

**Planning Commission**  
**01/09/06**

Manor Township Planning Commission Agenda

Monday, January 9, 2006 Time: 7:30 P.M.

1. Call to Order
2. Pledge to the Flag
3. Roll Call
4. Public Comment
5. Re-organizational Meeting Elect Chairman Vice Chairman Secretary Appointments/Re-appointment by Township Supervisors for vacancies on the Board Set Meeting Dates for 2006
6. Approve Minutes of December 12, 2005 meeting
7. Old Business Rezoning Request The Murry Companies/Sher-Wal Inc. The rezoning request the change of the current zoning district for two (2) tracts of land located on the northeast corner of Weaver Road and Cornerstone Drive. The current zoning is general commercial (GC). The petition requests a zoning of the properties to RH1 high density residential flex zone. This was discussed last month and the Commission postponed comments until tonights meeting. The Commission needs to review and submit comments to the Township Supervisor.
8. New Business Hampilos Subdivision Waiver Request LCSDDLDO Sec. 602.16.C - The property is in Manor Township and is bounded to the north by Letort Road and to the south by Walnut Hill Road. The proposal is to subdivide the property for 32 single family residences. Originally, a boulevard entrance was proposed to provide a physical separation between the ingress and egress movements for the development and, in the event of an incident that would block one of the boulevard lanes, the other could serve as access to the development. The original waiver was approved with the condition the developer provide an emergency entrance through the residual property. On behalf of Keystone Custom Homes, RGS Associates is requesting a waiver of Section 601.16.C of LCSDDLDO. The LCPC previously granted a waiver of this section, with conditions, in a meeting held May 10, 2004. Please see the attached copy of the LCPC correspondence granting the waiver for background information. We are asking for a modification of the waiver due to conditions explained in the attachment. The Commission needs to review and make comments to the LCPC.
9. Other Business - Act 537 Update - Update on Regional Comprehensive Plan - Annual 2005 Report - Correspondence
10. Adjourn

## DRAFT Planning Commission Minutes

Monday, January 9, 2006 Time: 7:30 P.M.

The Manor Township Planning Commission met on Monday, January 9, 2006 at 7:30 p.m. at the Manor Township Municipal Building, 950 W. Fairway Drive, Lancaster, PA. Mr. Ahlfeld introduced the Commission members and led the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.

Members Present: John Ahlfeld, James Henke, Scott Haverstick, Donald Witmer, James Miller and Mary Glazier. Member Absent: Beth Herr Visitors Present: See Attached List

Public Comment There was no public comment.

Re-organizational Meeting Mr. Haverstick nominated that the three current positions be retained by John Ahlfeld as Chairman, Jim Miller as Vice Chairman and Mary Glazier as Secretary. The Commission was unanimously in favor of the slate as nominated. The meeting dates are the second Monday of each month with the exception of October when it is on Tuesday. Mr. Miller made a motion to accept the meeting dates as presented. Ms. Glazier seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously. Minutes Mr. Witmer made a motion to approve the minutes of the December 12, 2005. Mr. Haverstick seconded the motion and the motion carried with Mr. Miller abstaining.

Old Business Rezoning Request The Murry Companies/Sher-Wal Inc. The rezoning request the change of the current zoning district for two (2) tracts of land located on the northeast corner of Weaver Road and Cornerstone Drive. The current zoning is general commercial (GC). The petition requests a zoning of the properties to RH1 high-density residential flex zone. This was discussed last month and the Commission postponed comments until tonight's meeting. The Commission needs to review and submit comments to the Township Supervisor. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that there was a presentation on this request last month. Mr. Ahlfeld asked Mr. Butler, from David Miller Associates, to give a brief presentation on the request. Mr. Butler stated that there are two properties subject to this request totaling approximately 2.4 acres. The two tracts are located on the north side of Cornerstone Drive and the east side of Weaver Road right behind the Interior 2000 building. The properties are currently zoned General Commercial (GC). The properties to the south in the Woods Edge Development are currently zoned High Density Residential (RH). Essentially, the request is to take the two properties out of the General Commercial District and allow development under a High Density Residential Flex District. The difference between the flex and the high density zoning districts is the flex district allows some relaxed front yard setbacks that provide flexibility in the design of the tract. This would help in the design to eliminate a parking lot along Cornerstone Drive. Mr. Butler listed the uses that are allowed in the General Commercial District. Mr. Butler stated that the district the applicant is requesting allows for the multi-family town houses and single family homes. Based on the density that is permitted within the high density flex district, the maximum number of units that can be placed on this lot would be 28 dwelling units. Currently, under General Commercial zoning, offices and restaurants are permitted uses; there are two good examples of such uses that are right off South Centerville Road. There is an accountants office that is approximately 2300 square feet in size on a smaller lot than this lot and it generates over 400 trips per day; that is

twice as much as the residential district use would generate with twenty-eight (28) residential units. If this was a medical office or dental office, that same 2300 square foot office building would generate somewhere in the neighborhood of 1,250 trips per day. The restaurant at the end of Cornerstone Drive is approximately 8,000 square feet and using the high quality restaurant criteria in the trip generation manual, that restaurant would generate 720 trips per day. Mr. Butler stated that as presented in their petition, the property, even though zoned commercial, does not front on a collector or arterial street; this is a criteria for many of the uses permitted in the general commercial district and for the general commercial district as stated in the Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Butler stated that these are the only two lots in the Township zoned general commercial that do not have frontage on a collector or arterial street. Also, because of the configuration of the lot and its odd location between the Weaver Road and Post Oak Road intersection, it appears the only viable access to stay away from the intersection would be onto Cornerstone Drive. Mr. Butler stated that the lot coverage, stormwater, sewer, and water structures are in place for the type of development being proposed. Mr. Ahlfeld clarified that the Commission is not acting on any specific proposal for developing this tract of land tonight. Whether the land stays in its current zoning or is rezoned, it would be at some future time when a specific proposal is presented that it gets reviewed under the subdivision/land development ordinance and other regulations that apply. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that the Commission is looking solely at which of two zoning districts is more appropriate for this tract of land. The Planning Commission does not approve or disapprove this request. Their purpose is to make comments or recommendations to the Township Supervisors who would then make the final decision after having their own public hearing. Ms. Glazier asked if the location of this lot as a General Commercial zoning lot is so inappropriate, why was it zoned general commercial in the first place. The zoning predated everyone present, therefore, no one was able to answer Ms. Glaziers question. Bonnie Miller, 113 Bent Tree Drive, stated that it was stated this evening that the proposal is for twenty-eight (28) town homes and last month she understood it was for twenty-eight (28) apartments. Mr. Butler stated that it is for twenty-eight (28) dwelling units. Mr. Ahlfeld again stated that the Commission is not acting on any specific proposal and anything shown in the past may or may not be what the developer ends up choosing to develop. Ms. Miller asked what the date was that the traffic study was done. Mr. Butler stated that they did not do a traffic study. The applicant utilized trip generation in the County Land Development/Subdivision Ordinance and also through the Institute of Traffic Engineers; both generate rates for various uses. The applicant utilized multi-family housing because that generates the highest rates other than the single family detached housing. Also, the applicant used some of the neighborhood type commercial uses that are in the area and would fit the lot for the trip generated figures. John Zander, 101 Post Oak Road, asked that the Commission would consider redesigning the intersection of Weaver and Post Oak Roads because it is a problematic intersection. There are three stop signs at Weaver and Post Oak Roads and a stop sign at another separate intersection of Cornerstone Drive and Post Oak Road. Mr. Zander stated that he would like to see one intersection at Weaver Road. Mr. Butler stated that is something that would be discussed in the subdivision/land development process. Eileen Perugini, 101 Pine Bridge Lane, asked for a definition of high density residential versus high density residential flex. Ms. Perugini was advised that her property is zoned high density residential. Mr. Butler stated that the only difference is that the applicant is asking for a flex overlay that allows for the reduction of the front yard setbacks to allow flexibility in the site design. Ms. Perugini asked what area the property covered. Ms. Perugini asked if the density would be the same as if three eight-unit

townhouses were put on the property. Mr. Miller stated that the permitted density would be the same. Frank Peachey, 103 Post Oak Road, questioned the architectural style of the buildings and he was advised that they do not have the rezoning for the property yet, so there is no design for the units at this time. Mr. Peachey stated that the vehicles will park on Cornerstone Drive and with that road being narrow, parking on either side of the street will create a one lane street. That will make it difficult traveling the street. Mr. Butler stated that the applicant would be required to provide parking for the twenty-eight (28) units on the site. Ms. Miller stated that in looking at the Manor Township Zoning Ordinance under Section 207.2, it clearly states that restaurants and taverns are permitted uses, but does not include driveway through or fast food restaurants or nightclubs. Ms. Miller stated that last month there was a comment from the Board that a McDonalds could be built on the lot. Section 207.2 has been changed. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that the section was not changed. Ms. Miller stated that the majority of the Woods Edge homeowners bought into a community and some of them were made aware of the commercial zoning development possibilities. As the years have gone by, various revisions have been made and granted with little or no disclosure to the homeowners. The homeowners now feel that the Township should let the tract remain zoned Commercial General and the owner develop it accordingly. Ms. Miller stated that Mr. Butler said last month that they had done a traffic study and she wanted to know when and where it was done. Mr. Butler stated that there was no traffic study done. Ms. Miller stated that there is plenty of high density residential flex now and there will be more in the future. This parcel is surrounded by commercial on three sides. Ms. Miller stated that this request can be defined as spot zoning; she stated that she had a copy of the Manor Township Comprehensive Plan that states residential/commercial policies for the Township. Ms. Miller stated that she hopes that these policies will be followed. She indicated that she had two letters from residents that were unable to attend this meeting. Mr. Ahlfeld asked Ms. Miller when she used the word we who was that representing. Ms. Miller stated that was representing approximately thirty (30) people she had visited who were going to try to be at this meeting. Ms. Miller stated that she took the time to sit in the accounting office parking lot for one day, on a Tuesday; she counted sixty-two (62) cars that came to and from the site that day. Mr. Haverstick stated that he did not recall Mr. Butler saying he had done a traffic study. What he was saying at this meeting was consistent with what he told the Commission last month. Mr. Butler stated that under special exception uses, a drive through and fast food restaurant is permitted by special exception. Mr. Butler stated that he did not site any traffic study last month but did talk about trip generation rates. Mr. Butler referred to the Comprehensive Plan and read the section regarding general commercial areas. Ann Roberts, 142 Langley Square, asked what would be the maximum height of a building in the high density residential flex district. Ms. Roberts was advised that it was thirty-five (35) feet for a principal structure and thirty (30) feet for an accessory structure. Also, Ms. Roberts asked questions regarding the setbacks in the flex zoning district. Sue Sheeler, President of the Homeowners Association of Woods Edge, stated that she handles snow plowing, mowing, fertilization, and all the complaints. She asked that the Commission look at how much space is available for residents to pull in and out. Ms. Sheeler asked if the parking would be provided on the site. Mr. Butler stated that the parking would be on the site. Mr. Butler stated that there would be one access drive into a common parking area off of Cornerstone Drive. Ms. Sheeler stated that the residents on Cornerstone Drive all have issues trying to park and she would like to see more parking pads on this site. Ms. Sheeler stated that there are more cars for a rental unit than for their residents that own homes on an average. Ms. Sheeler stated that if these were rentals there would be more cars usually because there are

more people who are not related. Ms. Sheeler asked what will happen with Cornerstone Drive which is heavily traveled. How many parking spaces will be on the site to accommodate the twenty-eight (28) units. Ms. Sheeler stated that there are condos presently being built which will create more traffic. Ms. Sheeler stated that she wanted the Commission to consider how much more impact this use will have on an already congested area. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that they must weigh all the uses that are allowed in the General Commercial district for this site versus all the uses that are allowed in the residential zoning district. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that no matter what kind of development takes place, there would be more impact on the area than the vacant lots. The Commission needs to be thinking about what would be the impact of the commercial development versus the impact and appropriateness of residential development or the worse possible case under commercial versus the worse possible case under residential. Pat Lemay, 78 Sun Lane, stated that residents will be coming in and out at all hours of the day with a residential use and with an office, traffic would be primarily during the hours from 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Dan Deiter, 3471 Cornerstone Drive, stated that he lives directly across the street and he hears the business delivery trucks all hours of the night as well as the dumpster being emptied any hour of the day or night. The proposed homes would be very close to the existing businesses. Mr. Deiter stated that when he bought his property, he asked about the parcels and he was advised it was zoned commercial; they said it would not be a drive in or anything like that and we assumed it would be like an insurance building of some sort. Mr. Deiter stated that there is a noise factor to consider and believes it would be better to leave it zoned as it is. John Zander stated that he agreed with Mr. Deiter. He said it is zoned commercial and that is what it should be. Mr. Zander stated that Interiors 2000 and Rohrer's Hardware have grown in the past and if you take that land away you are taking away growth opportunities for those businesses. Missy Yanchuck, 105 Bent Tree Drive, stated that one of her concerns is the large storm swale that is between her property and the neighbor; she is concerned regarding additional stormwater drainage. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that there are storm drainage standards that must be met no matter what the land use is when the lot is developed. Andrea Petrillo, 356 Weaver Road, stated that she is currently boxed in with a church and receives a lot of water drainage from Leisure Lanes; rezoning will allow the developer to stuff in more houses and add more traffic to Weaver Road. Ms. Petrillo stated Weaver Road has already become a speed trap. She is afraid for her children getting on the school bus in the morning because people do not stop for the school bus and you are going to add more homes and more traffic. She stated that Weaver Road is a cut through for the Woods Edge Development. There is businesses going in all along Weaver Road and this is a residential area. Mark McClain, 123 Weaver Road, asked what the impervious coverage of the lot was and asked if they have to meet the coverage with whatever is proposed. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that they must meet the lot coverage. Mr. McClain asked why they do not have to meet the setback requirement. Mr. McClain was advised that the setbacks must be met. Mr. McClain stated he noticed there is easement for water and stated that they would have to take care of that water; otherwise, the people across the street will be flooded. Mr. McClain was advised that regardless of the zoning, the water runoff would have to be addressed. Mr. Peachey asked if anyone thought of leaving the tract as open space. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that there are ways that it could be kept open space. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that if the land is for sale, the homeowners association or the Township could buy it and if it is not for sale it could be condemned. Mr. Bauder stated that most townships require much more open space from the developer. Mr. Bauder stated that East Lampeter requires .027 acres per dwelling. If someone wanted to put twenty-eight (28) dwellings on that tract in East Lampeter Township, they would have to

provide .75 acres of open space. Mr. Bauder stated shame on Manor Township because the Township does not have a decent subdivision/land development ordinance. Mr. Bauder stated that if they had a good ordinance, it would be impossible to develop that tract into residential units. Mr. Bauder stated that there was a statement made about the amount of traffic and that is a self-mitigating thing. The East Lampeter Ordinance requires a traffic study for anything over 100 trips a day whether commercial or residential and if that traffic study shows that it is impossible to do the development, it won't be done. Mr. Bauder stated that there are other issues besides traffic and one of them is open space. Manor Township has been overrun by developers that do not provide open space because we do not have our own ordinance. Tom Acker, Post Oak Road, asked if a developer could not be required to present a proposed plan. Mr. Acker stated that it seems that they would not be asking for a zoning change unless they had some idea in mind for this particular property. Why is it unreasonable for the Township to ask them to supply you with more information about what they propose for the site before you are required to make a decision? Mr. Ahlfeld advised the audience that the applicant could present proposals so that they have an idea of what they say they have in mind at this time but they are not bound to stay with those proposals. When the land is zoned in any particular way, it can be developed in any way that the zoning district allows. To rezone something on the basis that it is going to be used for certain use, is what is called contract zoning and that is not legal. Ann Roberts stated that based on the comments that Mr. Ahlfeld just made, it sounds like maybe it would be a good idea to keep the zoning in tact rather than change it. Phil McCain, 117 Bent Tree Drive, asked how many parking spaces will be provided if it becomes a residential use. Mr. Butler stated that with twenty-eight (28) dwelling units, which would be the maximum density, a total of sixty-two (62) parking spaces are needed. Mr. McCain asked if Cornerstone Drive would be widened and Mr. Butler stated no. Mr. McCain asked if No Parking signs would be posted on Cornerstone Drive and Mr. Butler stated that only the Township could post no parking signs. Steve Terry, 201 Post Oak Road, stated that he does not want twenty-eight (28) apartments. Mr. Terry stated that those people do not have a vested interest in the development. Mr. Terry asked why this site would not be the same zoning as the same residential zoning they are living in. Mr. Butler stated that under high density residential, which is the zoning presently in the development, the same type of units are permitted. Mr. Butler stated that the type of dwelling does not change with the flex zoning. D. R. Smith, 125 Round Hill Lane, stated that there is low water pressure now. What happens when twenty-eight (28) more dwelling units are built? Mr. Smith asked if anything would be done to increase the water pressure. Mr. Miller stated that the water lines are run by the City of Lancaster. Mr. Zander stated that the only thing the developer is talking about is north of Cornerstone Drive. Has anyone given any consideration to what is west of Cornerstone Drive; these are single family homes. Matt Streets, 318 Post Oak Road, asked if the parking spaces would be along the road or behind the homes. Mr. Butler stated that under a multi-family design with the highest density possible, the parking lot would be within the property itself. Mr. Streets stated that one thing to consider is a true traffic study to see what kind of traffic there would be. Also, the parking issue would be a major concern if the units are rental units. If the property is commercial, mostly likely they would close at a reasonable hour in the evening and most of the cars will leave the area. If it is residential, the residents have friends and people who will park overnight; those cars will sit there more than a day. Mr. Streets stated that it would be nice to take the park on the other side of the development on Centerville Road and turn that into residential development and make this parcel the park. Mr. Peachey stated that the Commission asked about what the worse case scenario would be. Millersville University is

constantly looking for units and if these rental properties are three bedroom units, what is stopping Murry from renting out each bedroom to an individual college student. Mr. Peachey stated that to him that would be the worse case scenario. Jim Miller stated that if you imagine it remains commercial and Interiors 2000 buys those lots, combines the lots, and expands their building, the loading dock will move right across the street. The trucks will be there all night. Is that a preferable situation? They would be permitted to do that. Scott Haverstick stated that the reality is these lots are going to be developed and may well be developed in away that residents will find it erroneous. Mr. Haverstick stated that he kind of assumed that the residents would prefer residential as opposed to commercial. Mr. Haverstick stated that he is clearly hearing that is not the case but he is reluctant to sit here with the same group upset about whatever is built in the future. Mr. Haverstick stated that the fact of the matter is that this Commission has put forth the initiative to try to get their own rules so that they can have more park space. Mr. Haverstick stated that he supports that. Mr. Haverstick stated that this is not the case now however, so the Commission is faced with dealing with the reality that these two lots that are going to be developed. Nothing that is built on these lots will be as comfortable as having a vacant lot there. Don Witmer stated that he figured people would have liked to see it stay commercial. They bought their homes knowing what it was zoned. Mr. Witmer stated that there is a road with commercial properties on three sides and to put residential in that block looks like spot zoning. Mr. Witmer stated that with all the development of houses you need a little room for businesses. Mary Glazier stated that she agreed with Mr. Witmer. Ms. Glazier stated that she drove to the tract and was struck by how much more those two lots are a part of the commercial and how there is a natural dividing line. Ms. Glazier stated that from her prospective, the burden is on Mr. Murry who wants to change the zoning to convince her that this really needs to be changed and she does not see it. Ms. Glazier stated that clearly the residents do not support it and there is very little commercial land that is not developed in the Township. Ms. Glazier stated that for the time being she believes it should stay zoned the way it is. Jim Miller stated that he would offer a different view not necessarily disagreeing with the other thoughts expressed. Mr. Miller stated that initially it seemed when the Woods Edge project came in the whole plot made sense to be General Commercial. He stated that he supposed it was the view that something larger would more than likely go in their and yet the reality is it did not happen that way. Both of the two businesses, a small shopping center and Interiors 2000, in a sense are really separate from this lot and can be made separate from this lot. With the parking to the rear of any proposed town homes, that would make those town homes included in that development as part of the residential development. I would disagree that they are segregated in that fashion from the rest of the residential development. Mr. Miller stated that they probably have been remiss with how it is developed. The realities of planning are that it is not static and it changes all the time. It changes by what ever the dynamics are in the community that occurs over a period of time. The Commission is required to re-evaluate those things based upon what has occurred. If twenty (20) years ago a decision was made that something should be this way that absolutely flies in the face of what has occurred in the subsequent twenty (20) years, then we are remiss for not taking a look at that. Mr. Miller stated that he thinks it is totally appropriate to rely on what is out there today not on what was done fifteen to twenty years ago. Mr. Miller stated that as it is zoned today, General Commercial, we are remiss in the Township for having it zoned that way because it does not fit our own Comprehensive Plan criteria for being General Commercial. Mr. Miller stated that it does not front on a collector or arterial street; it should not take high intensity commercial uses and it would be totally inappropriate in that setting for that to occur. Mr. Miller

stated that is not to say that some of the General Commercial uses would not be appropriate there and enhance the neighborhood. Mr. Miller stated that with respect to the traffic, any commercial use would generate more traffic than a residential use. Mr. Miller stated that the reason that most of the residents are here is because they believe that the units will be apartments. Mr. Miller stated that there is a housing affordability crisis in the County and there is nothing wrong with providing apartments. Ann Roberts stated that she sees how the present rental units are not taken care of. If people do not have ownership in the community, they do not have the pride in their home. Murry is the person she holds responsible because he owns the units and he should be the one taking care of them. Ms. Roberts stated that she wants the zoning to remain as it is. John May, 100 Red Fox Road, stated that he has heard good arguments both ways. Mr. May stated that he can imagine if units are built against the loading docks what would happen. Mr. May stated that he foresees an office building that would buffer noise from the loading docks. Mr. May stated that he is leaning towards leaving the tract zoned the way it is. Mr. May stated that there is not a big inventory of general commercial land available in the Township and the tax base requires that. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that he has personally been puzzled by some of the concerns raised. He sees all the points and understands all the viewpoints expressed but he believes if he was living on the south side of Cornerstone Drive that he would prefer having residential across the street from him. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that when he drove to the area initially, he thought it would be a great place for a doctors office, CPAs office or something that would be a transition from Interiors 2000 to the residential use. However, the Commission does not know if that is the kind use that would go in there. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that it could be an expansion of Interior 2000, so that their loading docks are one hundred (100) feet from your front door instead of three hundred (300) feet or whatever they are now. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that it could be a use that is opened around the clock and would have traffic in and out all day long. The use could have people parking on the street when the lot is crowded. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that he would be concerned about the use bringing traffic off Columbia Avenue to the site. Basically, now all the commercial traffic is on Columbia Avenue and Centerville Road. If you had some kind of a magnet there that attracted commercial traffic into that site, dont you think there would be a good chance that once they are at this site and they want to get back to Centerville Road that they will cut through the development to get back to Centerville Road? If they are going to stores on Columbia Avenue, they are probably going to stay on Columbia Avenue and South Centerville Road. Once the traffic gets off Columbia Avenue, Mr. Ahlfeld stated that he believes they will be more likely to cut through the Woods Edge Development. Mr. Zander stated that all the commercial traffic for Interiors 2000 uses Weaver Road and not Columbia Avenue. Ted Gingrich, 110 Bent Tree Drive, asked if Weaver Road is commercial or residential. Mr. Ahlfeld advised him that it is Mixed Residential Commercial (MRC) zoning and Mr. Ahlfeld listed some of the commercial uses for that district that are listed in the ordinance. A resident stated that commercial vehicles are talked about and many townships have signs up with restrictions regarding commercial vehicles. Mr. Miller stated that is all the more reason why general commercial should not be mixed with residential. Bonnie Miller thanked the Board for allowing the residents to come forward and voice their opinions. Joseph Gehres, 268 White Chapel Road, stated that there are college students up the street from him causing problems with regards to parking. A resident stated that the Commission should visit the area that Mr. Murry owns and rents to see how the buildings are not maintained. Jim Henke stated that he has listened intently and has heard excellent points for both sides. Mr. Henke stated that to a certain degree he also feels driving down Cornerstone Drive having residential on either side is more attractive than the

alternative of a loading dock or parking compound along the street. Mr. Henke stated that he wished everyone sitting here could sign a waiver that if there was some sort of commercial use was proposed a year from now that was a twenty-four (24) hour service, that you would not be sitting here asking why it was allowed. If you talk about just an up scale restaurant, for example, when the restaurant would be getting busy is when the residents would be coming home from work trying to find parking spaces. Mr. Henke stated that in the General Commercial district, the building height is up to seventy (70) feet now. Mr. Henke stated that he is concerned that there are uses that are not compatible with residential uses in the general commercial district. Guy Eshelman stated that he owns property at the corner of Weaver and Post Oak Roads. Mr. Eshelman stated that the area being discussed is a city block at the corner of Columbia Avenue and Centerville Road. If you don't want commercial uses there, where in the Township would you like see commercial uses. Everything across the highway is commercial. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that personally he thinks there are so many vacant commercial buildings that no more commercial land is needed at this time. Donald Witmer made a motion to recommend to the Supervisors that they deny Mr. Murrays rezoning request. Mary Glazier seconded the motion and the motion carried four to two with Mr. Miller and Mr. Henke opposing the motion.

