

**MANHEIM TOWNSHIP  
PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTES  
Wednesday  
November 19, 2008**

A meeting of the Manheim Township Planning Commission was held on Wednesday, November 19, 2008 at 6:30 p.m. The following members were present: Mr. Michel Gibeault; Mr. Robert Wolf; Mr. Cory Rathman; Mr. Donald Reed; Mrs. Mary Ellen Hollinger and Mr. Michael Martin. Mr. Jeffrey Sturla was absent. The following Township staff was present: Mrs. Lisa Douglas and Mrs. Shannon Sinopoli.

**Roll Call**

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

**Minutes**

Mr. Gibeault asked for a motion on the October 15, 2008 meeting minutes.

On a motion by Mr. Wolf, seconded by Mr. Reed, it was recommended to approve the October 15, 2008 meeting minutes.

**Motion Approved 6-0.**

Mr. Gibeault announced that the microphone system had malfunctioned and would be taped via a manual recorder.

**Comprehensive Plan Update**

Mrs. Douglas indicated that the first presentation of the draft Comprehensive Plan was presented to the Planning Commission last Wednesday, November 12, 2008 and that there were a lot of good questions asked from the residents and planning members.

Mrs. Douglas advised that there will be time for further discussion on the draft plan at the next regularly scheduled Planning Commission on Wednesday, December 17, 2008 at 6:30 p.m.

Mrs. Douglas indicated that for those who cannot attend the meetings, written comments will be accepted through the Planning and Zoning Department.

Mrs. Douglas advised that the public hearing before the Commissioners has not yet been set at this point.

**Old Business**

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

**1. Kissel Hill Commons PRD - Conditional Use Request (Signage) - Farnum Road and Kissel Hill Road - Zoned R-2.**

*\*\*Note: Planning member Robert Wolf recused himself from plan discussions.*

Present representing this Conditional Use request was Mr. Gregory Strausser, Strausser Surveying and Engineering.

Mr. Strausser indicated that during the previous presentation, the Planning Commission suggested that the applicant retain the existing sign elements by extending the existing sign instead of enlarging.

Mr. Strausser stated that the applicants have taken those suggestions and concepts that were recommended and revised the original submission to include utilizing the existing Shoppes at Kissel Hill signs and moving them out onto an attached pedestal and applying the tenant panels to the existing lattice where the Shoppes at Kissel Hill signs currently reside.

Mr. Strausser indicated that there would be 11 tenant panels on both of the existing sign structures for a total of 22 panels.

Mr. Gibeault stated that basically the Shoppes at Kissel Hill ovals will be pulled off and hung on the side and that the tenant panels will be put into that existing space.

Mr. Strausser indicated that was correct and advised that no tenants would be permitted to be on both structures, as there would only be one sign per business.

The planning members thanked Mr. Strausser for taking their recommendations and suggestions and revising the proposal.

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

On a motion by Mr. Martin, seconded by Mr. Reed it was recommended to approve the conditional use revisions to the existing Kissel Hill Commons sign to include the following: a) Relocation of the existing oval signs noted with the Shoppes at Kissel Hill; b) The addition to each sign, one on each side of the entrance street, a total of 11 tenant signs for each side totaling up to 22 maximum signs; c) Only one tenant per sign per business and d) The color scheme for the sign shall match the existing buildings.

**Motion Approved 5-0.** (with Mr. Wolf abstaining).

**Public Hearing scheduled for December 8, 2008.**

**New Business**

**A. Subdivision/Land Development Plans**

**1. R. Samuel Keens – Preliminary/Final Subdivision and Land Development Plan - 850 Keens Road – Zoned Agricultural.**

Present representing this Preliminary/Final Subdivision and Land Development Plan was Mr. Gregory Strausser, Strausser Surveying and Engineering.

Mr. Strausser indicated that this plan consists of 66 acres of Agricultural Zoned land along East Oregon Road, John Landis Road and Keens Road.

Mr. Strausser indicated that the bulk of this land is farmed and that there are 2 existing single-family dwellings and 3 accessory buildings which house various small businesses, with a trailer rental business being the largest user.

Mr. Strausser indicated that the proposal is to subdivide this parent parcel into 5 lots. Lot 1 would consist of a 2 acre tract to house a future single-family dwelling. Lot 2 would be a vacant farm and consist of 23+ acres. Lot 3 would consist of 11+ acres and one of the existing single-family dwellings. Lot 4 would consist of 13+ acres and would house the other existing single-family dwelling and all of the business uses. Lot 5 would be a vacant parcel consisting of 14+ acres for a future farm lot.

