

APPROVED

**SPRINGETTSBURY TOWNSHIP  
PLANNING COMMISSION  
OCTOBER 19, 2017**

**MEMBERS IN**

**ATTENDANCE:** Mark Robertson, Vice Chairman  
Charles Wurster  
Charles Stuhre  
Tim Staub

**ALSO IN**

**ATTENDANCE:** John Luciani, First Capital Engineering  
Ben Marchant, Township Manager  
Jessica Fieldhouse, Community Development Director  
Raphael Caloia, Assistant Planner  
Charles Rausch, Solicitor  
Sue Sipe, Stenographer

**NOT PRESENT:** Alan Maciejewski, Chairman

**1. CALL TO ORDER:**

**A. Pledge of Allegiance**

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

**2. ACTION ON THE MINUTES**

**A. SEPTEMBER 21, 2017**

**MR. WURSTER MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE MEETING MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 21, 2017 AS AMENDED. MR. STUHRE SECONDED. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**DUE TO THE ATTENDANCE OF THE COMMUNITY MR. WURSTER MOVED TO AMEND THE AGENDA TO PLACE THE CASE FOR RE-ZONING EAST PHILADELPHIA STREET AS THE FIRST ITEM. SECONDED BY MR. STAUB. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY PASSED.**

**3. ACTION ITEM**

**A. Re-Zoning East Philadelphia Street**

Seth Predix, Owner  
Alex Snyder, Representative Predix Properties

Ms. Fieldhouse indicated that Predix Properties, LLC submitted a re-zoning request on July 28, 2017, which was heard by the Board of Supervisors at their August 24 meeting. They voted to send the request to the Township and the County Planning Commission. The Planning Commission heard the request as a briefing item at the September 21 meeting. The York County Planning Commission reviewed the request on Tuesday, September 17.

Mr. Snyder confirmed they are requesting to rezone the property at 2309 East Philadelphia Street from R-7 small lot residential to a Mixed Use. He noted this location was formerly a school and is owned by a church and is being leased to another entity for various activities in the building. Mr. Predix is proposing to rehab the building, keeping the façade in the same condition and construct a high end 12-unit apartment facility. He noted this would not be permitted in the R-7 residential zone. The Comp Plan indicates the building is designated for public institutional. The issue the current owner has is with access and it is not economically feasible for a church or other uses. Mr. Predix stated he feels it would be a good use and consistent with the neighborhood to rehab the building into an apartment building.

Mr. Predix indicated he has been a neighbor in the Olde East community for approximately two years having purchased 2101 East Market Street. His interest is to recycle old buildings that were blighted to the community in York County. He presented a slide show on his previous projects in the York area.

Mr. Predix stated he proposes to convert the building into 12 luxury apartments. There would be four 2-bedroom apartments and eight 1-bedroom apartments. They will bring the building up to current building codes, as well as put the property back on the tax map. The renovation would include new windows, landscaping, black top roof, mechanical and electrical updates. He noted they will recondition the property into a useful asset for Olde East York. He noted he is already invested in the community and will continue to invest in the community. He indicated mixed use is already bordering the property, so it makes sense to change it to mixed use. Mr. Predix indicated it would not be possible to renovate the building without re-zoning.

Vice Chairman Robertson opened the floor to public comment.

Gilbert Malone – 2125 E. Philadelphia Street

Mr. Malone stated he found a similar case in which a variance was granted to enable them to redevelop a school into apartment and offices. He noted their concern is if re-zoned mixed use it would be open to other commercial businesses in the future. He was of the opinion a variance which is conditioned on using the school, not tearing it down and building something else would be a better solution. He indicated he was not opposed to the apartments but to the re-zoning issue.

Mr. Predix responded that a variance would be hard to prove because it must create a hardship. In this case, he would have to argue the property can no longer be a school, a church or a group home.

Paul Gunning – 2205 E. Philadelphia Street

Mr. Gunning stated in his opinion what is being considered is a change that shows little concern about the neighborhood and the taxpayers. He noted currently that building has never paid taxes, so there is no loss. He was also concerned about the traffic and retaining valuable homes and

property.