New Business Hampilos Subdivision Waiver Request LCSDDLDO Sec. 602.16.C - The property is in Manor Township and is bounded to the north by Letort Road and to the south by Walnut Hill Road. The proposal is to subdivide the property for 32 single family residences. Originally, a boulevard entrance was proposed to provide a physical separation between the ingress and egress movements for the development and, in the event of an incident that would block one of the boulevard lanes, the other could serve as access to the development. The original waiver was approved with the condition that the developer provide an emergency entrance through the residual property. On behalf of Keystone Custom Homes, RGS Associates is requesting a waiver of Section 601.16.C of LCSDDLDO. The LCPC previously granted a waiver. Keith Miller, from RGS Associates, stated the tract of land is located between Letort and Walnut Hill Road and southwest of Millersville Borough. The plan before the Commission in the past had a very similar format. Mr. Miller stated that they are looking at thirty-two (32) residential units on the land. The applicant is trying to purchase the land owned by Christ Hampilos. The problem with the lot is the width of the lot at Walnut Hill Road is not wide enough to meet the intersection separation requirements of the County Ordinance. It is being classified as a cul-de-sac street that exceeds the six hundred (600) foot requirement. Previously the Commission had reviewed and recommended approval of this waiver to the LCPC based on a provision to allow the construction of an emergency access through the residual tract along Letort Road. The applicant is having a difficult time obtaining that permission from the owner of the property as part of the sales agreement; Mr. Miller presented a copy of the pending litigation against the property owner. Mr. Miller stated that they are still intending to provide the potential for an emergency access between Lots 11 & 12, as shown on the plan. What is proposed as part of Street A, is a boulevard similar to what was previously reviewed. The applicant is proposing to widen the openings for the ingress/egress on the boulevard. Mr. Miller stated that what they are proposing for consideration is that if they put ingress/egress lanes that are wide enough in the event that one of lanes is blocked by an accident or an emergency vehicle activity, the lane would be wide enough to accommodate two-way traffic in extreme circumstances. In essence, we would be providing the same emergency access opportunity that was proposed through the residual tract to Letort Road. Mr. Miller stated that they are proposing a mountable curb on the boulevard that

will be approximately fifteen (15) feet wide and that could be driven across. Mr. Haverstick asked what the nature of the litigation is. Mr. Miller stated that the owner would not agree, as part of the sale agreement, to allow that emergency access through the residual tract. Mr. Haverstick asked if the applicant had taken title to the property and Mr. Miller stated that they have not. Don Witmer asked if there are any other alternatives for the second access. Mr. Miller stated that the adjoining owner is not interested at development at this time. Mr. Witmer asked if they had considered going through Pflumm property to connect to South Duke Street. Mr. Miller stated that has not been pursued. Mr. Henke asked where the church property is in relation to this tract. Mr. Miller stated that it currently sits in a north south orientation with the parking on the east side of the building. Mr. Haverstick stated that he believed there was a grass area between the driveway access to the church and their parcel. Mr. Henke asked if there is anyway an emergency access could be acquired from the church. Ms. Glazier asked if the second emergency access is required because of the length of the street. Mr. Miller explained how the length of the cul-de-sac street is determined. Ms. Glazier asked how many units would be at the north end on the cul-de-sac street. Mr. Miller stated that the street it is ten (10) feet short of the requirement. Ms. Glazier suggested several options she felt would be available. One option was not the build the units at the north end on the cul-de-sac street at the present time until a time in the future when the street could be continued. Mr. Haverstick asked Danny Whittle how the County interprets where a cul-de-sac begins. Mr. Whittle stated that the street length would be considered from Walnut Hill Road to the end of the cul-de-sac. Mr. Whittle stated that he had talked to the designers of the project several weeks ago about the emergency access issue. The seller is not willing to grant the emergency access. Mr. Whittle stated that his advice to them was to convince the Township Planning Commission that they need this relief. Mr. Whittle stated that a solution is to make a smaller development until the land on either side is available. Ms. Glazier stated that coming out onto Letort Road would be a nightmare. Mr. Miller stated that it was only for emergency access situations. Mr. Jim Miller asked what the rationale behind six hundred (600) feet as a maximum cul-de-sac length is. Mr. Whittle stated that the six hundred (600) foot distance deals with issues such as waterline pressure, emergency access, and snow that need to be plowed and stored. These are the items that determine the maximum six hundred (600) foot cul-de-sac length. Mr. Miller stated that it does not seem like the six hundred (600) feet is related to safety issues. Mr. Whittle stated that if it is a safety issue at all, it is the number of dwellings that could be isolated because of some catastrophe. Ted Gingrich asked what the width is of the double boulevard. Mr. Miller advised him that it is sixty-seven (67) feet from right-of-way to the right-of-way. Mr. Gingrich stated that is not much room if it is block by an emergency vehicle. Mr. Gingrich suggested that the boulevard be one way in and one way out. Mr. Haverstick stated that one is going to be an entrance and one is going to be an exit divided by a fifteen (15) foot strip. Keith Miller stated that they had a concern about making the boulevard too wide. They were concerned people may mistakenly use the boulevard, if it is too wide, as a two-way road. Mr. Henke asked what the sight distance was along the frontage on Walnut Hill Road. Keith Miller stated that they meet the PennDot sight distance criteria. Mr. Miller stated that the more centralized Street A is, the better the situation as far as common ingress/egress. Jim Miller stated that regardless whether there is a second entrance and not assuming that the property to the west will be developed someday and the true second entrance goes in from the intersection of Streets B & C to the end of the cul-de-sac, there is still only one way out of that cul-de-sac. Jim Miller stated that no matter what happens at the entrance, there is still only way out of the cul-de-sac. Jim Miller stated that this situation is a result of some old

trivial zoning requirements that really do not fit here very well. This is a minor request, although Jim Miller stated that the issues of ingress and egress are important issues. Mr. Haverstick stated that he would like to see an emergency access. Mr. Haverstick stated that the access possibly could be where Lot 6 is or approach the church to see if you can connect into their driveway or the excavators driveway. Jim Miller stated that could be a potential liability because you would have a public street going onto private property. Mr. Miller stated that he is not sure that is something the Township Solicitor would be comfortable with. John May stated that the results of the litigation may make this whole situation a mute point. Mr. Strauss, from Homefields, pointed out where their property is located in relation to the parcel being discussed. Mr. Strauss stated that they have a 1.3 acre parcel between them and the proposed development and they border the Hampilos property. Mr. Strauss asked if this waiver was previously approved with the emergency access through the residual parcel onto Letort Road. Mr. May stated that it was approved conditioned upon the emergency access route being obtained. Mr. Strauss stated that there are very few spots on Letort Road that are safe to enter the road. Mr. Strauss questioned whether the access onto Letort Road would be maintained. He asked if there would be a gate there. Mr. Haverstick stated that they are talking along the lines of a gated egress. Mr. Strauss stated that he is also concerned with the water runoff with regards to not just the amount but also the character of the water; he stated that Homefields is an organic farm. Mr. Strauss stated that their organic farm is in the middle of a piece of property that is zoned for medium residential density development. Mr. Strauss stated that the reason for their location is that they needed to have access to public transportation and they needed to be convenient to their shareholders. Ms. Lemay asked if the property needed to be subdivided and she asked if her assumption that the subdivision has not yet occurred is correct. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that she was correct that the property has not been subdivided at this time. Harold James, 136 Walnut Hill Road, stated that he is concerned that Walnut Hill Road is not wide enough and the proposed access to this development would be wider than the existing road. Would that cause confusion? Mr. James stated that there is also a concern regarding fire equipment getting into the site. James Miller made a motion to recommend to the LCPC a waiver of the length of the cul-de-sac from the LCSDLD Ordinance. Mr. Ahlfeld seconded the motion. Mr. Henke stated that he does not have a problem with the boulevard entrance as it is designed to serving that number of units. He continued by stating that he would like to see some effort be made to gain a paved access through the church or the excavating company with possibly a knock down gate. Mr. Henke stated that an emergency access is warranted if a second primary access cannot be obtained. Mr. Haverstick and Mr. Witmer stated that they agreed with Mr. Henke. Mr. Ahlfeld asked to what standards an emergency access has to be constructed. Mr. Whittle stated that their Ordinance indicates that there needs to be more than one entrance and exit from developments of this size. The reason the cul-de-sac was not considered before is because it was proposed to be a temporary cul-de-sac with anticipation that at some time in the future the road would be extended to Letort Road. In the meantime, there would be an easement to allow a secondary emergency access through the route that in the future would be a road. Mr. Whittle stated that it would have to be reasonably improved. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that theoretically it could be an access through two properties, like Lot 1 and 2, if it only requires an area clear of vegetation. Mr. Haverstick stated that he would feel more comfortable with something other than driving across someones yard. Mr. Haverstick stated that he would like to see a road bed of some sort and not just a grass yard. Keith Miller asked why having a knock down gate between lots would be significantly better than having one of the boulevards overly widened as they have proposed. Jim

Miller stated that he was withdrawing his motion and Mr. Ahlfeld stated he agreed to the withdrawal since he had seconded the motion. Keith Miller asked for clarification as to what the applicant should look at in regards to the emergency access. Mr. Whittle stated that the redesigned boulevard entrance needs to be discussed; the plan shows two eighteen (18) foot driving lanes with a mountable curb into the median and mountable curb onto the sidewalk on either side. Mr. Whittle stated that is a wide space that in an emergency two cars or two ambulances could pass. In the absence of a through street going to Letort Road and expecting sometime an access through to the property to the west that would have provided the emergency access in the opinion of not having to ask for a waiver it would have been the opinion of the staff at LCPC to recommend that the emergency access was not an issue. That is why the cul-de-sac is the only issue that they are addressing at this point. If this Commission feels that there is not an adequate emergency access, than that would be a reason for this Commission not to accept the plan. Mr. Ahlfeld asked if it is the thinking of the Commission that they are open to looking at other alternatives to provide another kind of emergency access somewhere. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that they could not act tonight on this waiver because they need more details to look at other alternatives. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that the Commission will table this proposal until next month.

Other Business Act 537 No Update. Update on Regional Comprehensive Plan There have been a number of meetings basically to talk regarding fine-tuning of the plan. There will be a dinner at Gordinier Hall at 6:00 p.m. on February 9. Mr. May stated that all the Supervisors will be attending the Multimunicipal Workshop and he would like to see the Planning Commission members attend also. Annual 2005 Report A copy of the report was given to each member that contained a record of all the meetings of 2005 with a cover memo enclosed. Correspondence Ms. Glazier stated that she had letters from the LCPC regarding action they had taken on what was recommended and the letters would be available if anyone wanted to look at them.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary Glazier Secretary

Recording Secretary Evelyn Rineer

Planning Commission Meeting

02/13/06

Manor Township Planning Commission Agenda

Monday, February 13, 2006 Time: 7:30 P.M.

1. Call to Order
2. Pledge to the Flag
3. Roll Call

#### 4. Public Comment

#### 5. Approve Minutes of January 9, 2006 meeting

6. New Business 3020 Sketch Plan & Waiver Requests The proposed plan involves a single 2.425 acre subject tract as represented on the Plans. The subject tract provides for an existing commercial/business facility including an existing office building and associated parking facilities. The lot is located on the south side of Columbia Avenue, approximately 750 feet east of Centerville Road in Manor Township, Lancaster County, PA. The plans propose a four-story office building expansion totaling 20,400 sq. ft. (all floors) for an expansion of the existing sites use. Associated with the proposed building will be required parking improvements, internal circulation facilities, and stormwater management facilities. Waiver request from the County Ordinance includes the following: Sec. 302 Preliminary Plan Application; Sec. 602.05.A Curbing with Parking Compound; Sec. 603.03 Bicycle Parking Facility. The Commission needs to review the sketch plan and make recommendations on the waiver requests to the LCPC.

Parkfield Phase 2 Final Plan Parkfield is located between Hershey Mill Road & Donerville Road. The second phase will be developed adjoining Phase 1 and connecting to Donerville Rd. Phase 2 contains approximate 41 acres and proposes 71 single-family lots. Density will be 1.83 units per acre. The site has public water and sewer. The tracts are zoned (RL1) Low Density Residential Flex. The Commission needs to review the final plan for Phase 2 and make recommendations and comments to the LCPC.

Crossgates Phase VII Final Plan - Waiver Requests The Crossgates Golf Course and Residential Development received preliminary plan approval in 1991. Crossgates Phase VII will be the third residential section. There will be 109 townhouses and duplex dwelling units. It will be adjacent to Phase IV with access from Murry Crossway. The Zoning District is (RH1) High Density Residential Flex. Public water and sewer will serve the project. The applicant is requesting the following waiver requests from the LCSDLDO: Sec. 602.02 Cartway width for one private street Maquire Ct. Sec. 602.06 Sidewalks along both sides of the street Sec. 602.08 Minimum Horizontal Radius for Private Street, Maquire Ct. Sec. 602.09 Minimum 150 separation between intersections for private street Maquire Ct. and mailbox access drive. The Commission needs to review and make comments to the LCPC on the final subdivision plan and waiver requests.

John W. & Mary A. Metzger Final Subdivision Plan - The property is located at 1765 1785 Temple Avenue. The applicant wishes to subdivide the existing townhouses onto individual lots. The Zoning Hearing Board granted a variance for the minimum lot width for townhouses on January 4, 2006. Public water and sewer serve the property. The property is located in the residential high density (RH) zoning district. The Commission needs to review and make comments and recommendations to the LCPC.

#### 7. Other Business - Act 537 Update - Update on Regional Comprehensive Plan - Township Subdivision/Land Development Ordinance - Correspondence

#### 8. Adjourn

## DRAFT Planning Commission Minutes

Monday, February 13, 2006 Time: 7:30 P.M.

The Manor Township Planning Commission met on Monday, January 9, 2006 at 7:30 p.m. at the Manor Township Municipal Building, 950 W. Fairway Drive, Lancaster, PA. Mr. Ahlfeld introduced the Commission members and led the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.

Members Present: John Ahlfeld, Beth Herr, James Henke, Scott Haverstick, Donald Witmer, Mary Glazier and James Miller. Visitors Present: See Attached List

Public Comment Linda Strauss, Founder and Board Secretary of Homefields and property owner of 357 S. Duke Street, Millersville, read a narrative she had written to the Planning Commission regarding the impact on the Homefields Organic Farm Program if the proposed Hampilos/Keystone Custom Homes Development would take place. Ms. Strauss explained that adults who have intellectual or developmental disabilities live in the home at Homefields. Ms. Strauss gave a brief history of Homefields, explained their present operation and gave her opinion as to the impact that the proposed development would have on their property. Mr. Ahlfeld asked Ms. Strauss if they wanted to be placed on next months agenda and Ms. Strauss indicated they would like to be on the agenda.

Minutes Mr. Miller made a motion to approve the minutes of January 9, 2006. Mr. Haverstick seconded the motion and the motion carried with Beth Herr abstaining.

New Business 3020 Sketch Plan & Waiver Requests The proposed plan involves a single 2.425 acre subject tract as represented on the Plans. The subject tract provides for an existing commercial/business facility including an existing office building and associated parking facilities. The lot is located on the south side of Columbia Avenue, approximately 750 feet east of Centerville Road in Manor Township, Lancaster County, PA. The plans propose a four-story office building expansion totaling 20,400 sq. ft. (all floors) for an expansion of the existing sites use. Associated with the proposed building will be required parking improvements, internal circulation facilities, and stormwater management facilities. Waiver request from the LCSDDLDO includes the following: Sec. 302 Preliminary Plan Application; Sec. 602.05.A - Curbing with Parking Compound; Sec. 603.03 Bicycle Parking Facility. The Commission needs to review the sketch plan and make recommendations on the waiver requests to the LCPC. George Smith from Rettew Associates presented the plan. Mr. Smith stated that project being reviewed is the 3020 project which is basically the Rettew Associate business offices located east of the intersection of South Centerville Road and Columbia Avenue. It is a 2.4-acre tract that is zoned General Commercial. The tract has Rettews existing office building which is a three-story building with over 16,000 square feet of office space on three floors. There are enough parking facilities for the proposed business. Also associated with the project is two existing points of access; one is from South Centerville Road and the other is from Columbia Avenue. Both access drives are private with associated easements. These were created through previous land development associated with the subject tract. Currently, utilities service the site including sewer and water. Stormwater is collected into a conveyance system and stormwater management facilities are located on the site. With the proposed expansion, we are taking the existing use and expanding

it; a four-story office building is proposed. Associated with the proposed expansion, there will be an expansion of the existing parking facilities that serves the site. The existing points of access will not be changed other than minor modifications such as the point of connection with the existing building and the proposed building. This will be modified to generate a more efficient traffic circulation with the proposed expansion. The plan will go through the standard land development process where the plan will be reviewed for stormwater and landscaping. The sketch plan before the Commission is engineered to meet the grading, zoning requirements, and the LCSDLDO requirements. Mr. Smith listed the waiver requests. 1) Waiver of the preliminary plan process The project is fairly small in size and represents an expansion of an existing permitted use. Currently, there is existing access to the site that will be preserved and maintained. Associated with the final land development plan, we will be providing full stormwater management facilities in accordance with the Manor Township Stormwater Ordinance and we will be designing the plans to the level of final land development with respect to stormwater, grading, landscaping and traffic circulation. We met with Township staff and Danny Whittle from the LCPC previously to discuss the project and to go over some specifics. 2) Waiver of the Bicycle Parking Facilities We have designed the parking based upon the intended usage to the site, which is a commercial business facility and we are proposing to provide a designated indoor parking facility for any bicyclist that may access the site. 3) Waiver of the curbing within parking compounds All the areas adjacent to the proposed building are proposed to have curbing. One of the considerations we will be dealing with is the stormwater management. Currently, an existing basin is on the site and we are proposing to retrofit that existing basin and provide the proper volume for the increase of impervious area. We will propose to provide the required volume through the use of retaining walls. The site designers suggested taking the final course of the wall and elevating that approximately eight inches above existing grade; this would function in the same respect that a curb would. Any parking area that is immediately adjacent to the retrofitted basin would have that proposed wall barrier that would prevent any type of over shooting the parking and would provide a safety measure around the proposed basin. The proposed parking lot and landscape islands are proposed not to be curbed. The site itself is fairly flat and unfortunately there is not a lot of grade change; in designing the site with the proposed parking expansion, they are really trying to match existing grades, which are less than 2% in some cases and trying to minimize any cut and fill. Mr. Smith stated that by eliminating curbing on the upper portion of the site, they are still allowed to preserve the natural drainage that goes across the site without low spots or drastically changing the natural flow across the site. In order to address the landscaping requirements, we have provided two primary landscaping islands that will have trees and other landscaping. The islands will provide a natural delineation for the eye of the traffic circulating through the parking facility. The existing conditions are very similar in that there is no curbing in the existing parking lot and it functions well. The existing landscaping areas are serving to pick up the natural drainage and it works without forcing water to a low spot. In the new parking areas, no curbing will allow water to flow into the landscape island and ultimately to the basin. With the elimination of the curbing, additional stormwater facilities have been eliminated for the low spots that are normally needed and the design promotes an overland flow using the entire landscaping area as a means to pick up water. In talking to the engineers, these will be designed as best management practices facilities to allow infiltration through the landscaping areas prior to the stormwater getting to the basin. We will be using the existing natural vegetation that surrounds the site and supplementing it with the required screening and landscaping. The last issue not specifically identified on the

agenda would be a three meeting delay that will be presented at the formal land development submission. Mr. Miller asked why the building is not parallel to the existing building. Mr. Smith stated with the walkways, the natural connection, and working with the architect lent itself to the building alignment. In addition, they were using the parking lot as a general reference. Mr. Miller asked how high the retaining wall would be. Mr. Smith stated that the wall would be approximately six feet. Ms. Glazier asked Mr. Smith to point out where the wall would be built. Ron Beam, one of the partners in 3020 Associates, compared the proposed wall to the wall on the stormwater basin at Interiors 2000. Mr. Beam stated that it works real well for Interior 2000 and it seems to be easily maintainable and looks nice. Mr. Beam stated that in regards to the building alignment, it is a large building and if at some point in time Rettew is not the tenant, there is a potential for them to lease it to two different parties and it will look like two separate buildings. Mr. Henke asked Mr. Smith to elaborate on the landscape islands. Mr. Smith stated that instead of being mounded like a traditional mulched bed, the bed will be sunk so all the drainage going across the site will flow into the landscape islands as kind of a glorified swale. The soil in the landscape islands but will be a combination of washed river gravel with a sandy soil medium underneath; the soil will promote drainage or at least some type of infiltration capacity for the BMP facilities. The intent is based upon some of the provisions recommended by the Conservation District where you take the stormwater flow from the parking lot and put it into an elongated management facility that will maximize the green surface that this water can be in contact with. By eliminating the curbing, they are able to have a natural collection area with the two proposed BMP facilities and get the water where we want it to go. Mr. Beam stated that they wanted to do more than they had to in terms of infiltration, because that is the business that Rettew is in. They wanted to have some examples to show different people. We did a lot of testing on the site and found out that the site has very poor permeable soils. By designing without curbing, they can get as much infiltration as possible. They wanted to keep this site at its original elevation as much as possible because the permeable area is in that first foot of soil. Mr. Henke asked questions regarding the landscaping. Mr. Henke asked if snow removal would be a problem. Mr. Beam stated that care would have to be taken as to where the snow can be pushed. Mr. Beam stated that the individual plowing snow prefers that there is no curbing. Bonnie Miller, 113 Bent Tree Drive, asked if this was the first building to be built commercially that was discussed two meetings ago that was three stories high with a peaked roof and four stories high if it was a flat roof. Ms. Miller asked if this building would comply with zoning and she was informed it would comply. Ms. Miller asked how many parking spaces were required for a four-story 20,000 square foot office building. Mr. Smith stated that one parking space is required for every 300 square feet of floor area and he calculated that 124 parking spaces are required for this proposed expansion; he stated that there are just under 130 spaces with the final parking configurations. Mr. Miller made a motion to recommend to the LCPC the waiver of the preliminary plan process for the application based upon the sketch plan that was presented tonight. Ms. Herr seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously. Mr. Miller made a motion to recommend to the LCPC the waiver of the curbing within the parking compound requirement. Mr. Haverstick seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously. Mr. Haverstick made a motion to recommend to the LCPC a waiver of the outside bicycle parking facility with the stipulation that there be an internal designated parking bicycle facility. Ms. Glazier seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously.

Parkfield Phase 2 Final Plan Parkfield is located between Hershey Mill Road & Donerville

Road. The second phase will be developed adjoining Phase 1 and connecting to Donerville Rd. Phase 2 contains approximate 41 acres and proposes 71 single-family lots. Density will be 1.83 units per acre. The site has public water and sewer. The tracts are zoned (RL1) Low Density Residential Flex. The Commission needs to review the final plan for Phase 2 and make recommendations and comments to the LCPC. Al Olah, registered landscape architect with Rettew Associates, presented the plan. Glenn Esbenshade, a partner in Fieldcrest Associates, was also present. Mr. Olah stated that the plan was before the Planning Commission in February 2003 as a 185 lot single-family subdivision. In October of 2003, they came before the Commission with the final plan for Phase I. Phase I is built out and they are now ready to begin Phase II. In Phase II, Fieldgate Drive will extend to Greenhedge Road and out to Donerville Road. This was a requirement of the overall plan that when Phase II was developed, the developer had to make sure the connection from Hershey Mill Road to Donerville Road was completed. Also, Greenhedge Road will extend to a point that will be a temporary cul-de-sac. Farmstead Road will also be extended. Most of the work for the project was done as part of the preliminary plan. The developer already has PennDot approval for the connection into Donerville Road and has been getting time extensions to do that work. The developer has water and sewer capacity for the project; part of the overall plan is to work with the Columbia Water Company to extend a whole new system along Hershey Mill Road that would bring water service into their site. Mr. Olah pointed out the sanitary sewer line and connection on the plan. The developer has the zoning approval in place for the sanitary sewer that goes through the floodplain. The developer is not asking for any additional modifications in Phase II. The E & S plan has been approved. The plans have been submitted to the LCPC. The plan has been submitted to the Township Engineer and five minor comments have been received. There are a total of 76 lots on about 41 acres of land in Phase II instead of 71 that was listed on the agenda. Phase I was 54 or 55 lots and Phase III will be 55 lots. Mr. Henke asked how many homes are built in Phase I. Mr. Olah stated about 32 or 33 homes. Bonnie Miller asked for a definition of low density flex compared to high density flex. Ms. Miller had questions regarding the density and the future land use regarding density. Richard Bauder asked about the configuration of the open space. Mr. Olah stated that the idea is that this area along the stream was an ideal opportunity for a linear walkway and the flat area could provide a parking area for other residents to come and park to use the open space. Some of the area is in the detention basin. Mr. Bauder asked what the slope on the open space and Mr. Olah stated that the plans did not show the slope. Mr. Bauder asked if the developer is planning for public access, pedestrian easements, bike easements, etc .for the open space. Mr. Olah stated that it would be developed to whatever the Township wants to do with the land when the Township takes ownership of the open space. Mr. Bauder asked the Commission what the target density was when they approved this plan. Mr. Bauder stated that he thinks the target density now is an average of 5.5. He asked if that was correct. Jim Miller stated that the current LCPCs goal is a 5.5 density. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that the LCPC is actually talking about higher densities than that. Mr. Bauder stated that he is surprised that this plan was approved with this low density since this area has water and sewer. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that is what the zoning was at the time. Mr. Bauder stated that just recently the Supervisors rezoned the Eshelman Tract to higher density. Mr. Bauder asked if there was no interest to rezone the tract at the time it was approved. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that is correct they did not talk about rezoning at that time. Mr. Henke made a motion to recommend to the LCPC approval of Parkfield Phase II Final Plan. Mr. Haverstick seconded the motion and the motion

carried with Jim Miller abstaining.

