

**Planning Commission Meeting
01/10/05**

Manor Township Planning Commission Agenda

Monday, January 10, 2005 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 2005
6. Approve Minutes of December 13, 2004 meeting

7. New Business Preliminary Plan for Manor Heights The proposed project is located south of Columbia Avenue and west of Hershey Mill Road. There is access to the tracts from both Columbia Avenue and Oakridge Drive. The applicant is proposing to build multi-family dwelling (70 dwelling units and 39 fee simple townhouses). The total lot acreage is 21.94 acres. The property has both public water and sewer. The zoning is high density residential flex (RH1). - Consideration and recommendations to the Township Supervisors on the following modification requests: Section 103.2 Increase the maximum street grade from 8% to 12% Section 103.3.A Decrease required paved roadway width from 34to 28 with parking restricted to one side. - Considerations and recommendations to the LCPC on the following Modification request from the LCSDDLDO: Section 602.03.C Required right-of-way width Section 602.06.A Provide sidewalk on both sides of proposed street Section 602.16.B Allowable traffic volumes on cul-de-sac Section 602.16.E Paved circular turnarounds with a radius of 50 for cul-de-sacs Section 604.02.A Maximum block length requirements. The Commission needs to review modification requests and make recommendations to the LCPC.

8. Other Business - Act 537 Update - Annual 2004 Report -Correspondence

9. Adjourn

DRAFT

Manor Township Planning Commission Minutes

Monday, January 10, 2005 Time: 7:30 P.M.

The Manor Township Planning Commission held its regularly scheduled meeting on Monday, January 10, 2005 at 7:30 p.m. at the Manor Township Municipal Building, 950 West Fairway

Drive, Lancaster, PA.

Mr. Ahlfeld introduced the Commission members pointing out that Ms. Glazier has been reappointed to a four year term and James Henke was appointed to a four year term taking the place of Mark Lauriello who did not wish to be reappointed. Mr. Ahlfeld led the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.

Members Present: John Ahlfeld, Jim Miller, Scott Haverstick, Donald Witmer, Mary Glazier and James Henke. Member Absent: Beth Herr Visitors Present: Jim Stauffer, 365 Weaver Road Dan Basehoar, 30 N. Orange Street, Lancaster Evelyn Stehman, 75 Chestnut Grove Rd., Conestoga Jim Huber, 113 Shannon Dr., Lancaster John Randolph, 1100 Pennsylvania Ave., Wilmington, DE Sandy Kime, 1076 Centerville Rd., Lancaster Elaine Jones, 670 Hershey Ave., Lancaster John May, 100 Red Fox Rd., Millersville Allen Kreider, 141 Supervisors Rd., Lancaster Stacey Morgan, Hartman, Underhill & Brubaker Danny Whittle, LCPC Donna & Mike Bare, 107 Chestnut Grove Rd., Conestoga

Public Comment Jim Huber, 113 Shannon Drive, expressed concerns regarding a previous land development plan that was presented at the last Planning Commission meeting, Villas at Sutherland, in regards to the stormwater runoff. Mr. Huber stated it was indicated the stormwater would go into the pond and feed the wetland. Mr. Huber expressed concern because the wetlands are sensitive and he wanted to know if the runoff would be treated or will it run directly from the parking areas into the pond. Mr. Huber stated the Army Core of Engineers did not favor putting more stormwater in the wetlands. Mr. Huber stated there were several people at the last Supervisors meeting who also expressed concerns. Mr. Huber was advised the final plan has not been received and the stormwater plan from the original Woods Edge Plan is what is being used. Ms. Glazier stated the minutes indicated the Township Engineer reviewed the plan and made several comments. Mr. Huber asked if the comments were available. Mr. Huber was advised to come into the Township Office and make a request to look at the comments.

Re-organization Meeting Mr. Haverstick nominated John Ahlfeld for the position of Chairman and the nomination was seconded by Jim Miller. Mr. Witmer nominated Jim Miller for the position of Vice Chairman and the nomination was seconded by Jim Henke. Mr. Miller nominated Don Witmer for the position of Secretary but Mr. Witmer declined the nomination. Mr. Miller nominated Scott Haverstick for the position of Secretary but Mr. Haverstick declined the nomination. Mr. Miller nominated Mary Glazier for the position of Secretary and Mr. Haverstick seconded the nomination. Mr. Henke made a motion to act on the slate nominated and Mr. Witmer seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously. Ms. Glazier made a motion the meeting dates for 2005 be the second Monday of the month with the exception of October when the meeting will be on the second Tuesday. The motion was seconded by Mr. Haverstick and the motion carried unanimously. The Commission asked that a letter be sent to Mark Lauriello thanking him for excellent service during his years on the Planning Commission.

Approve Minutes Mr. Haverstick made a motion to approve the minutes as written. Mr. Witmer seconded the motion and the motion carried with Jim Miller and Jim Henke abstaining.

New Business Preliminary Plan for Manor Heights - The proposed project is located south of

Columbia Avenue and west of Hershey Mill Road. There is access to the tracts from both Columbia Avenue and Oakridge Drive. The applicant is proposing to build multi-family dwelling (70 dwelling units and 39 fee simple townhouses). The total lot acreage is 21.94 acres. The property has both public water and sewer. The zoning is high density residential flex (RH1).

- Consideration and recommendations to the Township Supervisors on the following modification requests: Section 103.2 Increase the maximum street grade from 8% to 12%
- Section 103.3.A Decrease required paved roadway width from 34 to 28 with parking restricted to one side.
- Considerations and recommendations to the LCPC on the following Modification request from the LCSLDLDO: Section 602.03.C Required right-of-way width Section 602.06.A Provide sidewalk on both sides of proposed street Section 602.16.B Allowable traffic volumes on cul-de-sac Section 602.16.E Paved circular turnarounds with a radius of 50 for cul-de-sacs Section 604.02.A Maximum block length requirements.

The Commission needs to review modification requests and make recommendations to the LCPC. Stacey Morgan from the Law Firm of Hartman, Underhill and Brubaker representing the MBI Development Company introduced the plan. Ms. Morgan stated John Randolph from MBI Development Company, Sandy Kime from David Miller Associates and Dan Basehoar from Lancaster Housing Opportunity Partnership was also present. Ms. Morgan stated the tract is within the Urban Growth Boundary and there are 109 mixed income residential units proposed for this site. All the residential units that are proposed are permitted under the terms of the current zoning. A portion of the property is also located within the Floodplain Zoning District. On December 1, 2004, the Applicant received two special exceptions from the Zoning Hearing Board as follows: 1) to place a culvert within the floodplain and 2) place utilities underneath and cross over the floodplain. On December 6, 2004, the Applicant went before the Supervisors requesting two modifications from the Townships Road Ordinance for width of roadway and slope of road. The Supervisors postponed making a decision on those requests until they had a recommendation from the Planning Commission. Ms. Morgan stated tonight they are asking for two recommendations one for the Supervisors on the two modifications from the Townships Road Ordinance and one to the LCPC on the plan and several modification requests from the County Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance. Ms. Morgan stated John Randolph from the MBI Development Company would give a brief background on MBI and provide more information on the mixed income concept. Mr. Randolph handed out brochures to the Commission. Mr. Randolph stated that his firm has been in existence since 1982 and is an affiliate of the Ingerman Group. The Ingerman Group represents an umbrella of companies that includes residential real estate development, construction and management which includes MBI Development Company, Ingerman Affordable Housing, Ingerman Construction Company, and Ingerman Management Company. Mr. Randolph gave background indicating they have developed nearly 3700 units to date representing close to half a billion dollars worth of residential development. On the construction side, they have done about 240 million dollars worth of work and about 3500 units to date and currently they have about 100 million dollars worth of work in progress or under contract. On the management side, they typically manage all their rental projects. Mr. Randolph stated that they are therefore in the project for the long haul in terms of both ownership and management. There are about 2600 units under their management at this time. The project Manor Heights is a mixed income property with two components. The first will be 39 fee simple townhouses that will be upscale luxury type townhouses and the second will be a 70 unit affordable housing rental community. The townhouses will range from about 1600 to 2100 square feet and the starting price will range in the upper \$170s to the low \$200,000. There was serious

