

**SPRINGETTSBURY TOWNSHIP  
PLANNING COMMISSION  
NOVEMBER 16, 2023**

**MEMBERS IN**

**ATTENDANCE:** Tim Staub, Chairman  
Mark Robertson, Vice-Chairman via Zoom  
Paula Musselman  
Charles Stuhre  
James Tanzola

**ALSO IN**

**ATTENDANCE:** Randall Heilman, Director of Community Development  
John Luciani, Township Engineer/Deputy Zoning Officer  
Elizabeth Gangloff, Esq., Solicitor  
Jill Trostle, Stenographer

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

**A. Pledge of Allegiance**

Chairman Tim Staub called the meeting to order at 6:01 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance.

**2. ACTION ON THE MINUTES**

**A. OCTOBER 19, 2023**

Paula Musselman moved approval of the minutes of October 19, 2023, seconded by Charles Stuhre. All Board members present voted in favor and the motion carried.

**3. BRIEFING ITEMS**

**SD-2023-0001 - Poppy Lane Ventures & Christos D. Sacarellos**

Mr. Heilman provided an introduction to the application submitted by NuTec Design Associates, Inc. The project is in the zoning districts N-C Neighborhood Commercial (Article XII, §325-29 through §325-34). The existing property is a 3.28-acre vacant lot. This property is to be combined with an adjacent lot, (1.50-acres) in a minor subdivision application submitted concurrent with a land development SALDO application. The proposed project includes combining the 3.28 acre vacant lot in the N-C zoning district with the 1.5 acre adjacent lot in the R-10 zoning district. Mr. Chris Beaugard was present to discuss the plan.

Chris Beaugard, Nu-Tec Design Associates, Inc.

Mr. Beaugard stated he represents the applicant on both the subdivision plan and land development plan for the apartment project on Memory Lane.

The following modification/waivers are requested for the subdivision plan:

- a. §Section 289-13.A - Plan Scale

Waiver has been requested for requiring plans to be drawn at scales 50 and 100 feet per 1 inch. The applicant cites that due to the small size of the property, a smaller scale is needed to show the details of the

**Springettsbury Township Planning Commission**  
**Minutes of November 16, 2023**

---

proposed plan; which warrants a waiver. This comment will remain open until the Board of Supervisors has rendered a decision.

b. §Section 289-14 - Minor subdivision Plan

Waiver has been requested for a minor subdivision. The applicant cites that in lieu of a final subdivision plan a minor is warranted as it is combining two (2) parcels into one. This comment will remain open until the Board of Supervisors has rendered a decision.

c. §Section 289-26.A. & B. - Concrete Monuments

Waiver has been requested for setting all the corners as concrete monuments. The applicant cites that the northeast corner of the property is set by a steel pipe and is considered a record marker, and it is standard survey practice to not remove the record markers. All other corners will be set with concrete monuments. This comment will remain open until the Board of Supervisors has rendered a decision.

Comments from First Capital Engineering were received and reviewed. The minor subdivision plan will be submitted as a final subdivision plan in accordance with the engineer's comments, which results in additional waivers to be requested. This information will be passed on to Site Design Concepts, the PLS responsible for the project, and then resubmitted.

Mr. Luciani noted that the applicant may defer sidewalk improvements and road widening until the land development plan is submitted. The applicant is combining a parcel in the residential zoning district with a parcel in the neighborhood commercial district and will be requesting deferrals, not waivers.

**LD-2023-0001 - Memory Lane Apartments**

Mr. Beauregard briefly reviewed the land development plan which will include a new 11,000 square foot apartment building with 52 units on 4.75 acres with two access drives, parking, enclosed dumpsters, buffer yards and three stormwater management facilities. There is a large drainage area that comes down through the parcel from the north. In the first phase of construction a basin will be constructed and a stormwater diversion pipe will route the stormwater through the site and into the Township stormwater management system along Memory Lane. Subsequent phases will include construction of the northern access drive and the building pad. The final phase submitted to the York County Conservation District will include the southern roadway. A waiver will be requested for loading ratio, preliminary plan, requirement for sidewalks along the west side of Memory Lane, curbing along the west side of Memory Lane, and the drawing scale. Additional waivers may be required. All 33 comments provided by the Township Engineer have been reviewed. Mr. Beauregard asked how retaining walls are handled within the stormwater management basins. The ordinance requires 4 to 1 side slopes, but the side slopes are currently 3 to 1. Since the current retaining walls are vertical, Mr. Beauregard asked to clarify if they fall under the side slope requirement. Mr. Luciani responded they would, and a waiver would need to be requested. Two of three basins will have a fence. Basin 1 on the north side does not warrant a fence since there are no walls or steep slopes. All potential issues noted by the Township engineer will be resolved.