Crossgates Phase VII Final Plan - Waiver Requests The Crossgates Golf Course and Residential Development received preliminary plan approval in 1991. Crossgates Phase VII will be the third residential section. There will be 109 townhouses and duplex dwelling units. It will be adjacent to Phase IV with access from Murry Crossway. The Zoning District is (RH1) High Density Residential Flex. Public water and sewer will serve the project. The applicant is requesting the following waiver requests from the LCSDDLDO: Sec. 602.02 Cartway width for one private street Maguire Ct. Sec. 602.06 Sidewalks along both sides of the street Sec. 602.08 Minimum Horizontal Radius for Private Street, Maguire Ct. Sec. 602.09 Minimum 150 separation between intersections for private street Maguire Ct. and mailbox access drive. The Commission needs to review and make comments to the LCPC on the final subdivision plan and waiver requests. Linda Michels, a landscape architect with David Miller Associates, presented the plan. Bill Murry was also present. Ms. Michels stating that the plan being reviewed tonight is the Final Plan for Crossgates Phase VII. Ms. Michels stated that this is the third section in Manor Township. Ms. Michels stated that the property is zoned high density flex and is located south of Millersville where Frederick Street and Shenks Lane intersects Crossland Pass. Crossland Pass is an east/west road and Murrycross Way is a collector road that travels through the entire development. Phase VII is located across from the clubhouse of the golf course and is east of hole #9. This section is approximately 22 acres plus or minus with 109 proposed homes. This section was part of the overall master plan. The preliminary plan laid out the whole project including the golf course and was approved back in 1991. There is an approved 20 years phasing plan that is being followed. The sketch plan was reviewed with the Township in the summer of 2005. There was a waiver requested regarding the cartway widths for the public streets in this phase. They received a waiver to allow the public streets to have a 40right-of-way and 28 wide cartway, which applies to all the public streets with intersections. There are four modifications that are being requested in addition to a recommendation on the plan itself. They have submitted to the LCPC, the Township Engineer, and the water and sewer authorities. A clean letter from the Township Engineer regarding the stormwater was received. The stormwater along with other items were approved in 1991. The stormwater facilities already exist and are located within the golf course as part of the master plan that was done in 1991. They are in the process of making small revisions to the plan regarding sewer and water in regards to comments that were received. The modifications being requested are as follows: 1) Cartway width for one way private road all the streets are proposed to be public streets except for Maguire Court, which serves 20 houses. The applicant is asking for a waiver of cartway width. Actually, the LCPC came back to the applicant and asked us to reduce the 20 wide cartway width and advised us that the applicant would have to ask for a waiver from the LCSDDLDO. The applicant is proposing to keep the cartway to 16 in width and that conforms to what was done in the prior section of Crossgates. The applicant submitted their justification for the modification stating that the width is adequate for the traffic it will be serving as a private street and is wide enough to accommodate the parking. 2) Sidewalks The County Ordinance typically requires sidewalks along both sides of the street. Throughout the Crossgates project there has been a different design for the pedestrian walkway system. Ms. Michels pointed out the pedestrian system on the plan explaining that it is more of the free form walkway system. Ms. Michels stated that it does not necessarily run parallel or along the side of the streets but it does connect all the residential area to each other. Ms. Michels stated that this phase is the first section on the east side of Murrycross Way to be

developed. The applicant is proposing a similar type pedestrian system in this project and has provided a stub to the east that would serve a future residential area when it is completed. There are no sidewalks along Murrycross Way and that has been the concept to keep pedestrians away from that road. 3) Horizontal Radius Maguire Court has a radius that is 25 and the County Ordinance requires 50; the radius is smaller than what is permitted for public streets so that the applicant is asking for a modification to allow that width. The applicant feels that it is an appropriate radius for a court street serving 20 units and it is a private street. This modification for the court is similar to the modifications received in the prior sections; the radius proposed in this section is actually larger than some of the radii in the other sections and they have worked successfully. 4) Intersection Separations The County Ordinance has a section of the ordinance that requires you to have a minimum of 150 between intersections and when that is applied to Maguire Court, for example, the applicant cannot comply with that separation distance. Maguire Court is designed as a one-way street system so that there are not two roads coming out in close proximity to each other where the traffic is two way. The applicant feels that this alternate design of a one-way street system provides what the LCSLDLO wants. The one-way street system exists for Maguire Court and also in a loop in the north corner of the property that serves the community mailbox area. Jim Miller stated that he assumes that the street for the mailboxes is a private street and Ms. Michels stated that was correct. Mr. Miller stated that every time he drives through Crossgates, there are people walking everywhere. However the walkway system was designed originally, it definitely works very well. Mr. Miller stated that it is a very walkable community and he is surprised by how many people are out using the walks. Ms. Glazier stated that she would concur with Mr. Miller. She works at Millersville University and sometimes in the summer she walks in the area. Ms. Glazier stated that it serves the purpose very well and is a very inviting place to walk. If that kind of walkway system is going to be repeated in the other phases, then Ms. Glazier stated that she feels that the walkway system will be a great asset. Mr. Ahlfeld asked if this phase would be connected by the walkway to the phases on the other side of Murrycross Way or will there be gaps to be filled in with future phases. Ms. Michels stated that there is no current pedestrian connection but it will eventually be connected. Mr. Ahlfeld asked if when this phase is completed, would there be a way to walk from this phase to the existing phases. Mr. Murry explained how it would be possible for pedestrians to cross to the already developed areas. Mr. Henke asked if the driving range would be replaced with residential housing at some point in time. Mr. Murry stated that he preferred not to. Mr. Henke asked how many acres are located in the development including Millersville Borough Mr. Murry stated that there are about 360 acres in Crossgates. Mr. Haverstick asked how many more phases are there to be developed. Mr. Murry stated that there is three more phases. Mr. Haverstick stated that he would like to say as far as he is concerned that this is a project he wished that there was more of in Manor Township. It is well thought out and the walk system is beyond belief. Mr. Haverstick stated that he rides his bike on the walkway and it is phenomenal. Mr. Murry stated that bicyclists are welcomed on the walkway; that is what they were designed for. Jim Miller made a motion to recommend to the LCPC approval of the four waiver requests that was presented tonight. Mary Glazier seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously. Jim Henke made a recommendation to the LCPC that the Final Plan approval for Crossgates Phase VII be granted. Mr. Haverstick seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously.

John W. & Mary A. Metzger Final Subdivision Plan - The property is located at 1765 1785 Temple Avenue. The applicant wishes to subdivide the existing townhouses onto individual lots.

The Zoning Hearing Board granted a variance for the minimum lot width for townhouses on January 4, 2006. Public water and sewer serves the property. The property is located in the residential high density (RH) zoning district. The Commission needs to review and make comments and recommendations to the LCPC. John Metzger, 25 Bentley Lane, presented his plan and stated that there are six existing townhouse units and the proposal is to divide the area into six individual lots with a townhouse on each lot. With respect to zoning, all the criteria were met with the exception of the lot width. A variance was granted by the Zoning Hearing Board for about six inches per lot. Mr. Metzger stated that the only issue he has any knowledge of is the fire hydrant that was discussed by the Township and the Zoning Board. There was a concern that the hydrant may be too close to the parking area and cause problems when cars are pulling in and backing out. Mr. Ahlfeld asked if these would be sold off as individual lots. Mr. Metzger stated at some point that would occur. Mr. Miller asked if there are driveways now and Mr. Metzger stated that there is. Mr. Miller asked what they do now when pulling in and out of the driveway with the fire hydrant. Mr. Metzger stated that it has not seemed to cause any problems. Mr. Ott stated that the driveways are being redesigned and that is why there is a concern. Mr. Metzger stated that the difference is the driveways now are deeper and one car width. In accordance with what the Township wanted, he configured it with two parking places for each unit off Temple Avenue. Mr. Haverstick asked if the entire area would be macadam. Mr. Metzger stated that it will be intermittently grass and macadam. Ms. Glazier stated that there would be somewhat more paving and Mr. Metzger stated yes. Ms. Glazier asked if that would be a problem. Mr. Ott stated that there is no problem with the lot coverage requirements because the rear yards of the lots are deep. Mr. Haverstick stated, as he understands this, there is no change so there is no impact. It is merely dividing the land into six separate lots with little but no impact. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that the only exterior change is the parking. Mr. Metzger stated that the existing paved areas would be widened and shortened. Mr. Witmer asked Bruce for his opinion on where the fire hydrant is now. Mr. Ott stated that before, the drives were deeper and they parked behind one another. Mr. Ott stated that the Zoning Board, when it went through the zoning board process, felt that when cars would be backing out, the fire hydrant could be hit. Mr. Haverstick asked if it was possible to barricade the hydrant. Mr. Haverstick was advised there are regulations regarding placing obstructions at fire hydrants. There was discussion regarding the fire hydrant location. Bonnie Miller stated that there is a fire hydrant four feet from her drive and that she has not hit that hydrant. Mr. Haverstick made a motion to recommend to the LCPC approval of the final subdivision plan as presented. Beth Herr seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously.

Other Business Act 537 Update Mr. Ott stated that there was a legal notice on January 19th in the Lancaster Newspapers regarding the advertising of the Regional 537 Plan is under a 30 day review period. Update on Regional Comprehensive Plan Mr. Ahlfeld reported that the plan is in the final stages of being finalized. Revisions are being worked out based on work session that was held. Mr. Ahlfeld and Danny Whittle are making some provisions that are being sent to the consultant. In approximately 30 days, the revised final draft will go to the municipalities for a 60 day review period, during which time the Planning Commission along with the Supervisors will be asked to comment on it. Township Subdivision/Land Development Ordinance The Supervisors have selected Rettew Associates to write the Township subdivision/land development ordinance. The staff have set up a committee to work on the ordinance consisting of two supervisors John May and Dick Bauder as well as two representatives of the Planning

Commission Jim Henke and John Ahlfeld and three staff people being Bruce, Bill Laudien and Barry Smith. They met several weeks ago and talked about the schedule for the project and some of the key points. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that he felt that the Planning Commission would want to have a chance near the beginning of the process to have a brainstorming session and talk about any of the specific things that would like to see addressed in the ordinance. The date for the work session was set for February 28 at 7:00 p.m. Correspondence Ms. Glazier stated that she received the Draft update to the Growth Management Element, Culture Heritage Element and Housing Element. Ms. Glazier stated that she had several brochures on workshops including one on the Effective Acre on Township Government. A letter received from the LCPC scheduling Parkfield Phase II for March 13. Mr. Haverstick mentioned that the Township, in conjunction with the County, had a meeting regarding the rails to trails portion in Manor Township that looks positive and looks as though it is going to happen sooner rather than later if they can determine what they are going to do with the bridge over the Conestoga. Mr. Haverstick stated that at some point in time, it will require the Planning Commission to deal with a subdivision plan, because the right-of-way will have to be subdivided. There is an issue of the existing tract of land being on the same parcel as the part that has been abandoned. Mr. Miller stated that it is his hope that this is the catalyst to get the portion that is south of here in line. It would be nice if the whole thing comes together and everyone finds a way to resolve their differences. Ms. Glazier stated that Norfolk Southern would not give up the Manor Township section unless the County takes the bridge.

Mr. Miller stated that he wanted to comment regarding last months meeting regarding the proposed rezoning request that was before the Commission for action. Mr. Miller stated that there were three Supervisors present and two of them spoke at the meeting and gave their opinions on the rezoning. Mr. Miller stated that he questioned the protocol simply because their role is to make a recommendation to the Supervisors for them to act on. He stated that he felt that it was inappropriate for the Supervisors to come to the Planning Commission meeting to give them their opinion on how they are looking at the rezoning before the Planning Commission has given them their recommendation. Mr. Miller stated that it struck him very odd that they are getting opinions when they were suppose to be giving a recommendation to the Supervisors. Mr. Miller stated that he wanted to comment that he thinks that was totally inappropriate. The Supervisors are not present as private citizens but they are Supervisors and prior to the Commission making a recommendation they should not be giving them their opinions on the request that is before them. Mr. Haverstick stated that he understood what Mr. Miller was saying but it did not bother him that much. Mr. Miller stated that he is not personally offended, but he feels it is a totally inappropriate way for the functioning between the two bodies to occur. Ms. Glazier stated that she understands Mr. Millers point, but it does not bother her and she is happy to have some opportunity to communicate back and forth. Sometimes it is helpful to hear what somebody is thinking.

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 9:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary Glazier Secretary

Recording Secretary Evelyn Rineer  
Planning Commission Meeting  
03/13/06

## Manor Township Planning Commission Agenda

Monday, March 13, 2006 Time: 7:30 P.M.

1. Call to Order
2. Pledge to the Flag
3. Roll Call
4. Public Comments
5. Approve Minutes of February 13, 2006 meeting
6. Old Business Linda Strauss Presentation to the Planning Commission regarding Homefields.
7. New Business 3020 Preliminary/Final Land Development & Waiver Request for Three Meeting Delay The proposed plan involves a single 2.415 acre subject tract as represented on the Plans. The subject tract provides for an existing commercial/business facility including an existing office building and associated parking facilities. The lot is located on the south side of Columbia Avenue, approximately 750 feet east of Centerville Road in Manor Township, Lancaster County, PA. The plans propose a four-story office building expansion totaling 20,400 sq. ft. (all floors) for an expansion of the existing sites use. Associated with the proposed building will be required parking improvements, internal circulation facilities, and stormwater management facilities. Also, a waiver of the three meeting delay for scheduling at the LCPC is being requested. The Commission needs to review the final land development plan and make recommendations to the LCPC. Also, the Commission needs to approve the waiver request for the three meeting delay.

Manor Oaks Lot 146 Preliminary Land Development Plan - Cornerstone at Manor Oaks proposes the development of Lot 146 within the existing Manor Oaks residential development located at the intersection of Letort Road and Knollwood Road. The development of this tract involves the construction of a total of thirty (30) new townhouse units; residential development that matches the requirements of the residential zone which abuts the commercial zone is a permitted use. The townhouse dwellings have been designed to match the adjoining townhouse development under construction within Lot 145. The existing private access driveway within Lot 145 will be extended through Lot 146 to intersect with Knollwood Road, thereby providing a continued access way through the site. As part of the proposed development of Lot 146, Lot 145 and 146 will be joined in common. For those reasons, the current proposal has been submitted as a preliminary plan to revise the original information shown on the recorded subdivision and land development plans for this project. The Commission needs to review the preliminary land

development plan and make recommendations to the LCPC.

Final Land Development Plan for 3868 Columbia Avenue owned by Frank Hess - Mr. Frank Hess is proposing to construct building and associated parking facilities on an approximate 0.6 acre lot located at 3868 Columbia Avenue. The building will contain a retail flooring showroom and four (4) rental apartment units. The property is currently vacant and is located within the Local Commercial Zoning District of Manor Township. Public water and sewer will serve the site. The Planning Commission needs to make recommendation to the LCPC on the land development plan.

8. Other Business - Act 537 Update - Update on Regional Comprehensive Plan - Subdivision/Land Development Ordinance Report on February 28, 2006 Workshop Session - Correspondence

9. Adjourn

DRAFT Planning Commission Minutes

Monday, March 13, 2006 Time: 7:30 P.M.

The Manor Township Planning Commission met on Monday, March 13, 2006 at 7:30 p.m. at the Manor Township Municipal Building, 950 W. Fairway Drive, Lancaster, PA. Mr. Miller introduced the Commission members and led the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.

Members Present: James Miller, Donald Witmer, Mary Glazier, James Henke, Beth Herr and Scott Haverstick. Member Absent: John Ahlfeld Visitors Present: See attached list.

Public Comment There was no public comment.

Minutes Beth Herr made a motion to approve the minutes of the February 13th meeting. Don Witmer seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously.

Old Business Linda Strauss Presentation to the Planning Commission regarding Homefields. Ms. Strauss stated that she wished to give the other people in the community a chance to speak at this meeting. Tom Strauss, 357 S. Duke Street, stated that he expressed his concern about the proposed development next to Homefields two meetings ago because Homefields is an organic program. He continued stating that they did meet with representatives from RGS who explained that the consultant is responsible to design for the volume of water that would flow off the development but not the character of the water. Mr. Strauss stated that obviously streets will be put in that will be salted in the winter and that is what Homefields is worried about. There is a broader question about the area between Rt. 999 and the river. We have heard that Fred Funk would like to develop his property. We know that the people who live in the area around Homefields, which is bordered by Letort Road, Sun Lane, Walnut Hill and Duke Street, is zoned medium density residential (RM); it would be wonderful if the Supervisors and the Planning Commission would look at this area and think of what could happen. Mr. Strauss stated that this area was not zoned improperly in the first place, but because development has taken a direction

that no one could have anticipated. Mr. Strauss stated that his property at 357 S. Duke Street is zoned high density residential (RH). He continued by stating that he has no plans for an apartment building on that site; there is three acres of land that could be put somewhere else where high density residential development maybe needed. This could provide an opportunity for low income housing that we know everyone would like to see happen. Mr. Strauss stated that he hoped the Commission would look at the broader issue and the larger picture here and make some recommendations. Mr. Miller pointed out to Mr. Strauss that if there is an application that is before them, an application has what is called vesting rights and so changing the zoning is not an option while that plan is an active plan. Pat LeMay, 78 Sun Lane, stated that she understands the zoning permits medium density housing, but as she looks around the Township, she sees a lot of housing developments and she thinks one has to weigh another housing development against something that is truly unique in the County if not the State. Manor Township should be proud to host Homefields and recognize its uniqueness and should do everything in its power to protect it. Scott Breneman, current farm manager for Homefields vocational program, stated that at least ten years ago they embarked on a journey and Homefields is practicing stewardship of the land; this is not something you come by quickly or easily. We have worked on soil fertility, cover crop management, and we do everything possible to make sure chemicals and runoff is not coming into the fields and contaminating ground water. We feel that it is imperative that chemical runoff from yard applications, etc. do not come onto the land that we have worked very hard to keep pure. The program has great merit as Homefields work with people with disabilities and it has been good for the community. People with disabilities, through Goodwill, get to meet together and mainstream into society so that there is not that sheltered stigma that can go with people with disabilities. We are actually out there doing the farm work and getting to meet people from the community who come to the farm each week and pick up the vegetables. Jim Miller encouraged Homefields to approach the developer himself as opposed to their consultant. Mr. Miller stated that he believes that they would find the developer approachable to try to address some of their concerns. Mr. Miller stated that there may or may not be some technological possibilities that they may be able to work with to try to relieve some of their fears. Mary Glazier asked if the entire block is zoned medium density residential and she was advised it is the entire block. Ms. Glazier stated that this is an unusual situation where you not only having farming up against development but you have a particular kind of farming with a strong commitment to be organic. Ms. Glazier questioned if it would be possible through swales and grading to control the runoff from the proposed development onto the farm ground. Bonnie Miller, 113 Bent Tree Drive, asked if the development has been approved and she was advised it has not. Ms. Miller was advised that the developer was in to the Commission asking for waivers. The Commission had asked the consultant with respect to one of the waivers to go back and look for another emergency access. Scott Haverstick stated that he has the utmost respect for what Homefields is doing and how they are doing it and he would hope and encourage the Supervisors to be as sensitive as possible to their needs and wishes. Mr. Haverstick stated that on the other hand, he wonders about an organic farm next to an orchard in a rural area; he stated that he is not aware of there being any legislation that deals with that issue. Mr. Haverstick stated that he is not sure you can differentiate between those two situations. Mr. Haverstick stated that the Township should speak to the developer and make certain at the very minimum that the developer is sensitive to what Homefields is doing. Don Witmer asked what is being done with the water run off from the farm now. Mr. Strauss stated that there is some run off now but a development would have much more impermeable surface. Ms. Strauss stated that she has

been going to the neighbors and getting signatures of people interested in having the zoning changed for the entire block. Ms. Strauss asked a question regarding the proposed cul-de-sac and who is responsible for removing the snow. Mr. Miller explained the procedure for street dedication to the Township. Bonnie Miller stated that she would like to explain that the developer is responsible for roads before dedication and residents are responsible for their driveways and sidewalks.

**New Business 3020 Preliminary/Final Land Development & Waiver Request for Three Meeting Delay** The proposed plan involves a single 2.415 acre subject tract as represented on the Plans. The subject tract provides for an existing commercial/business facility including an existing office building and associated parking facilities. The lot is located on the south side of Columbia Avenue, approximately 750 feet east of Centerville Road in Manor Township, Lancaster County, PA. The plans propose a four-story office building expansion totaling 20,400 square feet (all floors) for an expansion of the existing sites use. Associated with the proposed building will be required parking improvements, internal circulation facilities, and stormwater management facilities. Also, a waiver of the three meeting delay for scheduling at the LCPC is being requested. The Commission needs to review the final land development plan and make recommendations to the LCPC. Also, the Commission needs to approve the waiver request for the three meeting delay. George Smith from Rettew Associates presented the plan. Mr. Smith stated that last month they were before the Commission with the sketch plan layout of the Rettew expansion. Mr. Smith stated that in the meanwhile they have converted the plans to preliminary/final land development plan that has been formally submitted to the LCPC and to Manor Township for stormwater review. The plans are pretty much identical to the sketch plans with the exception of some parking changes that were coordinated with Mr. Ott to break up and provide the appropriate landscaping islands. Those are reflected on the plans before the Commission. Mr. Smith stated that they also requested the same waivers from the LCPC that the Commission had made recommendations for. The waivers requested were for bicycle parking facility, preliminary plan processing and curbing. Mr. Smith stated that they had requested four waivers of Manor Township Stormwater Ordinance. Buchart-Horn made a recommendation on all four waivers. Buchart-Horn agreed with all four-waiver requests and had provided some technical review comments. The comments will not provide a hardship. Mr. Miller explained under what conditions a waiver is granted. Ron Beam stated that Buchart-Horn's engineer did ask Rettew Associates to secure permission from the neighboring landowner because the plans show construction of the stormwater basin very close to the property line. We have received a letter from the adjoining landowner. Mr. Haverstick had a question regarding the term internal circulation facility. Mr. Smith stated that the term refers to the ability to successfully maneuver within the site. Mr. Henke asked if they met the code as far as the internal landscaping. Mr. Henke was advised that the plan does meet the requirements. Mr. Haverstick made a motion to recommend to the LCPC the approval of the plan as presented and grant the waiver request for the three meeting delay. Beth Herr seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously.

**Manor Oaks Lot 146 Preliminary Land Development Plan - Cornerstone at Manor Oaks** proposes the development of Lot 146 within the existing Manor Oaks residential development located at the intersection of Letort and Knollwood Roads. The development of this tract involves the construction of a total of thirty (30) new townhouse units; residential development that matches the requirements of the residential zone, which abuts the commercial zone, is a

permitted use. The townhouse dwellings have been designed to match the adjoining townhouse development under construction within Lot 145. The existing private access driveway within Lot 145 will be extended through Lot 146 to intersect with Knollwood Road, thereby providing a continued access way through the site. As part of the proposed development of Lot 146, Lot 145 and 146 will be joined in common. For those reasons, the current proposal has been submitted as a preliminary plan to revise the original information shown on the recorded subdivision and land development plans for this project. The Commission needs to review the preliminary land development plan and make recommendations to the LCPC. Jeff Burkhardt from David Miller Associates presented the plan. Mr. Burkhardt stated that this is the very last phase of the development that is not under construction at this point. This is the open area as you come into the development from Letort Road. The site is now zoned local commercial (LC) and it was changed years ago at the inception of this phase of development. The commercial zoning does allow residential development as long as the residential development follows the requirements of any adjoining residential uses around the commercial property. This plan is essentially an extension of the existing townhouse development that is currently under construction within Lot 145. The 30 units the plan is proposing within Lot 146 is pretty much an exact extension of the same type of development. The only thing being changed is the use that was originally shown on Lot 146. The site topography is the same as it was before. Nothing has changed regarding stormwater and we have received review comments from Buchart-Horn that addresses very minor items. We have received a review letter from the Lancaster County Conservation District with a few housekeeping items. The sanitary sewer is being collected and discharged in the same direction that it was always proposed to be as well as the public water. The plan is scheduled at the end of the month at the LCPC. Mr. Burkhardt stated that the parking and landscaping within the island dividers are per the Zoning Ordinance. The units that are to the rear of Cartledge Lane will have garages underneath them, similar to the units that have garages underneath them to the west. Jim Miller asked if there is a parking area to the back of the units off of Cartledge Lane. Mr. Burkhardt stated that there is no parking area there; it is only access for the garages. Mr. Haverstick questioned what the intent of the project was at the onset for this parcel. Mr. Burkhardt stated that his firm was not involved as a company at the onset of the project He stated that there was a piece of land set aside for potential future commercial use and that is all he knows. Mr. Miller stated that the prior owners came through with a rezoning request asking the Township to consider changing the tract from residential high density (RH) to local commercial (LC) and the Commission agreed and the Supervisors rezoned the tract. Mr. Haverstick asked if there is a fair amount of Local Commercial left in the Township and Mr. Ott stated that there is not that much zoned local commercial. Mr. Ott stated he cannot think of any place that does not already have something on it. Mr. Haverstick asked if the Township is required to create more local commercial zoned areas. Mr. Ott stated probably not, especially with the new Regional Comprehensive Plan which will hopefully be adopted. Mary Glazier asked if the tract is built as residential, could someone take one of the homes and turn it into a beauty salon. Mr. Ott stated that he would have to check with the Solicitor, Tom Goodman for a legal interpretation. Mr. Miller had a question regarding that is must be similar to the adjacent residential zone; what happens if the adjacent zones were different. Mr. Burkhardt stated that he did not know; it would be a legal interpretation. Mr. Miller stated that it states on the plan that Lot 145 and 146 are being combined. Mr. Burkhardt stated that the LCSLDLDO requires them to do a new preliminary plan. Mr. Miller asked if they are also doing a lot add-on plan and Mr. Burkhardt stated they are doing a lot add-on plan. Mr. Haverstick asked if the two lots with two

different zoning designations can be combined and Mr. Burkhardt stated that he believed so. Jim Huber, 113 Shannon Drive, asked Mr. Burkhardt if he had a copy of the letter from the Lancaster County Conservation District and Mr. Burkhardt stated that he has the original letter which is dated March 10th. Mr. Burkhardt stated that Manor Township has been copied. Mr. Huber indicated concerns with using commercially zoned property for residential use. Bonnie Miller stated that the people who bought in Manor Oaks were aware that piece was going to be commercial to provide local services. Ms. Miller stated that her concern is that if something is built residential and it is zoned commercial, there may be a problem with financing for the homeowner. Mr. Haverstick stated that he does not fault the developer in this case and he does not see where the Commission has much of a choice. Mr. Haverstick stated that he is not sure that the Township thought this through when it was rezoned and he suspects that this was intended to be commercial. Beth Herr stated that she lives in the neighborhood and she remembers a discussion about the fact that there was going to be a small commercial area and she thought that would be nice because it would be convenient to the development and neighborhood. Jim Miller stated that they did think this through very well and at the time this made sense; there was not another zone in the Township that would be applicable here. Mr. Miller stated that this is a permitted use; the Commission can voice their displeasure at what the owner wishes to do, but it is a permitted use. Pat Lemay asked if anyone knows what businesses is the strip mall in Millersville. Ms. Glazier asked if the local commercial zone was not actually bigger at one time and Mr. Ott stated that it was. John May stated that he realizes what the Commission must do, but that he is disappointed in the plan. Joe Pankewicz , with Cornerstone Development Group, stated that when his company took possession of the property, it was already in these zoning districts. It was originally designed to be residential and his company cannot control what someone else had done to the property. Cornerstone Development Group purchased this property and the zoning allows us to have this residential use. The townhouse development has been very successful. We will be providing the same product on this tract. Ms. Glazier indicated that this might be a lesson for the Township. The Township needs to take a look at the zoning district and see how much of that zone we may need and see what unanticipated consequences can occur in terms of the permitted uses. Ms. Glazier asked if sidewalks will be installed along Letort Road. Mr. Burkhardt stated yes. The sidewalks were proposed with the original phase but are not installed yet. Mary Glazier made a motion to recommend to the LCPC approval of the preliminary/final land development plan with the consideration of requiring that the sidewalk along Letort Road be completed at the time of the construction of this phase. Beth Herr seconded the motion and the motion carried with Scott Haverstick abstaining.

Final Land Development Plan for 3868 Columbia Avenue owned by Frank Hess - Mr. Frank Hess is proposing to construct building and associated parking facilities on an approximate 0.6 acre lot located at 3868 Columbia Avenue. The building will contain a retail flooring showroom and four (4) rental apartment units. The property is currently vacant and is located within the Local Commercial Zoning District of Manor Township. Public water and sewer will serve the site. The Planning Commission needs to make recommendation to the LCPC on the land development plan. Steve Gergely from Harbor Engineering presented the plan. Mr. Gergely stated that they were before the Commission in November with a sketch plan. This is basically the same layout for the site located in the Local Commercial (LC) zoning district on about .6 of an acre. Mr. Hess is proposing to construct a three story building that is about 2400 square feet,

with the middle story as you walk in from the parking lot, which is going to be a retail flooring showroom. The upstairs and downstairs will be two apartments each. There are fourteen (14) parking spaces proposed. The plan had two waivers presented at the time of the sketch plan; one waiver was to waive the preliminary plan processing and the second waiver was for the intersection separation because Columbia Avenue is an arterial road and did not meet the dimensional requirements. The waivers were granted by LCPC. The waiver of sidewalk was denied by the LCPC, so the sidewalk is now on the plan. A final plan has been submitted and the stormwater management plan was prepared. There has been correspondence with LASA. There is a sanitary sewer line along the back of the property line that the project will tie into. LASA indicated that there is capacity, but we have not received letter as of yet. LASA is reviewing the technical aspects of the plan. Technical drawings have been submitted to Columbia Water Company and they met with Dave Lewis of the Columbia Water Company. We have resubmitted the plans to PennDot, because Rt. 462 is a state road and we need a driveway permit from PennDot for a low volume driveway. The plan has been reviewed by the Lancaster Conservation District and they are okay with the plan with one minor change. We have not received comments from Buchart-Horn regarding the stormwater plan. The developer has four stormwater waivers that they are requesting. They have submitted plans to the LCPC and the plan is tentatively scheduled for the April 10 meeting. Mr. Miller asked Mr. Gergely to verify when they had submitted the stormwater plans to Buchart-Horn. Mr. Gergely stated that they had the paperwork to everyone on February 24th. Mr. Haverstick asked if there was a screening issue of some kind. Mr. Gergely stated screening is required and that they have it along the back of the property line as shown on Sheet #3 of the plan. Mr. Miller asked if there were any specific uses for the commercial space at this time. Mr. Gergely stated that the main floor is scheduled to be a retail flooring showroom. Frank Hess, the owner, stated that the individual who is renting the space currently has space in Mountville and his business is called Flooring Concepts. It will be a 2400 square foot showroom with a small office area. There will be no storing of materials on the site. The business has another location for the storage of their products. Bonnie Miller stated that she is familiar with Flooring Concepts and it will be an asset to that piece of land. Jim Henke made a motion to recommend final plan approval to LCPC for the 3868 Columbia Avenue project. Scott Haverstick seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously.

