

APPROVED

**SPRINGETTSBURY TOWNSHIP  
PLANNING COMMISSION  
NOVEMBER 17, 2011**

**MEMBERS IN**

**ATTENDANCE:** Alan Maciejewski, Chairman  
Mark Robertson  
Mark Swomley  
Charles Wurster  
John Lutz

**ALSO IN**

**ATTENDANCE:** Jim Baugh, Director of Community Development  
John Luciani, First Capital Engineering  
Nicole Ehrhart, 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. MAY 19, 2011**

**MR. SWOMLEY MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE MEETING MINUTES OF MAY 19, 2011 AS PRESENTED. MR LUTZ SECONDED. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**B. JULY 21, 2011**

**MR. SWOMLEY MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE MEETING MINUTES OF JULY 21, 2011 AS PRESENTED. MR. ROBERTSON SECONDED. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**3. BRIEFING ITEMS**

**A. SD-11-01 – Devolias Funk Reverse SD**

Lee Faircloth, Gordon Brown Associates  
Bill Allison, Executor

Mr. Faircloth indicated this is a 7.7 acre tract of woodland located east of Edgewood Road along a private lane, south of the Penn Oaks Development to be subdivided. He noted the property is the result of the residual of land that was first subdivided in 1968. The second subdivision was 1970. This property wraps around those parcels. Their request is to subdivide the 7.7 acres into 2 lots adding each lot to the existing adjacent properties, owned by family members. There is no development involved.

Mr. Luciani stated this request qualifies as a minor subdivision defined as one with no public improvements and no new building lots. He noted there are some easements and storm water issues that will be discussed. He also noted there was discussion of a storm water basin that may have existed on the property. This was researched and no evidence was found. They did find several small storm water structures. He noted there is a gravel road which provides access to five property owners. He noted the Ordinance will require an access road agreement.

Mr. Allison stated his concern as Executor of the Estate as to whether the access road agreement is affected by the subdivision of the property.

Mr. Baugh indicated these issues will be discussed at the Staff meeting and will be resolved before the plan comes back for action.

**B. SP-11-01 – The Goddard School**

Attorney Stacey MacNeal

Robert Sandmeyer, Site Design Concepts

James Scargill, Goddard School Representative

Tom Austin, TRG

Lena Patel, Kasiv, LLC

Attorney MacNeal indicated that Ms. Patel has a contract on the property at Eastern Boulevard between Mill Street and Moul Street on the southern side. She acknowledged that the Board has seen this parcel of property in the past due to its challenges. The proposal for this property is a private school through the franchise of the Goddard School, a licensed pre-K and pre-school through the Department of Education. It meets the Township's definition of Private School as stated in the Ordinance. She noted there are also accessory day care facilities. It is an 84,000 sq. ft. facility with 9 classrooms, 20 staff and a maximum of 132 students. She noted that the Goddard School has performed a detailed, nationwide parking study on all their 378 facilities. Based on that study they have determined what their parking requirements are for the facility being proposed. Attorney MacNeal noted they are working with Site Design Concepts.

Attorney MacNeal indicated the property is in the Neighborhood-Commercial zone considered a transition district between the small lot single family to the rear, and the mixed-use across the street. Since the plan was last presented for this property, it is now part of the Town Center overlay which adds additional challenges for development on the site. There are several design criteria issues associated with the conditional use proceedings set out for the overlay provisions. This includes issues relating to how the building is to be oriented on the site, issues related to streetscapes and buffer yards and architectural design. She noted the building orientation issues were challenging for this site along with the limitation on building placement and location of useful areas, due to the unusual shaped lot. There are three street fronts – Eastern Boulevard which has a median from Moul Street, and Mill Street which has a median partway.

Mr. Sandmeyer stated the issues associated with this property including the requirement for 34 parking spaces to accommodate the square footage and use. Mr. Sandmeyer noted they have 38 parking spaces proposed located to the west of the property. They are circulating one-way traffic through the site to make a better traffic flow than two-way which does not utilize as much space, while providing better circulation and potential stacking of cars.

Mr. Sandmeyer indicated the internal green space for the parking area will have the standard for storm water management and will have an underground storm water system for the site. Relating to the Town Center (TC) zone, he noted they are required to screen the parking lot with evergreen and fencing, which they are proposing on the south side of the parking lot and on the west side of the parking lot with evergreens. Behind the building, they are meeting buffer requirements with fencing. In the landscape plan they are

required to meet the Town Center landscaping for streetscapes. They are also required to have benches along sidewalks and street lighting, which are proposed.