Mr. Strausser advised that this plan is merely for estate planning purposes and that the property owner is not interested in selling any of these lots at this time.

Mr. Strausser stated that he was questioning two stormwater plan review comments; one being in regards to stormwater inlets in yard areas and the other referring to detention basin flow discharge along Keens Road. He felt that these comments should not apply to this plan due to using the standard inlet detail (as required) and the basin comment being just a recommendation rather than a requirement of a certain section of the ordinance.

Mr. Gibeault asked Mr. Strausser if he had discussed these comments with staff and/or the Township Engineer.

Mr. Strausser indicated that he had not.

Mr. Strausser discussed the modification being requested for the reconstruction of existing roadways requirement.

Mr. Strausser questioned why the Township would want these roads widened when this area is Agriculturally (AG) zoned and there is no more development planned.

Mr. Strausser stated that the paving and widening and the curbing and sidewalk of streets in the AG Zone to address what is a very low impact development, actually seems to run counter to the whole purpose of having the AG Zone.

Mr. Strausser indicated that they would then have to address stormwater management in light of the additional paving, with added inlets, etc.

Mr. Strausser indicated that he did conduct traffic counts and there were 90 vehicles a day on Keens Road with at least 15-20 being horse buggy's.

Mr. Gibeault stated that, although these roads are located in the AG Zone, they are still traveled upon and that the Township cannot allow those roads to deteriorate.

Mr. Gibeault recommended the Mr. Strausser talk to staff about the widening and the possibility of some reductions because there is the possibility of 5 homes being located on these lots and that road improvements get paid by developers and not by the tax payers.

Mr. Gibeault asked if the idea of vacating Keens Road was explored with the Township and the property owners.

Mr. Strausser indicated that the three land owners along Keens Road have not been approached with that idea at this time.

Mr. Strausser indicated that he would have to discuss this idea with the Keens and the Kings.

Mr. Gibeault indicated that he's just suggesting that as an option and stated that another option could be that the property owner posts a fee in lieu of with the Township for 50% of the cost for future reconstruction.

Mr. Strausser indicated that he would like to further discuss the options with the applicants.

Mr. Gibeault asked for public comment.

*Patron #1: Mr. Michael Young, 737 Jake Landis Road.*

*Mr. Young stated that he lives within a short walk to this property. Mr. Young stated that he would agree that the quality of Keens Road is exceptional for jogging and biking.*

*Mr. Young stated that what the applicants are asking for is a modification of the Agricultural (AG) Zone and if there is a modification of the AG Zone, what evidence is offered that there won't be requests for additional modifications of the AG Zone.*

*Mr. Young indicated that when he hears the Manheim Township Zoning Commission speak and hears people ask for exemptions for Zoning permits, etc, he's heard them make comments to the effect that we have these rules in place for a reason. But someone came in and requested a setback for a small patio roof in Grandview Heights and it was not within the setback and this was not granted and in his opinion, it was a hardship for that particular home owner.*

*Mr. Young stated that it's not so much this subdivision, but if its for estate planning, when its sold, even if the first buyer says they are going to keep it the way it is, they could turn around and sell it and now the new owners are back here again asking for some exemption to the AG Zone.*

Mr. Gibeault responded by indicating that the applicants are not requesting a modification of what's allowed in the AG zone and that this subdivision plan merely triggers requirements from the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance which requires the reconstruction of the roadways to certain standards.

*Mr. Young stated that if that's an acceptable use in the AG zone right, then if that improved road is in place, and when one of those subdivisions are sold at some point (which it will be if its estate planning), then does anything prohibit the future buyer/owner from coming back and saying we have this improved road, lets come in and request a modification to the AG Zone and throw in a.....*

Mr. Gibeault responded by indicating that it would be highly unlikely that someone would come and try to rezone those parcels because the AG zone is sacred.

*Mr. Young indicated that he has no objection as to what is proposed tonight, his concern is someone coming back at a future date and changing the AG Zone.*

On a motion by Mr. Wolf, seconded by Mr. Rathman, it was recommended to table this plan until all outstanding comments can be adequately addressed.

**Motion Approved 6-0.**

**2. Moore Business Park - Preliminary/Final Subdivision and Land Development Plan - 780 Eden Road - Zoned I-1 Industrial.**

Present representing this Preliminary/Final Subdivision and Land Development Plan was Mr. Todd Shoaf, Pioneer Management.

Mr. Shoaf indicated that the project site is located on the south side of Eden Road adjacent to, or in front of the existing Moore Business Park.