consideration taken in trying to maximize the site to the best they can in terms of getting the best possible design configuration for the fee simple lots portion of the site. Basically every unit has a walkout basement with open space. On the other side of the property are the 70 affordable housing units that will be mostly townhouse style units. Of the 70, there are 58 units that will be townhouse style and 12 apartment flats. The 12 apartment flats will specifically serve individuals with disabilities. They will all be handicap accessible or adaptable. Additionally, on the site, there will be a community building that will be about 2500 square feet with a public community meeting space and other amenities and a play area with a tot lot. The site has a 12% to 15% grade through the middle of the site. The architecture used will help to respect the site as much as possible so that there would be little benching and having major drop offs. The units were basically designed to run with the grade of the property. The units will serve moderate income working class households in Lancaster County ranging from households that earn \$20,000 to \$40,000 per year. There will be written guidelines for renters to qualify to live in these units and they also need to pass a very strict background check. The project has already been awarded funding from the Lancaster Housing Opportunity Partnership, the Lancaster County Housing and Redevelopment Authority, and from the Pennsylvania Housing Finance Agency. Dan Basehoar, from the Lancaster Housing Opportunity Partnership, was present to talk about the affordable rental phase and the need for that type of housing in Lancaster County. Mr. Basehoar stated the most recent statement of what is occurring in housing is a publication put out by United Way last fall. Essentially, today we are looking at a situation in the County of having some 15,000 lower income households who rent their houses throughout the County and are presently not in affordable housing. Eighty percent of that number is families that actually pay more than 50% of their income towards rent and two-thirds of those are families who currently live outside the city. The reason for emphasizing these points is the following: 1) when people are paying that much of their income for rent you are asking for a lot of problems, not just for them as individuals but also for the communities. The multiple impacts of that in terms of family stability issues and community issues such as home ownership are critical. The Lancaster Housing Opportunity program works with people of lower incomes to buy their own homes. The issue is when people pay 50% of their income for a rental unit, they are not in a position to save and are running into all kinds of credit issues. That makes it very difficult if not impossible, for many people to take the step to homeownership. It is very critical to have rental housing to get people in line to ultimately purchase homes. 2) Jobs and transportation are a growing issue in the County. There is growing mismatch of where the affordable housing is located, affordable primarily in the city, and where the jobs are located outside the city. The situation created for employers as they are trying to hire the people is that you must get the employees from the affordable housing to the jobs. This places demands on the transportation system. Mr. Basehoar stated that this is a project they are happy to have and an opportunity to support because of its mixed income. There are very successful examples of this type of housing. The closest would be the Summit Hills Community in Mountville Borough. Sandy Kime, from David Millers Associates, stated that this property is approximately 22 acres. Mr. Kime stated that there is a point of access onto Columbia Avenue from the property as well as to the west which exists through a 60 feet wide access easement through the Oak Ridge Development and that aligns with the recently constructed access drive into the commercial complex. There is public sanitary sewer that runs through the site. The property is bound by the West Branch of the Little Conestoga Creek along the east boundary and unnamed tributary to the West Branch that goes runs through the north part of the site. There is public water on Hershey Mill Road and also on Oakridge Drive. As part of this

proposal, we are working with Columbia Water to extend a 16" main through the entire site to the water tank. The site does have a floodplain and a small wetland. The site has a slope ranging from 10% to 18%. There is a significant wooded embankment along the east side of the site that makes access between the site and the floodplain and Hershey Mill Road not feasible. There is only two potential points of access. Mr. Kime stated that this is an infill piece of ground that has a residential development of townhouses to the west, mixed uses of singles and some apartments to the east, and large single family lots to the south. The site is totally surrounded and there is no ability to expand the street system outward to other properties. It is zoned for High Density development (RH1) and in the past the site has been farmed but there are no significant prime agricultural soils on the site according to the Soil Conservation District maps. The allowable density within this district for a one family development allows 14 dwelling units per acre and for townhouses up to eight buildings per acre. Because of the significant floodplains and steep slopes, the applicant feels they have a reasonable density. The local family component, which is the apartments, has a density of 6.26 units per acre and for the townhouses there is a density of 4.58 units per acre. There are 39 single family units that have on lot parking and 70 apartments with a total of 305 parking spaces on the entire site. Within the apartment complex, there are 2.04 parking spaces per dwelling unit and the parking spaces are not assigned to individual lots. Within the fee simple lots are 2.92 spaces per dwelling unit and that is not including any on street parking that is being proposed on one side of the street. The on street parking gives 48 additional parking spaces and increased the ratio for the townhouses to 4.15 parking spaces per dwelling unit. Mr. Kime stated that it is a public street and regulated by the Township's street specifications. Mr. Kime stated they are asking for two waivers from the Township. The first one is the street grade. Mr. Kime stated that they tried different ideas but there is a 12% grade in one section of about 400 to 500 feet. One of the reasons for the 12% grade is because they are trying to go at a slight angle and in that 12% grade they have eight units fronting on that steep area. When they get to the top part of the site, where most of the units are located, it flattens out and there is a 3% to 4% grade in that area. They are also following the existing grade. To keep to the 8% grade, we would be over 20 feet in the ground by the time they reached the top of the hill. The applicant feels that they have a hardship and have tried to put enough bends in the road to be as compatible as possible with the grade. The Township Staff wanted them to make sure that when this was done, the driveways for the eight units could be kept relatively flat. Mr. Kime explained how the driveways would be reasonably graded. The second request is for the cartway width. They are proposing to go to a 28 foot wide cartway width with parking on only one side. This allows for two ten foot lanes and an eight foot parking lane. The street will be curved. Also, with the narrower streets, it helps to slow up traffic and with the grade of the street it is a preferred attribute for this development. The following are the County waivers requested. The first one coincides with the street width requirement of the Township. Section 602.03.C. Required Right of way width to correspond with the proposed 28 foot wide cartway, the applicant is proposing to establish the right-of-way width at 44 feet. The distance from the back of curb to right-of-way will be eight feet, which is consistent with the spacing between a 50 foot wide right-of-way and a 34 foot wide cartway. It is not clear whether a modification is required in this instance, since it could be argued that they exceed the requirements established in Appendix 3 for this street type/intensity classification, but the applicant would like to err on the side of caution in the event that the LCPC determines that such a modification is required for the proposed street right-of-way width. The proposed street right-of-way width represents the minimum modification required to the Ordinance and is equal to or better than the Ordinance

requirement. Section 602.06.A Provide sidewalk on both sides of proposed streets - This request is for sidewalks on just one side of the public street. The proposed streets are classified as residential low access, low-intensity streets. According, Appendix 4 in the Ordinance, sidewalk is only required on one side of the cartway for this class of street. However, the project site is within the UGB and they believe the LCPC has a policy to require sidewalks along both sides of streets within the UGB. It is not clear whether a modification is required in this instance since it could be argued that they comply with the requirements established in Appendix 4 for this street type/intensity classification. The applicant is proposing the installation of sidewalk to be limited to the east side of both Rocky Knob Way and Cascade Court. The justification for this request is that there are no townhouse lots proposed on the west sides of these streets, there is approximately 520 feet of Rocky Knob Way that has no proposed units on either side of the street, and the installation of sidewalks along the east sides of these two streets will adequately serve the residents of the development. There are also ample connections to the sidewalk system within the rental unit portion of the project located to the west side of Rocky Knob Way.

Section 602.16,B Allowable traffic volumes on cul-de-sac The applicant is seeking relief from the Ordinance requirements for maximum AADT permitted on a cul-de-sac. The Traffic Impact Study for Manor Heights indicates a projected AADT of 276 (40% of 691). It is noted that the cul-de-sac is providing access to more than the townhouse lots fronting the street. This results in a higher AADT projection. The justification for this request is that the access drive to the rental portion of the project on the west side of Rocky Knob Way (opposite Cascade Court) will provide an ingress/egress alternative in the event of an emergency to Oak Ridge Drive. Required cross access agreements will be provided.

