

**MANHEIM TOWNSHIP  
PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTES  
Wednesday  
March 21, 2007**

A meeting of the Manheim Township Planning Commission was held on Wednesday, March 21, 2007 at 6:30 p.m. The following members were present: Mr. Kevin Fry, Mr. Steven Geisenberger, Mr. Michel Gibeault, Mr. Jeffrey Sturla, Mr. Cory Rathman and Mr. Donald Reed. Mr. Robert Wolf was absent. The following Township staff was present: Mr. Sean Molchany, Ms. Lisa Greaves and Mrs. Shannon Sinopoli.

**Roll Call**

Mr. Fry called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and conducted roll call.

**Minutes**

Mr. Fry asked for a motion on the February 28, 2007 meeting minutes.

On a motion by Mr. Sturla, seconded by Mr. Rathman, it was recommended to approve the February 28, 2007 meeting minutes.

**Motion Approved 6-0.**

**Old Business**

**A. Development Plans**

**1. Worthington PRD – Tentative Plan & Conditional Use – Oregon Pike – Zoned R-2; R-2 (Bonus Density); R-3 and B-1.**

Present representing this Tentative Plan was Mr. Mark Johnson, RGS Associates and Mr. Craig Mellott, Traffic Planning and Design.

Mr. Johnson advised that they were present only to provide the planning members with an update as to the roadway improvements along Route 272.

Mr. Johnson advised that the applicants had recently met with PADOT and the adjoining property owners and indicated that they are in the process of finalizing outstanding issues with PADOT and staff.

Mr. Mellott, Traffic Planning and Design provided planning members with updates to the traffic issues.

Mr. Mellott indicated that PADOT has agreed with the recommendation of the Township in regards to the road widening and curb cross-section to accommodate an additional lane.

Mr. Mellott advised that per the recommendation of the Township Traffic Engineer, Royer Drive is being updated to widen the cross-section to 40 feet in order to provide enough width to allow for two lanes coming in and out of Royer Drive on both sides.

Mr. Mellott stated that, in response to staff concerns regarding the Westminster Church, the plan has been modified to provide a dedicated left turn lane on Oregon Pike approaching the southern most church driveway which would provide an approximate 200 foot length for stacking.

Mr. Mellott indicated that there was also a modification to the middle driveway of the church between Royer Drive and the southern most entrance to the church. Comments suggested that a concrete island be constructed in the middle of the driveway to restrict movement at that location to right in only and right out only.

Mr. Mellott advised that representatives of Keystone Custom Homes met with the church recently and the feedback was positive and that the improvements would be favorable and beneficial to them.

Mr. Mellott indicated that they also met with three other adjoining property owners. The first of which was The Helping Hand Daycare Center, who were also supportive of the proposed improvements.

Mr. Mellott noted that Brookshire Drive is going to extend through and actually go between two medical office properties. One of which is an Orthodontics office on the west side of Brookshire Drive and Lancaster Otolaryngology on the east side of Brookshire Drive.

Mr. Mellott stated that there was a request from the Township Traffic Engineer to restrict left turn movements out of Brookshire Drive by way of a concrete island due to safety concerns.

Mr. Mellott advised that, after presenting this idea to the property owners of both medical offices, they did not get a favorable response and that in particular; Dr. Rosenfeld of Lancaster Otolaryngology was certainly not in agreement with the restricting of left turns because of the need to respond to medical emergencies at Lancaster General Hospital and Lancaster Regional Hospital.

Mr. Mellott indicated that they are still working with the Township Traffic Engineer on a solution for Brookshire Drive.

A brief question and answer session took place. Planning members made the recommendation that the applicant investigate the possibility of lengthening the left turning lanes on Oregon Pike at Royer Drive. Mr. Fry asked for public comment. There was no response.

On a motion by Mr. Geisenberger, seconded by Mr. Sturla, it was recommended to table the requested modifications and plan.

**Motion Approved 6-0.**

**2. 730 Eden Road Office Building - Preliminary/Final Land Development Plan - Lot #3, Eden Road - Zoned I-1 Industrial.**

Present representing this Preliminary/Final Land Development Plan was Mr. Michael Huxta and Mr. Michael Hartley, ELA Group and Mr. Ned Grove, applicant.

Mr. Huxta provided planning members with a brief overview of the plan by identifying the location of this 3+ acre parcel and the proposed intent for this vacant lot.

Mr. Huxta indicated that the applicant is proposing to construct a three-story health services/medical office building with a total of 21,000 square feet of floor area with 7,000 square feet on each floor.

Mr. Huxta stated that there will be adequate parking supplied for the uses. There are 185 parking spaces required and 187 spaces are being supplied.