Mr. Shoaf indicated that there are 3 lots associated with this subdivision plan. Lot 1 would consist of a 9,500 square foot, 2-story general office building; Lot 2 would house a 44,560 square foot, 3-story general office building and Lot 3 would house the existing businesses, buildings, parking, etc.

Mr. Shoaf indicated that 730 Eden Road Associates is to the left (or west) of this development and is currently under construction for medical offices.

Mr. Shoaf indicated that a cul-de-sac street is proposed for dedication to the Township off of Eden Road and with the creation of this cul-de-sac, the existing access drive to the 730 Eden Road Associates lot will be closed off and in its place, a shared access between the two lots is proposed to bring those customers over to access the new cul-de-sac.

Mr. Shoaf indicated that in early meetings with staff, there were concerns raised regarding additional access drives along Eden Road and staff suggested combining the access for both the 730 Eden Road Associates and the Moore Business Park which will also provide 730 Eden Road Associates with full movement from Eden Road instead of the existing right-in, right-out scenario.

Mr. Shoaf advised that the owners of 730 Eden Road Associates were very cooperative in working together for this joint access.

Mr. Shoaf indicated that roadway reconstruction is planned along Eden Road and that a 150' deceleration (decel) lane would be provided for turning into the site.

Mr. Shoaf advised that the only area that they are not proposing sidewalk or roadway widening is the small triangle area at the northeast corner of the property, adjacent to the Route 222 bridge, however, the additional right-of-way is being provided.

Mr. Shoaf indicated that they are proposing one underground detention system for stormwater and that they are reducing the rate of discharge by 50% from what currently exists to improve what happens out there currently.

Mr. Rathman questioned if screening will be provided adjacent to the residential neighbors along the northern property line.

Mr. Shoaf indicated that there is a significant amount of existing evergreens along that boundary line and that they also plan on increasing that screening by providing additional plantings.

Mr. Rathman questioned tractor trailer traffic and what the possibility would be of those trucks trying coming into the new access instead of their existing route using Crooked Oak Drive.

Mr. Shoaf indicated that the new cul-de-sac is not being designed for truck traffic and that the shear layout of the business park is so tight that coming into

that front, they wouldn't be able to maneuver, so the tractor trailers coming to the existing Moore Business Park will continue to come in off Crooked Oak.

Mr. Martin questioned if a traffic signal would be added.

Mr. Shoaf indicated that 3 improvement areas showed up on the Traffic Study. One would be a deceleration lane (a right hand turn lane) into the proposed cul-de-sac street off of Eden Road. The second would be an off-site, right hand turn lane heading westbound on Eden Road at Roseville Road and the third improvement is a signal at Crooked Oak and Eden Road, however, a traffic signal is not associated with this particular plan.

Mr. Shoaf briefed the planning members on the modifications being requested and indicated that a meeting is scheduled with staff the first week in December to work through the first set of review comments.

Mr. Gibeault asked for public comment.

*Patron #1: Mr. Logan Harr, 1909 Eden Road*

*Mr. Harr questioned how many cars Mr. Shoaf would expect to go in and out of the site.*

Mr. Shoaf indicated that he did not have the traffic study with him, although he thought the number was around 218 vehicles.

On a motion by Mr. Rathman, seconded by Mrs. Hollinger, it was recommended to table this plan until all outstanding comments can be adequately addressed.

**Motion Approved 6-0.**

*\*\*\*Note: The Stockyards of Lancaster Office Park plan was moved to the end of the agenda.*

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

**1. City of Lancaster - Conditional Use Request - Booster Pump Station - 210 Hess Boulevard - Zoned R-2.**

Present representing this Conditional Use Request was Mr. Darrell Becker and Mr. Dale Kopp, The ARRO Group.

Mr. Becker indicated that this proposal consists of a small 9' x 11' addition to an existing water booster pump station along Hess Boulevard.

Mr. Becker indicated that this booster pump station is located back off of Hess Boulevard on its own lot, between two existing residential lots.

Mr. Becker stated that the lot has an adequate landscape buffer.

Mr. Becker indicated that utility uses are permitted in the R-2 Zoning District through the Conditional Use process as well as by providing necessary landscaping required by the Zoning Ordinance.

Mr. Becker indicated that there are specific criteria or items to address per Section 2210.3 of the Zoning Ordinance pertaining to Conditional Use requests and that this proposal meets all of those necessary items for approval.

Mr. Martin asked why this is being proposed.