Craig Thomas - 25 North Russell Street

Mr. Thomas submitted a letter stating his concerns. He noted he is the administrator for the Old East York Facebook page. He indicated his concern and the community's concern is the re-zoning and not Mr. Predix's vision for the historic Hiestand School building and property. Their concern is once rezoned mixed use, there would be nothing to prevent the potential of a more commercial business at that location sometime in the future. The residents of the community request the Board reconsider the use variance for this project or consider rezoning to Neighborhood Commercial/Historic rather than Mixed Use.

John Lutz – 106 N. Marshall Street

Mr. Lutz stated he is a member of the church. He acknowledged the property is going to be sold. The building has a lot of different levels, which makes it difficult for accessibility and cannot be used for many public purposes. He indicated he was in favor of Mr. Predix's plan, since if the building is torn down the property would likely be subdivided and cookie cutter homes built.

Steve Scalet – 27 North Russell Street

Mr. Scalet stated that since the property can no longer be used for a church or group home it must be updated. He asked if it would be better to change the zoning to Neighborhood-Commercial.

Mr. Predix indicated that would be considered spot zoning.

Richard Brown - 2207 Dixie Drive.

Mr. Brown was in support of the idea for upscale loft apartments.

Tracie Hoffman – 118 N. Manheim Street

Ms. Hoffman questioned the use for the area of the creek.

Mr. Predix stated they have no plans for accessing the creek.

Stan Reden – 25 N. Manheim Street

Mr. Reden indicated his concern about putting apartments in the building without any qualifications was not economically feasible.

**MR. WURSTER MOVED IN THE REZONING REQUEST FOR 2309 E. PHILADELPHIA STREET TO RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS TO CHANGE THE ZONING TO MIXED USE. SECONDED BY MR. STUHRE. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY PASSED.**

**4. BRIEFING ITEM**

**A. SD-17-02 George F. Wagman, III Subdivision**

Bob Sandmeyer, Site Design Concepts

Mr. Sandmeyer indicated this is a 2-lot subdivision in the Pleasantrees development which was subdivided in 1989 on Pleasant Valley Road. Part of it was Phase 1 consisting of 7 lots. He noted Mr. Wagman bought two lots. He is having a custom house built and would like to join the two lots together. This will result in a 5.8-acre property. There are steep slopes which will be addressed in the land development plan. He noted two-thirds of the property is in a conservation easement area. The initial design in 1989 was developed since they realized the lots would be in a conservation area with steep slopes. The house will be built in the upper part of the property.

He noted they are requesting two waivers – one would be a consolidation asking for the waiver for the minor subdivision and the second is a modification waiver for sidewalks and curbs along Pleasant Valley Road. He indicated they added a six month note to the plan to be installed upon notification from the Township.

Comments from the township engineer were resolved. There is one outstanding item which is a common access agreement for the driveway. The driveway currently serves four lots, so they are developing a common access drive.

**A MOTION WAS MADE BY MR. STAUB TO MOVE THE PLAN TO AN ACTION ITEM. SECONDED BY MR. STUHRE. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY PASSED.**

**MR. WURSTER MOVED IN THE CASE OF SD-17-02 GEORGE WAGMAN, III TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING WAIVERS:  
S.289-14 MINOR SUBDIVISION WAIVER  
S.289-32 SIDEWALK MODIFICATION WITH A SIX MONTH NOTE ON THE PLAN.  
SECONDED BY MR. STUHRE. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY PASSED.**

**MR. STAUB MOVED IN THE CASE OF SD-17-02 GEORGE WAGMAN, III TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS CONDITIONED ON ALL TOWNSHIP ENGINEER’S COMMENTS BEING ADDRESSED CONSISTING OF SIGNATURES AND THE DRIVEWAY AGREEMENT. SECONDED BY MR. WURSTER. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY PASSED.**

**B. SD-17-05 Brewery Products Subdivision**

Adam Anderson, Site Design Concepts

Bob Sandmeyer, Site Design Concepts

Derek Seigel, Brewery Products

John Casse, Brewery Products

Mr. Anderson indicated Brewery Products is a beverage warehousing distribution center. The property is located north of Rt. 83. North Sherman Street is on the west side and Eberts Lane on the east side. 10<sup>th</sup> Avenue is north, and Rt. 83 borders the southern portion. This is a subdivision to consolidate 5 lots. Parcel 1 is the main parcel of Brewery Products. Mr. Anderson pointed out the location of Parcel 2,3, 4 and 50 on the plan. It is zoned General-Industrial except for Parcel 50 which is zoned R-7 - small lot family residential. There are no improvements intended for the

site. A land development plan was submitted with the subdivision. A special exception was granted in August for construction within the 100-ft. setback from residential uses. There are waivers being requested, modifications and deferments to go along with the subdivision plan.