Ms. Musselman asked about the plan for the apartment units. Mr. Beauregard responded all units are one bedroom or loft apartments with a living room that converts to a bedroom. The proposed plan meets the zoning ordinance requirement for parking. Mr. Stuhre asked if the apartment building would be equipped with sprinklers, to which Mr. Beauregard responded yes. Mr. Stuhre asked if York Water Company will

have adequate water supply for the building. Mr. Beauregard responded they are waiting for final confirmation from York Water Company. Mr. Stuhre suggested that a waiver be submitted to convert the required eight-inch internal curbing to six-inch to prevent vehicle damage, which is the current trend.

Mr. Robertson asked if the plan includes space for visitor parking and accommodations for snow removal. Mr. Beauregard responded that the current parking requirement does account for visitor parking, and there are areas along the sides where snow can be deposited and melt into the stormwater basins.

Mr. Staub noted that two access points are required for this type of land development and asked the engineer if we should consider connecting to Lady Morgan Drive. Mr. Luciani responded the developer reached out to Kinsley, but Kinsley did not want the additional traffic. Traffic has not been reviewed, but most likely the southern driveway will be used more heavily in the morning. Mr. Staub suggested that the applicant consider adding an access road, trail or sidewalk to Lady Morgan Drive. Mr. Luciani will discuss available options with the developer.

Mr. Beauregard will address comments and resubmit the plan in a couple days.

#### **4. ACTION ITEMS**

##### **LD-2022-0007 - Panda Express - East York**

Mr. Heilman reported this plan has been presented to the Planning Commission numerous times previously as a conditional use application and land development plan. This project received Conditional Use approval by the Board of Supervisors (BOS) at their May 12, 2022, meeting pending relief from the Zoning Hearing Board (ZHB) for drive-through facilities. On July 7, 2022, the Zoning Hearing Board granted the applicant (ZHB-2022-0016) a variance for a drive-through facility in the Mixed-Use District for the proposed restaurant. The plan was put on hold in October 2022 due to an issue that needed to be resolved with PennDOT regarding the granting of a Highway Occupancy Permit (HOP) for access onto East Market Street. The site is currently served by public water and sewer. Mr. Heilman noted the applicant has addressed questions, concerns and comments that were outstanding and recommends that the Planning Commission recommend approval to the Board of Supervisors of both the requested waiver and the Panda Express Chinese Kitchen land development plan with the listed conditions. Mr. Vu Le was present to review the final plan and answer questions of the Planning Commission members.

##### **Mr. Vu Le, Klover Architects**

Mr. Le represented Panda Express and CFT, the property owner of 2510 E. Market Street. Mr. Le confirmed all outstanding questions, concerns and comments were addressed since the last time the plan was presented to the Planning Commission. Several design changes were made to the plan. There were four items that required further investigation or revision:

1. Street Trees - One street tree was relocated to the eastern property line along the drive-through to improve visibility.
2. Language was revised on the waiver request regarding the preliminary and final development plan to clarify it is specific to the Panda Express development plan. When CFT develops phase 2, it will be resubmitted for separate approval.
3. Research was conducted into the cross access agreement for this property. There is an agreement on the title dating back 50-60 years between this property and the property to the southeast which is

**Springettsbury Township Planning Commission**  
**Minutes of November 16, 2023**

---

the office building recently purchased by EDLW Inc. The cross access will be maintained intact allowing the other property access through the site to East Market Street.

4. In order to establish a stormwater solution for runoff between Panda Express and the adjacent property owner for runoff that flows toward Eastern Boulevard, Mr. Le left several phone messages for the other property owner with no response, and an official certified letter was sent to the property owner in June with no response.