Section 602.16.C Maximum length of cul-de-sac the applicant is seeking relief from 600 foot maximum length of cul-de-sac requirement of the Ordinance. The applicant is proposing a public cul-de-sac street of approximately 1300 feet, measured from Columbia Avenue to the end of Rocky Knob Way. This length is proposed in order to access the southern portion of the project site with a public street; however, due to the steep grades of the site and steeper slopes and floodplain to the east, provision for a second street or for a loop street configuration are not practical. As described above in the traffic volume modification request, an access drive will connect to Rocky Knob Way, directly opposite of Cascade Court, to serve the rental portion of the project. This access will be able to provide ingress/egress in the event of an emergency. Required cross access agreements will be provided. The length of the cul-de-sac beyond this second ingress/egress alternative is only about 400 feet.

Section 602.16.E Paved circular turnarounds with a radius of 50 for cul-de-sacs The applicant is seeking to modify the required paved circular turnaround radius for cul-de-sacs from 50 feet to 40 feet. As noted in the right of way width modification requested above, the applicant has requested a Township waiver for the minimum cartway width for a public street from 34 feet to 28 feet. Reducing the paved turnaround area will still provide required area for vehicles turning around, reduce storm water runoff, provide adequate area for utility placement between the cartway and the right of way, and is more compatible with the existing grades of the project site. The applicant has also restricted any parking within the turnaround to further facilitate vehicular movement.

Section 604.02.A Maximum block length requirements the applicant is seeking to eliminate the maximum block length requirements of the Ordinance. The project site is an infill site with no possible means of extending the street system to the adjacent properties. There are existing lots between the project site and Columbia Avenue to the north, there are steep slopes and floodplains located along the east side of the site, there are large single family lots to the south and southwest, and there is the existing Oak Ridge development to the west. Due to these

existing constraints, the proposed development is self-contained with two points of access at the only possible locations remaining to the project site. Where there is affordable housing there is a provision in the County Ordinance that states that residential or subdivisions of land with more than 20% of the units reserved for affordable housing may be exempted from dedication of park and open space land if adequate park and open space is provided by other means. This development is over the 20% limit. The Township has input as to what they want to do with the open space requirement. As part of this plan, they are providing a community building, 125 square foot play area tot lot, and the ability to locate a second tot lot, and an entire walkway system connects all the facilities. Lot #1 is an open space lot that is about 1.4 acres and there are three open space lots totaling over 4.2 acres within the fee simple portion. This is a conservation resource and there is a note on the plan they will provide the floodplain corridor as an easement to the Township to allow for future greenway development by the Township. After discussion with the Township Staff, the developers are willing to make a contribution of \$5,000 to the Townships funds for improvements to public parks elsewhere in the Township. Mr. Ahlfeld asked for more detail regarding the easement along the Little Conestoga. Mr. Kime stated the easement includes the entire floodplain and is shown on the plan. It has not been dimensioned at this time. There is a note on the plan that indicates the easement is being offered for the use of the Township. The developer will retain ownership. There is access to the easement. Mr. Haverstick asked if an alternative plan has been developed for the 12% grade if it is not approved. Mr. Kime stated they have tried numerous ideas but have been unable to make anything else work. Mr. Miller asked what the grade is on Oakridge Drive and Mr. Kime stated it is around 12%. Mr. Miller stated the secondary access will go down Oakridge Drive which is essentially at 12% and is a public road. Mr. Kime stated that is correct. Mr. Haverstick asked Mr. Whittle asked how many roads are in Lancaster County with 12% grades. Mr. Whittle stated there are not many. Mr. Whittle stated that the 12% will start to show up in the last pieces of land being developed in the infill of the urban area. Mr. Kime stated typically 8% or less in Lancaster County means you have prime agricultural soils. Mr. Miller asked Mr. Kime if he had any idea what River Road is when it climbs Turkey Hill. Mr. Haverstick stated it is probably an average of 8% and the top is probably approaching 10%. Mr. Witmer asked what Gamber Road is and Mr. Haverstick stated it may be close to 12%. Mr. Haverstick stated there is a very steep climb in East Hempfield called Indian Head that is probably the steepest. Mr. Whittle stated that the road in this development is only a short distance where it is approaching 12% where at Turkey Hill you are talking about a long stretch. Mr. Smith stated that the Supervisors at the last meeting asked the Staff to review the issue. Mark Harris, Road Foreman, and Barry Smith met with two engineers from Buchart-Horn specifically addressing the issues of the steep slope and it was concluded for the distance that is being submitted, there is no objection and Staff will support the waiver request. Also, Mr. Smith stated that regarding the cartway there is no objection to the reduction of the cartway and that the Township supports no parking on one side of the street but would like to note it is the Township Traffic Commission that actually has jurisdiction over setting that particular restriction. Donna Bare asked for clarification on the term fee simple townhouses. Mr. Kime stated you actually own the front yard, back yard, and the house. Jim Huber asked Mr. Kime to indicate on the plan the location of the Eagle Heights Development and where the Eagle Heights access is onto Columbia Avenue. Mr. Huber was advised Eagle Heights does not have access onto Columbia Avenue. Mr. Henke asked what they envisioned happening in the community building and is it strictly just for this community or could it be rented out. Mr. Henke was advised it is primarily for the formal rental community of 70 units. It

will contain a leasing management office, office for Social Services, maintenance office, small kitchenette and a community room of about 1100 to 1200 square feet that will service basically as a meeting space for meetings and after school activities for children in the community. Ms. Glazier asked who will manage this community building. Ingerman Management Company will manage the building. A requirement of financing is that the developer keeps management and requires the developer to own the property for a minimum of 15 years. It is designed and developed to the highest standards and managed to the highest standards obviously because they have a long term vested interest in the property. Ms. Glazier asked if they are required to have activities and she was advised it is a requirement. Ms. Bare asked if there are any other similar communities in Lancaster County they currently own and manage. Ms. Bare was advised there are no others in Lancaster County but that such communities exist in Maryland, Delaware, New Jersey, and other portions of Pennsylvania. Mr. Haverstick asked how many residents per unit would be anticipated. Two bedroom units would probably be about 2 to 3 individuals and for a three bedroom unit 3 to 4 individuals on an average. Mr. Miller asked Mr. Whittle how some of the waiver requests connect with what the Chesapeake Bay Alliance is trying to accomplish. Mr. Whittle stated the Chesapeake Bay Alliance recommendations are to limit hard surfaces where possible and reducing the pavement width is in line with that. Also, reducing unneeded sidewalks would be consistent with the recommendations of the Chesapeake Bay Alliance. The way this developer is dealing with the grading and using the step down benching minimizing the grading and disturbance and the actual runoff. Mr. Whittle stated that he feels the project is done very well. Mr. Henke stated that some of the grading walls look fairly high and asked if there is any fencing at the top of the wall for additional protection. Mr. Kime stated a structural engineer will design the wall along with fencing on top. Mr. Henke asked if there are provisions allowing an internal unit to go around the end units to get to the back. Mr. Henke was advised there will be a Homeowners Association and those issues will be addressed in the Homeowners agreement. Mr. Henke clarified what special exceptions were granted and asked if there is any structure in the floodplain. Mr. Kime stated that there is a structure in the floodplain. Jim Miller stated he would abstain from voting due to conflict of interest. Mr. Witmer made a motion to recommend to the Township Supervisors to approve the increase of the street grade from 8% to 12% and also decrease the cartway width from 34 to 28 with the restriction of parking on one side. Mr. Henke seconded the motion and the motion carried 4-1 with Mr. Haverstick opposing the motion. Mr. Miller abstained. Mr. Witmer made a motion to recommend to the LCPC the reduction of the right-of-way width from 50 to 44. Mr. Henke seconded the motion. Ms. Glazier asked what would be the harm of retaining the right-of-way width even though the street is narrower. Mr. Kime stated years ago the County had 50 wide right-of-ways and 60 wide right-of-ways on collector streets and they stated there are some cases where it is not needed and it is taking additional land. What is happening is the buildings are pushed further and further into the steep slopes and that is a waste of land which could be better used as open space. Mr. Smith stated the extensive right-of-ways beyond the public infrastructure puts specific restrictions on what a homeowner can do within the right-of-ways and should be taken into account. Motion carried with Jim Miller abstaining. Mr. Haverstick made a motion to recommend to the LCPC to waive the provision for sidewalks on one side of the street. The motion was seconded by Don Witmer and the motion carried with Jim Miller abstaining. Mr. Henke made a motion to recommend to the LCPC traffic be allowed to be increased on the cul-de-sacs as presented. The motion was seconded by Don Witmer and the motion carried 4-1 with Mr. Haverstick opposing the motion. Mr. Miller abstained. Mr. Witmer made a motion to recommend to the LCPC the reduction in the