Mr. Fry questioned the parking ratio for the uses.

Mr. Huxta advised that there is 16,500 square feet of building space proposed for health services for which would require 165 parking spaces and there will be 4,500 square feet of general medical office space which would require 20 parking spaces.

General discussions involving stormwater management took place. Mr. Huxta advised that the stormwater basin, as proposed, is also designed to take on some of the stormwater from the neighboring tract as a condition of the sales agreement for a future parking lot.

Mr. Hartley discussed the stormwater modification requests with planning members.

Mr. Rathman questioned the request for relief from the installation of gabion lined spillways and indicated that the gabion mattress is a preferred use by the Township and is the most failsafe method of erosion protection for emergency spillways.

Mr. Rathman suggested that the applicant speak with Phil Mellott, Township Public Works Department for discussions regarding any proposed alternatives.

On a motion by Mr. Gibeault, seconded by Mr. Reed, it was recommended to table the requested modifications and plan contingent upon a clean review letter.

**Motion Approved 6-0.**

**B. Lancaster Intermunicipal Comprehensive Plan (LIMC), "Growing Together"**

Mr. Molchany introduced himself to the audience as the Assistant Township Manager.

Mr. Molchany stated that he is in attendance representing Manheim Township to present the final version of the LIMC, Growing Together, Regional Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Molchany provided a brief background of the LIMC and advised that he was appointed to the steering committee by the Township in 2002, although he has participated in the creation of this comprehensive plan since late 2000.

Mr. Molchany indicated that the preliminary draft and the final draft of this plan were both previously presented to the Township Planning Commission and the Township Commissioners twice, at which time the plan was fully explained and thoroughly gone through during those presentations.

Mr. Molchany advised that the LIMC Committee is made up of 12 municipalities and that grants were received from the State and the County in order to fund this regional comprehensive plan.

Mr. Molchany noted that all comments which were generated from the Planning Commission and the Commissioners were forwarded to the LIMC Committee for consideration and that recommendations were generated from both commissions approving the strategies, goals and objectives.

Mr. Molchany briefed the audience members on the timeline of the creation of this regional comprehensive plan and described the plan process.

Mr. Molchany stated that although there were 15 regional meetings, advertised and open to the public, there was very little attendance and participation from the public.

Mr. Molchany further indicated that there were 8 meetings held within the Township, which also included 2 meetings to discuss goals and objectives and 2 meetings to discuss strategies.

Mr. Molchany indicated that the LIMC plan is now the final draft and that a public hearing will be held on April 9, 2007 to vote on the adoption of this regional comprehensive plan as an addendum to the Manheim Township

Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Molchany mentioned that a more formal presentation will be exhibited during the public hearing.

Mr. Molchany reiterated that the LIMC plan, if adopted by the Commissioners, would be an addendum to the current Manheim Township Comprehensive Plan which is currently in the beginning stages of being updated. After the updates to the Township Comprehensive Plan are complete, the LIMC plan will then become an addendum to the new version of the Township comprehensive plan.

Mr. Geisenberger thanked Mr. Molchany for all of his hard work over the past several years.

Mr. Geisenberger stressed that he believes that, without a transportation plan for the region, the LIMC plan is incomplete and with a proposed growth of 30% to Manheim Township and the significant overall growth to the County, the lack of a transportation plan to support it is a real weakness and his hopes are that this issue will be addressed during the updating of the Manheim Township Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Molchany responded by indicating that since this plan was on a budget, unfortunately the funds would have been well exceeded if transportation plans were included.

Mr. Fry asked for public comment. There was no response.

On a motion by Mr. Geisenberger, seconded by Mr. Rathman, it was recommended to approve the adoption of the LIMC comp plan as an addendum to the Manheim Township Comprehensive Plan.

**Motion Approved 6-0.**

The public hearing date is scheduled for April 9, 2007.

**New Business**

**A. Rezoning/Text Amendment/Conditional Use/Ordinances**

**1. The Crossings at Conestoga Creek - Planned Commercial Development (PCD) - Conditional Use request - Harrisburg Pike and Farmingdale Road - Zoned I-1.**

Mr. Michael Gibeault informed Mr. Fry that he would be abstaining from the discussions of this conditional use request.

Present representing this Preliminary/Final Land Development Plan was Mr. Benjamin Bamford, Mr. Steve Evans and Mr. Tom Smithgall, High Real Estate Group applicants; Mrs. Caroline Hoffer, Barley-Snyder; Joel Young,

Mr. Dan Synoracki and Jeri McClune, Rettew Associates; Mr. Frank Fox, Greenfield Architects and Mr. Donald Jacobs, Traffic Planning Design. Mr. Bamford informed the planning members and audience that they will be providing a Power Point presentation of their Planning Commercial Development proposal.