Mr. Le asked the Board to approve the original waivers submitted and grant approval to take the final plan to the Board of Supervisors.

Questions from the Planning Commission members

Mr. Stuhre suggested the Planning Commission review the access drive to Eastern Boulevard because it does not appear to meet Township standards. Drawing C-2.3 was displayed. Mr. Le responded that the curb is an existing condition which will not be modified. Mr. Luciani redirected to Sheet C-2.08, which shows the existing parcel and existing driveway connecting to both the old real estate office and former restaurant. Mr. Luciani shared that the signal at Kingston Road and Eastern Boulevard is being updated. The Eastern Boulevard side has an 80 foot right of way which is larger than shown on the sheet. Mr. Le was asked to address how truck deliveries will be made into and out of the site. Mr. Le responded trucks would enter from East Market Street and leave by Eastern Boulevard. Mr. Robertson asked what kind of trucks would be delivering to which Mr. Le responded that Panda Express would ensure the appropriate truck size for the site conditions. Mr. Staub noted that the island was to be changed to a rolled curb for trucks leaving the site. Mr. Le responded there would be no issue changing the island to a rolled curb.

Mr. Staub asked Mr. Luciani what can be done long term to resolve the stormwater management due to the pre-existing conditions and the known flooding issue. Mr. Luciani responded there is a substantial underground retention basin which drains and discharges to PennDOT's system and they are reducing the rate and volume for the impervious area in the front. The parking lot for the future medical facility will be a future land development plan where the existing paving will be demolished and seeded until the site plan is finalized, resulting in additional reduction in runoff. When the medical facility is being developed, there will most likely be some underground stormwater management to mitigate runoff. Mr. Luciani noted that although all stormwater cannot be managed, there will be incremental benefits with this plan and future land development. In summary, the applicant has taken all measures possible to solve stormwater runoff issues.

Mr. Staub asked if a blood twig dogwood is dense enough to cover headlights of the drive-through. Mr. Stuhre noted the dogwood will also lose its leaves, reducing density during the darkest time of the year. Mr. Staub suggested that a fence be considered in lieu of the dogwood tree. Mr. Le responded the client would be willing to do so if that is the Board's desire.

Mr. Staub asked about truck turning movements. Mr. Luciani replied that Mr. Le previously indicated trucks would enter from East Market Street and depart by Eastern Boulevard. Mr. Staub suggested earlier that the island would need rolled curbs. If Mr. Le provides a demonstration that the trucks can move through the parking lot, this could be added as a condition on the plan. Mr. Luciani summarized the additional requests of the Planning Commission members:

1. The plant species used to shield headlights may not provide enough year-round density and an alternative should be considered.

2. The Planning Commission members would like to see a truck turning template showing how trucks will enter and exit the site. Mr. Le responded this was provided previously, but not with the documents provided this evening. Mr. Le then shared his screen to provide the maneuver path.
3. Ensure that the curbs of the island are rolled to improve truck movement.

Mr. Robertson suggested the need for the curbs to have the appropriate foundation to prevent them from busting up. Mr. Le reported the drives are constructed of heavy duty asphalt and the drive through is concrete. Similar sites constructed in this manner have had no issues. According to the geotech report, the site is subject to sinkholes. Mr. Le noted if issues arise, the applicant will take the necessary measures to repair them in order to maintain high standards.

Mr. Staub entertained a motion.

**IN THE CASE LD-2022-0007, MR. STUHRE MOVED TO RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS THE PANDA EXPRESS LAND DEVELOPMENT PLAN WITH WAIVER REQUESTS AS LISTED BELOW AND THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS: SUPPLY ADEQUATE HEAD LAMP SCREENING WITH EITHER 12-MONTH DENSE VEGETATION OR SUBSTITUTE A FENCE OF ADEQUATE HEIGHT, AND MODIFY THE CURBING AT EASTERN BOULEVARD TO ALLOW TRUCKS TO RIDE OVER IT WITHOUT DAMAGING THE CURB. MS. MUSSELMAN SECONDED THE MOTION. ALL PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS VOTED IN FAVOR AND THE MOTION CARRIED.**