radius of the turn around from 50 to 40 with no parking provision in the cul-de-sac. The motion was seconded by Jim Henke and the motion carried with Mr. Miller abstaining. Mr. Haverstick made a motion to recommend to the LCPC to grant the waiver of the maximum block length requirement. The motion was seconded by Mr. Witmer and the motion carried with Mr. Miller abstaining. The waiver request for maximum length of cul-de-sac was not on the agenda. The maximum length would be 600 and what is being proposed from Columbia Avenue is 1300. Mr. Haverstick asked for an explanation as to the difference between the length of cul-de-sac and maximum block length requirement. Block length has to do with any block and the cul-de-sac has to do specifically with the length from the main road. Mr. Henke made a motion to recommend to the LCPC to grant a waiver request that maximum length of cul-de-sac be permitted as presented. Mr. Witmer seconded the motion and the motion carried with Mr. Miller abstaining. Mr. Haverstick stated that the parties involved made a very good case for this project. He came into the meeting preliminarily with a lot of problems with many of the waivers. He stated a good job was done with explaining most of his concerns regarding the project but he does maintain that a 12% slope is really too steep. He feels it will be a very good project for the township and a much needed project. Ms. Glazier stated she had some of the same reservations as Mr. Haverstick prior to the meeting. Mr. Ahlfeld asked if anyone would like to recommend approval contingent upon meeting all the standards of the County Ordinance. Ms. Glazier made a motion to recommend to the LCPC approval based on Mr. Ahlfeld's statement of meeting all the LCPC standards. The motion was seconded by Mr. Witmer and the motion carried with Mr. Miller abstaining.

Other Business Act 537 No Update. Annual 2004 Report Mr. Ahlfeld stated Staff has prepared an annual report and a copy was given to each member. Mr. Ahlfeld stated a copy of the report can be viewed at the office. The report is basically a copy of the minutes and all the actions for the past year and a summary as to the number of plans that was dealt with. LIMC Regional Comprehensive Plan Growing Together Mr. Ahlfeld stated there was a seven page list of draft objectives and goals for the regional plan for each member. The LIMC has circulated this to all the municipalities and asked them to have their elected officials, Planning Commission, Park Board, Zoning Hearing Board members and anybody who would be interested in planning issues to review and present any comments by the end of January. Mr. Ahlfeld stated the other things worked on are the individual chapters. The Steering Committee has representatives from each municipality and they meet the first Thursday of each month at 7:00 at the Maple Grove Community Building in Lancaster Township. These meetings are opened to the public. . Recently it was discussed about delineating some areas to be known as Growth Opportunity Areas and there was brainstorming for some locations at the December meeting. The consultants designed a draft map and Mr. Ahlfeld showed a sample of the map. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that the consultant had some statistics which showed basically by 2020, the population growth will be such that 6,000 more dwelling units will be needed in this part of the County. There was discussion and questions regarding the draft objectives. The consultants hope to have a complete draft of all the basic chapters sometime in the next month or two. Mr. Haverstick asked Barry Smith if he had any sense as to what may happen to the Armstrong Tract. He asked if there are people interested. Mr. Smith stated there have been calls regarding the tract and interest whether the previously approved plan is a valid plan. Mr. Smith stated he has received requests from three or four development companies. Mr. Haverstick stated he does not think anything will happen until Armstrong comes out of bankruptcy. Mr. Smith stated that the Township anticipates

something will happen with the tract and we will be prepared for it when it does. Mr. Haverstick stated it would be fantastic to be able to run through another plan. Mr. Miller stated that will take hours and it is a lot of work. Correspondence Mr. Miller listed the following correspondence: Mr. Miller stated he had a letter addressed to John Ahlfeld from Fred Funk talking about the property he owns off S. Duke Street where Funks Farm Market is located. He begins talking about the topic of revenue sharing and higher housing density in order to save farmland and open spaces. He feels that breaking up contiguous farmland is as destructive to agriculture as low density based growth is. He believes poor land use is a lack of good planning or in some cases a lack of good stewardship of the land using the example of the farm across Long Lane where an 80 acre farm was developed into eight lots. He ends by saying the existing boundary to the designated growth area splits his land and he would like the LIMC on their future Land Use Map to consider including that in the designated growth area. The letter is available at the Township and can be viewed. Letter dated December 31 from the LCPC regarding the Manor Heights Plan which is scheduled for action on February 14th. Letter dated December 28 from the LCPC regarding a sketch plan for Cedar Chase, which was conditionally approved requesting modification of the plan processing procedures. This plan lies in three municipalities and is primarily in West Hempfield Township. Manor Township was fine with it and agreed to waive any authority for review or approval and Mountville retains the responsibility and authority to review any stormwater facilities that may impact the borough. Letter dated December 28 from the LCPC regarding the Villas at Sutherland preliminary plan approval subject to a few conditions. Letter dated November 23 from the LCPC regarding the West Branch Town Homes requesting a 90 day waiver of time to meet all conditions which was granted. Mr. Miller had a copy of the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) that is the Phase 2 Bicycle/Pedestrian Plan. The plan talks about goals, locations, and safety. The copy will be at the Township for anyone who wants to look at it. Letter dated November 22 from the LCPC stating that the County is changing the way they will review planning modules. Mr. Miller asked Danny Whittle to explain. Mr. Whittle stated that up until January 1st they did a written report on the review of the modules and that report substituted for their routine Form B. The County decided they will just fill out Form B. Memo dated November 1 from the LCPC that list all their meeting and submission dates for 2005. Letter dated October 26 from the LCPC regarding Moove-In Storage approval of the final plan with several conditions. Letter dated October 13 from the LCPC regarding Jacob Toews final plan approval. This property was in Clean and Green. Letter dated October 13 from the LCPC regarding Moove-In Storage approval of requested modification of the requirement for a preliminary plan. They also approved the modification request with respect to construction of curbs and sidewalks. Ms. Glazier advised Mr. Smith that she would like to see the maps and other documents on the Township Web Site. She feels it would be a good thing to have the maps on the Web Site so they could be viewed without running into the Township Office. Mr. Smith stated they will look at their provider and see what capacity there is to accommodate the material.

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 9:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary Glazier Secretary

Recording Secretary Evelyn Rineer
Planning Commission Meeting
02/14/05

Manor Township Planning Commission Agenda

Monday, February 14, 2005 Time: 7:30 P.M

1. Call to Order
2. Pledge to the Flag
3. Roll Call
4. Public Comments
5. New Business Final Land Development Plan for Villas at Sutherland Woods Edge Phase 2 Sec. 1 & Three Meeting Delay Waiver Request - The project is located off of Stone Creek Road across from Pine Bridge Lane. The lot acreage is 3.19 acres. The property is zoned RH High Density Residential. The proposed use will be 42 multi-family dwelling units. The Commission needs to review and comment to the LCPC.
6. Other Business - Act 537 Update - Regional Comprehensive Plan Update - Correspondence - Draft Pequea Township Comprehensive Plan

7. Adjourn

Planning Commission Meeting
03/14/05

Manor Township Planning Commission Agenda

Monday, March 14, 2005 Time: 7:30 P.M.

1. Call to Order
2. Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag
3. Roll Call
4. Approve Minutes of January & February Meeting
5. Public Comments
6. Old Business Millersville Official Map 7. New Business Final Subdivision/Land Development Plan for Manor Heights The proposed project is located south of Columbia Avenue and west of Hershey Mill Road. There is access to the tracts from both Columbia Avenue and Oakridge Drive. The applicant is proposing to build multi-family dwelling (70 dwelling units and 39 fee

simple townhouses). The total lot acreage is 21.94 acres. The property has both public water and sewer. The zoning is high density residential flex (RH1).