Other Business Act 537 Update Mr. Ott stated that Barry Smith said that the final documents should be received shortly for adoption. Update on Regional Comprehensive Plan John May stated that the Steering Committee continues to meet and they are about to start the implementation phase. Subdivision/Land Development Ordinance Report on February 28, 2006 Workshop Session Jim Henke stated that on February 28th the Planning Commission gathered here at the Township Building to brainstorm with Rettew Associates, the consultant who has been selected by Manor Township Board of Supervisors, to help develop the ordinance. The intent of the meeting was to provide Rettew Associates with some thoughts from this Board regarding items that they would like built into the ordinance requirements. Several points that were discussed for Rettew Associates to investigate and come back with concepts were as follows: 1) issues of traffic, 2) sidewalks, 3) greenways, 4) cul-de-sacs, 5) liveable communities, 6) density in growth area, 7) density outside the growth area, and 8) performance standards as it relates to streets, open space and park and recreation. As an update, Rettew Associates was rapping up the boiler plate portion of the zoning ordinance. Those are items that would specifically deal with the plan processing. Mr. Haverstick stated that Don Witmer brought up a

good point that they need to adapt this ordinance so it takes into consideration the needs of the rural part of the Township as opposed to other parts of the Township so they may be subject to slightly different regulations. Mr. Miller stated that he thinks it is important to keep in mind this is a subdivision/land development ordinance. This is not a zoning ordinance. The zoning ordinance is what really takes care of most of those kinds of issues; a subdivision/land development ordinance is simply a how do I do kind of ordinance. Ms. Glazier asked what the next step is. Mr. Henke stated that there was no future meeting date scheduled. Mr. Henke stated that it is his understanding that Rettew Associates will be coordinating back with the staff at the Township in preparation for another meeting but no meeting date has been set. Mr. May stated that zoning was discussed to an extent. Mr. May stated that they will be looking closely at the zoning ordinance so that there is no contradictions. Mr. Haverstick stated that there was vision involved. The Commission was really thinking about how they would like this to be implemented in the future and how it will impact various parts of the Township. Mr. Henke stated that many of the things wanted are zoning related not subdivision/land development, so it was made clear that simultaneously or along with there may be some applications that the zoning ordinance needs to address. Bonnie Miller, 113 bent Tree Drive, requested that the Planning Commission have a vision.

Correspondence Mary Glazier stated that she had three pieces of correspondence from the LCPC. A letter regarding the Final Plan for VII Crossgates was approved by the LCPC on February 27th. A letter regarding the modification requests for 3020 Associates scheduled at the LCPC for March 27th A letter regarding the Preliminary Land Development Plan for Manor Oaks Lot 146 scheduled at the LCPC for March 27th.

Mr. May stated that Harry Roth presented two forms of a draft ordinance regarding commercial sprawl to the Board of Supervisors. This draft is a revision to the Shopping Center Section 448 of the Zoning Ordinance. They are sending it to the Planning Commission for their input. Mr. Roths ordinance is in regards to shopping centers over a certain square footage and requires that you build up rather than out.

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 8:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted

Mary Glazier Secretary

Recording Secretary Evelyn Rineer

Planning Commission Meeting

04/10/06

Manor Township Planning Commission Agenda

Monday, April 10, 2006 Time: 7:30 P.M.

1. Call to Order

2. Pledge to the Flag
3. Roll Call
4. Public Comments
5. Approve Minutes of March 13, 2006 meeting
6. Old Business Act 537 Presentation of Regional Sewage Facilities Plan Barry Smith
7. New Business An Ordinance amending the Official Zoning Ordinance of Manor Township, Lancaster County, Pennsylvania by (1) Implementing measures to protect valuable areas within the Townships commercial zones from sprawling development patterns associated with large-scale shopping centers; (2) Requiring multi-story development for large-scale shopping centers; (3) Requiring multi-story off street parking lots for large scale shopping centers; (4) Increasing required loading spaces sizes for shopping centers; (5) Clarifying the language of Section 401; and (6) Adjusting related sections to accomplish the preceding revisions. Commission needs to review and provide comments to the Supervisors.

Timpson Place Final Plan - The project is located on the west side of Donerville Road, 300 from the Donerville Road & Columbia Avenue intersection. The tract contains 5.5 acres and is zoned (RH) High Density Residential Zoning District. The project, proposes 53 units, containing a mix of single family detached, townhouses and apartment units. Public sewer and water is available. The Commission needs to review plans and make recommendations to the Lancaster County Planning Commission.

McCreight/Burkholder Lot Add-On Plan The project is located on Prospect Rd. The zoning district is Agricultural (A). Tract #1 is 16.02 acres and is being added on to the land owned by Mr. & Mrs. Burkholder. The lot add-on will increase the Burkholder land to be approximately 93.3 acres. The Commission needs to review and comment to the LCPC on this plan.

J. Scott & Celesta Funk Final Subdivision Plan The project is located at the corner of Stehman Church & Indian Run Roads. The land is in the Agricultural (A) Zoning District. The subdivision plan involves 67.1 acres. Lot #1 will be subdivided off the parent tract and contain 12.186 acres. Lot #1 will contain all the farm building and site improvements. Lot #2 will remain in agricultural use. The Commission needs to review and make comments to the LCPC.

Peter C. Alecxih Jr. Subdivision/Lot Add-On Plan This project involves two (2) lot add-ons and the creation (subdivision) of a new agricultural parcel that incorporates three separate tracts of adjoining land in Manor Township. Peter C. Alecxih, Jr. proposes a lot add-on of approximately 5.4 acres of land (Tracts 1A & 1B) from the adjoining tract of land (Lot #1) owned by his parents (Peter C. and Sara H. Alecxih) to the tract he owns (Lot #4) along with Nelson R. Breneman and Sara H. Alecxih. The receiving tract will then be subdivided to create a new agricultural subdivision (Lot #3) containing approximately 10.9 acres in size. The Alecxih Jr./Breneman/Alecxih tract will then transfer (via a second lot add-on) approximately 16.0 acres (Tract #2) to the adjoining Breneman tract for additional agricultural acreage. The total area of

land involved in the subdivision and add-on is approximately 96.4 acres. All involved parcels of land currently lie within the agricultural zoning district. The Commission needs to review and comment to the LCPC on this plan.

8. Other Business - Letter Columbia Water Company New Eagle Path Pressure Zone - Update on Regional Comprehensive Plan - Correspondence

9. Adjourn

DRAFT

Manor Township Planning Commission Minutes

Monday, April 10, 2006 Time: 7:30 P.M.

The Manor Township Planning Commission met on Monday, April 10, 2006 at the Manor Township Municipal Building, 950 W. Fairway Drive, Lancaster, PA. Mr. Ahlfeld introduced the Commission members and led the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.

Members Present: John Ahlfeld, Donald Witmer, Mary Glazier, James Henke, Beth Herr, Scott Haverstick and James Miller Visitors Present: See attached list.

Public Comment There was no public comment.

Minutes Beth Herr made a motion to approve the minutes of the March 13, 2006 meeting. Don Witmer seconded the motion and the motion carried with John Ahlfeld abstaining.

Old Business Act 537 Presentation of Regional Sewage Facilities Plan Barry Smith gave the background indicating the work that began on the Act 537 in March of 2001. Phase I was the inventory of the existing facilities and infrastructure. Phase II was the analyzing and coming up with a plan to deal with the needs of that were identified in Phase I. Mr. Smith provided to the Commission a summary of all the data contained in the Act 537 notebook. Mr. Smith advised that the notebook is available at the office for anyone to look at. Three things that have the most impact on Manor Township and its residents are the following: 1) Long range plan for future development as the Township is currently zoned and how LASA will be prepared to serve the development. 2) Based on surveys and analysis, two areas were identified and DEP has found those to be areas that need public sewer. The two areas are Perth Hills and Letort Manor. The plan identifies extending public sewer to those two areas. 3) There are requirements for the management of on lot sewage systems that will require all on lot systems to have a regular pump out and inspection schedule. A three-year cycle is proposed for pumping and inspection. The inspection is to determine if the tank is functioning as it is designed to be; for example, are the baffles in place to keep solids from the drain field. There is no time schedule as to when the plan must be adopted. Jim Miller questioned if the Chesapeake Bay Tributary Strategy influenced any of the results or recommendations that came from Act 537 study. Mr. Smith stated not other than what LASA would be doing as a regional provider. Mr. Smith stated that he believes it would be the treatment and discharge that is an issue. Don Witmer asked if with the new pumping of

systems, the public will be informed this will occur and Mr. Smith stated yes. Jim Henke asked if the summary and the mappings show how Perth Hills and Letort Manor will be served and Mr. Smith stated yes. John May stated that the Township does not have an option. The Township is told by DEP that they must do this. Mary Glazier asked if other municipalities have addressed the on lot system inspections. Mr. Smith stated that West Hempfield is the other municipality that has a significant amount of on lot systems. West Hempfield has gone before their Planning Commission and is proposing to adopt an ordinance that would require on lot system management with a three-year interval and probably dividing the Township up into sections. Ms. Glazier asked what would happen if the municipality does not do this. Mr. Smith stated that a moratorium would be placed on every development in the township and penalties. Mr. Smith indicated that the Township would like to act on this within a two to six month period. Ms. Glazier stated that she would like to take a careful look and see what the experiences of other townships are before rushing on. She feels two to six years sounds like a more reasonable time frame. John Ahlfeld asked if there is any requirement to upgrade systems that might predate current standards and Mr. Smith stated no. Mr. Miller asked what happens if an illegal system is found or a system is failing. Mr. Smith stated that the sewage enforcement officer would become involved. Mr. Miller asked if DEP is allowing individuals to replace an existing system that may have failed with systems that are currently allowed. Mr. Smith stated that the system can be repaired or a sand mound is an acceptable remedy. Mr. Miller asked if PSATS has weighed in on the pros and cons. Mr. Smith stated that they have not. Bonnie Miller, 113 Bent Tree Drive, stated that she had a transaction in Denver Borough and they have already implemented a procedure by sending a letter to the homeowner regarding cleaning of septic tank; the people have accepted the regulations. Ms. Miller also commented on Letort Manor. Steve Shue, 127 Stable Drive, asked if it would be mandatory to hook up to public sewer and water. Mr. Smith stated there is a connection ordinance for sanitary sewer but not for public water. Dave Charles asked who would bear the cost of the extension of the public sewer and what time frame is involved. Mr. Smith stated there are currently some provisions in place by policy of the LASA for the extensions in Manor and West Hempfield Townships. LASA will provide for one-third of the cost. It is proposed between the municipality, homeowner and LASA to secure grant funding, where possible, and mechanisms through LASA for a borrowing option. LASA is currently projecting 2007 - 2009 for completion.

New Business An Ordinance amending the Official Zoning Ordinance of Manor Township, Lancaster County, Pennsylvania by (1) Implementing measures to protect valuable areas within the Townships commercial zones from sprawling development patterns associated with large-scale shopping centers; (2) Requiring multi-story development for large-scale shopping centers; (3) Requiring multi-story off street parking lots for large scale shopping centers; (4) Increasing required loading spaces sizes for shopping centers; (5) Clarifying the language of Section 401; and (6) Adjusting related sections to accomplish the preceding revisions. Commission needs to review and provide comments to the Supervisors. Mr. Haverstick asked for a quick synopsis in the differences between the ordinances. Mr. May stated that one ordinance is much stricter. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that basically there are a few numbers that are different. The required minimum lot sizes are different and the building height. Mr. Smith stated that site-specific design issues relative to going up and horizontally out are the issues. The current ordinance was amended to allow 70 foot height that would be applicable in this ordinance. Mr. Smith stated that this ordinance allows you to go up but has done very little to condense the footprint. Mr. Smith

stated that if you want to prevent sprawl, it would best served if the parameters be changed on the footprint for the plan and make requirements for smaller parking areas and smaller spaces of building. Then you can take advantage of going vertically. Mr. May referred to Note A on the first chart and sub note 2. The alternate does not have that requirement except for buildings with more than 150,000 square feet of gross floor area. Section 448.8 on Page 3 is more stringent. Mr. Miller asked if the solicitor has made any comments. Mr. Smith stated that they have not gone to the Township council or to the County. Mr. Smith stated that he thought it would be pertinent to provide a document to be reviewed rather than a menu of things to be reviewed. The Solicitor will respond to what is presented and will not make recommendations relative to alternatives. Mr. May stated that they wanted to get the Planning Commission comments and then go to the County. Barry Smith gave the procedure that will be followed. Mr. Haverstick asked Mr. Whittle if he reviewed the ordinance and he indicated he has not. Mr. Whittle stated that they would be willing to give an advisory review. Mr. May stated that there is an ordinance like this in place in Bucks County and a township in Chester County. Mr. Ahlfeld questioned the definition of shopping center regarding clarification as to what a group of stores is. Another comment he had was that the approval process would be by special exception and the other option is conditional use; is there a particular reason special exception was chosen. The Table on Page 2 second column heading refers to gross feasible floor area and in the use column talks about gross floor area. Was it intentional to use different terms. In Section 448.8 Shopping Centers Design Requirements and the Shopping Center Design Requirements Alternative, the GC District was just amended to allow heights up to 70 feet; why are there height limits of 35 and 45 feet. Barry stated that the drafter of this ordinance was not aware of the amendment to the current ordinance. Mr. Miller stated that Urban Growth Boundary area is now known as Urban Growth Areas. Mr. Miller asked where the number 75,000 square feet came from and what does it relate to as far as the minimum floor area? He questioned Section 448.3 regarding one access drive permitted per road frontage for shopping center sites and asked why? Mr. Miller stated that he does not like the detail of the ordinance because it is prescriptive. Mr. Miller stated that the idea is to reduce the consumption of land and after calculating with some of the requirements in this ordinance, 43% of the lot is used for setbacks. Mr. Miller stated that land is being consumed by forcing more land to be used for huge setbacks. He was curious as to why the permitted impervious coverage steps down from 75% to 65% and again consumes more land. Mr. Miller stated that another thing that is outdated is the amount of parking spaces required per thousand square feet of store area. Mr. Miller stated he would like to see the ordinance fit what is needed to day. Mr. Miller also questioned the traffic impact study on Page 4. Mr. Miller suggested the ordinance be in compliance with MPC. Mr. May stated that he would like to see if this is modeled after another ordinance and go see a project that is built using the design standards. Ms. Glazier indicated that she has been in other places where you have to go what seems an absurdly long drive around to get to the entrance of the shopping center. Ms. Glazier agreed with Mr. Miller that having restrictions on how much of the lot can be covered and setbacks shown in this amendment, does not achieve what the ordinance is trying to do. Ms. Glazier stated that she would like to see these things changed to make more efficient use of the land. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that maybe the intent was not to use less land but to have less coverage of impervious surfaces so that a smaller percentage of the tract is impervious. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that there needs to be some standards to design to. Allan Kreider stated that he was in favor of the vertical parking but wondered how the concept would be received with some of the larger shopping centers. Mr. Miller stated that there is the economic component. Mr. Henke referred to the square footage of

the center and asked if a single user could request a variance if they were proposing to be a single user that contained 85,000 square feet; would they be permitted? Mr. Henke state that some of the giant grocery stores whole program is based on one floor and he stated that he cannot imagine they would come in with a new prototype store that is a two story grocery store. Mr. Haverstick stated that he conceptually likes the intent of the ordinance but it needs to be fine-tuned. Mr. Smith stated that the staff would look at the comments from the Planning Commission and try to get some answers to their questions. Mr. Miller stated that best management practices are needed to help municipalities get through this type of thing. Ms. Glazier agreed with the issues raised by Mr. Miller regarding setbacks and the inconsistencies with this proposal and our current ordinance.

Timson Place Final Plan - The project is located on the west side of Donerville Road, 300 from the Donerville Road & Columbia Avenue intersection. The tract contains 5.5 acres and is zoned (RH) High Density Residential Zoning District. The project, proposes 53 units, containing a mix of single family detached, townhouses and apartment units. Public sewer and water is available. The Commission needs to review plans and make recommendations to the Lancaster County Planning Commission. Melissa Kelly, from RGS Associates, presented the plan. Ms. Kelly stated that the plan before the Commission is for a recommendation on the final subdivision plan for Timson Place. The plan is essentially the same as the preliminary plan. There is a mix of residential units of single family, detached, townhouse units and apartment units for a total of 54 units and 12 lots. The extension of the existing Hampden Drive is being created to Donerville Road. RGS Associates have received a letter from Buchart-Horn dated March 23 stating that the stormwater comments have been addressed and the stormwater plan as presented is satisfactory. We are requesting plan approval and a waiver of the three meeting delay. In addition, we are requesting a waiver for sidewalks along Donerville Road. Ms. Kelly stated that the reasons for requesting a sidewalk waiver was that there is currently no sidewalks along Donerville Road or Columbia Avenue for several thousand feet and there is an existing culvert under Donerville Road located at the northern property boundary. The culvert discharges within the right-of-way of the road and in order for the applicant to fully comply with County Ordinance and run sidewalk to their property line along Donerville Road, they would have to extend the culvert and relocate the riprap outside the road right-of-way line. Permits would be needed from PennDot, Lancaster County Conservation District, DEP as well as LASA. The applicant feels that it is unjust and unwarranted for this property to bear the burden of constructing a sidewalk in a small area along Donerville Road that is not going to connect to anything. Instead, the applicant is proposing in lieu of sidewalk along Donerville Road to provide money in escrow for the construction of the sidewalk in the future. Mr. Haverstick asked what the distance was from the northern most point of the site to Columbia Avenue and was told it is approximately 300; the road right-of-way of Donerville Road is 33. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that a benefit of a sidewalk would be for someone going to Columbia Avenue to get a bus. Mr. Ahlfeld asked if a waiver for the sidewalk would be granted, would the area be graded and kept free of major vegetation, fence post, etc. Ms. Kelly stated that it could be accommodated; however, within the area of the existing culvert and a proposed end wall, they could not do anything different than what currently exists. Ms. Kelly stated that if the waiver was not granted, possibly they could provide sidewalk along the southern end where they can physically provide and grade the sidewalk in and make it work without having to deal with end walls or the culvert. Mr. Miller stated that this is not the first time money has been escrowed for sidewalks. Mr. Miller had questions regarding

long-term agreements and how the Township might handle them. There was extensive discussion on the sidewalk and the request for the waiver. Mr. Miller made a motion to recommend to the LCPC the waiver of the three meeting delay. Ms. Glazier seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously. Mr. Miller made a motion to recommend to the LCPC that they grant the waiver of the sidewalk along Donerville Road in lieu of the fee to be worked out. Mr. Witmer seconded the motion and the motion was defeated 3 to 4 with Mr. Ahlfeld, Mr. Haverstick, and Ms. Glazier and Ms. Herr voting against the motion. Mr. Miller made a motion to recommend that the LCPC approve the Final Plan for Timson Place. Ms. Glazier seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously.

**McCreight/Burkholder Lot Add-On Plan** The project is located on Prospect Rd. The zoning district is Agricultural (A). Tract #1 is 16.02 acres and is being added on to the land owned by Mr. & Mrs. Burkholder. The lot add-on will increase the Burkholder land to be approximately 93.3 acres. The Commission needs to review and comment to the LCPC on this plan. Jeff Burkhardt, from David Miller Associates, presented the plan. Mr. Burkhardt pointed out on the plan the piece of land that is being added-on. McCreight owns the property and Burkholder is the individual that has been renting it to farm from the McCreights for many years and he expressed interest in purchasing the property. The Township wanted to make sure we were trying to reduce the potential for another farmette by creating an individual lot. There will be a new deed written that the tract will be added on to the existing Burkholder tract. Mr. Haverstick made a motion to recommend to the LCPC approval of the lot add-on. Mr. Miller seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously.

**J. Scott & Celesta Funk Final Subdivision Plan** The project is located at the corner of Stehman Church & Indian Run Roads. The land is in the Agricultural (A) Zoning District. The subdivision plan involves 67.1 acres. Lot #1 will be subdivided off the parent tract and contain 12.186 acres. Lot #1 will contain all the farm building and site improvements. Lot #2 will remain in agricultural use. The Commission needs to review and make comments to the LCPC. Mr. Burkhardt presented the plan. The entire farm lies on the east side of Indian Run Road and south of Stehman Church Road. The area designated as Lot #1 contains 12 acres and contains all the existing improvements and buildings. The Funks wish to sell that 12 acres off and maintain the farming activity with the remaining ground of this tract. They have another adjoining piece of land across the road where they will be building a new home and that is a separate tract of land. Mr. Burkhardt stated that there is a creek that creates the southern boundary of the 12-acre parcel and they made an easement that contains the floodplain. Mr. Ahlfeld asked if the easement provides for public access. Mr. Burkhardt stated that if the Township wishes to impose that type of easement, it would go through whether there was a subdivision or not. There was discussion regarding easements across private property. Bonnie Miller questioned the request being made and how it effects clean and green. Steve Shue expressed his dislike of splitting up farms constantly and making small tiny little farms. Also, he stated that they make the farms at least 10 acres so that the farms can be in the clean and green program. Mr. Bauder stated that the County and the taxpayers pay a lot of money to preserve farms and creating an entity that, when we subdivide them into smaller tracts, is no longer a farm. A farm is being removed from the inventory. Mr. Bauder was advised that the remaining land would be farmed. Mr. Miller stated that there is no change in use in this application. Mr. Miller made a motion to recommend to the LCPC approval of the final subdivision plan. Mr. Haverstick seconded the motion and the

motion carried unanimously.

**Peter C. Alexih Jr. Subdivision/Lot Add-On Plan** This project involves two (2) lot add-ons and the creation (subdivision) of a new agricultural parcel that incorporates three separate tracts of adjoining land in Manor Township. Peter C. Alexih, Jr. proposes a lot add-on of approximately 5.4 acres of land (Tracts 1A & 1B) from the adjoining tract of land (Lot #1) owned by his parents (Peter C. and Sara H. Alexih) to the tract he owns (Lot #4) along with Nelson R. Breneman and Sara H. Alexih. The receiving tract will then be subdivided to create a new agricultural subdivision (Lot #3) containing approximately 10.9 acres in size. The Alexih Jr./Breneman/Alexih tract will then transfer (via a second lot add-on) approximately 16.0 acres (Tract #2) to the adjoining Breneman tract for additional agricultural acreage. The total area of land involved in the subdivision and add-on is approximately 96.4 acres. All involved parcels of land currently lie within the agricultural zoning district. The Commission needs to review and comment to the LCPC on this plan. Mr. Burkhardt presented the plan. This plan is currently comprised of three different parcels owners: Peter Alexih, Mr. Alexih's parents, and adjoining Breneman tract that is a farming operation. Tract #2 is comprised of 16 acres and would be added to the Breneman property. Mr. Alexih will keep Lot #4, which would be one of the new lots being created and contains the existing buildings. Lot #3 would be a new lot with no buildings and will have one house built on it. The land left is property that currently belongs to Mr. Alexih's parents. Tract 1A will be added to the rear, which will provide frontage for Lot #3. One new lot is being created. There is no stormwater management required. This property is in the agricultural zoning district and will continue in agricultural use. Mr. Burkhardt stated that Lot #1 is 11 acres, Lot #3 is almost 11 acres, Lot #4 is 21 acres, and the other 16 acres is being added to the Brenemans farm. Mr. Shue asked why someone would want 10 acres and he was advised by Mr. Burkhardt that many people would want that amount of land Paul Lefever stated that he is next to the Alexih property and he is not pleased about the continuance of subdividing farms into smaller tracts of land. Mr. Lefever read from the front of the Lancaster Farming Magazine. Mr. Henke made a motion to recommend to the LCPC approval of the Final Subdivision and Lot Add-On Plan for Peter Alexih Jr. Ms. Herr seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously.

**Other Business Letter from Columbia Water Company New Eagle Path Pressure Zone** Mr. Lewis from Columbia Water Company stated that some of their existing customers on Acorn Lane and Eagle Path have asked for increase of water pressure. Until water mains were extended, the water company was unable to increase pressure. In order to increase pressure, they had to get water around the tank through different means. Manor Heights is probably 95% done and with their water main that allows the water company to create a high-pressure zone. The Company had to apply for a public water supply permit and as part of that process they had to send out notifications to municipalities and that is what is before the Commission.

**Update on Regional Comprehensive Plan** Mr. Ahlfeld stated that a new draft to the plan is expected next week. They will make sure that all the questions and comments were addressed after which the plan will be conveyed to the municipalities for formal 60 day review period.

**Correspondence** Ms. Glazier stated that the following correspondence was received from the LCPC. A letter dated March 13 regarding the Parkfield Phase II Final Plan stating that the plan

received approval with conditions. A letter dated March 14 regarding the Asche Lot Add-On Plan stating that the plan was conditionally approved. A letter dated April 10 regarding the receipt of the 3868 Columbia Avenue Plan. A letter dated April 10 regarding the receipt of the 3020 Associate Plan. A letter dated March 27 regarding the Preliminary Plan approval for Manor Oaks Lot 146 subject to conditions. A letter dated March 27 regarding the approval of a waiver of the requirement to submit a Preliminary Plan for 3020 Associates. A letter dated March 27 regarding the receipt of the Final Plan for Manor Oaks Lot 146. A letter received on March 24 regarding McCreight/Burkholder and a note that this property is enrolled in the Clean and Green. A letter stating that on April 24 the LCPC will be looking at the John W. Metzger Final Plan. A letter stating that on April 24 the Timson Place Final Plan will be looked at by the LCPC.

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 9:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary Glazier Secretary

Recording Secretary Evelyn Rineer

### **Planning Commission Meeting**

**05/08/06**

Manor Township Planning Commission Agenda

Monday, May 8, 2006 Time: 7:30 P.M.