Mrs. Hoffer provided background to the Conditional Use request, filed per Section 2319 of the Manheim Township Zoning Ordinance.

Mrs. Hoffer indicated that if the Board of Commissioners approves this conditional use request for this project, a fully engineered plan would then be filed through the land development process.

Mrs. Hoffer advised that the proposed property is 89.73 acres, located on the south side of Harrisburg Pike and is zoned I-1 Industrial.

Mr. Young commenced the Power Point presentation.

Mr. Young began by showing the location of the project, the parcel boundaries, the existing structures and wetland areas on the parcel.

Mr. Young continued his presentation with conceptual site plan illustrations of the project including the concept of the retail uses, restaurants and other commercial activities proposed for The Crossings at Conestoga Creek.

Mr. Young indicated that the 650,000 square feet of retail/commercial is proposed in one phase.

Mr. Young stated that there is 51% of open space proposed which amounts to 46 acres of open space.

Mr. Young identified the circulations of traffic throughout the site along with the entrance from Harrisburg Pike and the entrance from Farmingdale Road. Mr. Young identified the pedestrian areas and the location of a proposed pedestrian trail which would wrap around through the entire development.

Mr. Young provided a conceptual lighting plan proposed along the main street and the parking areas.

Mr. Fry questioned the screening along the perimeter of the development and asked the applicant to describe what screening is proposed.

Mr. Young responded by indicating that that a series of street trees along the loop road would be proposed to ring around the outside and larger lights installed to allow ample light for the loop road itself.

Mr. Young introduced Mr. Dan Synoracki, Environmental Scientist with Rettew.

Mr. Synoracki indicated that there has been a lot of environmental sensitive planning involved with this plan, one of which is to improve floodplain by expanding the riparian buffer.

Mr. Synoracki introduced proposed creek and wetland area improvements.

Mr. Synoracki ran through the conceptual stormwater plans and indicated that the design is proposed to capture 90% of all annual rainfall off of impervious areas which would then go through a treatment system.

Mr. Sturla recommended that the applicants provide some type of screening in order to protect the wetland areas from blowing garbage and waste.

Mr. Synoracki responded that they could propose the planting of trees or a hedge row to catch any garbage from entering into the wetland areas.

Mr. Synoracki stated that the proposed concept plan and the water quality treatment package are going to surpass any loss of floodplain area as well as compliment the Little Conestoga.

Mr. Sturla questioned the comment regarding the taking away of some of the floodplain.

Mr. Young indicated that this project will be impacting the floodplain and that a report has been submitted to the Township for review.

Mr. Fox indicated that Greenfield Architects will be responsible for the architectural design of the buildings and streetscape.

Mr. Fox presented conceptual architectural illustrations of the proposed plantings, materials, outdoor seating, walkways, recessed buildings, lighting, benches, textures and patterns on the sidewalks, crosswalks and key intersection points.

Mr. Fox spoke about the internal and external open space and about the pocket park and open areas. Mr. Fox indicated that they will be recessing the buildings and/or angling them so that the view of the open space is sufficient and to provide a wonderful view of Main Street.

Mr. Fox further described the materials proposed to be utilized on the buildings in order to make them aesthetically pleasing.

Mr. Young introduced Mr. Donald Jacobs, Traffic Planning Design.

Mr. Jacobs advised that he was present to discuss the traffic within the specific context of the conditional use requirements, referring to Section 2319.2.P and 2319.2.Q of the PCD Ordinance.

Mr. Jacobs indicated that the first element of part P is the Study Area. The area was scoped out with the Township and an approved study area was approved. This study area was then forwarded onto PADOT for acceptance and comment.

Mr. Fry asked Mr. Jacobs to explain for the audience what it takes to study an intersection.

Mr. Jacobs advised that with each intersection in the study area, existing conditions are studied in the weekly A.M and P.M. peak hours as well as Saturday mid-day peak hour.

Mr. Jacobs indicated that for each intersection the traffic is then counted and the intersection is analyzed to determine a level of service or a grading of the intersection based on how much delay a motorist experiences at the intersection.

Mr. Jacobs continued that, after studying the existing conditions, the impact to traffic from the development is studied based on a 10-year design horizon after the projected opening of the center. This future year is then studied with and without the proposed center.

Mr. Jacobs advised that the study began at Harrisburg Pike & Plaza Boulevard and continued down Harrisburg Pike to the Dillerville/President Boulevard Intersection from west to east.