Preliminary Land Development Plan for Manor Corporate Center/Price Self Storage & Waiver of the Three Meeting Delay The properties are located on Charlestown Road and one is in the Industrial Zoning District. The Manor Corporate Center consists of three lots comprising a total of 22.79 acres. Waiver requests of the LCSDDLDO includes the following: Section 402.05.G. Traffic Impact Study Section 402.03.C. Existing Features within 200 feet of the tract One of the lots (Lot#1) is being developed by Price Self Storage. The lot area contains 7.79 acres. A total of 360 storage units are proposed. The Commission needs to review both the overall Manor Corporate Center preliminary land development plan and the Price Self-Storage preliminary land development plan. The Commission needs to make recommendations to the LCPC on the overall Manor Corporate LDP and the Price Self-Storage LDP. The Commission needs to make recommendations regarding the waiver modification to the LCSDDLDO. Lastly, the Commission needs to approve the modification request to waive the three meeting delay for scheduling the plan at the LCPC.

8. Other Business - Act 537 Update - Regional Comprehensive Plan Update - Correspondence

9. Adjourn

DRAFT Manor Township Planning Commission Minutes

Monday, March 14, 2005 Time: 7:30 P.M.

The Manor Township Planning Commission held its regularly scheduled meeting on Monday, March 14, 2005 at 7:30 p.m. at the Manor Township Municipal Building, 950 West 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, Beth Herr, Scott Haverstick, Donald Witmer and Mary Glazier. Member Absent: James Miller Visitors Present: John Randolph, 1100 Pennsylvania Ave., Suite 700, Wilmington, DE Sandy Kime, 1076 Centerville Rd., Lancaster John May, 100 Red Fox Rd, Millersville Doug Price, 2468 Crestview Dr., Lancaster Dan Price, 157 Beacon Dr., Harrisburg Al Olah, Rettew Associates Jack Gardner, Millersville Boro Elaine Jones, Lancaster Newspapers Rich Shoemaker, Manor Corporate Bonnie Miller, 113 Bent Tree Dr., Lancaster Steve Risk, Manor Corporate Allen Kreider, 141 Supervisors Rd, Lancaster Jon Kloppman, 541 Hilldale Rd., Holtwood Jim Stauffer, 365 Weaver Rd., Lancaster Bob Illo, 971 Quarry Rd. Ed Fisher, 845 Silver Spring Plaza, Lancaster Jim Huber, 113 Shannon Dr., Lancaster

Approve Minutes Don Witmer made a motion to approve the January 10, 2005 minutes and Scott Haverstick seconded the motion. The motion carried with Beth Herr abstaining. Scott Haverstick made a motion to approve the February 14, 2005 minutes and Mary Glazier seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Public Comment There was no public comment.

Old Business Millersville Official Map Mr. Ahlfeld stated at the last meeting the Commission discussed the map Millersville Borough is considering for adoption and there were some comments. It was suggested that someone from Millersville Borough join them tonight to give background and answer any questions the Commission may have on the map. Jack Gardner, who is a member of Millersville Borough Council, was present to give an explanation on the official map in regards to the relief route that is shown on the map. Mr. Gardner explained the location of the relief route and what the Borough expects to accomplish with the relief route. The Commission asked questions and expressed their opinions on the relief route. Mr. Gardner pointed out a lineal route starting at Funks Farm and expressed hope that Manor Township would pick it up in the future. Mr. Gardner also talked about the park and the paths that are proposed to tie into the Conestoga Greenways Plan. Mr. Gardner stated that they expected to have public hearings in the next month or two on the proposed map.

Final Subdivision/Land Development Plan for Manor Heights The proposed project is located south of Columbia Avenue and west of Hershey Mill Road. There is access to the tracts from both Columbia Avenue and Oakridge Drive. The applicant is proposing to build multi-family dwellings (70 dwelling units and 39 fee simple townhouses). The total lot acreage is 21.94 acres. The property has both public water and sewer. The zoning is high density residential flex (RH1). Sandy Kime was present to represent the plan. Mr. Kime stated that this is a final plan which is almost identical to the preliminary plan that was reviewed by the Commission in January. Since then, the Manor Township Supervisors approved the street grade waiver and the LCPC approved the waivers that they had including in their plans at the February 14th meeting. The applicant has submitted the final plans in February along with the cost estimate to the Township Engineer. They received a review letter from the Township Engineer with three comments as follows: 1) Obtain erosion and sedimentation control approval which they have received since the receipt of the letter. 2) The height of the wall is over 13 and they proposed a six inch rise on the wall plus a three foot high fence. They basically asked the Township to review the railing on top of the wall for safety. Mr. Kime stated that they are going to raise the fence six more inches to meet ADA standards and make a 42 railing. 3) There were comments regarding the improvement guarantee. The other issue with the County was the open space. Mr. Kime stated that in January the Commission was given a list of things being proposed which were the community center, tot lot facility, the inter lot pathway system, greenway which is being offered to the Township for its use in anyway. The Township wants to use it and the developer made a \$5,000 contribution to the Township to use in the developing of the park system. Mr. Kime stated because this is an affordable housing development, the Countys Ordinance does not require open space. Mr. Ahlfeld asked if all the action taken on the waivers was consistent with the comments or recommendations the Manor Township Planning Commission had made. Mr. Kime stated that they were consistent. Mr. Kime stated that three of the waivers were required because of the same condition regarding the cross access agreement. This way, the apartments would still have the right to use all the streets and likewise the fee simple lots would have the right to access by way of Oakridge Drive. In case there is an emergency, both sections of the project would have access. Ms. Morgan is putting an agreement together. Another comment had to do with the bus routes on Columbia Avenue; there are nearby bus stops both east and west of the site and the bus company has a policy that they must stop if anyone waves them to stop. Mr. Ahlfeld asked if the

open space would be dedicated to the Township. Mr. Kime stated that it was part of the greenway and it would be in an easement. Mr. Haverstick asked what the topography of the easement area was like. Mr. Kime stated it is very steep. Mr. Haverstick asked if it is wooded and Mr. Kime stated it is. Mr. Henke asked if there was any thought regarding the comment he had made regarding a pedestrian easement around the end units to give the internal units access to their rear yards. Mr. Kime stated there would be a Homeowners Association. Mr. Henke stated Lots 13 thru 17 has a wall 20' from the back of the house and the property line is another 30' beyond the wall. He asked if the Homeowners Association was going to take care of the fee simple lot properties. Mr. Kime stated that beyond the wall is a detention basin which will be taken care of by the Homeowners Association. Mr. Kime stated that it is the intent that the homeowner would have the ability to put a tree or shrub outside their house, but for the most part the homeowners association would be taking care of the property. Mr. Kime talked about the types of walls and the railings that will be on top of some of the walls. Mr. Henke asked if it is typical that a shop drawing would be submitted to the Township for review. Mr. Ott stated that he has never had a shop drawing submitted for his review. Jack Gardner asked if children could repel off the wall with this type of railing. Mr. Kime stated that he did not have the answer for Mr. Gardner. Bonnie Miller, 113 Bent Tree Drive, asked if the Commission has considered the amount of cars accessing Columbia Avenue. Mr. Kime stated that a traffic study was done and all the intersections were at levels of service A or B which is very good. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that there is a second access point. Ms. Miller stated that she was aware there is a second access. Jim Henke made a motion to recommend to the LCPC approval of the final plan. Ms. Herr seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously.