#### **1. §289-10. – Preliminary Plan**

**Waiver has been requested to submit a final land development plan. The applicant cites since they have received prior Conditional Use approval from the Board of Supervisors and a variance granted from the Zoning Hearing Board for a drive-through facility, the submission of separate preliminary and final plans is not warranted. This comment will remain open until the Board of Supervisors' render a decision.**

#### **Land Development Standards**

**1. §289-11.C(8)(a-g) & § 289-13.B(6)(a-i). – All certificates, affidavits, endorsements, or dedications shall be depicted as they are shown within these sections of the SALDO. Provide five (5) signature lines for both the Board of Supervisors and the Planning Commission.**

**2. §289-10.A(2)(i). – A letter stating that an erosion control plan has been filed with the York County Conservation District.**

**The erosion and sediment control plan should be submitted to York County Conservation District (YCCD) for review. A copy of the letter and any comments by the YCCD should be provided. Limit of disturbance (LOD) for the site is over one (1) acre shall have a NPDES permit procured. Additionally, demolition of the building and improvements on lot 1, Panda Express appears to require a NPDES permit and approval. [§ 289-10.A(2)(i), § 289-11.C(7)].**

**3. §289-29A. – The plan for installation of a water supply system must be prepared for the development with the cooperation of the appropriate water supplier. Connections to the water supply system shall be coordinated with York Water Company. Provide a copy of the approved site**

**plan to York Water Company. All connections, pipes and other miscellaneous shall conform to York Water Company standards.**

**LD-2021-0004 - Industrial Facility - 3750 East Market Street**

Mr. Heilman provided a brief background on the application for 3750 East Market Street. The project has been presented to the Planning Commission previously. The project is located in the zoning district, G-I, General-Industrial District (Article XVI, §325-70 through §325-94). The proposed project includes the construction of a 287,000 SF manufacturing facility. The existing building will be demolished (106,544 SF). The proposed building (287,000 SF) will have three (3) access points (one (1) from E Market and two (2) from Innovation Drive) along with 38 loading docks, 45 tractor trailer parking spaces and 153 car spaces. The proposed use, manufacturing facility, is a permitted use in the G-I zoning district per §325-70.B(3). First Capital Engineering has no issues with the proposed property use. The proposed building is 180,456 SF larger than the demolished building. Mr. Heilman stated the property is challenging, with the biggest issue being stormwater management, as a portion of the property is in or adjacent to the floodplain. There have been numerous meetings, emails and discussions with the consultant. Mr. Heilman asked the consultant, Mr. Tom Englerth of Site Design Concepts to review the project.

Mr. Tom Englerth, Site Design Concepts

Mr. Englerth stated the project was presented two times previously and it has been nearly three years since it was first introduced. Mr. Englerth referenced sheet C-4. Mr. Englerth's presentation is summarized below:

- The property is deemed a blighted property, unused, underutilized, and Mr. Englerth is unsure whether or not the utilities are connected.
- The site is contaminated from groundwater from another site.
- As an NPDES permit, it had to go to DEP for approval. Because of the contamination, managed release concept design was proposed.
- There is a floodplain to the west side of the property and a 287,000 square foot flex warehouse industrial space is proposed.
- Significant tractor trailer parking currently exists.
- There are two access points from the site for vehicles on to Innovation Drive and the township road, and another access road on to East Market Street that is existing. It does not meet current standards and will be completely reconstructed in the same location. Turning lanes are required.
- There were some above ground stormwater basins to the west, but these were pulled and it was proposed to construct everything underground with a managed release concept design.
- Outflows are below the flood elevation, which should be sufficient. The numbers have been demonstrated and a similar plan has been successful in another project within Springettsbury Township.
- The floodplain in this area has not been studied since the early 2000's. When new maps were published in 2015, it became an unstudied floodplain.
- The consultant has completed a HEC-RAS study to detail the base flood elevations for the stream at this location, and the baseline elevations closely mimic what is shown on the FEMA mapping.