1. Call to Order
2. Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag
3. Roll Call
4. Public Comment
5. Approve Minutes of April 10, 2006 Meeting
6. Old Business Act 537 For Planning Commission comments and recommendations to the Board of Supervisors An Ordinance amending the Official Zoning Ordinance of Manor Township, Lancaster County, Pennsylvania by (1) Implementing measures to protect valuable areas within the Townships commercial zones from sprawling development patterns associated with large-scale shopping centers; (2) Requiring multi-story development for large-scale shopping centers; (3) Requiring multi-story off street parking lots for large scale shopping centers; (4) Increasing required loading spaces sizes for shopping centers; (5) Clarifying the language of Section 401; and (6) Adjusting related sections to accomplish the preceding revisions. Commission needs to review and provide comments to the Supervisors.

7. New Business Stonemill Estates Preliminary Subdivision Plan Heritage Building Group (HBG) is submitting a preliminary plan for a residential subdivision on the property located on the east side of Donnerville Road, south of Weaver Road, adjacent to the existing Woods Edge development. The sketch plan for this project was before you in October of 2005. The preliminary plan before you now is similar in nature to the sketch plan; however, the density has increased slightly to include a total of 320, including 209 single-family lots and 111 townhouse lots. The proposed development is located within the Lancaster County Urban Growth Boundary as well as the Manor Township RH1-High Density Residential Flex Zone. The design proposes a mixture of single-family detached units and townhouse units with several parks located throughout the development that meet the County Open Space requirements. Access is currently proposed to the development via three locations; a proposed access onto Donnerville Road, and the connection to the Woods Edge development via St. Georges Drive and Stonemill Road. The plans also indicate our intension to create an extension of Stonemill Road through to Donnerville Road. The Commission needs to review and make comments to the LCPC.

Planning Module Owl Bridge Road Property - A subdivision is being proposed for the property at 197 Owl Bridge Road. The property is owned by Tim and Dan Nauman and will be divided into two residential lots each utilizing well and on-lot septic systems. The Planning Commission needs to review and complete component 4A-Municipal Planning Agency Review Form.

8. Other Business - Regional Comprehensive Plan - Correspondence

9. Adjourn

DRAFT MINUTES Manor Township Planning Commission Minutes

Monday, May 8, 2006 Time: 7:30 P.M.

The Manor Township Planning Commission met on Monday, May 8, 2006 at the Manor Township Municipal Building, 950 W. Fairway Drive, Lancaster, PA. Mr. Ahlfeld introduced the Commission members and led the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.

Members Present: John Ahlfeld, James Miller, Donald Witmer, Mary Glazier, Scott Haverstick and Beth Herr Member Absent: James Henke Visitors Present: Bob Musser, 200 Donnerville Rd Anthony Maros, James Crawford, Michael Wodotinsicy & James DeNave from Heritage Building Group Steven Black, Saxinger & Black Greg Elko & John Narager, Langan Engineering Guy Eshelman Bonnie Miller, 113 Bent Tree Dr John May, 100 Red Fox Rd Jim Stauffer, Weaver Rd Richard Bauder, 130 Sheep Lane Allen Kreider, 141 Supervisors Rd George Elko, 3126 Windon Ave Chris Elko, 3126 Windon Ave Jim Huber, 113 Shannon Dr

Public Comment There was no public comment.

Minutes Beth Herr made a motion to accept the April 10, 2006 minute as presented. Jim Miller seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously.

Old Business Act 537 For Planning Commission comments and recommendations to the Board

of Supervisors. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that this was before the Commission at last months meeting and we asked the members for their opinions. Mr. Miller stated that at the last meeting they were anxious to receive comments from LCPC, Solicitor, and the Township Engineer relative to the merits and he assumed nothing was received. Mr. Ott stated that he had received nothing. Mr. Miller as well as the other members felt that the discussion should be tabled. An Ordinance amending the Official Zoning Ordinance of Manor Township, Lancaster County, Pennsylvania by (1) Implementing measures to protect valuable areas within the Townships commercial zones from sprawling development patterns associated with large-scale shopping centers; (2) Requiring multi-story development for large-scale shopping centers; (3) Requiring multi-story off street parking lots for large scale shopping centers; (4) Increasing required loading spaces sizes for shopping centers; (5) Clarifying the language of Section 401; and (6) Adjusting related sections to accomplish the preceding revisions. Commission needs to review and provide comments to the Supervisors. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that at the last meeting there was a lengthy discussion and the Commission was looking for answers to questions they had as well as input from the County Planning Commission. Mr. Ott indicated that Mr. Whittle had intended to be at the meeting with comments. Ms. Glazier suggested the ordinance be returned to the agenda for next month. Ted Gingrich, 110 Bent Tree Drive, indicated that fire protection was not addressed in the two story buildings and parking garage. Mr. Gingrich stated that there is no equipment in this area to reach a two story or more building. Mr. Gingrich requests that the ordinance, at least in the parking garage, require standpipes at each of the stair towers. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that it is something they will consider when looking at the ordinance. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that this would be continued on next months agenda and he hopes to have additional information.

New Business Stonemill Estates Preliminary Subdivision Plan Heritage Building Group (HBG) is submitting a preliminary plan for a residential subdivision on the property located on the east side of Donerville Road, south of Weaver Road, adjacent to the existing Woods Edge development. The sketch plan for this project was before you in October of 2005. The preliminary plan before you now is similar in nature to the sketch plan; however, the density has increased slightly to include a total of 320, including 209 single-family lots and 111 townhouse lots. The proposed development is located within the Lancaster County Urban Growth Boundary as well as the Manor Township RH1-High Density Residential Flex Zone. The design proposes a mixture of single-family detached units and townhouse units with several parks located throughout the development that meet the County Open Space requirements. Access is currently proposed to the development via three locations; a proposed access onto Donerville Road, and the connection to the Woods Edge development via St. Georges Drive and Stonemill Road. The plans also indicate our intension to create an extension of Stonemill Road through to Donerville Road. The Commission needs to review and make comments to the LCPC. Tony Maros, from Heritage Building Group, along with several other gentlemen presented the plan. Mr. Maros stated that this plan was seen in a sketch form last year. They met with the Township regarding some issues such as the pocket parks. The plan as proposed now is 209 singles and 111 townhouses for a total of 320 units. The sketch plan previously seen had 317 units. The plan also contemplates a future extension of Stonemill Road. Both the County and State Agriculture Boards must approve this alignment, because part of the road encroaches onto a preserved farm in order to get the alignment with Donerville Road. The developer attended the County Agricultural Board who chose not to make a recommendation to the State Agricultural Board. They do anticipate that they will be able to work this situation out with the Agricultural

Boards involved. Due to the fact that the State Agricultural Board has not officially approved Stonemill Drive, the developer made the local road off of Donerville Road into the development a collector road to service this development, as an alternate plan. This design does conform to the requirements of the Township Ordinances. There are four basins shown on the property to manage stormwater that is a slightly different configuration than what was shown on the sketch plan; this was a result of the hydro engineering and determination of where and how the stormwater will flow. Those issues determined the size of the basins needed. Mr. Maros stated that they have received a stormwater review letter from Buchart-Horn. Mr. Maros went over the letter for the Board and explained how the basins would work. The applicant has made application and reserved the sewer capacity that is necessary for the project through LASA. Mr. Miller asked if the section referenced to in the Buchart Horn letter is in the Township Stormwater Management Ordinance and Mr. Ott stated he assumes that it is in the Townships Stormwater Management Ordinance. Mr. Miller asked Mr. Maros to talk about the pocket parks. Mr. Maros stated that there are five areas of open space and he pointed the areas out on the plan. It is the developers opinion that the parks as located comply with the requirements of the Ordinance. In discussions with the Township, the question had been raised of relocating all the pocket parks to one area; the area suggested was in the northwest corner where it abuts the Stauffer farm. The area is adjacent to basin #2. The developer showed a rendering of the open space in the northwest corner. Mr. Haverstick asked what the square footage was of the open space in the northwest corner and Mr. Maros stated that it is 2.6 acres; there is approximately one-half acre still located in the lower section of the tract that will remain. Ms. Herr asked if that is the same amount of land as the five open spaces contained. Mr. Maros stated that actually it is a little more area. Mr. Maros stated that the pocket parks are more desirable because they would be adjacent to the community throughout the development rather than in one concentrated area. Mr. Miller stated that there is a park area in the Woods Edge development adjacent to this development. One of the comments discussed with the previous sketch plan was with this project, would you be able to walk to that park area. Mr. Maros stated that sidewalks are proposed and they do connect to the park. Mr. Miller asked if there would be any connection from the northeast corner of the tract and Mr. Maros stated no. Mr. Witmer stated that it looks like there is more area between Lots 59 & 60; He asked if that area was for a walkway. Mr. Maros stated that there is a little connector walkway. Mr. Miller asked what could be done with the 2 ½ acre park proposed as it would be rather small for active recreation. There would be a playground area, passive area with some walking trails and benches and possibly a small multi purpose field. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that when they talked initially, they were hoping to see a more creative traditional neighborhood type of development for this tract. Mr. Maros stated that from a marketing standpoint, they try to isolate housing types in a community. There are two different types of single houses proposed. This is what is commonly called a traditional neighborhood design in terms of the overall layout. Ms. Herr asked what the pricing of the housing would be. Mr. Maros stated that it is not known yet but they will not be starter homes. Mr. Haverstick asked if it is their intent to build the three distinct communities concurrently. Mr. Maros stated that it would most likely be their model. Mr. Haverstick asked how many different architectural styles of houses will be offered. Mr. Maros stated that they have 24 or 25 different types of housing styles. Mr. Haverstick asked if it is possible that there would be 15 different designs in this community. Mr. Maros stated that the floor plan tends to be replicated but the front elevations will be very distinct and different. Ms. Herr asked if they have done any other projects in the Lancaster County area. Mr. Maros stated not in Lancaster County but we

have done a lot of projects in Berks, Chester, Montgomery, and Bucks Counties. Mr. Maros listed some of the projects in the other counties that they have done and are currently working on. Bonnie Miller, 113 Bent Tree Drive, expressed a concern with using St. Georges Drive as an egress since it is a small street. Ms. Miller was advised that St. Georges Drive was always intended to be connected and it would never rise above a local road classification. Mr. Kreider, 141 Supervisors Road, stated that the stormwater management areas look like they are going to be the tot lot areas. Are these basins going to be retention or detention basins? Mr. Maros stated that the three basins are not part of the open space. The one basin is contiguous to the open space area. The basins will be detention not retention basins. Jim Stauffer, 365 Weaver Road, questioned the location of the connections for the utilities to the development and asked for consideration that the sewer line stays on the east side of Donerville Road. Mr. Stauffer asked for elaboration on the pre and post discharge of stormwater and what they would do if springs were hit. Mr. Miller clarified what 50% reduction means. Mr. Stauffer asked what would be done with the existing well. Mr. Stauffer stated that there is a well on this property at the north end of the site. The water table there is high and Mr. Stauffer was concerned that there will be a water problem and if the water problem is not addressed the way it should be, that his property will be directly affected. Mr. Stauffer asked that the proposed park open space area be fenced in to protect his Christmas trees. Mr. Haverstick asked Mr. Stauffer if he would be satisfied with a fence along his property line and Mr. Stauffer stated that he would be satisfied. Mr. Stauffer questioned the two extensions that are cul-de-sacs and asked if they are planning to do something with the adjoining tract. Mr. Maros stated that they are not planning anything but at the recommendation of the Township to conform to the Ordinance, they need points of access to adjoining properties in case they are developed in the future. Ted Gingrich stated that the developer is proposing to pull water from S. Centerville Road. People from Woods Edge have complained to the Township about low water pressure already and if you take more water away from Woods Edge, you will make the current problem worse. Mr. Maros stated that the City of Lancaster requires a detailed water model and analysis. Those questions and concerns were raised and are being reviewed. Mr. Bauder stated that they met with the developer regarding the park requirements. They requested the developer to look at plan and give the Township a fairly large area. The Township preferred it not be along Donerville Road but it really does not fit anywhere else. The Township asked for a larger park adjacent to the Stauffer Farm so if the farm is ever developed, they can have a larger contiguous park in that area. The Township is concerned with safety along Donerville Road. Mr. Ahlfeld questioned why they chose to put the main park on the periphery of the project rather than in the center. Mr. Maros stated that they are balancing the requirement that they are to increase density with making space in terms of street layout. They looked at other alternatives but they do not work. Mr. Ahlfeld asked what the gross density was and was informed that it is approximately 4½ units per acre. Mr. Bauder asked if the Township is to meet that density on an average or on each individual development. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that it is on an average. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that the zoning requires the density. Ms. Glazier pointed out that the whole point of rezoning the tract was to increase the density. Ms. Glazier stated that maybe the Township would be better off with money rather than the 2½ acre park where you may not want it and is potentially a problem for the person next door. The Township could use the money to acquire parkland in a place where you really want it and can use it. Mr. Bauder stated that most township ordinances requires land or funds in lieu of and the funds must be used to acquire other parks or improve existing parks. Mr. Bauder stated that the Township does not have such an ordinance. Ms. Glazier asked the Township if

they would agree to have money in lieu of the park land and Mr. Bauder stated that they met with the developer to try to reach an agreement. Mr. Bauder stated that there are no plans for the Stauffer Farm to be developed but you do not know what will happen in ten years or twenty years. If the park is not on the boundary, you can never expand it. Ms. Glazier stated that she would rather have the money than a park that is really not exciting anyone. Mr. Bauder stated that sounds reasonable to him if the developer would be interested in doing that. Mr. Maros stated that they would be happy to talk with the Township. Ms. Herr stated that the park is too remote from the whole project. Guy Eshelman stated that the zoning was changed so you could have higher density already without the consent when we sold the property. You had 30 or 40 years to change the zoning. You are going to get money from every house that is built there with the higher density and you get taxes so dont try to keep pushing it. Bonnie Miller stated that the token of a park on South Centerville Road is not able to be used by Woods Edge residents. Put high density in this development and be considerate of connecting to the Stauffers; there is a piece of land behind Bent Tree Drive that could be used as a park for this community and Woods Edge that would be within the housing area so that people do not have to go outside of their community for a park. Mr. Miller stated that the park and open space can be dealt with when the Township has their own Park and Open Space completed and it is not necessary to have a subdivision/land development ordinance to do that. Mr. Miller stated that the Township does not want or need big parks everywhere. Little pocket parks are wanted as well as little walking trails and active parks. Mr. Haverstick stated that in lieu of does not address the over 300 units within the community which is entitled to have some recreational space within their community. Ms. Glazier stated that she feels the pocket parks would be more appealing and if they are connected it would be much more appealing to most people. Mr. Miller stated that he does not like Plan B with the 2½ acres in the corner and he prefers the pocket parks plan. Mr. Miller made a motion to recommend to the LCPC approval of the preliminary subdivision plan essentially with the pocket parks as shown but request that the developer take a look at increasing the size of the open space area in the central part of the site in attempts to make it a little more substantial recreation area as a park area as opposed to open space A. Ms. Glazier seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously.

Planning Module Owl Bridge Road Property - A subdivision is being proposed for the property at 197 Owl Bridge Road. The property is owned by Tim and Dan Nauman and will be divided into two residential lots each utilizing well and on-lot septic systems. The Planning Commission needs to review and complete component 4A-Municipal Planning Agency Review Form. Steve Black, from Saxinger and Black Surveyors, presented the subdivision for a lot located at 117 Owl Bridge Road. The property is located between Owl Bridge Road and Red Bud Drive. The property is zoned Rural and it is currently farmed. They are proposing two lots one being 11 acres with a dwelling and a driveway with stormwater facility and the other being a 4 ½ acre lot with proposed driveway off Red Bud Drive and a new dwelling and proposed underground stormwater facility. The adjoining property is zoned Rural and have on lot wells and septic and they all seem to be functioning properly. Mr. Miller made a motion to recommend Bruce fill out and sign the planning module. Ms. Herr seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously.

Other Business Mr. Ott presented a plan regarding a boat dock at the end of Blue Rock Road. Mr. Ott stated that it is his understanding there is grant for putting in a floating dock at the

waters edge at the end of Blue Rock Road off River Road. It will be a cooperative effort. The Township will do the parking area. There is a grant that will be signed by the Township and this is just information for the Board. Jim Miller stated that Charlie Douts was aware of a grant through the Fish and Boat Commission to put this floating dock in and it required that the Township actually be the grant requestor. The grant is already approved. It required half of the cost to be done by grant recipient who is Manor Township. Mr. Miller made a motion that the Board is in agreement with the grant request. Mr. Haverstick seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously. Mr. Miller gave an update on the Blue Rock Heritage Center. Regional Comprehensive Plan - The LIMC received the final draft on April 18th and is about to begin the 60-day period where municipalities will have their formal opportunity to review the draft. The Commission indicated that they would like to have a hard copy to review with the exception of Mr. Haverstick who wanted a CD. The draft will be sent to each municipality asking them for the Planning Commission and elected officials to review at public meetings and comments to the LIMC should come through the governing body. Correspondence Ms. Glazier reported that she had three letters from the LCPC regarding final plan approvals for 3868 Columbia Avenue, 3020 Associates, and John W. Metzger, each with some conditions. A letter dated April 19 was received from LCPC for review and comment copy of letter requesting the LCPC consider modification of Section 303 plan processing procedures action scheduled for May 8th. A letter of Notice for plan receipt for Stonemill Estates development was received. A copy of a letter from the developer of Timson Place requesting a waiver of LCSDLDO Section 602.06 Sidewalks was received. Mr. Whittle stated that it was considered by the LCPC a hardship beyond the scope of their plan. The developer is putting in sidewalks along all of Donerville Road with the exception of where the culvert is located and they will note on their plan that when the Township has a sidewalk improvement program in that area, that they will willingly contribute as required. Mr. Ahlfeld mentioned that on May 31, the Coalition for Smart Growth is holding an all day density summit. Mr. Ahlfeld also announced that on June 1st there is going to be a workshop on official maps presented by the Department of Community and Economic Development. Mr. Ahlfeld announced that on June 22 the LIMC will sponsor a forum for officials from all the municipalities participating in the regional plan.

Mr. Haverstick reported that he is representing Manor Township on the County's Rails to Trails Advisory Board. The Township has a 5½ mile section that most likely will be incorporated as the northern extension. Mr. Haverstick stated that if they can deal with the bridge over the Conestoga River at Safe Harbor, the County would like to proceed with our Township section which can be relatively quick and cheap.

Mr. Miller stated that the Turkey Hill Country Classic was well attended and it was a great day for the Township. Mr. Haverstick pointed out that the proceeds go to the Farmland Trust. Mr. Miller stated Turkey Hill also does a great job.

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 9:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary Glazier Secretary

Recording Secretary Evelyn Rineer

**Planning Commission Meeting**

**06/12/06**

Manor Township Planning Commission Agenda

Monday, June 12, 2006 Time: 7:30 P.M.

1. Call to Order
2. Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag
3. Roll Call
4. Public Comment
5. Approve Minutes of May 8, 2006 Meeting
6. Old Business Act 537 For Planning Commission comments and recommendations to the Board of Supervisors An Ordinance amending the Official Zoning Ordinance of Manor Township, Lancaster County, Pennsylvania by (1) Implementing measures to protect valuable areas within the Townships commercial zones from sprawling development patterns associated with large-scale shopping centers; (2) Requiring multi-story development for large-scale shopping centers; (3) Requiring multi-story off street parking lots for large scale shopping centers; (4) Increasing required loading spaces sizes for shopping centers; (5) Clarifying the language of Section 401; and (6) Adjusting related sections to accomplish the preceding revisions. Commission needs to review and provide comments to the Supervisors.
7. New Business Amendment to the Township Zoning Ordinance, Article 2, Chapter 214.2 to add Bed & Breakfast as a permitted use in the MRC Zoning District of Manor Township and Article 4, Section 408.1 to include the MRC Zone to the list of zoning districts within which bed and breakfast are permitted as of right. The Planning Commission needs to review and comment to the Township Board of Supervisors.

Manor Oaks Lot 146 Final Land Development Plan - Cornerstone at Manor Oaks proposes the development of Lot 146 within the existing Manor Oaks residential development located at the intersection of Letort Road and Knollwood Road. The development of this tract involves the construction of a total of thirty (30) new townhouse units; residential development that matches the requirements of the residential zone which abuts the commercial zone is a permitted use. The townhouse dwellings have been designed to match the adjoining townhouse development under construction within Lot 145. The existing private access driveway within Lot 145 will be extended through Lot 146 to intersect with Knollwood Road, thereby providing a continued access way through the site. As part of the proposed development of Lot 146, Lot 145 and 146 will be joined in common. For those reasons, the current proposal has been submitted as a final plan to revise the original information shown on the recorded subdivision and land development plans for this project. The Commission needs to review the final land development plan and

make recommendations to the LCPC.

Final Subdivision & Land Development Plan for Landings at Eagle Heights The site is north of Hershey Mill Road on this revised plan the site is a total of 52.149 acres. There will be a 45 single family dwellings (no change from original plan), 26 duplex units (no change from original plan), 78 townhouses (decrease of 28 units), and 182 multi-family units (an increase of 82 units). The proposed density is 6.35 dwelling units/acre. Public water and sewer will be utilized. The Planning Commission needs to review and make comments to the LCPC.

8. Other Business - Regional Comprehensive Plan - Correspondence

9. Adjourn

DRAFT Manor Township Planning Commission Minutes

Monday, June 12, 2006 Time: 7:30 P.M.

The Manor Township Planning Commission met on Monday, May 8, 2006 at the Manor Township Municipal Building, 950 W. Fairway Drive, Lancaster, PA. Mr. Ahlfeld introduced the Commission members and led the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.

Members Present: John Ahlfeld, James Miller, Donald Witmer, Mary Glazier, Beth Herr and James Henke Member Absent: Scott Haverstick Visitors Present: Jeff Burkhart, David Miller Associates John S. May, 100 Red Fox Road Joel Snyder, RGS Associates Bonnie Miller, 113 Bent Tree Dr Jim Huber, 113 Shannon Drive Melissa Kelly, RGS Associates Danny Whittle, LCPC Allen Kreider, 141 Supervisors Rd Miriam & Jay Stauffer, 345 Weaver Road Nadine Bell, 212 N. Queen St. Jim Stauffer, 365 Weaver Rd. Brian Bingeman, MMLLP Vic Kicera, Eagle Heights Mike Glass, Eagle Heights Peter & Betsy ODonaghue, 388 Hershey Mill Rd Frantz Herr, 746 Hershey Mill Rd Elaine Jones, LNP

Public Comment John May, 100 Red Fox Road, stated that the bridge that was replaced on Owl Bridge Road by the County included stormwater management plans both during and after construction. Mr. May indicated that it is a complete disaster and encouraged the Planning Commission to take a look at the site. Mr. May stated that the water runoff is severely eroding Ann Klines property and beginning to undercut Owl Bridge Road. Mr. May indicated that the water is channeled into a small area which shoots the water into the Little Conestoga Creek. There is a vinyl trench that runs into the creek from the north side that looks like a childs slide in an amusement park. Mr. May indicated that it is a County project and the Supervisors have expressed their concerns. Mr. May stated that he will resist any effort to get the Township to correct the problem, because the problem was made in the last six months. Bonnie Miller, 113 Bent Tree Drive, asked that the Board put caution into all decisions they make going forward with regards to what is being presented and how it is being done. Ms. Miller indicated that the northern part of the Township is being densely populated and the people are up in arms regarding water retention, water flow, and in her development the open space factor. Ms. Miller feels that the slums of the future are being created. She indicated that open space is needed and not just the segments that developers are willing to give. Ms. Miller stated that Barry Smith made a

statement that the Woods Edge Park is used quite often and she had individuals check that out. Children do not go to the park unsupervised. There are people who use the park; for example, a women who push a stroller to the park and cars that are in the parking lot, but children are not using it as a play park unless parents supervise them. If parks are put into a community, put the park in the middle of the development so children can go to the park unsupervised.

Minutes Ms. Herr made a motion to approve the minute as received. Mr. Miller seconded the motion and the motion carried with Mr. Henke abstaining.

Old Business Act 537 Mr. Ott stated that there is nothing new to present. It is his understanding that the Supervisors have voted to go ahead with it. Mr. May indicated that the Supervisors will be scheduling the Act 537 for adoption by the end of the month. Mr. Miller stated that he had comments. One comment it that it is very important that the Act 537 match the land use planning to the extent that the areas planned for growth need to be accommodated by sewer and water facilities. The second comment is that the Act 537 does not address the Chesapeake Bay Tributary Strategy and the impacts that will have as it is adopted and implemented. Mr. Miller stated that he feels the Act 537 is inadequate and that it does not address this last comment at all.

An Ordinance amending the Official Zoning Ordinance of Manor Township, Lancaster County, Pennsylvania regarding shopping centers Mr. Ahlfeld asked if the Commission wanted to make comments to the Supervisors or have either the consultant or someone else make a presentation and answer questions regarding the amendment before any action is taken. Mr. Miller stated that he read Mr. Whittles comments and that the comments seem to be well placed. Mr. Miller stated that any action on this proposal may be premature until we are finished with the regional Comprehensive Plan. The Commission was in favor of tabling the amendment at this time until the Comprehensive Plan is done. Mr. Witmer stated that he agreed. Ms. Glazier and Ms. Herr felt that they could hear the presentation before the Comprehensive Plan is adopted which would give them time to consider the amendment.

New Business Amendment to the Township Zoning Ordinance, Article 2, Chapter 214.2 to add Bed & Breakfast as a permitted use in the MRC Zoning District of Manor Township and Article 4, Section 408.1 to include the MRC Zone to the list of zoning districts within which bed and breakfast are permitted as of right. The Planning Commission needs to review and comment to the Township Board of Supervisors. Nadine Bell from the Law Firm of Nikolaus and Hohenadel was present on behalf of Miriam Stauffer. Ms. Stauffer was presenting a petition to amend the Township Zoning Ordinance to add Bed & Breakfast as a permitted use in the MRC Zoning. They are requesting an amendment pursuant to Section 704.5 of the Zoning Ordinance to allow a Bed & Breakfast as a permitted use in the MRC. Two provisions of the Ordinance must be amended. They are Article II Section 214.2 and Article IV Section 408.1. Currently Bed & Breakfast are only permitted whether by right or special exception within the Agricultural, Rural and Village Zoning Districts. Ms. Bell read the definition of a Bed & Breakfast from the Ordinance. Ms. Bell indicated that the purpose of the MRC Zoning District is to provide for a mixture of commercial and residential uses. Ms. Bell stated that there is no harm in having this type of use in a MRC District. Permitting the proposed use by right will have no greater impact and the impact is, in fact, less than any number of uses that are already provided for in the MRC Zone and listed the uses. The applicant believes that this use accomplishes the goal of subsection

No.14 of Section 214.2. She read the section. Ms. Bell stated that this is a single building where uses can be mixed. Jim Stauffer gave a description of the property proposed to be used for a Bed & Breakfast and a brief history of the property. Mr. Stauffer indicated that the property is presently used as part of an agriculture operation and has been rented out in the past. Mr. Stauffer indicated that their plans are to operation a Bed & Breakfast. Mr. Stauffer described the character of the neighborhood where their property is located. The petition recommended that Bed & Breakfast use be permitted in structures constructed up to the year 1875 and having a minimum gross floor area of 4,000 square feet. The limitations were proposed to uphold the standards of a Bed & Breakfast. Mr. Stauffer stated that generally when using a Bed & Breakfast you are looking for something different and unique. Mr. Miller stated that in the Agricultural zoning district, the building is not required to be a historic structure and in the rural district they are; also, in the Village zoning district they do not have to be a historic structure. Mr. Miller stated that he feels that the Ordinance should remain consistent throughout the Ordinance. Mr. Miller stated that he supports the idea but does not like the 4,000 square foot criteria for minimum floor area. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that he feels it is appropriate to be in a historic structure but he was not sure whether the standards need to be consistent throughout the Ordinance. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that where he saw standards like this was in a historic overlay district, where you may be permitting an extra use to help make it feasible to maintain a historic structure. Mr. Henke agreed it was a good use. He agreed that the historic nature is unique and if a person can convert such a structure into a Bed & Breakfast and maintains the integrity of the use that is great. Mr. Henke agreed with the use but felt that the restrictions on the size of the house and historical nature are not necessary. Bonnie Miller stated that she feels that this is a good contribution to the northern part of the Township. She indicated that there is a preserved farm across the road and Mr. Stauffers farm market provides a lot of fun things for children in Woods Edge and the community. Mr. Miller recommended that the Supervisors adopt the ordinance with the exclusion of #11. Ms. Glazier seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously.