Mr. Sandmeyer indicated they are asking for several variances which are diminimus, one of which relates to landscaping. He noted the buffer requires 15% of the plants to be on one side of the fence as opposed to the other side, resulting in the majority of plants on the high density residential side. Mr. Sandmeyer noted due to the playground area the Goddard School has a restriction in their bylaws that plants can not be placed in the vicinity of the play yards. The age of the students/children precludes the presence of berries, bark, mulch, etc., which could be consumed by a child or cause a choking hazard. This will require a waiver modification by placing the plants on the other side of the fence.

Mr. Sandmeyer stated the rest of the buffers will meet the requirements for the parking lot screen and for the remaining streetscapes.

Mr. Sandmeyer noted another waiver request relates to the property to the west which is on the opposite side of Moul Street. Since they are not developing that parcel they are requesting a waiver on the sidewalks until future development has been determined. Other issues relating to that – Eastern Boulevard has a unique shape on the curb line. They would have to tie into a 5 ft. green space and a 5 ft. sidewalk. For the TC zone they would have to have an 8 ft. green strip and an 8 ft. sidewalk.

They will also be requesting a waiver for a single access driveway.

Mr. Austin of TRG indicated the traffic use is compatible with the surrounding area. He indicated they updated the counts at Mills and Eastern Boulevard intersection, as well as Moul Street. He indicated that traffic in the vicinity of Mills and Eastern Boulevard in the p.m. peak hour is heavier than what it was prior to the Yorkshire Elementary School already located in that area. He indicated they did not see much in the a.m.. He noted that during the traffic study for the elementary school, a four way stop was considered. He noted they will be evaluating that intersection to determine what needs to be done with the increase in traffic. The site will generate based on the IT standards about 600 vehicles a day, which according to PennDOT is a low volume operation. Consequently, Mr. Austin agreed with the request concerning the single driveway for this use, noted that one driveway will serve this use. He also noted the site layout is in the best location, in their opinion, since it is away from the intersection of Eastern Boulevard and Moul Street with good sight distance. They reviewed the need for a left turn lane on Eastern Boulevard at Moul Street and at this point the numbers do not precipitate it. Mr. Austin noted as this project moves through the process, they will be completing the more detailed studies.

Attorney MacNeal indicated there is also sufficient access for emergency vehicles in this area.

Attorney MacNeal stated another variance request is related to the fence height – an increase from the required 4 ft. They are proposing to have a 6 ft. opaque fence surrounding all of the play yard, which is a safety issue for the children. She noted Goddard School has conducted studies and their safety recommendations is that the 6 ft. fence is necessary for the safety of the children. Not only does it prevent them from getting out, it prevents others from getting in and the opacity prevents a visual contact with the children. The fence will be screened along Mill Street. There is landscaping on the exterior of the fence and on the other side the fencing is between the play yard and the parking lot. Fencing in the rear is in accordance with the Ordinance buffer yard criteria.

In regards to parking, Attorney MacNeal stated the 34 space requirement was used since according to the Ordinance they are technically considered a school because of the Department of Education licensure. Elementary school criteria for passenger parking would only require 14 spaces. Child care centers would require 34 spaces and Goddard School requires 30. She indicated they are providing 38 spaces on this plan, since the additional passenger parking spaces is the best use of the paved parking lot. The Ordinance also

cites the requirement for a bus loading space and a parent pickup/drop off space. Attorney MacNeal stated that space would be better utilized for parking spaces, since there will be no buses utilized with the school. Goddard does not allow parent pick up or drop off of children. All children must be walked into the secured facility. At pick up parents must go in and bring the child back out. Given the limited nature of the site it would be better to provide additional passenger parking spaces above what is required by the ordinance. Similarly they are also asking for a variance from the commercial loading space that would otherwise be required. For this type of use they will only get an occasional UPS truck. They do not serve meals so there is no cafeteria service that would require delivery service.

In discussing the variance for location of the parking, Attorney MacNeal stated the Town Center overlay indicates the parking should be to the side or rear of the building. She reiterated that technically under the Ordinance this property has three front yards. The only portion of any yard that is not front is a small portion to the rear of the building, which is approximately 5,000 sq. ft. Because of the location of the property some parking facilities will need to be in a front yard. They will be keeping the parking to the side and rear of the building and for the Town Center overlay they will have it heavily screened, but noted it will be very difficult to not have parking that would be considered by the Ordinance as front yard.