Mr. Kopp indicated that it is for chlorine injection and that, in order to keep drinking water safe, the city must boost the chlorine residuals which oxidizes germs and provides for safe consumption.

Mr. Reed questioned what the noise level will be.

Mr. Kopp said there is only a little tiny feed pump inside the building and that the building is a solid structure.

Mr. Gibeault asked, since everything else is underground, why this building couldn't be located underground as well.

Mr. Kopp indicated that the new building will house a feed system which the workers will be mixing with water and since they have to drag buckets around, it's for safety reasons.

Mr. Kopp added that the only reason there is an underground portion is because the water main runs through it and they need to be at the injection point when have to do maintenance on it.

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

On a motion by Mrs. Hollinger, seconded by Mr. Reed, it was recommended to approve this conditional use request.

**Motion Approved 6-0.**

**Public Hearing scheduled for January 12, 2009.**

**2. Hurst Enterprises - Text Amendment Petition to amend the Manheim Township Zoning Ordinance to permit Agricultural Composting activities in the Agricultural Zoning District.**

Present representing this Text Amendment Petition was Mr. Aaron Marines, Blakinger, Byler & Thomas; Mr. John Williamson, TeamAg; Mr. Loren Martin, Terra Gro; Mr. George Hurst, applicant; Mr. Harry Campbell, Chesapeake Bay Foundation.

Mr. Marines stated that, in an effort to reduce the amount of nitrogen running into our water and into the Chesapeake Bay, the Chesapeake Bay Foundation and the Department of Environmental Protection have joined together come up with ways to improve this runoff.

Mr. Marines indicated that one of the ways is composting activity which takes some of the manure produced on the farms and instead of land applying it; it is mixed and made into compost.

Mr. Marines indicated that back in March, Mr. Hurst and Mr. Williamson came to the Township with this composting idea and a project that they wanted to move forward with, however, staff indicated that there was nothing within the existing ordinance that would regulate this activity or provides for such an activity.

Mr. Marines stated, therefore, they decided to propose the addition of this use to the Zoning ordinance which permits this activity and gives the Township some control over where it goes, how big it is, how it's operated and in compliance with the DEP and their general permit requirements.

Mr. Williamson indicated that the goal of the project is to improve sustainability of agriculture where the land base is shrinking, while at the same time improving the environment and the community.

Mr. Williamson stated that the challenge before them is that annually, there are approximately 14 million pounds of nitrogen and over a million pounds of phosphorous that runs off from agricultural land and into the Susquehanna River and Chesapeake Bay.

Mr. Williamson stated that the goal of the Commonwealth is that we will reduce those amounts by 10 million pounds of nitrogen and 750,000 pounds of phosphorous.

Mr. Williamson indicated that Oregon Dairy Farm is trying to find other uses for its manure, such as compost to be utilized elsewhere, which will benefit their operation considerably by providing flexibility with their manure management.

Mr. Williamson advised that this composting project would be comprised of combining 18,000 tons of manure and mixing it with an equal amount of spent sawdust bedding from regional horse farms.

Mr. Williamson indicated that other composting inputs would include institutional food scrap wastes and municipal and institutional yard waste.

Mr. Williamson advised that the material would then be placed inside Windrow Buildings (60' x 408' hoop structures) and that all of the compost and finished product would be under buildings or under cover.

Mr. Williamson indicated that the uses for compost product includes soil amendment for turf and landscaping on athletic fields and golf courses; abandoned mine reclamation work; erosion and sedimentation control as well as the product will be bagged and sold at the Oregon Dairy Lawn & Garden Center for individual usage.

Mr. Williamson indicated that the projected traffic impacts would be approximately 5-10 trucks per day, with nearly all traffic coming from and going to Route 222. This could also reduce the amount of farm equipment on the roadway.

Mr. Williamson indicated that the odors from this compost will actually be reduced versus spreading on open land.

Mr. Wolf asked what the square footage sizes were for the structures.

Mr. Williamson stated 24,000 square feet each.

Mr. Rathman indicated that he thought it was a great idea, however, it appeared to him that this operation would act as a commercial facility and he was concerned about the traffic generated by it.

Mr. Rathman indicated that this particular project is located on a main route, but wondered what about the next project and the possibility of it being located on a less traveled local road or having these large trucks going through a neighborhood. Mr. Rathman questioned how the Township can keep the trucks off of local roads and/or neighborhoods.

Mr. Loren Martin provided additional information and background to composting projects and techniques, however, was inaudible.

Mr. Harry Campbell spoke about the environmental benefit of such composting and indicated that the Chesapeake Bay Foundation is committing about \$250,000 to help implement this particular initiative.