Manor Oaks Lot 146 Final Land Development Plan - Cornerstone at Manor Oaks proposes the development of Lot 146 within the existing Manor Oaks residential development located at the intersection of Letort Road and Knollwood Road. The development of this tract involves the construction of a total of thirty (30) new townhouse units; residential development that matches the requirements of the residential zone, which abuts the commercial zone, is a permitted use. The townhouse dwellings have been designed to match the adjoining townhouse development under construction within Lot 145. The existing private access driveway within Lot 145 will be extended through Lot 146 to intersect with Knollwood Road, thereby providing a continued access way through the site. As part of the proposed development of Lot 146, Lot 145 and 146 will be joined in common. For those reasons, the current proposal has been submitted as a final plan to revise the original information shown on the recorded subdivision and land development plans for this project. The Commission needs to review the final land development plan and make recommendations to the LCPC. Jeff Burkhart from David Miller Associates presented the plan. Mr. Burkhart stated that it is the same as the preliminary plan seen several months ago. Lot 146 is the lot being developed at this time and was preliminarily approved. This lot is proposed to be added to the already existing development under construction at this time. The maintenance and public utilities will be taken care of by a homeowners group. There were some comments from the Township Engineer on the preliminary plan; those issues were addressed and the Township had one remaining issue dealing with the park and recreation fee. That has since been

resolved. LASA is in the process of drafting their letter qualifying that the applicant has the capacity to serve the site that will allow the exemption of the planning module to proceed forward. Mr. Miller stated that he is disappointed that they did not provide the mixed use. Ms. Glazier asked if sidewalks are being constructed as part of this plan along Letort Road and she was advised that they are. Bonnie Miller stated that the mixed use would have been wonderful. People who originally bought there thought that this lot would be a mixed use and now these people must drive down Letort Road through Millersville to get to a Turkey Hill or something. Hopefully, the Comprehensive Plan will be adopted so this does not happen in the future. Mr. Henke made a motion to recommend the approval of Manor Oaks Lot 146 Final Plan. Ms. Herr seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously.

Final Subdivision & Land Development Plan for Landings at Eagle Heights - The site is north of Hershey Mill Road on this revised plan the site is a total of 52.149 acres. There will be a 45 single family dwellings (no change from original plan), 26 duplex units (no change from original plan), 78 townhouses (decrease of 28 units), and 182 multi-family units (an increase of 82 units). The proposed density is 6.35 dwelling units/acre. Public water and sewer will be utilized. The Planning Commission needs to review and make comments to the LCPC. Melissa Kelly, a landscape architect with RGS Associates, presented the plan. Ms. Kelly was asked for a waiver on the preliminary plan as well as a waiver of the three meeting delay. Ms. Kelly indicated that this area of the site is within the rental community and is basically a revision to the last phase of construction within the rental community. The revision to the previously recorded plan is relatively simple. There was a lot add-on of 2.2 acres approximately a year ago. Talon Drive is being extended to the property line. The unit count has been increased. The total unit increase is about 54 units. Plans have been submitted to the LCPC and well as to the Township Engineer for stormwater review. The stormwater basin is in the same location. The grading for the basin must be modified slightly to accommodate the additional increase in impervious coverage. There are storage units being added that are strictly for the Landings at Eagle Heights residential use. They will not be rented out for public use outside of this community. As part of the recreation fee calculation for the increase in units, we are proposing to utilize that money to provide park amenities in the open space on Lot 75. Playground equipment will be added as part of that park. Mr. Miller asked if they had previous preliminary approval for the site and Ms. Kelly stated they did. Mr. Ahlfeld questioned the density before the revision. Ms. Kelly stated that it was 5.55 units per acre and now it is 6.35 units per acre. Mr. Miller asked if the figures were for entire site. Ms. Kelly stated that the figures were for the entire site. Mr. Henke asked if there would be anything prohibiting the storage of outside vehicles, campers, etc. Ms. Kelly stated that the intent is for internal storage only. Mr. Glass stated that the management is under their control and that they will be regulating the use of the storage units through the storage unit lease. Mr. Henke asked if a vehicle could be put in one of the storage units and be worked on. Mr. Glass stated that there would not be garage door on the unit. Ms. Glazier asked how many town homes and apartments would be built. Ms. Kelly stated that it is an increase of 54 units. The total number is 78 townhouse units in the entire rental community and 182 apartments within the rental community. That is different than the previous plan which had 106 townhouse units and 100 apartment units. Mr. Glass stated that 28 of the additional units are on the lot add-on part of the plan and the remaining additional units comes from modifying the townhouse buildings to garden apartment buildings. Elizabeth ODonoghue, 388 Hershey Mill Road, asked if the lot add-on plan is behind the Millstone Village project. Ms. Kelly stated that this lot add-on plan is

behind Millstone Village. Ms. ODonoghue expressed concern regarding water runoff because she is having a problem with water runoff going through her property. Ms. Kelly explained the stormwater plan for this proposed plan and answered Ms. ODonoghues questions. Ms. ODonoghue stated that she has complained numerous times to the Township and the Lancaster Conservation District regarding the water runoff and mud going through her property. There was extensive discussion regarding the stormwater and water runoff. Bonnie Miller indicated that there were several residents from Hershey Mill Road regarding water runoff at the Supervisors meeting. She asked if it is possible for Manor Township and the developers to get together and help the people on Hershey Mill Road who are being inundated with mud. She feels that the problem is that there is no communication between everyone involved. Jim Stauffer stated that he has had problems with stormwater issues in the past and asked if he is correct in understanding that Manor Township is in charge of policing their own stormwater management. Mr. Ahlfeld asked Mr. Ott if a meeting could be held with the Township Engineer and other parties involved making sure that everything has been constructed in accordance with the design. Mr. Ott stated that he would pass the request on the Mr. Smith. Mr. Witmer stated when you get a 3 inch rain in 15 minutes, it does not matter what is done; you will get flooded out. Mr. Witmer stated that he is not saying this is what the problem is but it can happen. Ms. Miller asked if the developer could give her any names of developments that offer onsite storage units to the residents. She was advised in Warwick Township there is a development called Newport Commons that has storage units as part of the buildings. Ms. Miller asked what the size of the units is and is any cars are being stored in them. Ms. Miller was advised that the size of the units were similar but there are no cars stored in them. Mr. Glass advised the Planning Commission that the storage units are regularly inspected and there is a full time manager on the site who keeps a very close watch on the units. Mr. Miller made a motion to recommend to the LCPC approval of the Final Subdivision/Land Development Plan for The Landings at Eagle Heights. Mr. Henke seconded the motion. Ms. Herr asked why, if the Commission advised for a meeting to take place to look into the stormwater issue would the Commission recommend to the LCPC approval of this plan until they have the results of that meeting. There was further discussion on stormwater issues and Mr. Ahlfeld stated that they recognize there are stormwater issues that need to be looked at and dealt with. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that the approval of the plan does not excuse anyone involved from following the plans as they are approved and satisfying the various agencies involved. The motion passed 5-1 with Ms. Herr voting against the motion. Mr. Henke made a motion to recommend approval of the three meeting delay and recommend approval of the waiver of the preliminary plan processing. Mr. Witmer seconded the motion and the motion passed 5-1 with Ms. Herr voting against the motion. Mr. May stated that he would call Mr. Smith and set up a meeting and asked that the developers also call Mr. Smith regarding the issues brought up tonight. Other Business Regional Comprehensive Plan - A hard copy and CD was given to the Commission members of the April 18th draft. The official 60-day review period is for June and July. Comments are attached to the cover letter that the Steering Committee still want addressed but wanted to wait for the municipal comments and then address all the comments at the same time. Mr. Ahlfeld advised that all of the comments are to come through the governing bodies. In order for the Planning Commission to give their comments to the Supervisors before the deadline, Mr. May stated that the Supervisors would have a special meeting in July in order to incorporate the Planning Commissions comments. After the comments are received at the end of July, the Steering Committee will meet and decide what to do with the comments. The consultants will then be asked to come up with a final draft that will

be circulated for the public hearing. Correspondence There was no correspondence available.

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 8:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary Glazier Secretary

Recording Secretary Evelyn Rineer

**Planning Commission Meeting**

**07/10/06**

Manor Township Planning Commission Agenda

Monday, July 10, 2006 Time: 7:30 P.M.

1. Call to Order
  2. Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag
  3. Roll Call
  4. Public Comment
  5. Approve Minutes of June 12, 2006 Meeting
  6. Old Business Amendment to the Township Zoning Ordinance, Article 2, Chapter 214.2 to add Bed and Breakfast as a permitted use in the MRC Zoning District of Manor Township and Article 4, Section 408.1 to include the MRC Zone to the list of zoning districts within which bed and breakfast use are permitted as of right. Also, added as part of this amendment since last months review, we are recommending the elimination of the residential permitted use in the local commercial district. Before you is the official amendment as drafted by the Township Solicitor. The Commission needs to recommend that this document as prepared meets your recommendation made to the Supervisors last month. Any new comments will be passed onto the Supervisors.
- Regional Comprehensive Draft Plan Review & Discussion The Commission received copies of the Draft Regional Comprehensive Plan at last months meeting. Tonight the Commission will discuss any recommended revisions that they wish to give to the Board of Supervisors.
7. New Business Hampilos Subdivision Waiver Request LCSLDLDO Section 602.09.C Street Intersection Separation - The property is located north of Walnut Hill Road and south of Letort Road in the Medium Residential (RM) Zoning District. The proposal is to subdivide the property for 32 single family residences. The applicant is requesting an interpretation of Section 602.09 regarding intersection separation. Section 602.09.C applies to Collector streets and speed limits

of 40 mph. The applicants interpretation is that the proposal falls under the jurisdiction of Section 602.09.B that requires a minimum of 150 between these intersections because Walnut Hill Road is not a collector and the speed limit is less than 40 mph. (35mph) If it is interpreted that our situation is regulated by Sec. 602.09.B, than no waiver request is necessary. If this sketch is regulated by Sec. 602.09.C, than we will need relief from the requirement to provide a minimum of 300centerline separation. The Commission needs to review and comment to the LCPC on this waiver request.

Alecxih/Quanbeck Planning Module The Planning Commission reviewed the subdivision/land development plan at the April 10, 2006 meeting. This is the planning module needed by DEP for the subdivided lot. The property is on Franklin Road. The Commission needs to complete Component 4A Municipal Planning Agency Review form from the planning module.

H. Chester Haverstick Lot Add-on Plan The property is located at 265 Redwood Drive. The property is located in the Medium Residential (RM) zoning district. Lot 1A contains 6,419 square feet is being added onto Lot 1 owned by H. Chester Haverstick and contains 15,434 square feet. The combined Lot 1 and 1A will result in a lot containing 21,853 square feet. Lot 1A is currently owned by Lamar & Kathryn Stauffer. The Commission needs to review and make their recommendations to the LCPC.

8. Other Business - Letter from Risco Development Manor Corporate Property - Stonemill Estates (Eshelman Tract) Discussion of LCPC condition of approval including the Stonemill Road extension. - Correspondence

9. Adjourn

DRAFT Manor Township Planning Commission Minutes

Monday, July 10, 2006 Time: 7:30 P.M.

The Manor Township Planning Commission met on Monday, July 10, 2006 at the Manor Township Municipal Building, 950 W. Fairway Drive, Lancaster, PA. Mr. Ahlfeld introduced the Commission members and led the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.

Members Present: John Ahlfeld, James Miller, Donald Witmer, Mary Glazier, Beth Herr, James Henke and Scott Haverstick Visitors Present: Audra Littlehok, 3667 Blue Rock Rd Andrea Reich, 247 Pine Bridge Ln Ryan Shrom, 1008 Flagstone Ct. Anthony Maras, 2500 York Road, Jamison Keith Miller, RGS Associates J. Diffindall, 52 Redbud Drive Linda Strauss, 357 S. Duke St. Robert Barber, 2749 Chapel Rd Nick Hess, 929 Donerville Road Duane Hess, 175 Carol Dr Glenn Hess, 833 Central Manor Rd Jeff Burkhart, David Miller Associates Ron Kratofil, 524 Hummingbird Rd Al Kreider, 141 Supervisors Rd Miriam & Jay Stauffer, 345 Weaver Rd Chris Herr, 360 N. Duke St Bonnie Miller, 113 Bent Tree Dr Jim Stauffer, 365 Weaver Road

Minutes Jim Miller made a motion to approve the June 12, 2006 minutes. Beth Herr seconded

the motion and the motion carried with Scott Haverstick abstaining.

Old Business Amendment to the Township Zoning Ordinance, Article 2, Chapter 214.2 to add Bed and Breakfast as a permitted use in the MRC Zoning District of Manor Township and Article 4, Section 408.1 to include the MRC Zone to the list of zoning districts within which bed and breakfast use are permitted as of right. Also, added as part of this amendment since last months review, we are recommending the elimination of the residential permitted use in the local commercial district. Before the Commission is the official amendment as drafted by the Township Solicitor. The Commission needs to recommend that this document, as prepared, meets your recommendation made to the Supervisors last month. Any new comments will be passed onto the Supervisors. Mr. Miller asked Mr. Ott for any background information regarding the removal of residential as a permitted use. Mr. Ott stated that the amendment has to do with the Manor Oaks project. Mr. Ott stated that the staff felt this would be a short-term fix so that they do not have local commercial areas being built as all residential and it would be revisited when updates are done to the Zoning Ordinance after the Comprehensive Plan is adopted. Mr. Haverstick asked if this was in response to an actual application. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that there was a specific request for a house to be converted to a bed and breakfast on Weaver Road. Mr. Miller asked Mr. Whittles thoughts on the proposed change. Mr. Whittle stated that it might be worth considering if there is remaining local commercial that could be a mixed use. Mr. Whittle related how East Hempfield Township was handling a mixed-use district. Mr. Whittle indicated that he believed they were looking for mixed use and if residential were not permitted there would be no mixed use. Mr. Whittle stated that the residential use could be a conditional use if it is not a permitted use. Mr. Miller stated that he believes they want to maintain the mixed-use category and by just removing residential as a permitted use should not be the final answer. Mr. Miller stated that in the short run, it may be acceptable but in the long run we are not accomplishing what we want to. Ms. Glazier stated that she is not in favor of making the change at this time. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that maybe it should be a conditional use and we can add some criteria in the conditional use section of the ordinance that would provide a basis for deciding whether it is appropriate in certain cases. Mr. Miller stated that it is helpful to have the Countys thoughts before the Commission deliberates over something of this substance. Ms. Glazier stated that if they were going to revisit it, she would rather leave it as it is for now. Ms. Glazier stated that she felt they should also look at it only if there is a sufficient amount of land zoned local commercial. Mr. Miller made a motion to recommend to the Manor Township Supervisors the adoption of the Ordinance as presented with the removal of Section 1 for further evaluation and input from the County. Section 1 deals with removing residential as a permitted use in the MRC Zone. Don Witmer seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously.

New Business Hampilos Subdivision Waiver Request LCSDDLDO Section 602.09.C Street Intersection Separation - The property is located north of Walnut Hill Road and south of Letort Road in the Medium Residential (RM) Zoning District. The proposal is to subdivide the property for 32 single family residences. The applicant is requesting an interpretation of Section 602.09 regarding intersection separation. Section 602.09.C applies to Collector streets and speed limits of 40 mph. The applicants interpretation is that the proposal falls under the jurisdiction of Section 602.09.B that requires a minimum of 150 between these intersections because Walnut Hill Road is not a collector and the speed limit is less than 40 mph. (35mph) If it is interpreted

that our situation is regulated by Sec. 602.09.B, than no waiver request is necessary. If this sketch is regulated by Sec. 602.09.C, than we will need relief from the requirement to provide a minimum of 300centerline separation. The Commission needs to review and comment to the LCPC on this waiver request. Keith Miller, from RGS Associates, presented the plan. Mr. Miller stated that this is the same sketch as presented in the past. The project is located between Letort and Walnut Hill Roads west of Millersville Borough and adjacent to the Grace Baptist Church. Previously, they had a proposal to have a boulevard entrance that would provide ingress and egress to the site. Keith Miller was directed by the Commission at that time to seek an alternate access via the Grace Baptist Church or through Pflumms Construction. A letter of rejection was received from the church and they had received a similar verbal rejection from the Pflumms. They prepared a revised sketch to provide the maximum separation between Streets A and Bas shown on the plan which still allows them to meet Penn Dots safe stopping sight distance clear sight triangle without any encroachment onto adjacent properties to the east and west of the site. It allows them approximately 270between the street intersections. They are before the Commission for an interpretation first and, if needed, a waiver request of the requirements of Section 602.09.B. Mr. Miller stated that Walnut Hill Road has posted a 35 mph speed limit so there is room for interpretation of how this situation applies to the Ordinance. Jim Miller stated that he did not see Walnut Hill Road listed in the Zoning Ordinance as a collector road. Jim Miller stated that he did not feel it was for them to make that determination. Jim Miller asked Mr. Ott if he relies on the Zoning Ordinance in determining what a collector road is and Mr. Ott stated he goes by the list. Mr. Haverstick asked for the definition of a collector road and Mr. Whittle gave an explanation. Ms. Herr stated that the configuration of stop signs installed at the corner of S. Duke and George Streets would make Letort Road a collector street because everybody is avoiding that intersection. Mr. Whittle stated that the issue for this particular set of circumstances is that there is a measurable difference between 270and 300in terms of its impact on this road. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that the Commission almost unanimously thought that this was a good idea and that the consultant should look into it. Ms. Herr asked if the last time that the Commission looked at the plan, didnt they want to have an emergency access onto Letort Road. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that was one option. Mr. Miller stated that they had approval from the Commission and County Planning to have emergency access via Letort Road but ran into a problem with the owner of the residual tract. He chose not to support that after they had the plan approved and that is why they came back with alternate proposals. Ms. Glazier asked if the plan was revisited with the people who own the tract. Mr. Miller stated that they still have a law suit pending. Mr. Henke asked if they meet the safe stopping distance as well as do the intersections encroach on the adjacent property owners. Mr. Miller stated that they are positioned so that the safe stopping sight distance triangle exactly hits the corner of the property. Mr. Henke made a motion that as shown on the sketch plan, Streets A and B as they are proposed and assuming that Walnut Hill Road is a local road, that the access points be recommended for approval. Jim Miller seconded the motion. The motion passed with 4 voting yes, 2 voted no (Beth Herr and Scott Haverstick) and Mary Glazier abstained. Jim Miller asked if the developer had talked to the individuals who had concerns. Jim Miller asked Keith Miller to relay to the developer that the concerned residents would like to speak to the developer about some details. Mr. Herr stated that their concern is not only water runoff but also the additional traffic. Mr. Herr stated that he feels that Letort Road is a collector road because of the changes with the stop signs on Duke Street. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that the road is not listed as a collector. Mr. Ahlfeld stated for

clarification neither the Commission nor the County is taking final action on this plan at this point. The entire plan will come back before the Commission for a full review on all aspects of the subdivision ordinance before it will be approved.

**Alecxi/Quanbeck Planning Module** The Planning Commission reviewed the subdivision/land development plan at the April 10, 2006 meeting. This is the planning module needed by DEP for the subdivided lot. The property is on Franklin Road. The Commission needs to complete Component 4A Municipal Planning Agency Review form from the planning module. Jeff Burkhart, from David Miller Associates, was present for the plan. Mr. Burkhart stated he was before the Commission for the completion of the planning module. Jim Miller made a motion that they recommend approval of the planning module. Scott Haverstick seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously.

**H. Chester Haverstick Lot Add-on Plan** The property is located at 265 Redwood Drive. The property is located in the Medium Residential (RM) zoning district. Lot 1A contains 6,419 square feet is being added onto Lot 1 owned by H. Chester Haverstick and contains 15,434 square feet. The combined Lot 1 and 1A will result in a lot containing 21,853 square feet. Lot 1A is currently owned by Lamar & Kathryn Stauffer. The Commission needs to review and make their recommendations to the LCPC. Gary Shirk, from Weber Surveyors, presented the plan. Mr. Haverstick currently owns Lot #1 and Mr. Stauffer owns Lot #2 and Lot #1A. Mr. Haverstick would like to add the back portion of Mr. Stauffers lot onto his property. Mr. Ahlfeld asked if the resulting properties would all comply with area requirements of zoning and everything else. Mr. Shirk stated that the properties do comply. Mr. Henke made a motion that the H. Chester Haverstick lot add-on plan be recommended to the LCPC for approval. Beth Herr seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously.

**Other Business Letter from Risco Development Manor Corporate Property** Barry Smith wanted the Commission to have this letter. This is not a petition for rezoning but only states the facts about the property, the zoning and what type of contracts they had on the lots and have not been sold. At this point, it is an information piece and no action is required.

**Stonemill Estate (Eshelman Tract) Discussion of LCPC condition of approval including the Stonemill Extension** - Mr. Whittle handed out minutes from the LCPC meeting and stated that the County included as condition of preliminary approval of the plan to be consistent with the local ordinances that Stonemill Road would be extended consistent with the Township Official Map Ordinance from the Woods Edge Development to Donerville Road. Mr. Maras and Heritage Building Group had proposed a modification of that condition to allow them to proceed but still have some safeguards for the Township. They came up with a modification that the Planning Commission and Mr. Whittle felt ensured to the best of their ability to construct Stonemill Road from the Woods Edge Development to Donerville Road and the developer would be responsible to do everything humanly possible to make the extension happen. If they cannot make the extension happen because of things not under their control and the road can not be built, then there will be some supplements made to the Township to be able to make improvements elsewhere that will compensate for the traffic problems that may be created if Stonemill Road is not extended. Mr. Maras stated that they now have preliminary plan approval. Mr. Maras stated that they proposed to exhaust all remedies and options available with regards to trying to construct the road in as close to conformity with the layout shown and if they cannot do that, they will look for an

alternative way that both Penn Dot and the State Ag Board will approve. They met with Penn Dot and showed them some design alternatives. When the farms were preserved, no accommodations were made to preserve an easement through them for future road construction or widening. Mr. Maras stated that if the Township had preserved its easement right in the preservation process, there would have been a much greater impact on the preserved farm. Mr. Maras stated that they have found a way to mitigate that and reduce that by working with the Eshelman's and the Township that lowers the impact from what would have been a three-acre impact to .119 impact what they are willing to offset. Mr. Maras stated that after discussion, they have indicated that when they post their escrows, they would revise those escrows and escrow the full amount of the improvement and grant all right-of-way easements for the improvement. They would commence construction and keep working on the design alternative. Mr. Maras stated that he was asked to come back before the Township Planning Commission and explain the condition and make sure that the Commission was comfortable with what was done. Mr. Maras stated that there are several blocks on St. Georges Street and other streets in the proposed plan that is below the County minimum of 300 for block length. All the streets exceed the minimum requirements for liquid fuels but it is a question of block length. They are asking for a waiver of the requirement. Scott Haverstick recommended to LCPC approval of the waiver for the block length restriction. Mary Glazier seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously. Bonnie Miller, 113 Bent Tree Rd., asked if some reason Stonemill Road does not get built, where does all the traffic go? Mr. Maras pointed out the traffic pattern on the plan if Stonemill Road would not be built and also traffic flow if Stonemill Road is built. Ms. Miller expressed concerns if St. Georges Street is opened for through traffic. Jim Stauffer stated that the purpose of extending Stonemill Road is for it to become a collector artery if there are emergencies. Mr. Stauffer stated in his opinion there is a good chance that the extension of Stonemill Road will never be built. Mr. Stauffer stated that he feels there is a way to get Stonemill Road to Donerville Road and it may not have to be at the intersection indicated; he stated that he feels by granting a waiver, there will be a better chance that it does not get built. Mr. Maras stated that they are not asking for the road not to be built but will do everything possible for the road to be built. Mr. Maras stated that due to Penn Dots intersection spacing, driveway spacing, traffic volume considerations, clear sight distances, etc. including the fact he does not control the Eshelman Farm, there is no additional method of obtaining access along the developers side that meets all of Penn Dots criteria. They have talked with Penn Dot regarding some waivers from some of there design criteria that would further mitigate .119 acre of encroachment on the preserved farm by changing some the cartway widths. Mr. Maras stated that what are being talked about are off-site improvements. Jim Miller stated that when the official map was created, there were not many future roads on the map but the Stonemill Road extension was one of them. Mr. Miller stated that the map was prior to the farms being preserved and the corridor shown on the official map is a different configuration from what is on the plan. Mr. Miller stated that we have the designated growth area boundary line and we preserved the farms but we failed to preserve this corridor at that time. Jim Miller would acknowledge to the LCPC the Commissions agreement to the conditions that the LCPC imposed upon the developer for the location of the Stonemill Road intersection with Donerville Road. Scott Haverstick seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously. Bonnie Miller stated that Woods Edge does not want to end up like Hershey Mill Road. As this plan goes forward, she asked the Commission be considerate of the hundreds of cars coming through the area and she stated that

she feels that this area will become a high traffic volume area. Jim Miller advised Ms. Miller that the Woods Edge traffic will go through this development area when they want to access Donerville Road and go west so this will improve and reduce traffic flow that is already occurring in Woods Edge. Ms. Miller stated that the traffic is not going to Donerville Road (maybe sometimes) but the majority of these homeowners are going to Rt. 30 or Rt. 462 and not to Ironstone Ridge Road and Charlestown Road heading towards Washington Boro. The vehicles will be going east.