Preliminary Land Development Plan for Manor Corporate Center/Price Self Storage & Waiver of the Three Meeting Delay The properties are located on Charlestown Road and are in the Industrial Zoning District. The Manor Corporate Center consists of three lots comprising a total of 22.79 acres. The waiver requests of the LCSDLDO include the following: Section 402.05.G. Traffic Impact Study Section 402.03.C. Existing Features within 200 feet of the tract One of the lots (Lot#1) is being developed by Price Self Storage. The lot area contains 7.79 acres. A total of 360 storage units are proposed. The Commission needs to review both the overall Manor Corporate Center preliminary land development plan and the Price Self-Storage preliminary land development plan. The Commission needs to make recommendations to the LCPC on the overall Manor Corporate LDP and the Price Self-Storage LDP. The Commission needs to make recommendations regarding the waiver modification to the LCSDLDO. Lastly, the Commission needs to approve the modification request to waive the three meeting delay for scheduling the plan at the LCPC. Al Olah, a Landscape Architect with Rettew Associates, was present to represent the plan. Mr. Olah stated this plan application incorporates two developers. Mr. Olah introduced the individuals that were present. Steve Risk and Rich Shoemaker with Risko Partners, Inc.; Doug Price and his brother representing their father, Gary Price the developer for Lot 1B and their consultant, Bob Illo. Mr. Olah stated this originally was a four lot subdivision created in the 1990s. Lot 1A was subdivided off for the cell site and there are three lots left. This is located on the south side of Charlestown Road between Centerville Road to the west and Manor Boulevard to the east. There is a 75' wide PP&L right-of-way along the southern property line and on the west side. The property is zoned I Industrial as well as the property across the street. There are single-family homes fronting Chapel Road to the south of the site. That area is zoned medium residential. Kirchner Beer Distributor developed Lot #4 several years ago and as

part of that development, there is no access off of Lot #3. There have been considerable improvements made. They include roadway improvements with curb, storm drainage inlets, an entrance serving Lots 3 and 4, an entrance serving Lots 1 and 2, and a 50wide utility easement. Being proposed at this time, are two preliminary land development plans. One plan is for Lot 1B, which will be developed for mini-storage buildings. A preliminary plan is being presented to show Lots 2 and 3 and how the sites can be maximized. Mr. Olah explained the proposed stormwater basin. Mr. Olah stated that the water from the site as well as water from the north side of Charlestown Road will drain into the basin. Mr. Olah explained the present drainage and what will occur with the proposed drainage system. Mr. Olah stated that the overall stormwater is designed to meet the 50% reduction requirement of the Township Stormwater Ordinance. Mr. Olah stated that when Lot #4 was developed, there was street trees planted and the same type of tree is being proposed along the street on these properties. Mr. Olah described the landscaping that will be planted. Mr. Olah stated that these plans are only preliminary to size the basin and the final plans will not be seen for two of the lots until there is a buyer. At that time, the use and the size of the facility the individual would want to build will determine what the actual final plan will look like. Mr. Olah stated that in addition to taking action on the plan, they are requesting several waivers. Mr. Olah stated that they are asking that the Township to waive the three meeting delay, which will enable the LCPC to act on this plan at their March 28th meeting. The second waiver is for Section 402.03.C, which requires the Applicant to show features within 200of the tract. Mr. Olah stated that in most cases, they have shown the facilities within 200 feet. Mr. Ahlfeld asked if the property immediately to the west is the farm that fronts on Charlestown Road. Mr. Olah stated that the area directly west would be the PP&L substation. Mr. Ahlfeld asked if there is sidewalk along Charlestown Road. Mr. Olah stated that sidewalk was required on Lot #4 and it would be continued. The third waiver request is for Section 402.5.G requiring a traffic impact study. A study is required if there is more than 100 trips per peak hour and Lot #3 there are 90 spaces and the calculations show that there were 84 and 88 trips. Because the other lot was maximized showing a 120,000 square foot building it puts them over the 100 trips; however, this is not a final plan so we are asking to waive that requirement at this time and then, if a traffic study is required, it can be done at the time of the final plan. A waiver request of Section 405.3 of the Manor Township Stormwater Ordinance is also needed. The Ordinance states that the basin should drain within 24 hours. Mr. Olah stated that the stormwater basin will be used as a better management practice basin and the bottom 1 ½ of it acts as infiltration to allow water to percolate into the soils as required by DEP. Typically DEP states that the basin must drain dry within 72 hours. Their plan shows it will drain down in 62 hours. Steve Risk stated that they have had this land for a long time and several people asked how soon a permit could be obtained. Mr. Risk stated that when they tell them they must go through land development they lose interest. Mr. Risk stated that they want to receive preliminary plan approval so that when someone is interested in the future, they can then proceed with a final plan. Mr. Haverstick had questions on the drainage basin on the eastern end of the property and where it will drain to. Mr. Haverstick was advised that this is an emergency spillway. Bob Illo, of Architectural Engineer Innovations, who is an architect and civil engineer presented the plan for Lot 1B. Mr. Illo stated the use for this site would be self-storage. There will be paving to provide access into the site. There will be a small amount of gravel area on the site. All the buildings will be clustered together, to the north of the basin. Swales will then be cut into the north bank of the basin to allow water coming between the buildings to be dissipated and delivered into the basin. A residential screening is required and they are proposing a fence that

will follow the paving a distance of 75 feet. The lighting will be wall pacts on the northeast walls of the buildings so that no light will shine into the residential areas. A pole light is required at the entrance. There will be a small building that will serve as a rental office which will be occupied during the day for new customers to inquire about rates. There is no fence at this point shown around the site and the stormwater will be conveyed to an eastern and western swale. There is off site stormwater from the compost facility area that is coming through an existing swale on Lot 1A. Lot 1A contains the cell tower. When the stormwater enters Lot 1B, a swale is provided along the western bank which runs into the basin. Ms. Herr asked if there would be fencing around the storage units. Mr. Illo stated that fencing would be possibly put in later for security only. The south side is the only side required to be screened. Ms. Glazier asked how many storage units are proposed. Mr. Illo stated there will be 360 units. Mr. Henke questioned the area that is gravel. Mr. Henke stated that the runoff is a sheet flow and there will be channels from the swale into the basin. Mr. Illo stated that was correct. Mr. Henke asked who is responsible for the maintenance of the basin. Mr. Illo stated the owner of Lot 1B would be responsible. Mr. Risk stated that there would be a joint agreement for the maintenance of the stormwater for all three lots. Mr. Henke questioned the perk results. Mr. Haverstick asked if there is lighting on the northeast corner of the building. Mr. Illo stated lighting would be on the northeast side. Mr. Haverstick stated that the access to the buildings can be from any side but there is no lighting on one side of the building. Mr. Illo stated that was correct. Mr. Haverstick asked if there are any security issues because the one side of the building is not lighted. Mr. Illo stated that was done to avoid glare in the residential area. Ms. Herr asked if there is 24 hour access to the facility. Mr. Illo stated that there is 24 hour access to the facility. Ms. Glazier asked if there would be lighting on the backside of the building, what would be required to prevent the light from the residential area. Mr. Illo stated that they would have to explore some lighting fixtures. Ms. Glazier stated that she did not feel that it was desirable to have this facility without lights on both sides of the buildings. Mr. Henke had some questions on who would be responsible for the cost of a traffic study. Mr. Henke was advised that the owner would be responsible. Mr. Henke asked why the certificates were not sealed on the plans submitted. Mr. Illo stated that they are sealed before they are recorded. Mr. Olah stated they have received the following comments from the Township Engineer: 1) The review certificate is missing on the Price Self Storage plan sheets. The cover sheet has been revised and forwarded to the Township. 2) Provide the E&S approval letter. It will be provided when available. 3) Proposed work within the PP&L utility easements. The plan shows grading in their right-of-way and we have met with PP&L and they have no problem with what is being done. We requested a letter be provided to the Township and the County. 4) The basin grading, just south of the basin berm, requires revision. The contours have since been added to the plan. 5) Provide an analysis for the existing inlet at the lot 3 entrance, shown to capture runoff from the new impervious area. Mr. Olah stated they could provide documentation showing the runoff will not be into the street. 6) A drafting comment to make the contours more readable in the basin and that can be done when the next submission is provided. 7) Applicant should make every effort to replace the existing 18 CMP sewer downstream of point of connection for the proposed basin. The provided analysis indicates adequate downstream capacity, however, replacing the sewer is recommended to remove the existing bends in the pipe that does not currently meet Ordinance standards. Mr. Illo explained the comment and stated they would prefer not to touch the area. Mr. Illo stated they are improving stormwater conditions going to that pipe to such an extent they should not have to deal with replacing the pipe. 8) For Price Self Storage plans, the sheets need to be numbered consecutively