Ms. Fieldhouse indicated the plan will be re-presented to the Planning Commission after Staff has reviewed the township engineer's comments.

Mr. Anderson indicated they are requesting the following waivers/modifications:

- Preliminary plan - they are submitting a preliminary final plan.
- Traffic impact study – they are asking for a modification since they are submitting a traffic summary letter. They are not anticipating this project creating more traffic.
- Modification for concrete monuments – they are proposing to set two concrete monuments at the Rt. 83 right of way. The existing monumentation will be set with steel pins.
- Deferment of concrete curbs, sidewalk until land development which is two different deferments.
- Landscaping will be deferred to land development along with street lights.

#### **LD-17-05 – Brewery Products**

Adam Anderson, Site Design Concepts

Bob Sandmeyer, Site Design Concepts

Derek Seigel, Brewery Products

John Casse, Brewery Products

Mr. Anderson noted Sheet C-4 is the site layout plan which shows the subdivision with the lots consolidated. He noted there is an existing maintenance storage shed for the storage of trailers which will be demolished. They are proposing a 32,500-sq. ft. warehouse expansion with four additional docks for a total of 12 docks. There will be additional paved area around the edges. The parking is driven by the square footage of the warehouse expansion. There will not be additional employees with this plan. They are showing the 93 required spaces. He noted this is designated as a FEMA designated 100- year flood plain, with a no-rise certification. They are cutting in fill areas so it will be a net zero. The township engineer has reviewed it and issued an adequacy letter.

Concern was expressed about light spill over to residential areas. Mr. Anderson indicated the site lighting plan meets Township requirements. He also noted noise will be contained regarding trucks to the back of the facility.

Discussion was held regarding the necessity of all the parking spaces. Ms. Fieldhouse said they would address this during the Comp Plan review as well as during the eventual zoning ordinance update. They want to evaluate decreasing parking in certain areas and this would be one area to consider.

Mr. Anderson indicated the following waivers requested:

- Preliminary plan – submitting a preliminary/final plan
- Traffic impact study – they are submitting a traffic summary letter

- Installation of concrete curb – along Eberts Lane and Tenth Avenue to include a modification for a six months notification to be installed in the future.
- Sidewalks along North Sherman Street, Eberts, Tenth Avenue – modification for a six month note
- Streetlights and landscaping – they have an existing stormwater management basin along Rt. 83 right of way. The slope easements are on both edges of the property, so they are right up against the easements for the property.

Mr. Anderson provided a rendering of the proposed building.

## **5. ACTION ITEM**

### **A. SD-07-06 Triplet Springs**

Dave Koratich, Warehouse (formerly LSC Design)

Mr. Koratich stated since they last presented in August there have been no changes with the plan. The proposal is for 127 lots located above Metso on Pleasant Valley Road having access of the existing Metso Driveway off Pleasant Valley Road and access off Alcott Road and Ridgewood Road. This is an open space development from the 2007 Ordinance proposing 34 acres of open space. There are four additional waivers requested:

S.289-11. B. Plan scale 1” = 100 Ft.

S.289-36. Street lights along Alcott Road

S-281-15. B.1.Fencing – stormwater basins greater than 18” in depth

S-281-15. C.3.a, b & c.- Loading Ratios for stormwater management

Mr. Koratich stated the NPDES permit has been issued. Signatures are still needed.

Discussion was held regarding street lights on Alcott Road. Mr. Koratich stated they are proposing street lights internal to the development. He noted there is an existing street light close to the intersection. They are providing curb and sidewalk along the side of Alcott as well as the infill between Metso and the church along this property. They will have sidewalk along both roads down to the church. They are not adding any streetlights along Pleasant Valley Road. It was noted there are street lights at the church.