Regional Comprehensive Plan Draft Review and Discussion - Mr. Ahlfeld gave a background and asked the Commission members for their comments. Jim Miller had the following comments: Page 3.8 the section on population the last sentence; Page 3.12 on the clarification of gross and net density; Page 5.2 5.3 section on goals/objectives growth in reinvestment areas he questioned the percentage; Table 6.5 results in growth tracking not the same as at the County; Page 6.4 needs to be consistent with the County and the County has removed the village growth area from their urban strategy and is part of the rural strategy now; Page 6.21 needs to have specific plans to advance the goals and objectives; there is no definition of open space; Page 9.52 questioned what is an enhancement area; there are no provisions or mention of the Chesapeake Bay Tributary Strategy which could have a major impact on this plan; Tables 10.3 and 10.4 indicated that in 2030, Manor Township will have in excess of needed parkland by 29 acres. Mary Glazier stated that she feels it is difficult to derive anything from the maps because they are so small and she does not know if anything can be done about that. She stated that she feels that the UGB and UGA should be consistent; Page 6.37 on the bottom half regarding the safety in Lancaster City. She stated that the strategies listed are not necessarily true; evidence needs to be provided; Page 10.6 - Table 10.3 she wondered if the six miles of low grade rail to trail should not be indicated. Don Witmer commented on Section 6.19 regarding farming and non-farming traditions. Mr. Witmer questioned what a concentrated animal feeding operation is considered to be. There was some confusion in how the concentrated animal feeding operations were being considered. All the comments made will be submitted to the Supervisors to pass onto the Steering Committee.

Correspondence Ms. Glazier stated that she had letters from the LCPC indicating three plans were approved in May as well as the Joel and Jacquelyn Frey approval with one condition. There were letters for plans that are coming before the LCPC. There was also a letter with the preliminary plan approval of Stonemill Estates that would be copied and sent to the Commission members.

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 9:46 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary Glazier Secretary

Recording Secretary Evelyn Rineer

**Planning Commission Meeting**  
**08/14/06**

## Manor Township Planning Commission Minutes

Monday, August 14, 2006 Time: 7:30 P.M.

The Manor Township Planning Commission met on Monday, August 14, 2006 at the Manor Township Municipal Building, 950 West Fairway Drive, Lancaster, PA. Mr. Ahlfeld introduced the Commission members and led those in attendance in the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag.

Members Present: John Ahlfeld, Mary Glazier, Beth Herr, James Henke and Scott Haverstick.  
Members Absent: James Miller and Donald Witmer Visitors Present: Peter Risser & Mary Risser, Pox Box 44, Millersville John May, 100 Red Fox Road Ted Gingrich, 110 Bent Tree Drive Michael Saxinger, Saxinger & Black, Naumann/Hall Bob Latsha, 40 Red Bud Drive Pat Lemay, 70 Sun Lane Christine Sellers, Saxinger & Black, Manor Blvd. RoseMary Hess, 833 Central Manor Road JoAnn Diffendall, Red Bud Drive Michelle Keller, Red Bud Drive Danny Whittle, Lancaster County Planning Commission Elaine Jones, Lancaster Newspaper

Minutes Beth Herr made a motion to approve the July 10, 2006 minutes as presented. Scott Haverstick seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously.

### New Business

Amendment to Township Zoning Ordinance Mr. Ahlfeld stated that the request for an Amendment to the Township Zoning Ordinance has been withdrawn. There will be no action tonight.

Nauman/Hall Owl Bridge Road Final Subdivision Plan This plan proposes a two-lot subdivision. The property lies on the north side of Owl Bridge Road and south of Red Bud Drive. Lot #1 will contain 10.992 acres and Lot #2 will contain 4.619 acres. Both lots will be served by on-lot water and septic. Access to Lot # 2 is by way of Red Bud Drive and Lot #1 will be accessed off of Owl Bridge Road. The zoning district is Rural. The Commission needs to review the plan and comment to the LCPC on this plan. Mike Saxinger, from Saxinger/Black Inc., stated that he is representing the Nauman/Hall Owl Bridge Road Plan. Mr. Saxinger stated that this project is a two-lot subdivision out of a 16 acre parcel. He stated that it is located outside of Millersville on Sun Lane and Owl Bridge Road, next to the Fawn Hill subdivision. Mr. Saxinger displayed the plans for the subdivision and explained the configuration of each lot going over the boundaries of each. Mr. Saxinger stated that as part of the subdivision they would be providing additional right-of-way along Owl Bridge Road and along Red Bud Drive, noting that this would match up with the adjoining lot that was subdivided off previously. He stated that the lots were perked and probed, is located in the Rural Zoning District, and stated that the location of the houses would be limited due to the configuration of the land. Mr. Saxinger stated that Lot #1 or Lot #2 could not be further subdivided in the future. He stated that they have received DEP Planning Module Approval. John Ahlfeld asked if there was a notation on the plan that the lots may not be subdivided in the future. Mr. Saxinger stated not at this time but that could be added to the plan if necessary. Scott Haverstick asked if the reason that the lots cannot be subdivision in the future is because they are at their maximum possibility for subdivision now. Mr. Saxinger

stated that this subdivision will make the lots at their maximum as per zoning. Mr. Ott agreed. Jim Henke asked if the access off of Red Bud Drive is a private easement. Mr. Saxinger stated that there is no easement recorded at this time and it is just there by deed right to the parent tract, but they do know that they will need to record an agreement as part of the subdivision plan. Mr. Henke asked about the small portion of land that extends to the far end of the property and who will maintain that extension. Mr. Saxinger stated that they should have the right to maintain that piece. Peter Risser, 24 Red Bud Drive, asked if they had to cross private property to get to these lots. Mr. Saxinger stated that the parcel has a right of access on the deed and that was part of the original tract when lots were first taken off. He noted that information was sent to Mr. Goodman the Township Solicitor, for his review. Mr. Ott stated that Mr. Goodman did review the deeds but gave no comments regarding accessibility. Michele Keller, 60 Red Bud Dr, asked several questions of the two proposed lots and where the drive access will be to each lot. She also asked who will maintain the drive if shared. Mr. Saxinger noted that the proposed access areas and stated that in a case of people sharing a driveway, a lot of times the effected parties will enter into an agreement to share the responsibilities. Mr. Haverstick stated that he did not have a problem with the plan, but expressed concerns about the right-of-way for access and felt it is necessary to have the Township Solicitors opinion. Mr. Saxinger stated that he thought we had that opinion when he was given information to review. Mr. Ott noted that Mr. Goodman checked the deeds to make sure they were valid but that was all. Mr. Ahlfeld suggested that in our comments to the LCPC, we should request that they make sure everything is legal about this access. Mr. Saxinger stated that if for some reason the access for the 4.619 acre tract is not valid, they would be able to provide access to that tract through the other one. It was not their first choice to do it that way. John May, 100 Red Fox Road, asked if this access location is a private road and not a dedicated Township road. Mr. Saxinger noted that is correct it is not a dedicated Township road. Mr. Saxinger stated that the County Ordinance requires that when subdividing where there is no access easement, then an access easement would need to be provided. After some discussion, the Board agreed that the subdivision plan is acceptable, but there is still a question to the access. JoAnn Diffendall, 52 Red Bud Dr, questioned the location of the lots and what could be built on them. Mr. Saxinger stated both lots have passed the perk and probe tests and only one dwelling would be able to be built on each lot. The Board discussed whether or not they should pass the plan on with a recommendation for approval to the LCPC without the access agreement issue resolved. The Commission noted that if they did not pass the plan on to the County because of questions on the access agreement, it would delay the process because the County will require the access easement agreement anyway. They were pleased with the configuration of the lots and the overall plan. Mr. Ahlfeld explained that they could approve the plan on the condition that the County finds the proposed access on Red Bud Drive to be legal. The Board agreed. Mary Glazier moved that the Board recommend approval of the plan, subject to confirmation that the proposed right-of-way is legal. Beth Herr seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Manor Boulevard Preliminary Subdivision Plan and LCSLDLO Waiver Request Section 602.16.E Minimum Radius of the Cul-de-sac This plan is located off of Manor Boulevard and Williamsburg Road. There will be eight semi-detached dwellings and two single-family dwellings. Public water and sewer will serve all the lots. The property is located in the medium residential (RM) zoning district. The Commission needs to review and make recommendations to the LCPC on the subdivision plan and the waiver request. Chris Sellers, from Saxinger & Black

Inc., stated that she is presenting the preliminary subdivision plan for Manor Boulevard, which has been on going for some time. This final design being submitted is of a 20 ½ acre parcel, bordering the Little Conestoga Creek, off Manor Boulevard. It is located in the Georgetown Hills subdivision and also has an access onto Williamsburg Road. Ms Sellers noted that the land is zoned medium residential (RM) and they are proposing duplex houses and single family houses. She noted the existing LASA pumping station and the access to the pumping station. Also, she noted that the plan shows a strip of land along the Little Conestoga, that the applicant would like to convey to Manor Township to contribute to their Greenway. She went over lot sizes, projected costs, and described the less than 600cul-de-sac noting this will also give access to the LASA parcel and the proposed Township greenway. Ms Sellers explained a small piece of land that stands alone due to a lot add on plan done several years ago that created this land locked parcel. She noted that they have been in contact with the Township on this project and have met with the County Staff for recommendations. She stated they will be asking for a waiver of the Cul-de-sac showing a 38radius instead of the County requirement of a 50 radius, noting that this is due to some flood plain and steep slopes issues. Ms. Sellers asked the Board if they had any questions. Mr. Ahlfeld asked several questions about the Greenway area and if it included the entire frontage along the Little Conestoga Creek. Ms Sellers stated yes, except for the single family dwelling shown as Lot #10. Mr. Ahlfeld asked if there was a public easement through the single family lot. Ms Sellers stated there is not an easement at this time, but they could provide that. She also explained another area off of Williamsburg Road where they would be able to access the greenway. Mr. Ahlfeld asked if there were any other access points along the Little Conestoga and Ms Sellers answered not at this time but explained where they could possible locate one. She did add that it would be difficult due to the steep grades. Mr. Ahlfeld asked if there was any public access on the properties that had the lot add- on plans done. Ms Sellers stated the only thing on those properties is a drainage easement. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that he would like to see the plan provide access to the small piece of ground that is land locked since there would not be access along the stream to get to it. John May, 100 Red Fox Road, stated that he and the other Supervisors of Manor Township have looked favorable on this plan. He questioned the parcel that belongs to LASA. Ms Sellers stated that LASA does own the parcel and their easements is shown, but in the future they will have direct access via the Cul-de-sac. It will go with the recording of this plan. Mr. May noted that due to the size of the Cul-de-sac, the fire trucks will have a problem turning around. Ms Sellers stated that the fire trucks are capable of reversing even though they usually do not want to. She stated that the smaller Cul-de-sac is due to the limitations from the flood plain and the steep slopes they are dealing with along with the request from the County to provide the most development density on the amount of land. The Board discussed different locations for the fire hydrants in the cul-de-sac and where they should be located to help the fire company. Ted Gingrich, 110 Bent Tree Drive, stated where he felt would be best for the hydrants to be placed and added that this cul-de-sac at 38and even if it were 50, would not be large enough for some of the new equipment to turn around, causing them to back the equipment out anyway. Mr. Henke asked about the 100 year flood plain location listed as approximate. Ms. Sellers stated that it was taken from the FEMA maps. Mr. Henke asked if the flood plain crosses Manor Boulevard. Ms. Sellers stated it does not cross manor Boulevard. Ms. Sellers stated that they do have a clean letter addressing storm water and they are waiting for comments from the Lancaster Conservation District. She added that they also have DEP exemption approval. Mr. Henke made a motion to recommend to the LCPC that they approve the 38radius of the cul-de-

sac subject to a written response from the emergency provider regarding the review of this plan as it relates to both the reduced radius and hydrant locations. Beth Herr seconded the motion. Mr. Haverstick asked if the only reason the developer cannot provide the 50 radius is because it would cause a higher retaining wall. Ms Sellers stated that the biggest reason is a safety issue and that the County is requesting the higher density. Mr. Ahlfeld called for the motion. The motion carried unanimously. Mr. Haverstick made a motion to approve the Manor Boulevard Preliminary Subdivision Plan contingent upon providing multiple access easements to the greenway. Mary Glazier seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Other Business Manor Oaks Lot 146 Act 14 Notification for Connection to Existing Sanitary Sewer. Mr. Ott stated that this is notification to the Planning Commission so that the applicant is in compliance with Act 14 Notification regulations.

Correspondence Mary Glazier noted a letter from the County in reference to Lot 146 in Manor Oaks, which was considered by the LCPC on July 24, 2006 and approved. Ms. Glazier stated that there was another letter from the County dated July 25, 2006 in regards to the proposal to leave dwellings as a permitted use in the (LC) local commercial zone and allow bed and breakfasts in the (MRC) mixed residential commercial zone. She noted the approval of the bed and breakfasts and the deletion of Section 1 in the ordinance amendment. Ms. Glazier noted a copy of a letter from Jim Huber regarding the issue of inviting people to discuss or sign a petition at a public meeting and also a letter to put home study on the ballet. Ms Glazier also noted receiving a letter from Jim Miller to the Board.

There being no further business, Mr. Ahlfeld adjourned the meeting at 8:30 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary Glazier Secretary

Recording Secretary Rita J. Young

**Planning Commission Meeting**

**09/11/06**

Manor Township Planning Commission Agenda

Monday, September 11, 2006 Time: 7:30 P.M.

1. Call to Order
2. Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag
3. Roll Call
4. Public Comment

5. Approve Minutes of August 14, 2006

6. Old Business Presentation by Harry Roth An Ordinance amending the Official Zoning Ordinance of Manor Township, Lancaster County, Pennsylvania by (1) Implementing measures to protect valuable areas within the Townships commercial zones from sprawling development patterns associated with large-scale shopping centers; (2) Requiring multi-story development for large-scale shopping centers; (3) Requiring multi-story off street parking lots for large scale shopping centers; (4) Increasing required loading spaces sizes for shopping centers; (5) Clarifying the language of Section 401; and (6) Adjusting related sections to accomplish the preceding revisions.

7. New Business Washington Boro UMC Expansion Waiver of Access Drive Width LCSDLDO Section 602.19.c & Waiver of the Three Meeting Delay - The property is located at 1965 Water Street, Washington Boro, PA. The project is to construct an all purpose facility in the rear of the property. The zoning district is Village (V). The Commission needs to review and make recommendations on the waiver of the access drive to the LCPC and act on the waiver of the three meeting delay.

8. Other Business - Correspondence

9. Adjourn

DRAFT Manor Township Planning Commission Minutes

Monday, September 11, 2006 Time: 7:30 P.M.

The Manor Township Planning Commission met on Monday, September 11, 2006 at the Manor Township Municipal Building, 950 W. Fairway Drive, Lancaster, PA. Mr. Ahlfeld introduced the Commission members and led those in attendance in the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag.

Members Present: John Ahlfeld, James Miller, Donald Witmer, Mary Glazier, James Henke, Beth Herr and Scott Haverstick. Visitors Present: John Roche, Fisher Engineering Harry Roth Bonnie Miller, 113 Bent Tree Dr. Rosemary Hess, 833 Central Manor Rd. Bill Murry, Murry Development Les Eckman, Washington Boro Allen Kreider, 141 Supervisors Rd Richard Bauder, 130 Sheep Ln. George Elko, 3126 Windon Ave.

Minutes The minutes from the August meeting had not been distributed before the meeting; therefore, they will be approved next month.

New Business Washington Boro UMC Expansion Waiver of Access Drive Width LCSDLDO Section 602.19.C & Waiver of the Three Meeting Delay - The property is located at 1965 Water Street, Washington Boro, PA. The project is to construct an all purpose facility in the rear of the property. The zoning district is Village (V). The Commission needs to review and make recommendations on the waiver of the access drive width to the LCPC and act on the waiver of the three meeting delay. John Roche from Fisher Engineering and Lester Eckman presented the

plan. Mr. Roche indicated that they are asked the Board for two waiver requests. They had the plan before the Township Zoning Hearing Board for relief regarding the access drive width and that is the same issue before the Commission this evening. The site has access from Rockfish Street from the rear of the property through an existing stone alley. The width of the alley is approximately 10 to 12 feet. There is no access onto Water Street because of the grade. The access is on a strip of property that is not controlled by the church; there is a cemetery to the east of the driveway and there is a building to the west. There are numerous restrictions for widening the existing access. The proposed expansion will not generate any more traffic. The building addition will be a fellowship hall to be used for church socials. The Zoning Hearing Board felt that the existing access is adequate. The second waiver request is for the three meeting delay. This is a minor plan and does not require stormwater management. There will be porous paving and a net decrease in impervious surface. Mr. Haverstick stated that he recused himself from both discussion and voting on this matter because he is involved in the transaction. Mr. Miller asked what impervious area was being removed. Mr. Roche stated that they are not removing any impervious. The net decrease is that they are removing the hard packed gravel existing in the parking lot to put in a porous paving material. Mr. Henke asked if this plan would still be seen by this Commission as a land development plan and Mr. Roche indicated that it would. Mr. Miller made a motion to recommend to the LCPC a waiver of the three meeting delay and waiver for the access drive width. Ms. Glazier seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously with six in favor and one abstaining.

Old Business Presentation by Harry Roth An Ordinance amending the Official Zoning Ordinance of Manor Township, Lancaster County, Pennsylvania by (1) Implementing measures to protect valuable areas within the Townships commercial zones from sprawling development patterns associated with large-scale shopping centers; (2) Requiring multi-story development for large-scale shopping centers; (3) Requiring multi-story off street parking lots for large scale shopping centers; (4) Increasing required loading spaces sizes for shopping centers; (5) Clarifying the language of Section 401; and (6) Adjusting related sections to accomplish the preceding revisions. Mr. Roth, a local planning consultant in the Lancaster Area, was hired by FAID to get involved in testifying on their behalf in the Wal-Mart matter. In doing that, he reviewed the Townships Ordinance. Mr. Roth gave the background on how he became involved in writing this amendment, how he went about writing this amendment, his feelings on growth in the area and how land use is being affected. Mr. Roth stated that he met with one of the Township Supervisors and the LCPC staff to explain the concept regarding this issue relating to shopping centers. Everyone seemed to be excited about the concept Mr. Roth said. Mr. Roth indicated that other municipalities are looking at the approach that he was presenting. Mr. Miller had numerous questions and statements regarding the proposed amendment. Mr. Millers comments and questions were as follows: - There was opposing comments from the county staff then what Mr. Roth presented. - The statement that local officials believe large-scale commercial uses has the resources and market appeal to develop properties with multi-story buildings is based on what information. - Why dose this ordinance limit the number of access drives on a street frontage of the site to one? - Why is the number of parking spaces the same as in the current ordinance? - He questioned the term group of stores under definitions. - He asked why the ordinance requires a number of spaces for off street loading. - Mr. Miller asked how many sites this amendment would apply to in Manor Township. - Mr. Miller made several statements regarding the design requirements and he questioned the need for large setbacks from property lines. He stated that with the indicated setbacks, more land

would actually be used to meet the setbacks requirements. - Mr. Miller questioned the height limit of 35 feet. - Mr. Miller questioned the reduction of impervious surfaces when you are actually getting larger. - Mr. Miller asked how the definition of shopping centers as two or more stores works into the livable community concept. - He asked what the cost difference between structured and surface parking? - Mr. Miller read the first comment from Danny Whittles letter. It stated that it appears that the proposed provisions apply only to the project and the site that is now before the Manor Township Zoning Hearing Board. - He asked if the amendment was designed around a specific site. - He stated that he feels like this amendment should not be considered while in the middle of the Regional Comp Plan. - Mr. Miller referred to Mr. Whittles letter in regards to whether this use should be a conditional use or a special exception use. - He stated that there needs to be incentives to off set the additional costs for building up. Costs for building up need to be considered when considering an ordinance amendment. Mr. Ahlfelds comments and questions were as follows: - Mr. Ahlfeld stated that the number of parking spaces required may be able to be reduced. - Under the definition the term group of stores needs to be detailed as to exactly what that means. - Mr. Ahlfeld stated that he can see why a single access would be required. - He stated that the Township has increased the building height in the GC to 60 feet. - Mr. Ahlfeld stated that he could see having different setback requirements depending on the adjacent property use. - Mr. Ahlfeld stated that after the Regional Comp Plan is adopted, if other municipalities are interested in this amendment, they would work together to adopt it. - He stated that in the Future Land Use Plan, will this shopping center amendment apply to only regional commercial centers or will it also apply to neighborhood commercial areas as well. Mr. Henkes comments and questions were as follows: - Mr. Henke asked Mr. Roth if he had any pictures and drawings regarding his concepts. - Mr. Henke commented on the one access. - He asked if there is anything around the area that is similar to what this ordinance is proposing and he asked how this ordinance has been prepared in other municipalities.

Ms. Glaziers comments were as follows: - Ms. Glazier stated that she has been in shopping centers that have parking underneath the building and she feels that the concept works well. - She stated that this amendment is for the General Commercial Zone only. She was in agreement that the setbacks need to be different according to adjacent land use. - Ms. Glazier stated that she feels that if this concept is compatible with the LIMC plans overall philosophy, then the Township should move forward with this amendment. Mr. Haversticks comments contained the following: - He felt that Mr. Millers questions regarding if amendment was designed around a specific site was irrelevant. Mr. Roth stated that some of the changes that may make the amendment more preferable to the Commission are: 1) reduce the required parking spaces down to the five spaces per 1,000, 2) reduce the required number of off-street loading spaces, 3) there will be less interior landscaping required thus reducing the parking lot size, and 4) reduce the setback requirements. Mr. Roth stated that he would be willing to do a revised draft that may respond to some of the questions and comments and send several drawings that show how the design standards relate to the requirements. Mr. Haverstick asked Bill Murry for his thoughts on the proposed amendment. Mr. Murry stated that he looked at the two-story retail environment and the demographics of the community and at this time, commercial development does not demand that kind of density. Mr. Murry also gave cost figures to build structured parking compared to paving a parking lot. Mr. Murry listed some stores that are more than one story and commented on why they work. Mr. Murry asked if the developers who must work within this

ordinance have been contacted. Mr. Murry also commented on the sizes and number of stores listed that constitute a shopping center. Mr. Murry stated that there are very few sites in Manor Township that can be used for a shopping center. Bonnie Miller, 113 Bent Tree Drive, stated that she has worked with retail for 25 years. This is a suburban area and does not compare to other areas that have been indicated. Ms. Miller stated two story buildings are the way of the future and the Township must strive to salvage what land remains. Ms. Glazier stated that if there are changes in the emphasis in housing patterns and we develop the land more densely, the demographics will change and that will have an effect later on whether the multi-story retail facility appears feasible to developers. Allen Kreider stated that he is concerned about environmental issues. When Park City was built, stormwater runoff became a major problem and if they had built vertical parking, it would have eliminated much of that problem. George Elko, 3126 Windon Avenue, stated that in terms of incentives, he would think that structured parking would get your vehicle closer to the shopping center. Bonnie Miller stated that FEMA redid their flood study and the whole area of Jackson Drive is in a flood plain now because of Park City. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that he would talk with Staff and the Supervisors as to where they want to go with this and we can revisit the issue at future meetings.

Correspondence Ms. Glazier had several letters from the LCPC. One letter was approving the request for modification requirement for the minimum 300 block length for Stonemill Estate. Another letter from LCPC was to approve a 90-day waiver of the time period to meet all conditions of approval for Parkfield Phase II Final Plan. Mr. Ott reminded the Commission that next month the meeting would be Tuesday, October 10, 2006. There being no other business the meeting was adjourned at 9:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary Glazier Secretary

Recording Secretary Evelyn Rineer

**Planning Commission Meeting  
10/10/06**

This was changed from the 9th as Oct. 9th is Columbus Day.

Manor Township Planning Commission Agenda

Tuesday, October 10, 2006 Time: 7:30 P.M.

1. Call to Order
2. Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag
3. Roll Call

4. Public Comment

5. Approve Minutes of August 14 and September 11, 2006

6. New Business Rezoning Request J. Glenn Hess & Rosemary Hess For Property at 833 Central Manor Road & Roy F. & Evelyn A. Enterline at 857 Central Manor Road - Petition to rezone two tracts of property totaling approximately 9.3 acres located on Central Manor Road in Manor Township, Lancaster County, Pennsylvania from agricultural to local commercial. The Commission needs to review and submit comments to the Township Supervisors.

Zoning Ordinance Amendment Amendment to provide for automobile, boat, trailer, truce, farm machinery, and mobile home service and repair facilities, including but not limited to auto mechanics, drive-thru lubrication services and tires, auto paint, brake, muffler, transmission, windshield, auto body, car radio and upholstery shops as a permitted use in the local commercial zone of Manor Township, Lancaster County, Pennsylvania. The Commission needs to review and submit comments to the Township Supervisors.

Rezoning Request The Murry Companies/Sher-Wal Inc. - The rezoning request for the change of the current zoning district of two (2) tracts of land located on the northeast corner of Weaver Road and Cornerstone Drive. The current zoning is general commercial (GC). The petition requests a zoning of the properties to RH1 high density residential flex zone. The Commission needs to review and submit comments to the Township Supervisors.

7. Other Business - Correspondence from Commission Secretary - Subdivision Application Letter J. Robert & Yvonne Musser for information purpose. - Letter Millersville Fire Company regarding Manor Blvd. project for your information.

8. Adjourn

## DRAFT Minutes

### Manor Township Planning Commission Minutes

Tuesday, October 10, 2006 Time: 7:30 P.M.

The Manor Township Planning Commission met on Tuesday, October 10, 2006 at the Manor Township Municipal Building, 950 West Fairway Drive, Lancaster, PA. Mr. Ahlfeld introduced the Commission members and led those in attendance in the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.

Members Present: John Ahlfeld, James Miller, James Henke, Scott Haverstick, Donald Witmer and Mary Glazier  
Member Absent: Beth Herr  
Visitors Present: See attached list.

Public Comment There was no public comment.

Minutes Mr. Haverstick made a motion to approve the August 14 and September 11, 2006 minutes as written. Jim Henke seconded the motion and the motion carried with Mr. Witmer and Mr. Miller abstaining since they were not present at the August 14 meeting.