which will be resolved with the engineer. Mr. Henke asked the Applicant if the resident agreed to have the pipe replaced, would they have a problem replacing the pipe. Mr. Risk stated that they preferred not to replace the pipe. Mr. Henke asked if they had talked to the resident and they stated they had not. Mr. Henke asked what happens if the basin does not perk in a year from now. Mr. Risk stated other measures would have to be taken. Mr. Henke asked what remediation could be offered. Mr. Risk stated he could not answer that. Mr. Witmer asked if anyone has talked to the neighbors to see if they have ever had any problems with the 18 pipe handling the stormwater that occurs now. Mr. Risk stated that there is a 75 foot grass area between the proposed facility and the residential properties. Mr. Risk stated that he has talked to one individual and that individual did not mention any problems. Bonnie Miller asked where the traffic would be coming from to this site. Ms. Miller was informed the traffic would be coming from the east and the west. Ms. Miller also asked the hours of operation and she was informed it was 24 hours. Ms. Miller stated that she was not aware of any storage facility that was not fenced. Ms. Miller was informed that about 25% of the storage units in Lancaster County do not have fences. Mr. Ahlfeld stated it is like any other property owner, in that, they must decide if they want fencing. Mr. Ahlfeld stated to his knowledge there is no standards that need to be met with regards to fencing. Mr. Haverstick made a motion to recommend to the LCPC approval of the waivers for the Traffic Impact Study and Existing Features within 200 feet of the tract, and also approve the waiver of the three meeting delay. Ms. Glazier seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously. The Commission stated that they wanted the Applicant to discuss with the neighbors that are affected the issue of the replacement of the stormwater pipe. Allen Kreider asked if anyone has done a CCTV investigation of the line to see what condition the line is in. The Commission asked that the Applicant at least inspect the line and report what they found in their next submission. Ms. Glazier made a motion that the existing stormwater pipe be inspected and the neighbors be contacted and that the LCPC takes the recommendation into consideration and a report is made and the matter be reconsidered when the final plan comes in. Ms. Herr seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously. Mr. Witmer made a motion to recommend to the LCPC they approve the waiver to extend the perk time on the stormwater basin. Ms. Herr seconded the motion and the motion was carried unanimously. Mr. Witmer made a motion to withdraw the motion regarding waiver modification to the LCSDLDO until the engineers comments are received. Mr. Henke seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously. Mr. Haverstick stated that he had reservations regarding Lot 1B because of the lack of security regarding fencing and lighting. Ms. Glazier concurred with Mr. Haverstick. Mr. Henke asked questions regarding the phasing of the project. Mr. Henke was advised that six buildings would be built and when they have reached 75-80% capacity they would build the additional buildings. Mr. Henke questioned where the future access that would join to Lot 2 was located and he was shown that it was located just south of the street trees. Ms. Glazier made a motion for the applicant to look at the issues of lighting and security fencing and there were no other comments concerning Lot 1B. Ms. Herr seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously. Other Business Act 537 - Mr. Ott advised the Commission that there was a meeting that Mr. Smith attended that morning and there will be more information regarding this in the future. Regional Comprehensive Plan Update - Mr. Ahlfeld stated at the Steering Committee meeting on March 3, the consultants circulated a tabulation of all the goals, objectives and strategies that had been prepared to date. The Steering Committee has been asked to make any comments on the chapters received in draft form to date by March 25. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that each municipality has received a copy of land use map to make corrections. Mr.

Whittle stated that questions were asked about the comments that were made and what was done with them. Mr. Whittle stated the comments were included in a form similar to the one handed out indicating that the comments were considered and included in the latest draft that was presented to the Steering Committee on March 3. All the comments were given consideration and most of them were used as part of a later draft. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that there is an ongoing project with East Hempfield, West Hempfield and Manor Townships involving the Chesapeake Bay Alliance and related environmental organizations. They have been working on items such as draft ordinance provisions that can be used to address environmental issues. All the data has been put together in a final report that will be presented at a dinner meeting March 24. Commission members interested in attending the dinner should contact the Township Office.

Correspondence - Ms. Glazier reported on the correspondence. A letter was received from the LCPC regarding the Manor Heights preliminary plan. A copy of a letter sent to Charlie Douts of West Hempfield Township stating that on March 14 at the LCPC meeting, the Cedar Chase Plan that is in West Hempfield, Manor Township and Mountville was considered. A letter regarding the final land development plan for the Villas at Sutherland was before the LCPC on January 24 and received unconditional preliminary plan approval.

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 9:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary Glazier Secretary

Recording Secretary Evelyn Rineer
Planning Commission Meeting
04/11/05

DRAFT

Manor Township Planning Commission Minutes

Monday, April 11, 2005 Time: 7:30 P.M.

The Manor Township Planning Commission held its regularly scheduled meeting on Monday, April 11, 2005 at 7:30 p.m. at the Manor Township Municipal Building, 950 West 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, Beth Herr, Scott Haverstick, James Miller and Mary Glazier. Member Absent: Donald Witmer Visitors Present: John May, 100 Red Fox Rd., Millersville Joe Copolloni, 29 N. Prince St., Millersville Brad Powers, 333 White Chapel Rd., Lancaster Allen Kreider, 141 Supervisors Rd., Lancaster Gary Price, 510 Estelle Dr., Apt. 22, Lancaster Tom Frey, 2650 River Rd., Conestoga Dick Bauder, 130 Sheep Ln., Millersville Bonnie Miller, 113 Bent Tree Dr., Lancaster

Approve Minutes Jim Henke made a motion to adopt the meeting minutes from March 14, 2005 meeting and Ms. Herr seconded the motion. The motion carried with Jim Miller abstaining.

New Business J. Thomas & Susan Y. Frey Lot Add-On The property is located at 2650 River Road and is owned by J. Thomas & Susan Frey. The applicant is adding on Parcel 3A (37,095 sq. ft.) to the existing Lot #3 (46,524 sq. ft.). Total acreage with lot add-on will be 1.92 acres. Property is located in the Rural (R) Zoning District. Mr. Frey was present to represent the plan. Mr. Frey stated he would answer any questions the Planning Commission might have. Mr. Henke asked if the well on Parcel 3A is the well that feeds Lot 3 and Mr. Frey stated that was correct. Mr. Frey stated his father had the lot subdivided in the mid 80s and asked Mr. Freys wife to design a house for the lot and then added a garage. Mr. Frey stated recently he decided he wanted to own the house personally and expand the garage. After talking to Mr. Ott, he discovered that the garage was not on the lot. Mr. Haverstick asked Mr. Frey if he bought the existing lot from Frey Dairy Farms and asked if they own Parcel 3A. Mr. Frey stated if plan were approved he would buy the lot from Frey Dairy Farms. Mr. Haverstick made a motion to approve the lot add-on as presented. Ms. Herr seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously.

Other Business - Amendment to the Zoning Ordinance Floodplain Section Required FEMA changes to Township Floodplain section in the Zoning Ordinance for review. Letter from the Department of Community Economic Development dated February 23, 2005 lists necessary changes to the Ordinance. Mr. Ott stated that the amendment in front of the Commission is the Township Solicitors amendment draft. Also, the Township needs to adopt the new FEMA maps. Mr. Ott stated that Mr. Goodman has drafted an amendment to the Ordinance based on the Township Ordinance section numbers. This will bring the Township Ordinance up to the standards required by the National Flood Insurance Program and also the Pennsylvania Act 66. Mr. Ott reviewed the sections that required changes and additions to the current sections in the Ordinance as they relate to the floodplain regulations. The sections and revisions were as follows: Section 1 Article 2, Zone Regulations, Section 211 - There were several terms that were deleted and substituted with another term such as, for example, deleting the term Federal Insurance Administration and replacing it with the term Federal Emergency Management Agency.

Section 2 Article 2, Lands in the Floodplain Zone, Section 211.2, as defined in the ordinance is amended by adding several subparagraphs including FW (Floodway Area), FF (Flood Fringe Area), FE (Special Floodplain Area), and FA (General Floodplain Area). The additional terminology refers to the floodplain maps they have provided for the Township. These need to be added to the Ordinance so that the Ordinance terms are the same as the terms on the map.

Section 3 Article 2, Zone Regulations, Section 211.12, needs to be amended to include subsections as they relate to the Uniform Construction Code Coordination that was not in effect when the last floodplain update was done.

Section 4 Article 2, Zone Regulations, Section 211.13, Special Requirements for FW, FE, and FA Areas. Section 5 Article 2, Zone Regulations, Section 211.5, Permitted Uses is amended by deleting Subsection 1 and substitute a new paragraph regarding floodproofing on nonconforming

structures.

Section 6 Article 2, Zone Regulations, Section 211.2, Lands in Zone Defined paragraph A is deleted and substituted as per Ordinance.