Discussion was held regarding the following:

- Ground water which was an issue with a previous owner. It was determined it was speculated to be caused by York Water Company's 30 inch line.
- It was noted the proposed building does not have a basement.
- Stormwater retention being affected by site concerns. Mr. Sandmeyer indicated that they will be doing an infiltration perc test for the site.
- Dumpster on the site - Attorney MacNeal indicated a small dumpster will be located on the property, however due to Goddard requirements it will not be emptied during school hours. Pick up will be restricted to weekends at certain hours to be respectful of the residential homes.
- Traffic stacking as a result of people coming dropping off and coming out to Moul Street and trying to make turns off of Eastern Boulevard Mr. Austin indicated that based on preliminary numbers, using IT Trip Generation and studies done by Goddard School, they predict 100 trips - 50 in, 50 out over the hour. He noted they took a worse case look at the traffic assigning the majority of the traffic to Moul and Eastern Boulevard Stacking should not be an issue. The levels of service are good - C or better at that intersection.
- Concerns with the left out off of Moul Street and the proximity to the traffic island and potential for problems at that intersection, since traffic must cross over Eastern Boulevard to go west with difficulty. Mr. Austin noted that upon TRG analysis – it should be a C level of service.
- Hours of service – Mr. Scargill noted there are no restrictions on when children are dropped off. The peak hours are 7: 30 to 9:30 a.m.
- Concerns of traffic – Mr. Austin noted the speed limit in this area is posted 25 mph. A search of the accident reports for 5 years indicated one accident reported on Moul Street in 5 years. He reiterated that as the project moves forward they will be conducting detailed traffic studies. They have begun initial traffic counts and he is cognizant of the concerns and felt confident they would be able to work with the Staff to address them and arrive at the best plan for the area.
- Sidewalk – it was noted the waiver for sidewalk will need to be worked out. A 6 month note may be necessary.

- Parking for Staff - Mr. Scargill indicated that at peak lunchtime there would be 20 staff members - six leave at noon resulting in 14 staff members in the evening. The staff members leave as their classrooms empty. The parking for staff is the far end of the western lot.
- Fence heights - Mr. Scargill reiterated that the 6 ft. fence was necessary for safety and security of the children. The 6 ft fence would encompass the front of the building and around the back of the building. A four foot fence is erected within the play area to separate the two age groups which are 6 weeks to 3 years, and 3 to 5 years . Their play equipment is age specific as per state licensing requirements. The six foot fence also serves as a sound buffer. He also noted there is only one classroom consisting of approximately 40 children for each area in the play yard at any time.
- Concern about the overall appearance of the opaque 6 ft. fence. Attorney MacNeal pointed out the amount of landscaping on the outside of the fence. Mr. Scargill stated they do have the ability to deviate from an opaque white vinyl fence and can consider other types of fence.
- Parking lot lighting – building lighting – very minimal but will meet the requirements of the Township. A lighting plan will be produced. Mr. Scargill stated they will have 6-8 shielded lights on the building for emergency access. The playground will not be lit at night since there are no activities at night. He noted they have sufficient parking lot lighting to make it safe for the parents to transition from the building to their vehicles.

**4. ACTION ITEMS – none**

**5. WAIVER RECOMMENDATIONS – none**

**6. NEW BUSINESS**

**A. ACT 167, York County Proposed Stormwater Management Ordinance**

Mr. Luciani explained that Act 167 is the state storm water ordinance. In 1978 the state assigned counties to monitor and control storm water and distribute that information to townships. There were several Act 167 studies which included Kreutz Creek and the Codorus Creek.

On October 12, 2011 the County sent out the mandate for Townships to adopt the Act 167 Ordinance.

Mr. Luciani stated that Mr. Holman requested six months for the Township to review the Ordinance and make a determination.

Mr. Luciani provided a PowerPoint overview. He noted the County is most concerned about DIA – disconnected impervious areas, which he noted the County is referring to this as the integrated water resource plan – meaning storm water.

He reviewed the differences in the model storm water plan with the Township’s current Ordinance, as well as administrative changes that would result in adopting the new Act 167 Ordinance.

Mr. Luciani noted that one of the requirements of the new Ordinance would mandate yearly inspections for the first 1-5 years for residents making modifications to their home or outlying buildings. Then subsequently conduct an inspection every 3 years after that, and again after five years if there would be a 10 year event storm.

He noted the Township will recommend a GPS location of where the storm facilities are built so that it can be put on a master plan map and make documentation easier. This is because the Township must sample certain areas of the Township to make sure pollutants are not discharging into the waterways.

Mr. Luciani stated that it is important for the Township to monitor the peak rate run off which he felt was a contributing factor to maintaining storm water management.

**7. OLD BUSINESS – None**

**8. OTHER BUSINESS**

It was noted the annual Christmas Party will be held Wednesday, December 18<sup>th</sup> at the Eagles Nest Restaurant at 5:30.

**9. ADJOURNMENT**

**CHAIRMAN MACIEJEWSKI ADJOURNED THE MEETING AT 8:00 P.M.**

Respectfully submitted,

Secretary

/ses