Mr. Jacobs stated that Farmingdale Road & Oreville Road and Oreville Road & Good Drive were included which are located in East Hempfield Township. Also included was the half interchange off of Route 30 at Manheim Pike (Route 72) where there is an east bound off and a west bound on.

Mr. Jacobs indicated that this was the extent of the intersections identified by the Township and forwarded to PADOT.

Mr. Jacobs indicated that PADOT responded as being in agreement with the Township approved intersections, however they requested an additional eight (8) intersections be included in the study area.

Mr. Jacobs identified the following additions per PADOT recommendation: Harrisburg Pike & Race Avenue; Harrisburg Pike & College Avenue; Harrisburg Pike & Charlotte Street; Harrisburg Pike & Mulberry Street; Harrisburg Pike & Rohrerstown Road; Rohrerstown Road & Oreville Road; Good Drive & Spring Valley Road and Manheim Pike & Farmingdale Road.

Mr. Jacobs presented slides to show the recommended improvements at the studied intersections.

Mr. Jacobs presented an illustration of the interchange area and the improvements.

Mr. Jacobs explained the proposed Single Point Urban Interchange (SPUI) and indicated that such SPUI would allow dual left turn movements off of the Route 30 off-ramps to proceed at the same time and two dual left turning movements that occur at the same signal to get onto the ramps would also occur at the same time. The third phase would be the through movements.

Mr. Jacobs noted that, by ordinance, the applicant has to improve the interchange area by at least 33% and that with the proposed improvements there will be an approximate 56% of reduction in delay.

Mr. Jacobs indicated that Farmingdale Road will be proposed to be maintained as a right in, right out; the existing light at Toys R Us is proposed to remain and a connection construction in the rear so that the traffic could utilize this intersection; and the main intersection would be opposite Long's Park.

Mr. Fry asked if there is a full access driveway proposed onto Farmingdale Road.

Mr. Jacobs answered yes and advised that it will be located just south of the Toys R Us driveway and constructed as one lane in and one lane out.

Mr. Jacobs further mentioned that they are recommending that a left turn lane on Farmingdale Road be constructed in the area approaching the access drive so that people making a left into that driveway would not be blocking the thru lane of Farmingdale Road.

Mr. Jacobs continued by illustrating where Harrisburg Pike necks down from 5 lanes to three heading east from the interchange and advised that there is significant widening and additional lanes proposed in that section of Harrisburg Pike.

Mr. Jacobs continued along Harrisburg Pike and indicated that, in the vicinity of the Post Office and Donnelly, a 3 lane section currently exists today with a left turn for entering movements and one lane in each direction. Two thru lanes in each direction and maintaining the left turn areas are being proposed.

Mr. Jacobs indicated that, in the area of the Norfolk Southern underpass bridge, two alternative treatments are being proposed.

The first proposal would be to provide a second thru lane going eastbound, whereby, two lanes heading in the eastbound direction and one lane heading in the westbound direction until coming underneath the bridge, where the westbound traffic would immediately taper out into two lanes.

The other proposal would be having two lanes going both ways the entire length.

Mr. Jacobs stated that at this point, they are offering up alternatives, but there will be much more discussion.

Mr. Jacobs continued with his illustration by proceeding toward the city. Mr. Jacobs indicated that at the intersection of Harrisburg Pike, Dillerville Road and President Avenue, they are proposing to widen Harrisburg Pike enough to fit two standard lanes to create a separate right turn onto President Avenue. The other proposed improvement to that intersection would be the widening Dillerville Road to construct a separate right turn lane so that the traffic coming south on Dillerville Road can turn right onto Harrisburg Pike.

Mr. Jacobs wrapped up his presentation with advising that the study area included the East Hempfield Township intersection of Oreville Road & Good Drive which was identified in the traffic study as needing signalization to operate in an efficient manner. Such improvement would require East Hempfield Township to apply and install the traffic signal.

Mrs. Hoffer concluded by indicated that there are three (3) key components involved in a Planned Commercial Development, most of which have been covered during this presentation.

After reiterating that this plan is a conceptual design layout, Mrs. Hoffer indicated that one (1) of the key components is the square footage calculations and indicated that this item will be addressed and achieved during the land development process.

Mrs. Hoffer indicated that the second key component is to apply one (1) Transferable Development Right (TDR) for each acre of impervious area. With this plan, as presented today, forty-four (44) TDRs would be required, although the final plan could vary a bit because of the requirement being based on the impervious coverage area.

Mrs. Hoffer indicated that the third component are the required roadway improvements which are necessary and in order to be considered for conditional use approval the conceptual plan needs to show the roadway improvements and show how all of those roadway improvements would be accomplished as the language is very clear in the ordinance which states that prior to the issuance of a building permit, all of the monies required to install the improvements must be posted as financial security or all of the work must be done.