Lancaster County contributes over 10% of the total nitrogen that enters into the Susquehanna River and the Chesapeake Bay. This makes Lancaster County the largest source of nitrogen on a watershed basis (the Conestoga River watershed) than any other watershed in the entire

Chesapeake Bay. Just this project alone would be about a 2% reduction of that total load.

Mr. Rathman asked if the hoop barns are required.

Mr. Martin indicated that constructing hoop structures are not required by the DEP, but the hoop structures allow a better product and allows them to work in any type of weather and it does benefit the Township.

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

On a motion by Mr. Wolf, seconded by Mr. Reed, it was recommended to table this text amendment request.

**Motion Approved 6-0.**

**Public Hearing scheduled for January 12, 2009.**

**3. Charter Homes at Grandview Inc. - Rezoning Petition - New Holland Pike, Pleasure Road and Esbenshade Drive - Request to change zoning of property from R-2 Zone to R-3 Zone.**

Present representing this Rezoning Petition was Mr. Rob Bowman, Charter Homes.

Mr. Bowman indicated that this rezoning petition, as well as the following petition, consists of a 54.25 acre tract situated along New Holland Pike, to the northeast of Pleasure Road and the east of Esbenshade Drive.

Mr. Bowman indicated that he has been working on this site for seven (7) years and there have been other proposals over the past several years involving this project site.

Mr. Bowman gave a brief overview of his proposal.

Mr. Bowman indicated that two separate petitions have been submitted. One petition is to rezone approximately 24.41 acres from R-2 Residential to R-3 Residential and the second petition (below) is to rezone approximately 29.84 acres from R-2 Residential to B-1 Business District.

Mr. Bowman indicated that his proposal would be to construct up to 75 single family dwellings on the R-3 parcel and 3 office buildings on the B-1 site.

Mr. Bowman stated that the new residential development would connect to Helen Avenue, Salisbury Court and Edgemoor court, as a seamless connection.

Mr. Bowman indicated that they would be proposing 40,000-50,000 square feet

of office space that would be consistent with the B-1 Zoning.

Mr. Bowman stated that the B-1 site is really going to be defined by the access condition that they find at the intersection of where the existing driveway meets Route 23.

Mr. Bowman indicated that would probably be limited to permit only so many vehicle trips out onto Route 23, whereby that access would most probably be a right-in, right-out condition, which would need to be sorted out with PADOT and the Township if the rezoning gets approved.

Mr. Bowman indicated that this plan allows them to provide over 40% open space.

Mr. Bowman stated that, in order to make this proposal and the new homes feel more like the existing Grandview Development, an alley would be proposed through the site that would allow them to build homes with garages that would face to an alley instead of the street.

Mr. Gibeault questioned why Mr. Bowman is proposing to rezone to the R-3 District when he could build Single Family Detached Dwelling units on the current R-2 Zoning designation.

Mr. Bowman indicated that his reason for wanting to rezone to R-3 is that it would allow them to configure the single-family homes to look similar to the existing development.

Mr. Bowman indicated that the other option would be to develop this site as 15,000 square foot lots, which would permit them to build approximately 40-50 houses, or to develop under the Planned Residential Development (PRD) Ordinance, as previously proposed, with a mix of singles, duplexes and/or apartments.

Mr. Gibeault indicated to Mr. Bowman, that the planning members would like to find a way to leave that portion of the site zoned R-2 since only single family detached dwellings are proposed; while at the same time still get him to the 75 units that he is looking to build.

Mr. Gibeault asked Mr. Bowman if he has considered the purchasing of Transferrable Development Rights (TDRs) in order to obtain more density and the smaller lot size within the R-2 designation.

Mr. Bowman indicated that he was not aware of that option, but would be willing to look into that option.

Mr. Gibeault indicated that the B-1 site would have constraints due to traffic and the right-in, right-out proposal.

Mr. Bowman indicated that when they had their original proposal with the mix

of commercial and residential they had proposed a bridge connection which crossed over the creek and connected into Helen Avenue.

Mr. Bowman indicated that, at that time, if they were unsuccessful in reconstructing Route 23 and installing a light that they would come back and not push that traffic through Grandview, therefore, this B-1 use would not have any access into Grandview whatsoever.

Mr. Gibeault advised that the B-1 designation would only permit, by right, Agricultural uses; Community Facilities; Offices; Parks and Public Utilities.