Mr. Staub asked why there was a switch to discharging to an underground facility. Mr. Englerth responded that an above ground system and underground facility were proposed. After meeting with Township staff two or three times to review the design, show how it was to function, and share the system designed and

**Springettsbury Township Planning Commission**  
**Minutes of November 16, 2023**

---

approved for another project—Brewery Products, the consultant was not able to meet the Township’s approval. The stormwater system was redesigned to be all underground. On the right side of the property it discharges into existing Township MS4 pipes into Innovation Drive.

Mr. Englerth reviewed the waivers requested:

§Section 289-10 - Preliminary Plan

§Section 289-13.A - Plan Scale

§Section 289-24 - Feasibility Report for Sewer and Water - (Note: The sewer could be removed because a planning module exemption was submitted.)

§Section 289-27.C - Concrete Apron at Driveway Access - (Note: PennDOT does not allow this on the apron out front and consultant does not propose them based on the usage on Innovation Drive)

§289 Attachment 5 - Commercial and Industrial Buffer Yards

§Section 281-12.A - Stormwater Volume Control - CG-I Method - (Note: Consultant is anticipating a 20% reduction and providing 50-87% peak rate reduction for the higher year storms.)

§Section 281.13.A - Stormwater Rate Controls (Note: Township requires 100% of existing impervious to be considered meadow. Unfortunately, with the managed release concept, that does not work. Due to the design, it completely blows up the size of the underground basins. This is getting approved by Pennsylvania DEP through the individual permit and their requirements are 20% of existing impervious taken back to meadow conditions, which has been done.

Springettsbury Township C&M, Section -52525, Cement Concrete Curb and Sidewalk

Mr. Englerth summarized the 25 comments of First Capital Engineering down to four issues:

1. NPDES Permit - Approval was granted by DEP in February/March 2023, with the only outstanding comment being we needed an acknowledgement signed by the Township that we planned to put runoff into their MS4 system into Innovation Drive. The acknowledgement was not received from the Township, so DEP required the applicant to either pull the application or they were going to deny it. The application was pulled and resubmitted. The second application was just approved this week with the same outstanding condition being the signed acknowledgement by the Township. If the acknowledgement form is not signed by November 20, the application will have to be pulled again and resubmitted with new fees.
2. PennDOT Permit - This has been in process for almost two years. Applicant has a clean comment letter from PennDOT and four or five documents/agreements that need to be worked out with and signed by the Township in order to complete the permit, such as signage, responsible party for the stormwater pipes, etc.
3. HEC-RAS Study - The study was completed and flood elevation identified. Mr. Englerth stated he has worked with Township staff numerous times to address this issue, and he believes the study is significant and robust. The study goes past the bridge on the southeast side of the plan and it is

**Springettsbury Township Planning Commission**  
**Minutes of November 16, 2023**

---

understood how the bridge constricts the flow and potentially backs up water. The most recent comment received from the engineer suggests this be studied for a couple hundred feet down where there is a confluence of another stream 350 feet away. Township staff have asked the consultant to complete the HEC-RAS, not only to that confluence, but past it. As part of that, the consultant would have to go up the other stream as well—resulting in almost three times more study than the study already performed. Looking at the existing conditions, topography, the existing FEMA mapping that has not been studied (but proven to be within a foot of the consultant’s study), the consultant believes it is an excessive request.

4. New comment - For the managed release concept, DEP requires the bottom of subsurface basins be two feet, but no more than one foot, above the seasonal high groundwater level. Mr. Englerth reported the stormwater facilities are higher now and he believes this issue has been addressed. The Township believes the highest seasonal water table elevation is the 100-year flood elevation, and the consultant disagrees because their research provides evidence to the contrary. The consultant also has a letter from their geotech indicating the two items are not the same.

Mr. Englerth reported that the four issues above are close to resolution and requested the Planning Commission recommend them for approval to the Board of Supervisors.

Mark Robertson asked Mr. Englerth to address the buffer on the west side of the property. The applicant will provide a little more than half the plants required and will rely on the existing forest wood line to create the remainder of the buffer, which is the reason for the requested waiver. The additional trees and shrubs provide a place to catch debris.