Mr. Fry explained the conditional use process to the audience members and advised that the public hearing is scheduled for May 7, 2007.

Mr. Fry further advised that if the conditional use is granted, the applicants will then have to come back with land development plans and go through the land development process with the Planning Commission and then again to the Commissioners.

Mr. Fry stated that Township staff has contacted representatives of the City of Lancaster, East Hempfield Township and the County of Lancaster in regards to this meeting and invited them to come and asked the audience if there was anyone present representing the City, County or Township.

Mr. Melvin Hess, representing Lancaster City introduced himself.

Mr. Hess indicated that City representatives have not reviewed the traffic study and asked the Planning Commission to give the City some time to look at the traffic since this is the biggest issue for the City as well as the impact on Long's Park and how this proposal could affect the use of the park, the peacefulness that exists and there are pollution concerns.

Mrs. Hoffer advised that she would provide representatives of Lancaster City, East Hempfield and Lancaster County with copies of the traffic studies.

Mr. Reed questioned the status of the funding for the proposed roadway improvements.

Mr. Smithgall advised that the application has been made for the infrastructure and facilities improvement program funding which is still being considered by the DCED, ultimately winding up on the governor's desk.

Mr. Smithgall further indicated that another journey to Washington, D.C. was conducted and an earmark for this project was requested.

Mr. Rathman asked if the intersection of Good Drive and Harrisburg Pike were studied.

Mr. Jacobs advised that it was not included in the study area and felt that the reason why was because that particular intersection is currently running at a satisfactory level and is being improved by Woodcrest Villa and Lancaster General, therefore it would not need to be studied again.

Mr. Rathman asked how the adjacent properties and downstream property owners will be impacted with the loss of the floodplain.

Mr. Jeri McClune, Rettew Associates indicated that they see the benefits of the flood plain as channel storage, the volume of the floodplain, water quality through the filtering of sediments and pollutants and infiltration and what is being proposed is to balance the volume where the floodplain is impacted by encroachment, there are going to be excavated areas to make up that volume, whereby addressing the quantity.

Mr. McClune indicated that the proposal will go above and beyond the Stormwater Management Ordinance to make up for the loss of water quality improvements through the floodplain, therefore, the only thing is infiltration. This area is completely a lime stone area and to create additional surface area for a floodplain, rock blasting would be necessary whereby creating a high potential for sink holes, therefore, infiltration is not anything that can be made up on this site.

Mr. McClune clarified where the encroachment of the floodplain would be occurring and advised that this floodplain, the whole way up to Harrisburg Pike, is back water from the Little Conestoga Creek therefore it is a flat water surface and could be filled in and it wouldn't change the water surface.

Mr. Rathman questioned additional stormwater items, however, was inaudible.

Mr. McClune advised that the applicants are proposing to use the No-Harm Alternative and down stream impact analyses are being taken.

Mr. Geisenberger encouraged the audience to obtain a copy of the traffic study and review it and suggested that it be placed on the Township's website so that the public has access to this study.

Mr. Geisenberger questioned the retail uses and wondered if they have decided on the individual uses.

Mr. Evans indicated that entertainment, dining and shopping is what is ultimately proposed, however, there is not a full use concept at this time.

Mr. Geisenberger asked if there will be any second floor uses.

Mr. Evans indicated that they are contemplating on having some components with a second level, possibly along Main Street.

Mr. Geisenberger questioned whether an intersection, recommended for improvements, falls outside of the Township would need to be shown on the drawings and would it become a condition of the approval.

Ms. Greaves responded by indicating that if the improvement(s) becomes part of the roadway improvement plan as part of the PCD conditional use, then it is part of the plan, however, the legalities should be discussed with the Township Solicitor.

Mr. Geisenberger asked Mr. Smithgall what the price tag was on the proposed improvements.

Mr. Smithgall answered approximately \$25 million for all of the improvements.

Mr. Geisenberger advised that, in addition to the specific requirements for the conditional use that are in the PCD ordinance, there are also nine (9) basic requirements in the Zoning Ordinance for all Conditional Use requests.

Mr. Geisenberger indicated that of those nine (9) basic requirements, there were some that he felt as though the applicant should clearly and adequately address. The first being: That the proposed use will not have an adverse effect upon congestion of streets and highways. The second being: That the proposed use will not have an adverse effect on adjacent properties.

Mr. Geisenberger stated that a big issue to him is the impact on Farmingdale Road. He indicated that it is not a very safe road and that he has some concerns. Mr. Geisenberger questioned what the impact assessment is for Farmingdale Road.