**MR. STUHRE MOVED IN THE CASE OF SD-07-06 TRIPLET SPRINGS TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS WITH THE FOLLOWING WAIVERS:**

- **S.289-11. B PLAN SCALE - DEVELOPER IS REQUESTING A WAIVER TO HAVE SELECT PAGES OF THE PLAN AT A SCALE OF 150 FEET = 1 INCH**
- **S.289-36 STREET LIGHTS - DEVELOPER IS REQUESTING A WAIVER TO FORGO INSTALLING STREET LIGHTS ALONG ALCOTT ROAD.**
- **S.281-15. B.1 FENCING - DEVELOPER IS REQUESTING A WAIVER TO NOT FENCE TWO STORMWATER BASINS.**
- **S.2851-15. C.3.A, B, & C LOADING RATIO - DEVELOPER IS REQUESTING A WAIVER TO EXCEED MAXIMUMS FOR IMPERVIOUS, AND TOTAL LOADING RATIOS FOR KARST AREAS.**

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

**MR. STAUB MOVED IN THE CASE OF SD-07-06 TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS PROVIDED APPLICANT IS THE APPLICANT OF THE PETITION FOR ALCOTT LANE, RIGHT-IN/RIGHT-OUT, AS WELL AS ANY OUTSTANDING COMMENTS ASSOCIATED WITH OCTOBER 4, 2017 LETTER FROM FIRST CAPITAL ENGINEERING. MR. WURSTER SECONDED. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY PASSED.**

**B. LD-16-05 Quattro**

Attorney Stacey MacNeal  
Joshua George, Snyder, Secary  
Jon Seitz, TRG  
Representatives from Liddl

Mr. George stated they are looking for a recommendation on both the subdivision and land development plan. The subdivision plan is proposed to create two lots out of the existing lots. The existing lot lines will be removed, and one lot line created to create one lot for Royal Farms and one lot for Liddl Grocery Store. He indicated they have revised the plan several times based on First Capital's comments and have not received additional comments.

It was noted the subdivision plan was not included on the agenda since there were no revisions. The same lot lines proposed on the subdivision are depicted on the land development plan. Attorney MacNeal indicated the subdivision plan was submitted many months ago and is ready for action.

Ms. Fieldhouse stated she could not tell when it was submitted. She suggested making approval of the land development conditional upon approval of the subdivision to be presented to the Planning Commission in November and then potentially approved in December.

Attorney MacNeal referred to the land development plan open issues. She noted there was discussion with the Planning Commission in April and May on their requested modifications from buffer yard.

Mr. George indicated no action was taken when it was discussed at a previous meeting. He noted a landscape buffer is required along collector roads since they have significant frontage. The buffer yard modification is broken into several pieces. They have the proposed landscape buffer 20 ft. wide but are asking that to be modified to not require a landscape berm in the area of the site. The justification for the waiver request is part of the existing landscaping has screening and buffering and is in PennDOT's right-of-way. They are proposing the 20 ft. wide plantings in addition to what is already there. This will result with approximately a 60-70 ft. wide buffer in certain areas because of the width of the right-of-way. The modification is to not require the berm to be constructed in lieu of the additional width that is provided.

Mr. George indicated in the portion of the site near the intersection of Concord and Mt. Zion roads, they have asked for a modification to allow the natural grade of the site to act as the buffer. Their site will be significantly lower than the intersection and the grade change creates a natural buffer between Mt. Zion Road, Concord Road and the site. They are asking for that area of the buffer to be waived in exchange for the fact the grade separation creates the buffer itself.

Concern was expressed about vehicles parking at Royal Farms with headlights toward Concord Road with headlights spilling into drivers at that elevation.

Mr. George stated there will be no light spillage since they are 7-10 ft. lower than Concord Road at that specific location. They are proposing a modification to allow them to construct a narrow buffer because while the grade separation disappears, they need to provide a buffer since the site gets narrower. The modification would allow them to put in a denser buffer in conjunction with a decorative vinyl fence 3-4 ft. tall to act as screening.