Mr. Stuhre does not feel the Planning Commission can recommend approval until the issues are resolved. Mr. Staub asked the Township staff to express their concerns on the unresolved issues. Mr. Luciani expressed agreement that this project has been in the queue for a long time and agrees that the most recent HEC-RAS study is fairly consistent with the original floodplain maps, which changed the elevation they anticipated would flow underneath East Market Street through their site. Mr. Luciani did reach out to PennDOT. They plan to rebuild the bridge on East Market Street in 2025, but have not started to prepare hydraulic information. Mr. Luciani shared that when he spoke to Bob Sandmeyer and asked how DEP reacted to the floodplain, DEP was not aware of it. Mr. Luciani referred to sheet C-12 and noted they show a high water elevation of 398.50. The orifice that controls the water going out to the creek is a distance below that elevation. This creates a concern that when there is a rain event, water will fill up the channel and it will not free flow without headwater to discharge against. The second concern is when the water fills up it will take 5.6 days to clear out with a managed release system. If there is a five-year storm event, water could flow through the rectangular orifice, and within a half-day the entire underground storm system would be full. Mr. Luciani noted that empty pipes underground tend to become buoyant when the water rises above them. Mr. Luciani had previously suggested the consultant take a new path as opposed to burying it in the stream because the consultant's model does not adequately project how it will work. Mr. Luciani is not comfortable with the managed release system because the water in the stream is higher than the water storage system and the discharge point is below the 100-year level.

Mr. Englerth reiterated that DEP has approved this permit twice and he is confident that DEP is aware it is in the floodplain. Mr. Englerth shared that he emailed Mr. Luciani asking the Township to sign the acknowledgement for DEP and Mr. Luciani responded he spoke to DEP who confirmed the Township did not need to sign it. Mr. Englerth noted that he was not previously aware of the buoyancy and rain leader concern prior to this meeting. Mr. Englerth stated it appears the consultant and the Township are at a stand



**Springettsbury Township Planning Commission  
Minutes of November 16, 2023**

---

still and unable to come to a resolution; therefore, he requested that the Planning Commission grant approval for them to go to the Board of Supervisors to make their case. He added that his client, Norman Rockwell from Northern Chesapeake Builders who is working for the landowner, plans to attend the Board of Supervisors meeting and address the issue publicly if this project is not part of the formal agenda.

Mr. Tanzola stated the case should go to the Board of Supervisors for review and resolution since the applicant and Township staff are unable to agree on the issues.

Mr. Robertson was also not sure about the underground stormwater. Mr. Englerth responded he does not feel there is a high water table, but there is a floodplain with potentially high water flooding the surface.

Mr. Staub asked if the geotech letter was supplied to the Township, to which Mr. Englerth responded he had just received it. He then shared copies of the letter with the Planning Commission members and Township staff.

Ms. Musselman asked how long the property had been sitting unused. Mr. Luciani responded there have been three active land development plans on the site, which were eventually withdrawn, with the most recent being Amazon in 2019. When a plan touches on one of PennDOT's pipes, it is PennDOT's desire to assign permanent responsibility for the pipe and anything connected to it to the Township. PennDOT has an agreement in their design manual 2, chapter 10 for stormwater and there are boilerplate agreements. The Township is not going to be responsible for maintaining the pipe, but would be the co-applicant with a financial guarantee that the developer be responsible for maintenance. Mr. Englerth stated the developer would be glad to enter into such an agreement, but Mr. Englerth has not been given feedback from the Township on specifics on how to handle it. PennDOT's agreement has to be with the Township, but the Township can pass responsibility on to the developer. Mr. Englerth is willing to work with the Township to finalize an agreement, but has not received responses to his requests. Mr. Luciani responded that it has been discussed numerous times in meetings, and the Township agreed to be a co-applicant, but made it clear the responsibility would be on the developer. Mr. Bob Sandmeyer of Site Design Concepts was present in the audience and came forward to share that he has sent numerous emails to the Township staff and Mr. Luciani throughout the PennDOT permit process asking for information and requesting signatures on the application so it could be submitted to PennDOT, with no response to date.

Ms. Musselman expressed her agreement with Mr. Tanzola's opinion that this case be passed on to the Board of Supervisors since the parties have reached a stalemate. Mr. Staub entertained a motion from the Planning Commission.