Mr. Jacobs answered that since they are only in the conditional use process, the Traffic Impact Study was done only to address specific points in the ordinance regarding intersections that were laid out for study, therefore, at this point, there has been a lot of effort with the initial study area and the additional study areas to lay out a lot of information regarding the operations at those intersections.

Mr. Jacobs further indicated that at this point they are awaiting feedback from the Township pertaining to the Traffic Impact Study and that once it is received, the next step can be taken and a lot of the issues, certainly Farmingdale Road is an issue, can be dealt with.

Mr. Sturla commented on the traffic improvements but it was inaudible.

Mrs. Hoffer stated that since the study area is expanded beyond the scope of the Township, she would propose.....the roadway improvement plan to the extent that the applicant is proposing improvements at the additional intersections which reside outside Manheim township boundary limits....she would suggest that the applicant be required to indicate and show the improvements, but they would be subject to ultimately the township or the city approving the applicant installing them, but not to treat it as something that would prohibit the applicant from proceeding with the Conditional Use. Therefore if the City does not want the light at College Avenue optimized, they could propose the money be placed in escrow for future use.

Mrs. Hoffer further stated that both East Hempfield Township and Lancaster City provided input to PADOT to include those additional intersections in the Traffic Study for this project.

Mr. Sturla asked how Manheim Township is looking at the rest of the intersections.

Ms. Greaves answered that initially, there had to be some concurrency with the Township Traffic Engineer and PADOT.....as far as what the Township Traffic Engineer looks at, he looks at all the issues in the study and the recommended changes.....but the question is still how Manheim Township can push another municipality to step forward and want those improvements as well. Ms. Greaves indicated that off-site improvements need to be addressed now with the conditional use process.

Mr. Fry asked for public comment.

Patron #1: Mike Warren, property owner at the entrance to Park City, stated that he was concerned with the encroachment on the floodplain and the impact "upstream".

Mr. Warren indicated that the velocity flow of the Little Conestoga impacts him there and that there is a large area that floods there currently; therefore he is requesting that the impact be looked at upstream as well as downstream.

Secondly, he would also like to see that the intersection that services his property isn't adversely affected.

Patron #2: Cindy Brodbeck, Farmingdale Road resident questioned how much additional traffic would come down on Farmingdale Road.

Mr. Jacobs responded that with the shopping center, during the P.M. peak hour, the additional traffic would be approximately 1-2 cars per minute heading each way.

Ms. Brodbeck stated that for the record, there are numerous residents that would like to see Farmingdale Road closed down and was also wondering what type of uses were planned for the two larger structures.

The applicants responded but it was inaudible.

Patron #3: Jerry Lawrence, resident of Barcrest Development. Mr. Lawrence questioned whether or not Farmingdale Road was capable of taking on that many additional cars since it is not designed for heavy traffic and it's dangerous and curvy and is not built to handle the additional cars.

Mr. Lawrence stated that there needs to be a redesign of that entire road and questioned why Farmingdale Road cannot be terminated.

Mr. Geisenberger and Mr. Sturla advised that Manheim Township cannot terminate Farmingdale Road as it lies within the jurisdiction of East Hempfield.

Mr. Sturla further stated that East Hempfield Township has been contacted by Manheim Township on numerous occasions and were asked to come to these meetings.

Patron #4: Cathy Ashworth, Farmingdale Road resident, asked if there is a figure on the total number of cars expected per day to come in and out of the new shopping center and if so, how many of those are expected to come from the south and west of the site?

Mr. Jacobs advised that he did not have figures for the total trips per day, just the additional peak hour findings which is a worse case scenario.

Ms. Ashworth advised that she is interested in the all day impact of the traffic, not just the peak times.

Ms. Ashworth asked what the residents of East Hempfield Township need to do in order to get their Township representatives to come to the meetings and what impact would they have on Manheim Township's decision making process, because it sounds like if they meet the ordinance, then it doesn't matter what anyone else says.

Mr. Fry indicated that Manheim Township would be very interested in considering East Hempfield Township's feedback and point of view.

Ms. Ashworth indicated that she also had concern about the negative impact onto adjacent properties and that this project is taking a residential area and turning it into something other than residential which scares her.

Mr. Sturla responded by indicating that he agreed with Ms. Ashworth about the impact, but the Planning Commission has to look at how it adversely impacts as it is currently zoned and what could go in there.

Mr. Sturla further stated that this parcel is currently zoned I-1 Industrial and if this was zoned residential and they were asking for this, he certainly would agree that they wouldn't even be here. Further, the Planning Commission and Commissioners need to look at this as it adversely affects the adjacent properties more or less than what the intended use under the zoning could allow, therefore, if this is worse than industrial then it has to be taken into consideration.