A question was raised about what is being done about storm water management controls between the intersection and the property to ensure that stormwater is not cascading down the hill into the Royal Farms property.

Mr. George indicated stormwater management is addressed and they have several catch basins near the bottom of the hill to catch the stormwater which is then conveyed to a proposed stormwater basin.

Mr. George pointed out the location of the final section for a 30-ft. wide buffer modification to allow the buffer to be provided but not the berm. He noted they are trying to buffer the truck dock area from the street and to achieve it through the vegetation itself. The berm does not add additional buffering. They have an area where there is plenty of width to provide a wider buffer. He indicated they have four different conditions across the frontage of the property because of the significant amount of frontage. They are asking for modifications in different portions of the site based upon the site conditions while making every attempt to provide the best buffering possible for the site.

Discussion was held regarding traffic. Attorney MacNeal indicated the issue for the intersection for Concord Road and Mt. Zion Road is the marginal degradation in the service with development at those two locations. One is a reduction in level of service by 12 seconds. The other is a reduction level of service of 10.7 second. Both intersections currently without development are a Level C just above a level D. But while there are small reductions in service it is enough to take them down to a level D which Mr. Seitz indicated is an acceptable level of service. PennDOT has indicated they will be looking for some discussion about the marginal degradation that has been happening at those intersections.

Attorney MacNeal indicated the reason for that problem is the restrictions on the ability to add an additional turn lane because of the bridge. She noted Mr. Seitz has conducted further investigation and discovered the bridge is in very good condition and will not be replaced any time soon. She indicated they had discussion with Staff about working with the Township regarding the plan on how to get it widened in the future.

Attorney MacNeal stated all the other improvements planned amounting to approximately \$750,000 dollars is substantially mitigating those degradations and are appropriate for this redevelopment project to get this site utilized. She noted they cannot proceed with PennDOT until they have a conditional plan approval.

Attorney MacNeal also indicated when they first identified the potential issues with the intersection approximately a year ago, they talked with staff about the software program they typically use which is the Synpro program. She noted there is a newer, more complex program called Symtraffic which accounts for how traffic moves and what the traffic is going to look like in that intersection. She referred to a presentation lead by the township engineer to the Board of Supervisors in February about Symtraffic to determine if it could be used as an analysis for this project. The consensus was to move forward in that direction. She indicated the information has

been provided to PennDOT.

Discussion was held with Mr. Seitz about the traffic signal and the green time. Mr. Seitz indicated by having the two lanes go through for the southbound left and providing full through lanes for them they can utilize both left turn lanes.

Attorney McNeal stated they are seeking additional right-of-way from the County with the concept of a traffic signal at the intersection at the east most access drive across from the post office. They would then move their traffic down to that point and would not have to deal with the ingress and egress where they are extending the additional lane of traffic. They have indicated with the traffic signal down at the post office and the County access point they would be willing to dedicate the additional right-of-way necessary for that extended turn lane.

Mr. George indicated they have been talking to the County and walking through several alternatives and the County is telling them they want a traffic signal at the post office driveway where the ICE entrance goes back into the prison. Part of that is based on the fact when they widen Concord Road and extend that lane it currently drops off at Kinsley Driveway. The end of that extension is at the prison's northern-most driveway just before the curve on Concord Road. They talked to the County about removing the driveway on Concord Road. The exiting traffic then circulates through the prison property to the driveway where ICE currently exists. The signal would become an important factor in the overall discussion along with the post office's existing traffic. If they put a signal there they would close off the northern driveway.

Attorney MacNeal indicated they do not yet have a legal agreement with the County. Their expectation is either before they go before the Supervisors or before final plan approval by the Supervisors they will have that agreement.

Mr. George also noted where the exiting driveway is now they are proposing to leave a bump out for the bus stop, to enable the bus to pull into that bump and not be on Concord Road. The bus stop would be relocated to that same point. They are working with the bus company in that regard.

Discussion was held regarding the entrances. Mr. George confirmed they are working towards having the County signing the plan since they are a property owner. They will add them since they will be dedicating the right-of-way before the plan is recorded.