**IN THE CASE LD-2021-0004, MR. TANZOLA MOVED CONDITIONAL APPROVAL TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS PENDING RESOLUTION OF THE VARIOUS ITEMS DISCUSSED. I.E., PENNDOT PERMIT, HEC-RAS STUDY, DEP MANAGED RELEASE ISSUE RESOLUTION DOCUMENT, AND FORMAL AGREEMENT FOR HOP PERMIT. THERE WAS NO SECOND. FURTHER DISCUSSION ENSUED. MR. TANZOLA ASKED TO WITHDRAW THE PREVIOUS MOTION, SECONDED BY MS. MUSSELMAN. ALL COMMISSION MEMBERS VOTED IN FAVOR AND THE MOTION WAS WITHDRAWN.**

**IN THE CASE LD-2021-0004 - 3750 E. MARKET STREET, MR. STAUB MADE A MOTION FOR THE PLANNING COMMISSION TO RECOMMEND CONDITIONAL APPROVAL AND FURTHER DISCUSSION BY THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF THE WAIVERS ASSOCIATED WITH THE STORMWATER RUNOFF, THE HEC-RAS STUDY AND**

**COORDINATION BETWEEN THE APPLICANT AND TOWNSHIP STAFF AND ENGINEER TO RESOLVE THE HOP SIGNATURE AGREEMENT AND DEP AGREEMENT. MS. MUSSELMAN SECONDED THE MOTION.**

**DISCUSSION:** Mr. Staub stated it would be helpful to have the documented communications shared between the applicant and Township staff ahead of time, as well as any documentation of communications associated with the HOP to clear up any misunderstanding of the information requested. As a staff and as a community, Mr. Staub noted this is the responsibility of both parties to communicate back and forth.

Mr. Stuhre stated the documents that need to be signed by Township staff in order for the applicant to proceed should be done expeditiously.

**ALL PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS VOTED IN FAVOR AND THE MOTION CARRIED.**

**5. MODIFICATION/WAIVER RECOMMENDATIONS**

No modification/waiver recommendations were submitted.

**6. INFORMATIONAL**

Mr. Heilman announced there would be a Planning Commission meeting on December 21. Mr. Heilman anticipates receiving the following applications for review/action.

- Conditional use application for Mt. Zion Commons
- Conditional use application for Shiny Shell Car Wash
- Resubmission of Shields Subdivision
- Druck Valley Road Project

**7. NEW BUSINESS**

Mr. Heilman introduced Benjamin McCue, the new Zoning Officer for Springettsbury Township, who will begin in 2024. Mr. McCue worked in Lancaster County for six years as an assistant zoning officer, serving in that capacity with the consulting firm that contracted with a host of municipalities in Lancaster County to provide that service. He holds a degree in Geography from Millersville University. The Planning Commission welcomed Benjamin to the Township.

**8. OTHER BUSINESS**

Mr. Staub expressed his hope that the new comprehensive plan addresses what should be done with brown field areas, stormwater management and traffic flow.

Some of the cases presented this evening were briefly discussed. Mr. Luciani shared that DEP is moving away from pump and treat procedures to eliminate contamination. Information was shared on several streetlights that are not operating. Mr. Luciani responded he is aware of many of them and the Township is working on them.

**Springettsbury Township Planning Commission  
Minutes of November 16, 2023**

---

Mr. Stuhre questioned the lack of light heads at the old York Valley Inn development. The parking lot lights are on, but the streetlights are off. Mr. Luciani responded this will be done in coordination with First Energy.

Planning Commission members were asked to remain after the meeting to sign the plan for Pilgrim Wire.

Ms. Musselman asked if the Township reviews density for the proposed apartment units. Mr. Luciani stated the Township does have a density requirement and should be checking the types of apartments to ensure density is met. Studio apartments have a density of one and up to four bedroom apartments may have a density factor of five. In addition, when a residential project is approved, the local school district must be notified. It was suggested that the new comprehensive plan address the formula for apartment complexes to make sure fair share is met and the Township is not over developing.

**9. ADJOURNMENT**

**CHAIRMAN STAUB ADJOURNED THE MEETING AT 8:18 P.M.**

Respectfully submitted,

Secretary  
/jht