On a motion by Mr. Reed, seconded by Mr. Rathman, it was recommended to table this Conditional Use Request.

**Motion Approved 5-0 with Mr. Gibeault abstaining.**

The public hearing date is tentatively scheduled for May 7, 2007.

**2. Berkshire-Lancaster LLC – Planned Commercial Development (PCD) – Conditional Use request – Granite Run Drive – Zoned I-1. (Hearing Date 5/7/07)**

Present representing this Preliminary/Final Land Development Plan was Mr. Charlie Suhr, Stevens and Lee; Mr. William McCollum, Berkshire Development; Mr. Steve Horst, property owner; Mr. David Madary, David Miller and Associates; Ms. Jodie Evans, McMahon Transportation Engineers; Mr. John Rufo, Architect and Mr. David Rue, Archeologist.

Mr. Suhr advised that the applicant has filed an application for a PCD as part of Granite Run Corporate Center and there is essentially a retail component as well as existing conditions which are being incorporated in as part of the overall PCD.

Mr. Suhr indicated that the required number Transferable Development Rights (TDR) under the current ordinance would require the use of eighteen (18) TDRs.

Mr. Suhr further mentioned that there is a pending text amendment brought forth by Berkshire Development in regards to traffic and that the traffic impact study which was originally submitted was submitted under the language of the proposed text amendment. However, since the conditional use application preceded the adoption of the text amendment, we had to create a supplement to the traffic study to focus on the requirements of the ordinance as it stands now.

Mr. McCollum gave the planning members a brief introduction of Berkshire Development LLC by indicating that they are a full service development company headquartered in Springfield, MA and their primary business is retail development.

Mr. McCollum advised that they selected Lancaster, PA as a market because they felt that this area is under-served from the standpoint of retail.

Mr. McCollum indicated that the overall development proposed is 180,000 square feet with the largest tenant being 50,000 square feet and the smallest tenant being 500 square feet.

Mr. Rufo presented the planning members with proposed sketch drawings and provided a brief presentation. This presentation was completely inaudible due to the lack of using the microphone.

Mr. Fry asked how they are proposing to link the several properties together to achieve the 40 acre minimum requirement.

Someone responded but was inaudible.

Mr. Sturla questioned how the applicant could link the two properties that have a stream running between them.

Mr. Madary responded, but was inaudible.

Mr. Horst advised that there will be pedestrian trails to provide the linkage. Mr. Horst continued but was inaudible.

Mr. Sturla questioned how 22 acres can be taken and then allow for the option to add this and add that to come up with the 40 acres to meet the PCD.

Mr. Sturla stated to the applicant that they advised that a path is being created to link these properties to the PCD, but that it was his understanding, in concept, that the ordinance was established so that a PCD less than 40 acres would not be permitted.

Mr. Sturla stated that at some point in time, he's not quite sure if taking a 20 acre parcel and adding a couple of lots to it is ok, because do we then open the door for a 5 acre parcel to keep adding lots to be able to fall into a PCD.

Mr. Sturla asked where does the Planning Commission and Commissioners draw the line.

Mr. Sturla indicated that he needs an explanation as to how the original PCD ordinance went from a 50-acre PCD minimum to a 40-acre PCD minimum and that the intent is not being stretched way beyond it was ever meant to and to stretch it by saying someone is going to take a 20-acre and now add a couple of lots to it and because there is a bike path through them, they are part of the PCD.

Mr. Horst responded but was inaudible.

Mr. Sturla addressed the applicant and advised that if he was told that they planned on taking out everything existing and then build a 40-acre PCD, which would be fine.

Mr. Horst responded that there is nothing that he has read in the PCD Ordinance that it has to.....(inaudible).

Mr. Geisenberger asked where the rich historical architectural structures in the existing buildings are, and stated that there is no compatibility between the existing structures and the proposed structures.

Mr. Suhr advised that the entire 40 acres is owned by Granite Run Properties which is maintaining the 40-acre ability.

Mr. Sturla asked if common ownership the.....could he go out and find a few car dealerships that are owned by the same owner with a 5,000 acre strip beside them and they can put in a PCD because it would meet....

Mr. Suhr answered that it is a logistical issue and that it would be.....

Mr. Sturla stated that there needs to be a review of that intention to convince.....and thought that the intent was to have a 40-acre tract and be a contiguous development and met all of the requirements, however, this proposal is a.....slight of hand of that and it's not meeting the intent.

Mr. Suhr indicated that they had discussions about the acreage size when the ordinance was pending with the Commissioners where this concept was brought out and everyone knew the vacant area where the new retail.....was coming in, was a limited size.

