to identify if it is okay as a modification and to accept the change or deny it and require them to go back through the conditional use and require the Planning Commission take a look at it again. Staff can provide their analyses but it will ultimately go before the Board.

Attorney MacNeal indicated she agreed in regard to site layout changes if they would need to shift driveways. The concern is they could have a recorded land development plan and an approved conditional use and still not have a tenant identified. If after it is recorded and a tenant is identified and they want to do a different type of articulation, could the applicant present those architectural drawings to Staff with the change which would meet the requirements of the ordinance. Would they be required to go through a 60-day conditional use process, presenting to the Planning Commission and then to the Supervisors. Or is it okay for Staff to say at that point yes, they meet the requirements of the ordinance so it is sufficient.

The Planning Commission agreed that the mechanism by which this should be handled should be resolved and put in writing. It determined to obtain guidance from the township solicitor, Attorney Rausch, to resolve the ambiguity and provide clear direction on how this should properly be addressed.

Discussion was held regarding the modification request to allow increased access drive width wider than 25 ft. Lot #1 will be 37 ft. and Lot #2 will be 35 feet to allow for dedicated turning lanes. It was questioned whether this would be detailed in the traffic study as to why it is necessary. Mr. Seitz of TRG indicated the configuration of the driveways was included in the traffic study. He noted because it is a flat, open area there is good sight distance in that area.

Attorney MacNeal stated the main issue is for the main access point on Lot #1 and the main access point on Industrial Highway on Lot #2 both showing a dedicated left turn lane and a right turn lane. Because of those dedicated lanes they need to go wider than 25 ft.

Discussion was held regarding the modification for the transparency request for the first floor of the assisted living facility. She noted they are now at 16.1% transparency on the first floor with the additions to the windows and architectural detailing on the residential garages. The requirement is 25%.

A question was raised regarding the calculations for floodplain. Attorney MacNeal stated they are making a land development plan submission tomorrow and that documentation will be included.

Concern was expressed for the water situation in that area. Mr. Anderson indicated at the west access drive on Lot #1 the roadway is low enough that they will have ponding in that area. There will be an access onto Northern Way that will be above the 100-year flood elevation, which is a right-in, right-out and there is egress on the site. On the west side of Lot #1 - the western most

access is a right in but they have designed it to be a mountable curb which can be used in an emergency situation to exit the site.

Attorney MacNeal pointed out changes to the plan since it was last presented based on Planning Commission comments:

- Site Design Concepts moved the pedestrian bridge – it was shifted closer to the middle of the site as was recommended to provide better connectivity.
- They changed the location of the primary pedestrian walkway so it is now between the access drive on Lot #1 and the stream. It used to sit on the other side of that access drive.
- They have included a green space plaza with benches in front of the assisted living facility main entrance to provide more visual interest.
- In general, with the landscaping plan and the architectural renderings, they attempted to increase the visual interest at that corner as was suggested.

In regard to recreational space, Attorney MacNeal indicated the walkway is adjacent to that stream corridor. The reason why the walking path is in that area, there is some slope down into the stream so they are trying to stay up at the top of the bank of the stream. Consequently, the walking path is meandering along the stream in that location to provide passive recreation in the area. The public plaza on Lot #1 is visible and accessible to the stream course as well.

In fulfilling their recreation needs, Attorney MacNeal stated with the subdivision/land development plan submission, they will have discussion about recreation requirements. She noted they have had recent discussion with the Township in regard to seeking a fee in lieu of the dedication of recreational facilities at this time.

Chairman Maciejewski referenced correspondence sent to the applicant from Ms. Fieldhouse outlining recommendations applying to the Town Center Overlay for the project and asked if these have been reviewed.

Attorney MacNeal indicated they received the recommendations yesterday and have not had the opportunity to go through them in depth. She noted they have a hearing in a month and at this time cannot make substantial changes to the uses represented. It is their intention after the meeting to review the recommendations to determine how they can accommodate the recommendations.

Chairman Maciejewski commended Ms. Fieldhouse on developing the recommendations to assure the applicant is following the Town Center Overlay.

A question was raised regarding the 18-ft. sign delineated on the plan. Attorney MacNeal stated the sign is permitted in the zoning district and the Town Center Overlay for a shopping center per the definition in the ordinance. She noted this was discussed with Attorney Rausch and Ms. Fieldhouse prior to submittal. Lot #2 will be considered a shopping center and therefore the 18-ft. sign is permitted.

3. ACTION ITEMS

It was noted the Quattro case was withdrawn from the agenda.

4. WAIVER RECOMMENDATIONS - None

5. OLD BUSINESS – None

6. NEW BUSINESS – None

7. ADJOURNMENT

CHAIRMAN MACIEJEWSKI ADJOURNED THE MEETING AT 7:50 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Secretary

/ses