Attorney MacNeal provided an update concerning the Liddl store layout. She noted they have spent considerable time trying to make sure what they were presenting is a safe situation. They have explored all options for other alternatives and what would be workable for the end user. She reminded the Board where entrances and exits are especially as it relates to their rendering. She reviewed the layout of the site and the circulation of the site. They also worked on the access drive to provide channelization and to provide a way to be sure they had safe movements for use of the loading docks.

Mr. George reviewed the design of the access drive. He noted they are proposing two lanes from an egress standpoint – one would be a dedicated right; the other would be a straight and left, and then one dedicated inbound lane. Between that they are proposing a 12-foot wide concrete median. The median would be flush, but it would be corrugated. This will provide a buffer between the inbound and outbound traffic. They are trying to achieve the goal set in the Ordinance which is to separate the inbound and outbound traffic to make safe movements. At the same time, they are coupling this median with an area for the trucks to get into the loading dock

for the Liddl store.

Mr. George indicated he reviewed alternate layouts with Liddl which came from previous discussions. He presented a sketch of an alternate layout, but they determined it was not a workable solution. The sketch was shared with Liddl and Liddl indicated it would be a deal breaker.

Due to the concerns and issues that were raised concerning the driveway and truck dock area, Mr. Seitz presented a PowerPoint to demonstrate what is being proposed is safe given the expected traffic and truck deliveries for the site. He provided a comparison with other locations within Springettsbury Township that are nearby. He compared it to four different sites:

Lowes  
Wolf Furniture  
Aldi's  
Walgreens

Lauren Bickers, Development Manager with Liddl

Ms. Bickers stated she spoke to their delivery operations. Their goal at Liddl is to filter the majority of their deliveries through their regional distribution center. Most of the deliveries will be coming on a Liddl truck and they will plan to deliver everything during off-peak hours so most of the deliveries should be coming before store opening in the morning. They average four deliveries per day.

Ms. MacNeal indicated one of the modifications that has been added since the last presentation is related to the channelization at the access drive off Concord Road. They need a modification from an access drive within that location. They previously discussed a waiver of preliminary plan.

A comment was made by the Planning Commission as to whether there would be an option that considers shifting the store somewhat to make a turn lane or a parking area where the trucks can come out and maneuver into this site.

Mr. George indicated they have decided on a scenario they think is the safest and facilitates the access the best way. He did not believe an intermediate option is going to make any of the issues better.

Rob Walters - Quattro Developers

Mr. Walters stated the issue is the further the building is moved forward, the more parking will be in the back resulting in more people walking through the parking lot.

Ms. Bickers indicated from a Liddl perspective they only count the number of parking spaces to the left of the loading dock on the plan, since they are all about convenience and this is a long walk to the front door. They need at least 160 spaces and any kind of intermediate plan is going to be approximately 120 spaces but not enough for their operations. She noted they will not get approval on a site which has only 120 spaces.

Continued discussion of the truck turning movements. Concern was expressed regarding stacking of vehicles waiting on trucks. Attorney MacNeal stated they are not anticipating stacking more than 5 vehicles. She noted should that occur there is a dedicated right turn lane into the site.

Ms. Fieldhouse stated the applicant has withdrawn S. 289-21. E (2) – Modification to determine

conformance of the proposed roadway improvements with the Township's requirements for a traffic impact study.

**MR. STUHRE MOVED IN THE CASE OF LD-16-05 QUATTRO TO RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVAL OF WAIVER S.289-10A PRELIMINARY PLAN. SECONDED BY MR. WURSTER. MOTION WAS DENIED (2 NAYS).**

**MR. STAUB MOVED IN THE CASE OF LD-16-05 QUATTRO TO RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVAL OF WAIVER S.289-35C MODIFICATION TO PERMIT LANDSCAPED BUFFER YARDS TO VARY ALONG THE ROADWAY FRONTAGE. SECONDED BY MR. WURSTER. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY PASSED.**

**MR. STAUB MOVED IN THE CASE OF LD-16-05 QUATTRO TO RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVAL OF THE FOLLOWING WAIVERS:**