Mr. Reed stated that the area proposed for R-3 would not prohibit anyone in the future from making that area 100% apartments, townhouses, etc. by right and therefore, the planning members and applicants need to find some mechanism. Mr. Reed stated that the TDR route is one mechanism to maintain the existing neighborhood of Grandview and not allow something which will impact that neighborhood tremendously.

Mr. Rathman had a concern that somehow the business traffic ends up getting out into the residential development and out onto Pleasure Road Mr. Rathman asked Mr. Bowman if he felt that a right-in, right-out access to accommodate a business use would be sellable to tenants, and what would happen if the right-in, right-out proposal doesn't work.

Mr. Bowman indicated that this is also a concern of his and that Pleasure Road really can't take anything more than what they are proposing here and that it would also be hard to cross the stream and build a road through the floodplain which prevents access to Pleasure Road and full build out of the site.

Mr. Gibeault advised that the public hearing for this rezoning petition and the following petition will take place on January 12, 2009 at 7:30 p.m.

Mrs. Douglas explained the PRD Ordinance and the TDR program for the audience.

Mr. Gibeault asked for public comment.

Mr. Gibeault asked that everyone wishing to speak, that wanted to be on public record, would need to come up to the podium and provide their name and address.

*Patron #1: Mr. Allen Hawkins, 1025 Grandview Boulevard*

*Mr. Hawkins asked, if the access along New Holland Pike will be right-in, right out only, then how would someone access Route 30 or head east?*

Mr. Bowman indicated that traffic items, such as this, would have to be worked through with the future Traffic Impact Study.

\*\*Note: The tape stopped recording briefly.

Patron #2: No name or address provided

*Patron #2 expressed his appreciation of Mr. Bowman for keeping the neighbors up to speed with the proposals.*

*Patron #2 expressed his concern about the uses that could possibly be placed on the site if it were to be rezoned R-3, such as apartment buildings, cluster developments, etc.*

*Patron #2 questioned the use of TDRs and the possibility of using them at this location to gain additional density and smaller lot sizes.*

*Patron #2 stated that he is also against the B-4 zoning due to the variety of uses that could occur which would allow intense light sources which could illuminate and destroy the neighborhood.*

Mr. Bowman stated that he will explore the TDR option, but under the ordinances right now, 200-250 homes could be built on this property without any rezoning under the PRD Ordinance, which could be apartments, townhouses, multi-family, whatever fits under the PRD.

Mr. Bowman stated that with this proposal of 75 single family dwellings, it seemed to be the best option for Charter Homes and the best option for the Grandview development.

Mr. Gibeault stated that all property owners have the right to develop their properties in accordance with what is permitted and that a Planned Residential Development (PRD) would be permitted on this property by Conditional Use, but there would be more hoops to jump through.

Mr. Gibeault indicated that the PRD Ordinance has been around since 1992 and that the Planning Commission has seen 4 PRDs since 1992. Mr. Gibeault explained the process for proposing a PRD.

Patron #3: Mrs. Helen Bushnell, 956 Grandview Boulevard

*Mrs. Bushnell stated that she has lived in Grandview for 60 years and asked Mr. Bowman why has he been at this 7 years and if he gets the idea that something is wrong.*

*Mrs. Bushnell stated that Grandview is such a tiny place and they don't need 200 new homes, and they don't need 75 homes there.*

*Mrs. Bushnell stated that the people that live in Grandview love it there, or else they wouldn't stay there and that there are old people and very young folks with families that love it.*

*Mrs. Bushnell asked why do we need this at all when that property could be used for something fabulous, and why is the applicant trying to make it look like Grandview, because it will never look like Grandview.*

*Mrs. Bushnell stated that Grandview Heights was the first “development in the United States”, and that nobody is ever going to make it look the same.*

*Mrs. Bushnell stated that she has sat through all of these meetings and listened to all of this, and that she just doesn’t understand and was hoping someone could explain to her why there is all the fuss with this.*

Mr. Gibeault indicated to Ms. Bushnell that this property, like the Grandview Development, is zoned for housing and that the property owners have the right to develop their property for housing.

Mr. Gibeault stated that people would love for farmed fields to stay that way forever, but that’s not practical with the zoning we have and the growth we have, so what we are trying to do is to make it the best possible use that we can while keeping neighbors and adjoining happy.

*Patron #4: Dave Montgomery, 949 Pleasure Road*

*Mr. Montgomery questioned if the area where the original farm is now going to stay R-2, or is this being proposed for B-1?*

Mr. Bowman indicated that the original farm area would be B-1.