New Business Rezoning Request J. Glenn Hess & Rosemary Hess For Property at 833 Central Manor Road & Roy F. & Evelyn A. Enterline at 857 Central Manor Road - Petition to rezone two tracts of property totaling approximately 9.3 acres located on Central Manor Road in Manor Township, Lancaster County, Pennsylvania from agricultural to local commercial. The Commission needs to review and submit comments to the Township Supervisors. Zoning Ordinance Amendment Amendment to provide for automobile, boat, trailer, truce, farm machinery, and mobile home service and repair facilities, including but not limited to auto mechanics, drive-thru lubrication services and tires, auto paint, brake, muffler, transmission, windshield, auto body, car radio and upholstery shops as a permitted use in the local commercial zone of Manor Township, Lancaster County, Pennsylvania. The Commission needs to review and submit comments to the Township

Supervisors. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that the Township Solicitor advised no action be taken this evening since the Commission did not have the actual draft ordinance before them. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that the Commission would listen to the presentation and have discussion. Action would be taken at the meeting that the Commission has the ordinance before them. Matt Crème who was representing the petitioner made a presentation. Mr. Crème stated that the affected property owners, Mr. & Mrs. Hess and Mr. Enterline were present. Mr. Crème stated that they are asking that the Township to consider rezoning approximately 9 ½ acres of land. The Hess family owns a little more than 8 acres of land and Mr. Enterline owns a little more than one acre. The request is to take the land and rezone it from the agricultural to the local commercial zoning district. The two properties are contiguous to each other and also contiguous to the third property that is already zoned local commercial located at the corner of Route 999 and Central Manor Road. This would increase the amount of local commercial land at that location from 3 ½ to approximately 13 acres. During review with the staff, it was learned that there is not a great deal of local commercial land in the Township. The second request is to take a use already defined in the Township Ordinance which includes automobile, boat, trailer, truck, farm machinery, mobile home service and repair facilities and adds that as a permitted use in the local commercial zoning district. Mr. Crème stated that they believed that is the kind of service that is appropriately found in a local commercial zone. This request would affect the Hesss and it is their request that they be permitted to continue the truck and automobile repair that they do at the property. The Hesss have owned the property since 1969 and have maintained and operated a farm implement repair and related service business for most of that time. Over a period of time, they moved into repairing their own vehicles, repairing trucks for the farmers whose implements they were repairing and since the late 70s have done automobile and truck repair on the property. It has only been recently that both the Township and the property owners realized that the use that has evolved was not a permitted use. They continue to do farm implement repairs and have

not switched uses. The repair of motor vehicles is something that was added in the late 70s and evolved into a larger part of what they do. Their request is to rezone the two properties to a local commercial zone and to permit in that zone the use of automobile, etc. repairs. Mr. Crème identified on the zoning map the properties before the Commission for rezoning. Jim Miller questioned the definition under special exception use in the local commercial zone is automobile filling station which includes minor incidental repair and stated that he does not know if the ordinance defines minor incidental repair. Mr. Miller stated that it would be the determination that this would not be minor incidental repair. Mr. Crème stated they would not be selling gasoline as a principal use. Mr. Miller asked if any of the work done by the Hesss predated the Ordinance and Mr. Crème stated that they were unable to establish a pre-existing nonconforming use. Mr. Ahlfeld had questions regarding the term they were requesting to be added. Mr. Crème indicated that they requested to take Section 407 and the definition and including it in the local commercial zone. Mr. Haverstick asked if Mr. Crèmes client was currently doing auto body and paint work. Mr. Crème stated that they are not doing that type of work nor do they anticipate doing that type of work. They will be doing service and repairs only. Mr. Miller stated that it is currently recognized as an appropriate use in the Village Zone by special exception and asked what the special exception criteria are. Ms. Glazier asked if they are requesting to have the definition put in as a permitted use and not special exception and Mr. Crème verified Ms. Glazier was correct. Rosemary Hess, 833 Central Manor Road, stated that they are committed to keeping their property in farm use and they also cultivate a portion of a neighbors property. Don Witmer stated he would like to hear the neighbors opinion on this request. Jim Harnish, 768 Central Manor Road, stated that they have property directly across from the Hesss. The Hesss have been operating their business for years for farm equipment, pickup trucks, and just about anything that needs to be fixed and have been operating in a very professional manner. Mr. Harnish stated that the Hesss are an asset to the community and the rezoning so they can continue to

operate would be a major benefit to the Central Manor Community. Rick Shearer, 809 Central Manor Road, stated that he lives next door to the Hesss and he feels they are beneficial to the community. Their property is always very well maintained and he does not expect that to change. Glen Rohrer stated that he is a dairy farmer east of the Hesss along Rt. 999 and the Hesss have serviced their vehicles for years. Mr. Rohrer stated that he feels the rezoning of the property would be good for the community. Allen Kreider, 141 Supervisors Road, stated that he thought the original petition was also requesting this to be changed in the Village Zone but does not see it in what is being considered tonight. Mr. Crème stated that the petition mentions this use is permitted by special exception in the Village Zone but that they are just making the reference in the petition and it is not part of this petition. Bonnie Miller, 113 Bent Tree Drive, asked if someone comes before the Board in the future after this would be approved and asked for something similar, is each request judged upon its merit. If this area becomes a local commercial zone, is this the local commercial requirements apply throughout the Township. Mr. Ahlfeld advised her that it would apply throughout the Township. Wilmer Stoltzfus stated that he is a neighbor and he understood these properties were commercial years back and they were changed without the owners being notified. Mr. Miller made a motion to table this petition until the proper documentation from the attorney is prepared. Mr. Haverstick seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously.

**Rezoning Request The Murry Companies/Sher-Wal Inc. -** The rezoning request is for the change of the current zoning district for two (2) tracts of land located on the northeast corner of Weaver Road and Cornerstone Drive. The current zoning is general commercial (GC). The petition requests a zoning of the properties to RH1 high-density residential flex zone. The Commission needs to review and submit comments to the Township Supervisors. Jeff Burkhart from David Miller Associates presented the request on behalf of the Murry Companies and Sher-Wal Inc. The property is located along the north side of Cornerstone

Drive and off Weaver and Post Oak Roads. It is a total of approximately 2.4 acres. The applicant is requesting to have the existing general commercial zoned properties changed to the residential high density flex zone. This tract is not in an area prominent for commercial uses; one of the reasons is because it does not lie along a major corridor. There is residential zoning to the south of this property. Mr. Burkhart listed the permitted uses in the residential high density flex zone. Most of the listings in the commercial zone require more visibility than this site has. The potential trips per day should be reduced, if it would be rezoned residential. Stormwater management should not be an issue since everything was designed for the site at a maximum lot coverage type use. Mr. Burkhart stated that they do not see anything in the high density residential flex zone that would take away from or impair any use in adjoining residential or commercial areas that already exist. Mr. Ahlfeld asked Danny Whittle the expectations regarding recommendations from the County. Mr. Whittle stated that to his knowledge to date, it has not been sent to the County for scheduling. Mr. Ott stated that he believes Mr. Goodman sent the Ordinance at the end of last week. Mr. Whittle stated generally it is scheduled within 30 days from the time the County receives it. Mary Glazier asked if the last request was the same and she was advised it was essentially the same request. Mr. Haverstick asked if the property has been marketed actively and Mr. Murry stated yes it has. Mr. Murry discussed the interest that has been shown in the property and why things did not work out. Mr. Haverstick had questions as to the date of the Woods Edge Development and the zoning of this property. Allan Kreider expressed concerns regarding commercial property that was given away in the Manor Oaks Development to developers and stated there is limited commercial property in the Township and he would hate to lose this tract. Bonnie Miller stated that 60 residents were at the last planning commission meeting when this was discussed and were unable to attend this meeting. Ms. Miller stated that putting apartments or condominiums on this site would cause parking problems. She requested that the property remain commercial. Mr. Burkhart stated that anything

proposed must have parking provided internally on the site. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that for clarification, whatever the zoning is, a developer can do whatever is permitted in that zoning district. Dick Bauder stated that in the previous application, the Commission voted no; it was not withdrawn. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that they voted negative and then it was withdrawn before action by the Supervisors. Mr. Bauder asked how this differs from the previous application and Mr. Bauder was advised it does not differ. Ms. Glazier stated that there is limited commercial area in the Township and there is intense development occurring, which may lead to a different climate in terms of having a buyer for this land for a commercial use. Ms. Glazier stated that she feels it is appropriate to wait and not rezone at this time. At some point in time, she expects that the Commission will be looking at zoning and land use in a more systematic way and that may be a better time to have the property rezoned. Mr. Murry stated that the market place for retail is along major corridors. Doctors offices are virtually non-existent because the major hospitals are buying the practices out and the only other source is general office space and other locations are not getting the office users. The national chain restaurants are not going to take this type of location and if a restaurant is not a national chain, the restaurants are having difficulty getting financing because of high bankruptcy rates. Mr. Burkhardt read the introduction to the general commercial zoning and pointed out some things that were not true for this parcel. Mr. Burkhardt stated that the property is zoned commercial may not be able to be used commercially. In the mixed residential commercial zone west of Weaver Road, there are residents that have been there a long time and eventually the properties may be sold and the residences will be torn down and a commercial use may be built. Bonnie Miller stated that the County is taking on the concept of balance and this piece of property could have numerous uses. Ms. Miller pointed out commercial uses that are occurring across the highway. Allan Kreider stated that this would be perfect opportunity to consider the site for a fire company or some kind of emergency service system and could be a good tax write off for the seller. Joan Matterness, 142 Sutherland Road, stated that she is a

new resident and talked about the area she came from and the commercial uses that had been occurring there. She stated that it does not make sense to rezone this piece of property if it is not part of the county plan. She indicated that marketing changes from one year to the next. Jim Miller rhetorically asked that if this piece of property did not have zoning attached to it today and we were debating what we should zone this property, Mr. Miller stated that he believes we would all have a hard time zoning this property general commercial given that this is a vacant piece of property and we were to consider zoning classification for today. Mr. Miller stated that regarding the parking comments, that regardless of the use, the Ordinance requires parking whether residential or commercial use. Mr. Miller stated on a normal day the parking is probably adequate but if something special is going on there would not be adequate parking and there would be parking on the street. Regardless of the use and zoning, there will be times the site will not accommodate all the parking. Mr. Miller stated that he questions if they would take a two-acre site that does not front on anything other roads but a local road and zone it general commercial if this was a vacant site with no zoning. Ms. Glazier read from the zoning ordinance regarding commercial office zones and stated there maybe some other better commercial zoning district other than general commercial, which is not necessarily high density residential flex. Mr. Haverstick stated given the lack of general commercial in the Township, he is inclined not to favor this change. Mr. Haverstick stated that he is astounded that the residents would prefer commercial to residential. Mr. Haverstick stated that if they do not approve this change, he would hope whatever goes into that commercial property lawfully does not cause people to come to this meeting and complaint about it. Eileen Perugini, 101 Pine Bridge Lane, stated that she is directly across the street from this property. Ms. Perugini stated that regarding parking she is sure parking is planned out and hopefully it works but she would invite anyone to drive down Pine Bridge Lane any day of the week. Cars are parked along both sides of the street all the time and that is just residents. She cannot imagine a multi-unit complex not creating more

parking on the street and feels it would be bedlam trying to get in and out. Mr. Ahlfeld advised Ms. Perugini the area she lives is zoned high density residential. Mr. Ahlfeld asked how she would feel if that tract was zoned the same as her side of the street and developed the same as her side of the street? Ms. Perugini stated that if it was going to be the same number of families and the same type of structure, she would have to see. Mr. Murry stated that the concept they have proposed is virtually the same footprint that they used for the Villas of Sutherland that is now under construction. Mr. Witmer stated that it comes down to are more residents needed or something to serve the residents that already live there. The property would be much better used as a local dentist office or doctor office. Mr. Witmer stated that it has been zoned commercial for 20 years and it has been before them two times in several months. Why all of a sudden does it need to be changed? Mr. Witmer stated that even if it goes another 20 years, that is how it is zoned and there is very little of this type of zoning in the entire Township. Ted Gingrich, 110 Bent Tree Drive, stated the lack of commercially zoned properties in the Township may be true but look at the properties along Columbia Avenue that have not been sold. Mr. Whittle stated that the County Comprehensive Plan and the LIMC Plan encourages mixed use and higher density. The mixed use could be satisfied with the present zoning and the higher density could be satisfied with changing the zoning. It is a matter of how it can best be developed so that it goes on the tax rolls as at a higher ratable property than sitting as a vacant lot. The mixed use being a mixture of residents in Woods Edge and adjacent properties and the commercial along Columbia Avenue is what the Township plan calls for as well as Growing Together and County Plan. Mr. Haverstick made a motion given the lack of General Commercial and subject to reopening this in the future that at this point we deny the request for the change of the zoning district. Mr. Witmer seconded the motion. Mr. Miller indicated RH Flex is a much preferred land use to general commercial for this particular site. Mr. Miller stated he does not see this site as ever being general commercial and does not think it is a good mix of uses. Mr. Henke stated he echos Mr. Millers

comments. He also believes residential opposite the existing homes that are along the road is the appropriate use. Mr. Ahlfeld called for the motion. There was three in favor and three opposed. The motion did not pass. Mr. Miller made a motion to recommend to the Manor Township Supervisors support of the rezoning petition. Mr. Henke seconded the motion. There was three in favor and three opposed. The motion did not carry.

Other Business -Correspondence Ms. Glazier presented the correspondence. A letter was received from the LCPC scheduling the review of the Washington Boro United Methodist Church sketch plan for the meeting today. A letter dated September 25 from the LCPC considered a preliminary plan application for the Manor Boulevard Plan and they approved it with conditions. A letter was received from the LCPC approving a 90-day waiver for 3868 Columbia Avenue Plan. A letter was received from LCPC giving an extension for the Timson Place Plan.

Mr. Ahlfeld stated that there was a letter from the Millersville Fire Company relating to the letter just read for the Manor Boulevard Plan. A subdivision application letter was received and Mr. Ott stated it was from the Ag Preserve Board giving J. Robert & Yvonne Musser permission to subdivide a two-acre tract off their farm. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that he had a brochure regarding a workshop presented by the Penn State Extension titled Grow Proactive Communities that is being held October 26.

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 9:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary Glazier Secretary

Recording Secretary Evelyn Rineer

**Planning Commission Meeting  
11/13/06**

Manor Township Planning Commission Agenda

Monday, November 13, 2006 Time: 7:30 P.M.

1. Call to Order
2. Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag
3. Roll Call
4. Public Comment
5. Approve Minutes of October 10, 2006
6. Old Business Rezoning Request J. Glenn Hess & Rosemary Hess For Property at 833 Central Manor Road & Roy F. & Evelyn A. Enterline at 857 Central Manor Road - Petition to rezone two tracts of property totaling approximately 9.3 acres located on Central Manor Road in Manor Township, Lancaster County, Pennsylvania from agricultural to local commercial. The Commission needs to review and submit comments to the Township Supervisors.

Zoning Ordinance Amendment Amendment to provide for automobile, boat, trailer, truck, farm machinery, and mobile home service and repair facilities, including but not limited to auto mechanics, drive-thru lubrication services and tires, auto paint, brake, muffler, transmission, windshield, auto body, car radio and upholstery shops as a permitted use in the local commercial zone of Manor Township, Lancaster County, Pennsylvania. The Commission needs to review and submit comments to the Township Supervisors.

7. New Business Final Subdivision Plan Fairway Drive & Waiver of the Three Meeting Delay The plan is located at the corner of Fairway Drive and Millersville Road. This plan subdivides an existing single lot into two (2) lots for residential use. The existing dwelling will remain on Lot #1 (16,916.11 sq. ft.) with no improvements. Access to Lot #1 shall remain from Millersville Road. Lot #2 (11,638.57 sq. ft.) consists of a lot for a single family detached dwelling unit access from Fairway Drive. Public water and sewer will be provided. The Commission needs to review and make recommendations to the LCPC.

8. Other Business - Correspondence from the Commission Secretary
9. Adjourn

## DRAFT MINUTES Manor Township Planning Commission Minutes

Monday, November 13, 2006 Time: 7:30 P.M.

The Manor Township Planning Commission met on Monday, November 13, 2006 at the Manor Township Municipal Building, 950 W. Fairway Drive, Lancaster, PA. Mr. Ahlfeld introduced the Commission members and led those in attendance in the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.

Members Present: John Ahlfeld, James Miller, Donald Witmer, Mary Glazier, Scott Haverstick and Beth Herr. Member Absent: James Henke Visitors Present: Jim Huber, 113 Shannon Dr Al Kreider, 141 Supervisors Rd Melissa Kelly, RGS Associates Glenn Hess, 833 Central Manor Rd Elaine Jones, Lancaster Newspaper Ted Will, 2230 Manor Ridge Dr David Charles, 26 Millersville Rd

Mr. Ahlfeld commented on the agenda stating the two items under old business are interrelated and the survey work that was needed for the Township Solicitor to write the rezoning ordinance has not been completed. The items will be delayed until the work is done. There was a letter from the LCPC with comments on this agenda item that will be background for the Commission for the next time it is on the agenda.

Public Comment There was no public comment.

Minutes Mr. Miller made a motion to approve the minutes from October. Mr. Haverstick seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously.

New Business Final Subdivision Plan Fairway Drive & Waiver of the Three Meeting Delay The plan is located at the corner of Fairway Drive and Millersville Road. This plan subdivides an existing single lot into two (2) lots for residential use. The existing dwelling will remain on Lot #1 (16,916.11 sq. ft.) with no improvements. Access to Lot #1 shall remain from Millersville Road. Lot #2 (11,638.57 sq. ft.) consists of a lot for a single family detached dwelling unit access from Fairway Drive. Public water and sewer will be provided. The Commission needs to review and make recommendations to the LCPC. Melissa Kelly, Landscape Architect from RGS Associates, presented the plan. Dave Charles, owner of the property, was also present. Ms. Kelly stated this is an existing lot located at the southeast corner of the intersection of Fairway Drive and Millersville Road. The property is approximately .65 acres in the medium residential

zoning district. There is an existing house on the property that has access to Route 741 by way of their driveway and that house and driveway will remain as part of new Lot #1 being created. An additional lot is being created, that is listed as Lot #2 to provide for a single family detached dwelling. It will have public sewer and water and will have access off Fairway Drive. They are requesting a waiver of the three meeting delay. They do not have comments from the LCPC or from the township engineer, Buchart Horn. Mr. Miller made a motion to recommend to the LCPC approval of the final subdivision plan for Fairway Drive plan and waiver of the three meeting delay. Ms. Glazier seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously.

Other Business Mr. Ahlfeld stated they received correspondence from the LCPC regarding rezoning of the Murry /Sher-Wal tract that was discussed at the last meeting. Mr. Miller stated the LCPC correspondence is going to be amended. LCPC will be requesting that the applicant and the township try to determine what is the best zoning for that site as opposed to a flat out denial. Ms. Glazier had the following letters from the LCPC: Letter from the LCPC dated October 30 approving the 180-day waiver of the time period to meet conditions for Timson Place. Letter from the LCPC dated October 4 approving the lot add-on plan for H. Chester Haverstick. Letter from the LCPC dated October 10 requesting modification of requirement to construct 20wide access drive for Washington Boro United Methodist Church. Ms. Glazier stated also there were notices of things that have already happened or being considered today from the LCPC.

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 7:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary Glazier Secretary

Recording Secretary Evelyn Rineer

**Planning Commission Meeting**

**12/11/06**

Manor Township Planning Commission Agenda

Monday, December 11, 2006 Time: 7:30 P.M.

1. Call to Order

2. Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag
3. Roll Call
4. Public Comment
5. Approve Minutes of November 13, 2006
6. Old Business Rezoning Request J. Glenn Hess & Rosemary Hess For Property at 833 Central Manor Road & Roy F. & Evelyn A. Enterline at 857 Central Manor Road - Petition to rezone two tracts of property totaling approximately 9.3 acres located on Central Manor Road in Manor Township, Lancaster County, Pennsylvania from agricultural to local commercial. The Commission needs to review and submit comments to the Township Supervisors.

Zoning Ordinance Amendment Amendment to provide for automobile, boat, trailer, truck, farm machinery, and mobile home service and repair facilities, including but not limited to auto mechanics, drive-thru lubrication services and tires, auto paint, brake, muffler, transmission, windshield, auto body, car radio and upholstery shops as a permitted use in the local commercial zone of Manor Township, Lancaster County, Pennsylvania. The Commission needs to review and submit comments to the Township Supervisors.

7. New Business Lot Add-On Plan Walter E. Jr. & Vicki L. & Loretta J. Rebman The plan proposes to take Parcel A containing 4.09 acres (gross) from the Rebman property and add it to the property of Arthur W. & Patricia E. Knight. The total acreage of the Knight tract with lot add-on will be 40.44 acres and the Rebman tract will be left with 11.369 acres. The Commission needs to review and make recommendations to the LCPC on this lot add-on plan.

8. Other Business - Correspondence from the Commission Secretary
9. Adjourn

DRAFT MINUTES Manor Township Planning Commission Minutes

Monday, December 11, 2006 Time: 7:30 P.M.

The Manor Township Planning Commission met on Monday, December 11, 2006 at the Manor Township Municipal Building, 950 W. Fairway Drive, Lancaster, PA. Mr. Ahlfeld introduced the Commission members and led those in attendance in the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.

Members Present: John Ahlfeld, Donald Witmer, Mary Glazier, James Henke, Beth Herr and Scott Haverstick. Member Absent: James Miller Visitors Present:

Rosemary & Glenn Hess, 833 Central Manor Road Kenny Shertzer, Lancaster  
Glenn Rohrer, Lancaster Nick Hess, Millersville Duane Hess, Washington Boro  
Lynn St. Denis, 821 Central Manor Rd. Dick Warfel, 821 Central Manor Rd. Dave  
Hess, 42 Manor Oaks Drive, Millersville John May, 100 Red Fox Rd., Millersville  
Bill Sell, Light-Heigel Roy F. Enterline, 857 Central Manor Rd., Washington Boro  
Jim Harnish, 768 Central Manor Rd., Washington Boro Richard Bauder, Manor  
Twp. Al Kreider, Manor Twp. Bonnie Miller, 113 Bent Tree Dr.

Public Comment There was no public comment.

Minutes Don Witmer made a motion to approve the minutes from the November 13,  
2006 meeting. Mr. Haverstick seconded the motion and the motion carried with  
James Henke abstaining.

Old Business Rezoning Request J. Glenn Hess & Rosemary Hess For Property at  
833 Central Manor Road & Roy F. & Evelyn A. Enterline at 857 Central Manor  
Road - Petition to rezone two tracts of property totaling approximately 9.3 acres  
located on Central Manor Road in Manor Township, Lancaster County,  
Pennsylvania from agricultural to local commercial. The Commission needs to  
review and submit comments to the Township Supervisors.

Zoning Ordinance Amendment Amendment to provide for automobile, boat, trailer,  
truck, farm machinery, and mobile home service and repair facilities, including but  
not limited to auto mechanics, drive-thru lubrication services and tires, auto paint,  
brake, muffler, transmission, windshield, auto body, car radio and upholstery shops  
as a special exception use in the local commercial zone of Manor Township,  
Lancaster County, Pennsylvania. The Commission needs to review and submit  
comments to the Township Supervisors. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that there has been a  
revision to the proposal since it was before them and they do not have the comments  
from the LCPC; therefore, there would be no final action taken at this meeting. Ms.  
Glazier asked what revision was made. Mr. Ahlfeld advised the Commission that  
some of the uses are allowed as a special exception rather than a permitted use.  
Attorney Bernadette Hohenadel, representing Mr. & Mrs. Hess, stated the difference  
is that the Hesss would have to obtain approval through a special exception to  
operate their business at the present location as well as anyone else who wished to  
operate this type of business would have to obtain a special exception. The  
amendment will be reviewed by the LCPC on December 26th. Mr. Haverstick asked  
who initiated the amendment. Ms. Hohenadel stated that the Township initiated the  
amendment and her clients had no objections with the revisions. Ms. Glazier asked  
if the Hesss did everything that was listed in the text. Ms. Hohenadel stated no and  
the reason that language was used was that the language is already in the Ordinance  
in other sections. Ms. Hohenadel stated that the Hesss engage in truck, auto, and  
farm machinery repair. Ms. Glazier had comments on the businesses that are  
proposed in the amendment and felt some of them did not make sense for the local  
commercial zoning district. Mr. Haverstick asked if bodywork is done at this

location. Mr. Haverstick was advised that there is no bodywork done at this time nor is it ever anticipated that bodywork would be done. Mr. Ott advised the Commission that the criteria for a special exception is found in Section 407 of the zoning book and advised the Commission take a look at the section. Allen Kreider, 141 Supervisors Road, stated that he agreed with Ms. Glazier that this amendment is very broad in what it covers; anything from a repair business to a paint shop is listed. Mr. Kreider expressed concern since the ordinance was in affect before Manor Township had electrical inspections if someone put in an auto paint shop in an existing building, it would not need to be inspected. Mr. Kreider stated that you will end up with a hazardous area with explosion proof equipment not being used. Mr. Kreider stated that he does not feel auto mechanics should fall into the same category as auto paint shops as well as some of the other businesses listed. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that action would be postponed until the January meeting when the Commission will have comments from the LCPC.

New Business Lot Add-On Plan Walter E. Jr. & Vicki L. & Loretta J. Rebman The plan proposes to take Parcel A containing 4.09 acres (gross) from the Rebman property and add it to the property of Arthur W. & Patricia E. Knight. The total acreage of the Knight tract with lot add-on will be 40.44 acres and the Rebman tract will be left with 11.369 acres. The Commission needs to review and make recommendations to the LCPC on this lot add-on plan. Bill Sell from Light-Heigel Associates presented the plan. Mr. Rebman owns a little less than 15 acres on both sides of Pittsburg Valley Road. The property is divided by Pittsburg Valley Road with a little over four acres on the one side of the road and the remaining acreage on the north side of the road. On the north side of the road there is a house, barn, etc. with sewage facilities. The plan is a lot add-on plan taking the four acres on the south side of Pittsburg Valley Road and adding it to the property of Arthur Knight. This plan is for lot-add on conveyance purposes only and there is no building activities or development planned for this tract. It has been submitted to the LCPC for review. Mr. Sell stated that the lot add-on plan is a type of subdivision by definition. Mr. Sell stated that the centerline can be used as the dividing line and that type of plan is called a centerline separation plan. Mr. Sell stated that the property is in Clean and Green. Mr. Henke asked if it is required to identify an alternative septic system and Mr. Sell stated not with a lot add-on plan. Mr. Haverstick asked if the Knight property is a single deed and Mr. Sell stated yes and it is 36 acres. Mr. May asked if both properties are in Clean and Green and Mr. Sell stated he believes they are. Mr. Henke made a motion to recommend to the LCPC approval of the Walter E. Rebman Jr. lot add-on plan. Ms. Herr seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously.

Other Business Ms. Glazier listed the following correspondence she had received from the LCPC: A letter was received indicating that the Rebman Lot Add-on Plan was received on November 21st. A letter was received indicating that the Hess rezoning and zoning ordinance amendment has been scheduled for review on December 26th. A letter was received indicating that the Fairway Drive Final

Subdivision Plan application has been approved. A letter was received approving a 90-day waiver of time for Parkfield Phase II; this is the second time extension. A letter was received with comments regarding the Woods Edge property proposal. A letter was received pertaining to the Hess tract amendment with comments.

Mr. Ahlfeld reported that the County had an event last week and recognized some projects under their Smart Growth Awards Program. Two projects out of four recognized were related to Manor Township. Under the project category, there was recognition of the Manor Heights Development; under the planning category there was recognition for the Act 537 Plan in which Manor Township participated.

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 7:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary Glazier Secretary

Recording Secretary Evelyn Rineer