- **289-41. J(6)(B) – WAIVER TO PERMIT THE CHANNELIZATION WITHIN PROPOSED CONCORD ROAD ACCESS DRIVE TO BE CONSTRUCTED USING FLUSH, CORRUGATED CONCRETE RATHER THAN MOUNTABLE CONCRETE.**
- **28-41. J (1) – WAIVER TO PERMIT THE ACCESS DRIVE TO EXCEED 35 FEET IN WIDTH.**

**SECONDED BY MR. WURSTER. MOTION WAS DENIED (2 NAY).**

**MR. STAUB MOVED IN THE CASE OF LD-16-05 QUATTRO TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:**

- **RIGHT-OF-WAY ACQUISITION**
- **SANITARY SEWER ACCESS**
- **PENNDOT HOP**

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

**B. CU-17-01 Springetts Commons**

Attorney Stacey MacNeal  
Adam Anderson, Site Design Concepts

Attorney MacNeal indicated this project began approximately a year ago. It started with a meeting with the Board of Supervisors November 2016 where they asked for the Board's comments on aspects of the previously plan. Based on those comments and input they made numerous design changes. The sketch plan was taken to a Staff meeting in April for discussion and comments. Based on comments received from Staff they made additional changes to the plan. They submitted a draft sketch plan and full conditional use application at the end of June. They met with Staff in a subsequent meeting on July 11 to review the sketch plan. It was then presented to the Planning Commission on July 20 for discussion. A formal zoning application was submitted and then re-presented on September 21.

Attorney MacNeal stated since the last presentation they have two requested modifications on the plan.

- Access drive width –changed the primary access point on Lot #1. There was concern about

having two egress points directly next to each so they have reduced it resulting in one egress-one ingress lane. The two separate egress lanes remain on Lot #2 because with the separation that exists, there is adequate sight distance with no safety concerns at those locations. However, even with the change to Lot #1 to reduce it to one egress lane, they still had to request the modification due to the additional width on both of the drives which is necessary to get trucks in and out of the site. Mr. Anderson provided the plan showing the two main entrances onto Industrial Highway.

Attorney MacNeal indicated the access drive width on Lot #2 does not include the right-out egress, only the two lanes of travel necessary. One of these is approximately 35 ft. and the other is 36 ft.

- The second modification is the percentage of translucency on the first floor of the assisted living facility. She noted they made changes to the garages after review at the July Planning Commission meeting, by adding windows and other architectural features but it is not enough to obtain the required minimum for the first-floor level. She noted the entire façade of the building does exceed that requirement.
- She noted they have withdrawn the procedural modification.

End users are not yet identified but they will have more information as they go through land development.

Attorney MacNeal addressed comments received before the last Planning Commission meeting. She noted there are minor detail changes referenced in the response letter. There were four comments on the traffic impact assessment. They will continue to discuss traffic through the land development process.

One of the issues discussed is the corner of Northern Way and Concord Road. Attorney MacNeal indicated there had been recent crash data of concern. She noted Mr. Seitz conducted research on the accidents with the police department to obtain more information. It was discovered the accidents occurred with wet or snowy road conditions. They suspect this was caused by a slipping problem at the intersection. It was TRG's recommendation to install a high friction surface on the road in that location which they are proposing with the plan.

Attorney MacNeal indicated they had discussion at Staff regarding queuing, which was revealed in the traffic impact study with signal timing changes. She noted they will be working with PennDOT on traffic signal timing at Memory Lane and Industrial Highway and will be working through that during land development.

Referring to Zoning comments, Attorney MacNeal indicated she met with Staff and the township solicitor to determine if additional modifications were necessary. Regarding a question as to whether the bus shelter was an authorized use, it was determined that it is authorized in the development in this zone. There was a general comment about it needing to be consistent with the comprehensive plan as long as they meet the objective requirements of the zoning ordinance.

She noted there was discussion about the Ordinance requirement that states street layouts should provide for blocks that are 300-600 ft. deep by 300-600 ft. long. The determination was they are not laying out streets so it is not applicable. However, Staff's primary concern was location of Lot #2 access drive and if it is advantageous to line up with the Wolf Drive access drive. It was TRG's recommendation that would lead to a less safe situation in this case given the amount of

volume at both of those access drives. Where it was left at Staff meeting was they recognize the concern but also see it would be a less safe situation to have it in proximity to the traffic signal as well as the amount of traffic that would be expected at those locations.