*Patron #5: Mrs. Adrea Mehl, 879 Janet Avenue*

*Mrs. Mehl stated that she understands that Mr. Bowman wants to make the facades of the homes look like a Grandview house, in terms of the lot widths, and that right now with the R-2 zone, it would look like a country club house.*

*Mrs. Mehl questioned why Mr. Bowman can’t just redesign it and make the lots deeper and make the facades all look like Grandview while keeping the zoning the way it is.*

Mr. Gibeault indicated that there are zoning regulations for minimum lot width and depth.

*Patron #6: Mr. Charles Helm, 970 Helen Avenue*

*Mr. Helm stated that he has Mr. Bowman say that as it is now, being R-2, he could put townhouses and apartments there, however, the uses in the residential zoning list does not indicate such under the R-2 listings.*

Staff pointed out the Planned Residential Development use on Mr. Helm’s list and advised that such would be permitted by Conditional Use.

Patron #6: Keith Dieterle, 1121 Pleasure Road

*Mr. Dieterle questioned if, with the property the way it is, there would be a cap on how many townhomes that could be built?*

Mrs. Douglas advised that there are percentage criteria in the PRD and it would depend on how many different housing types a developer was proposing.

Patron #7: Ron Rill, 967 Pleasure Road

*Mr. Rill indicated that he and his wife, Sally, have been living in Grandview for 28 years and that he has had a concern for some time in regards to Pleasure Road.*

*Mr. Rill stated that Pleasure Road is posted at 25mph and that there is a school and two churches along there with many properties that have driveways, in which case they have to slow down in order to pull in their driveway.*

*Mr. Rill stated that there is a tremendous amount of speeding along Pleasure Road and it is a concern of his and he would like to know, with an addition like this proposal and with more traffic and people hurrying to get from one point to the other, what is the Township planning to do to control the traffic along that road.*

*Mr. Rill indicated that he has been told that Pleasure Road is a connecting road and that is why there are two yellow lines in the middle of the road and why Grandview Boulevard doesn't have two yellow lines, although its posted 35 mph over there.*

*Mr. Rill stated that something has to be done, possibly with speed bumps, more stop signs, a traffic circle at the end and asked if there is anything in the plans for traffic control along that road.*

Mr. Gibeault stated that the issue before the Planning Commission this evening is for rezoning and that, with regard to what Pleasure Road is posted and what people drive, and speed bumps, stop signs, etc., traffic is not a part of this proposal at this time, however, Mr. Gibeault urged Mr. Rill to bring his valid concerns to the Board of Commissioners.

Patron #8: Mike Boomsma, 1113 Helen Avenue

*Mr. Boomsma stated that one of his concerns was that if the area to the north would be rezoned to B-1, what would prevent someone from coming back later and requesting a rezoning to B-2, B-3, or B-4?*

Mr. Gibeault indicated that it would be the same process that is taking place this evening and that if it is rezoned to B-1, nothing is preventing Mr. Bowman, or someone else from coming back next month and requesting to go to B-2, although it's not very likely.

*Mr. Boomsma stated that back in 1995 the Planning Commission zoned this site as an R-2 designation and questioned what has happened since 1995 to the present that requires this to be undesirable use.*

Mr. Gibeault stated that he doesn't think anything has happened, and that the Planning Commission has an opinion in front of them from the developer who is saying that the property would be better for him to rezone it R-3, however, that's one person's opinion.

*Mr. Boomsma pointed out that the surrounding area is all Residential Zoned and stated that he thought that it looked like spot zoning with the proposal of the B-1 District, and stated that spot zoning is illegal under Pennsylvania Law.*

Mr. Wolf stated that it's important to note that those same people (the Planning Commission) that developed that 1995 Comprehensive Plan also developed a zoning classification for a PRD, a Planned Residential Development, which encourages developers to look at that particular option of increasing density in exchange for open space by adding mixed use, different types of uses, commercial shops, with the idea of townhouse, apartments, single family dwellings being developed on the same site in conjunction with light use commercial.

Mr. Wolf stated that he thinks all of the comments tonight make sense, but as he sits there and looks at a plan on a 70 acre property that is zoned for development, not a property that is zoned agricultural, the Township has to keep an open mind because we are dealing with an applicant that is local, and that is credible and cooperative when we could have out of state interest.

Mr. Wolf stated that the Planning Commission looked at a plan several months ago that was laid out for a PRD with over 200 units and retail, offices and other commercial space and that he is surprised that that PRD plan is still not in the works and he would've been surprised if that PRD would not have received full approval.

Mr. Wolf stated that he would encourage the audience to stay open minded when looking at a plan where he thinks will be the lowest density that could be submitted with future developers.