Mr. Suhr stated that this was discussed that the buildings would not be torn down and that they would be able to meet the area requirements and the answer was, to sweep in the existing parks.

Mr. Fry stated that he could support this if they took the large building and completely redeveloped the front and back of it to match the proposed architecture.

Mr. Geisenberger stated that the existing structures need to be incorporated into the main street and into the development.

Mr. Sturla indicated that what was talked about in this whole concept were limited areas in the Township that could fall under.....why didn't you come in and ask for a 20 acre PCD.

Mr. Suhr advised that they did, but that staff wanted to see the larger acreage

Mr. Sturla addressed the applicants and indicated that we are at a point now where, when during the text amendment, we went around looking for the 40 acre industrial tracts in the Township where a PCD could come in.....and now what kind of Pandora's box would we be opening.....if I'm being told that we didn't do our due diligence on this ordinance and now everyone with 15 acres that can possibly drag in 6 other parcels around it through common ownership is open for this, then we have a whole other can of worms and he hopes that the Commissioners understand that.

Mr. Geisenberger responded by indicating that he thought that what Mr. Sturla was getting at was that he hoped the ordinance was written in a way that if areas were combined, that the integration, including old buildings and new buildings, old land and new land, had to meet the requirements of the ordinance.

Mr. Sturla concurred.

Mr. Madary continued with the presentation, however, it was again inaudible due to the lack of using the microphone.

Mr. David Rue, Archeologist spoke briefly about the existing cemetery. Mr. Rue indicated that per the year 1872 Atlas of Lancaster County, this area was part of a larger parcel and was known as the Stauffer Farm. The cemetery is thirty-five (35) feet in diameter with 16 family graves which date between 1840 and 1880's.

Mr. Rue continued by providing planning members with the plans to preserve and maintain the existing cemetery.

Ms. Jodie Evans discussed the traffic study areas and plans. Ms. Evans advised that she had met with Township Traffic Engineer to discuss the study area and that they are awaiting comments from the Township Traffic Engineer.

Ms. Evans continued with the traffic presentation but was inaudible due to the lack of using the microphone.

Mr. Sturla asked Ms. Evans to address Fruitville Pike and questioned why the applicant cannot do any improvements to BelAir.

Ms. Evans advised that a signal is not warranted and.....(inaudible).

Mr. Geisenberger questioned if there could at least be an additional lane added.

Ms. Evans advised that the reason it is failing.....(inaudible).

Mr. Sturla further expressed his concerns regarding Fruitville Pike because of the section, of Fruitville Pike, after the light at Granite Run Drive is a traffic nightmare especially during the peak hours.

Ms. Evans continued her presentation by discussing Manheim Pike & Lausch Lane and Granite Run Drive & Manheim Pike.

Ms. Evans advised that there will be a signal on Granite Run Drive at the entrance to the PCD.

Ms. Evans discussed the interchange at Manheim Pike and Route 283. Ms. Evans advised that this interchange is currently functioning very well and that additional turning lanes are proposed, however no SPUI (Single-Point Urban Interchange) is being proposed.

Mr. Geisenberger advised that the existing ordinance says that the roadway improvement plan shall include a SPUI, or if approved by the Township, an alternative interchange design improvement that can yield equivalent or better improvements in level of service or reduction in delay of such interchange, which means you would have to provide as much improvement as a SPUI would AND there shall not be less than a 33% reduction in delay.

Ms. Evans stated that her interpretation of the ordinance that you provide a SPUI OR.....if approved by the township an alternative improvement and that's what they would be providing.

Ms. Evans indicated that after the proposed improvements are complete, the interchange would be operating at a Level A with less than a 10 second delay overall, therefore, it didn't make sense to do a SPIU at that interchange.

Mr. McCollum indicated that the proposal does reduce the delay by 33%.

Mr. Geisenberger responded that it meets the second criteria, but the question is that the first criterion is at the discretion of the Township.

Mr. Fry asked for public comment.

There was no response.

On a motion by Mr. Reed, it was recommended to table this Conditional Use Request until the Commissioners respond in terms of what the 40 acres really means. Motion died due to the lack of second.

On a motion by Mr. Geisenberger, seconded by Mr. Sturla, it was recommended to table this Conditional Use Request.

**Motion Approved 6-0.**

The public hearing date is tentatively scheduled for May 7, 2007.

On a motion by Mr. Sturla, seconded by Mr. Geisenberger, it was recommended to adjourn the meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 11:07 p.m.

The next Regular Planning Commission meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, April 18, 2007 at 6:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Shannon L. Sinopoli