Mr. Seitz noted the traffic counts into and out of the Social Security Administration office are reflected in their study. He reiterated the peaks for this development are the PM peak and the Saturday peak. He noted there is no traffic there on Saturday.

Attorney MacNeal indicated they discussed the possibility of obtaining a modification to reduce the level of lighting from the Ordinance requirements along the pedestrian pathway. The engineer felt the lighting required by the Ordinance which is what they provided is appropriate and the conclusion was to leave it as is.

Regarding parking facilities, Attorney MacNeal noted for Lot 1 they have an oddly shaped lot with limited road frontage resulting in the parking for the building at the road frontage to the side and rear of that building. She noted the parking shown between the two facilities is necessary parking and associated with the building at the front of that lot.

Attorney MacNeal indicated they had discussion about vehicle circulation and walking paths both in conjunction with adding continuous walking paths throughout the development. She noted they have been working on this over the previous months and made numerous changes. They are also anticipating providing future connectivity to the Township's pedestrian path plan.

Attorney MacNeal indicated they had conversations about street standards. They provided the Industrial Highway streetscape required by the ordinance which is discretionary as to on-street parking. It was their impression from the Planning Commission meeting in July that on-street parking on Industrial Highway would not be appropriate or safe. She also had discussion with Attorney Rausch and Ms. Fieldhouse as to what is the Township's vision for Industrial Highway which sees a tremendous amount of traffic in the 9,000 trips per day. Discussion was held as to the options for traffic calming in this area.

The Planning Commission commented they are looking for the development of this site to be a superior development and different from other shopping centers. It was further commented that it also presents the component of having a residential area which will encourage walking on the pathways in the vicinity of the development.

Discussion was held regarding the possibility of a bike lane. Ms. Fieldhouse indicated her concern about bicycles on Industrial Highway without some type of traffic calming.

Attorney MacNeal indicated they have had discussion about traffic calming and would consider working with the township to plan or design some options but not implement them until the Township does the study to determine what would be the most advantageous.

Atty. MacNeal indicated they have had discussion and worked on the public plaza areas. There was a Staff comment about the location of the Lot #1 public plaza and they have made changes to the pedestrian walkway to inter-connect it more extensively. They are planning two public plazas, each with a slightly different purpose. One would provide visibility on the corner near the dining and outdoor space. The second one will be used extensively by the residents of the assisted living facility but also connect into the pathway. It is 400 ft. from the other plaza and is a quieter space.

Regarding Planning Commission comments she noted they have added internal way finding.

Attorney MacNeal indicated the recommendation for rain gardens was discussed and some have been added to the plan. She noted there are soils on the site not suitable for rain gardens. As they work through land development and the permitting process they will continue to do some work with the stream. She noted they will need a DEP permit for the pedestrian bridge.

**MR. STAUB MOVED IN THE CASE OF CU-17-01 TO RECOMMEND CONDITIONAL USE APPROVAL TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS PROVIDED THERE IS ON-STREET PARKING AND TRAFFIC CALMING APPLICABLE TO INDUSTRIAL HIGHWAY AS STATED IN THE ORDINANCE AND THE TOWN CENTER OVERLAY PLAN. SECONDED BY MR. WURSTER. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY PASSED.**

**4. WAIVER RECOMMENDATIONS - None**

**5. OLD BUSINESS**

**A. LD-17-01 Susquehanna Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery**

Ms. Fieldhouse indicated there is a minor change surrounding the Susquehanna Oral Surgery Center where it may add up to 500 sq. ft. of impervious surface. This may be proposed at a future meeting.

**B. Quattro Discussion**

Discussion was held regarding the recommendation made for waiver 289-41. J (1) - waiver to permit the access drive to exceed 35 feet in width. It was decided to discuss this with the applicant at the November meeting.

**6. NEW BUSINESS**

**7. ADJOURNMENT**

**VICE CHAIRMAN ROBERTSON ADJOURNED THE MEETING AT 9:55 P.M.**

Respectfully submitted,

Secretary

/ses