Mr. Wolf stated that with the widening of Route 30 within the past 10 years, he thinks that changing that portion abutting the highway to B-1 makes sense versus constructing homes along a major roadway.

*Mr. Boomsma expressed his concerns regarding traffic and noise and lighting concerns associated with the rezoning to B-1.*

Mr. Wolf stated that those items would double if the land was to be developed under the PRD provisions.

*Mr. Boomsma expressed his concerns about the character of the development and felt that additional commercial space is not necessary in Manheim Township.*

*Patron #9; Ms. Carolyn Kauffman, 1004 (street name inaudible)*

*Ms. Kauffman asked Mr. Bowman what the units for the proposed development will look like and where the apartments and townhouses are located.*

Mr. Bowman indicated that under this proposal, all of the units are single family detached housing and that no townhouses or apartments are being proposed.

*Ms. Kauffman spoke but was inaudible.*

There were several other patrons that spoke out of the audience, but were inaudible.

On a motion by Mr. Reed, seconded by Mr. Rathman, it was recommended to table this rezoning request.

**Motion Approved 6-0.**

**Public Hearing scheduled for January 12, 2009.**

**4. Charter Homes at Grandview Inc. - Rezoning Petition - New Holland Pike and Route 30 - Request to change zoning of property from R-2 Zone to B-1 Zone.**

*\*\*Note: Discussions and comments involving this petition took place in conjunction with the above rezoning petition.*

On a motion by Mr. Reed, seconded by Mr. Rathman, it was recommended to table this rezoning request.

**Motion Approved 6-0.**

**Public Hearing scheduled for January 12, 2009.**

**New Business - Continued**

**3. Stockyards of Lancaster Office Park - Preliminary/Final Land Development Plan - 1300 Marshall Avenue - Zoned Central Manufacturing (City of Lancaster)**

Present representing this Preliminary/Final Land Development Plan was Mr. Howard Dieter TCH Realty & Development Co., LLC; Mr. Ronald Secary, Snyder-Secary & Associates, Mr. Timothy Harris, applicant and Mr. Frank Vargish, Blakinger, Byler and Thomas.

Mr. Dieter indicated that the initial development of this project site would include a 40,000 square foot office building to house 10 employees initially and then up to 60-70 employees. The site is 21 acres and 5 acres would be disturbed with this plan.

Mr. Dieter indicated that no land development is proposed within Manheim Township, all of which is located within the City of Lancaster's jurisdiction.

Mr. Dieter indicated that roadwork along Marshall would involve Manheim Township as well as the city.

Mr. Dieter advised that future uses could include a 145,000 square foot flex office, a bank and a restaurant, but at this point they are just contemplating on possible future uses in order to figure out the extent of roadway reconstruction that will be necessary.

Mr. Dieter indicated that a right turn lane into the main entrance and widening and curbing along Marshall is proposed and that the main access will line up with the post office access across the street.

Mr. Dieter indicated that initially the intersection will not meet signal warrants, even with the projected traffic, but as they get into the full second phase of development they are going to have to go back and revise the traffic study and the impacts.

Mr. Dieter indicated that Plum Street is not able to be reconstructed due to an existing building being located within the existing right-of-way as well as other existing issues which would prevent roadway reconstruction to Township standards.

Mr. Gibeault asked how future phases are planned for in order to determine what the necessary roadway improvements would need to be.

Mr. Harris indicated that the most appropriate way to do that is to provide a plan with the maximum density that can exist, then reach a certain density which would kick in the road improvements.

Mrs. Douglas indicated that would be a challenge and that typically the Traffic Impact Study considers the entire build out.

Brief discussions took place in regards to traffic and roadway improvements.

Mr. Rathman asked about truck trailers accessing the site and if they could use Plum Street.

Mr. Dieter indicated that there is a potential for truck traffic and that this first tenant would only need one docking bay.

Mr. Gibeault suggested that the applicants meet with staff to discuss Plum Street and to figure out what roadway improvements need to be done.

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

On a motion by Mr. Reed, seconded by Mr. Rathman, it was recommended to table this plan until all outstanding comments can be adequately addressed.

**Motion Approved 6-0.**

### **Public Comment**

There was no public comment.

### **Adjournment**

On a motion by Mr. Wolf, seconded by Mr. Reed, it was recommended to adjourn the meeting.

Motion approved 6-0 and the meeting adjourned at 11:10 p.m.

The next Regular Planning Commission meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, December 17, 2008 at 6:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Shannon L. Sinopoli