Section 7 Article 2, Zone Regulations, Section 211.14, Permits, adds a list of requirements for getting a zoning permit in the floodplain zone. Some of these items were not required specifically for properties containing floodplain in the past.

Section 8 Article 2, Zone Regulations, Section 211.8, Prohibited Uses, is amended by adding #19 to the list, spaces below the lowest floor.

Section 9 Article 2, Zone Regulations, Section 211.6, Special Exception Uses, is amended by adding subparagraph N entitled Fill. This is a list of requirements when fill is used.

Section 10 Article 2, Zone Regulations, Section 211.9, Nonconforming Uses and Structures in the Floodplain Zone is amended by adding #6 which deals with making improvements to existing structures located in a floodplain area.

Section 11 Article 2, Zone Regulations, Section 211.15, Definitions is added to the floodplain section.

Mr. Miller asked if the definitions are solely under a floodplain section of the ordinance or do they apply to the entire ordinance. Mr. Ott stated that the definitions would be part of floodplain ordinance section. Mr. Haverstick asked if this is standard FEMA wording. Mr. Ott stated last April he sent a copy of the current floodplain ordinance section to DCED in Harrisburg who reviewed it and returned it to the Township with the amendments necessary for us to be in compliance. The Supervisors will be acting on this ordinance on May 2. Mr. Miller recommended to the Manor Township Supervisors the adoption of the FEMA changes to the Manor Township Floodplain Zoning Ordinance. Ms. Herr seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously.

Act 537 Update Mr. Ott stated that Mr. Smith had nothing new to report to the Commission Regional Comprehensive Plan Update Mr. Ahlfeld stated that last month a list of the proposed goals, objectives and strategies were handed out and any comments were to be submitted. The review time for the comments has been extended to May 20. Mr. Miller stated he believes an economic section is needed. Mr. Haverstick asked Mr. Miller what his thoughts were as to what is needed in an economic section and how it should be incorporated in the Regional Comprehensive Plan. There was extensive discussion on what needs to be included in an economic section of the comprehensive plan and what Commission members felt regarding this issue. Mr. Bauder stated that there is very little in the comprehensive plan addressing traffic studies and there was discussion on the issue involving traffic studies. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that one chapter in the Comprehensive Plan is devoted to traffic. - Correspondence Ms. Glazier read the following correspondence received from the LCPC: The Manor Heights Plan received unconditional preliminary plan approval on March 14th and received final approval today with comments. The Villas at Sutherland received final plan approval on March 28th with conditions.

The Price Self Storage Land Development Plan received preliminary plan approval on March 28 with conditions. The Manor Corporate Center Plan received preliminary plan approval on March 28 with conditions. Ms. Glazier stated that she received a brochure from the Pennsylvania Governors Center for Local Government Services that are presenting two new Transportation Enhancement Opportunities from PennDot. Courses are available for appropriate individuals.

Ms. Glazier stated that she received copy of the recommended model development principles for East Hempfield, West Hempfield, Manor Township, and Lancaster County that was part of the Builders for the Bay project. Mr. Ott stated that Barry Smith wanted to advise the Commission that the Township is requiring Price Self Storage to replace the pipe that was discussed last month.

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 8:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary Glazier Secretary

Recording Secretary Evelyn Rineer

Planning Commission Meeting

05/09/05

Manor Township Planning Commission Agenda

Monday, May 9, 2005 Time: 7:30 P.M.

1. Call to Order
2. Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag
3. Roll Call
4. Approve Minutes of April Meeting
5. Public Comments
6. New Business Final Land Development Plan for Price Self Storage & Waiver of the Three Meeting Delay - The property is located on Charlestown Road and is in the Industrial Zoning District. Lot #1 is being developed by Price Self Storage. The lot area contains 7.79 acres. A total of 360 Storage units are proposed. The Commission needs to make recommendations to the LCPC on the Price Self-Storage final LDP. Also, the Commission needs to approve the modification request to waive the three meeting delay for scheduling the plan at the LCPC.

Stonemill Development Sketch Plan - The subdivision is located on a 93 plus/minus acre tract along Donerville Road on the west and Woods Edge Development on the east. The intent is to create a mix of 165 single family detached units, 90 semi-detached units, and the existing

farmstead. The property is located in the RM1 Medium Density Residential Flex Zone. There is a waiver request from the LCSDDLDO: Section 602.08 Horizontal Alignment Minimum tangent length between reverse curves of 50 for local access streets. Also, the Applicant is asking for a waiver of the Manor Township three meeting delay requirement for scheduling this sketch plan and horizontal alignment waiver request. The Commission can review and comment on this sketch plan and waiver request.

7. Other Business - Act 537 Update - Regional Comprehensive Plan Update - Correspondence

8. Adjourn

DRAFT Manor Township Planning Commission Minutes

Monday, May 9, 2005 Time: 7:30 P.m.

The Manor Township Planning Commission held its regularly scheduled meeting on Monday, May 9, 2005 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, Beth Herr, Scott Haverstick, James Miller, Mary Glazier, and Donald Witmer. Visitors Present: Melissa Kelly, RGS Art OConnor, 1654 Colonial Manor Dr., Lancaster Robert Barber, 2749 Chapel Rd., Lancaster Elaine Jones, Lancaster Newspaper Bonnie Miller, 113 Bent Tree Dr., Lancaster Allen Kreider, 141 Supervisors Rd., Lancaster Dan Price, 157 Beacon Dr Bob Illo, 971 Curvair Rd. Rich Shoemaker, 11 W. State St., Quarryville Gary Price, 510 Estelle Dr. Richard Bauder, 130 Sheep Ln. Val Despard, 638 Courthouse Circle, Lititz Mr. Crouse, 785 Stehman Dr. Jon Kleppmann, 145A N. Donerville Rd. John S. May, 100 Red Fox Rd., Millersville Jim Huber, 113 Shannon Dr., Lancaster

Approve Minutes Beth Herr made a motion to accept minutes as presented. Scott Haverstick seconded the motion and the motion carried with Donald Witmer and Jim Miller abstaining.

New Business Final Land Development Plan for Price Self Storage & Waiver of the Three Meeting Delay - The property is located on Charlestown Road and is in the Industrial Zoning District. Lot #1 is being developed by Price Self Storage. The lot area contains 7.79 acres. A total of 360 Storage units are proposed. The Commission needs to make recommendations to the LCPC on the Price Self-Storage final LDP. Also, the Commission needs to approve the modification request to waive the three meeting delay for scheduling the plan at the LCPC. Bob Illo, the architect and engineer for Price Self Storage, presented the plan. Mr. Illo stated that the project has been approved at the preliminary plan phase and the final plan is exactly what was submitted before. All the issues from the preliminary plan have been addressed satisfactorily. The plan shows 360 storage units. The County Conservation District has reviewed the erosion sediment control plan and the applicant has satisfied all the comments regarding the outlet for the basin. The applicant has agreed to reroute the basin piping into the area between the two properties to a new box on the north side of Chapel Road. The piping will then continue easterly along Chapel Road and then into an existing catch basin. The drawing was forwarded to Vince

Wayne at Buchart-Horn for review and he has accepted the pipe routing. Mr. Illo stated that they are requesting final approval to proceed with Lot 1B, which is the plan for the self-storage units. Mr. Haverstick stated that he recalls that the only question the Commission had was the pipe issue. Jim Miller asked if the easements exist for the off site piping. Mr. Smith commented that there is Township right-of-way on Chapel Road and when the final design occurs, if any right-of-way is necessary, the Township will facilitate that matter. Mr. Miller asked what the results were with the conversations with the homeowners. Mr. Smith stated Mr. Barber was present. Mr. Barber had several questions and indicated that he was okay with the plans. Mr. Miller questioned the curbing and Mr. Illo stated that the curb is 4 vertical with a flat top. Mr. Bauder stated that he had several issues regarding the stormwater and he had sent a letter to each Commission member. Mr. Bauder stated that he felt that there were some problems with what he saw on the plans. Mr. Bauder referred to the Township Stormwater Ordinance and stated that he did not feel they were meeting the stormwater ordinance. Mr. Bauder also referred to a DEP document known as an Act 14 notification and mentioned that a box was marked with an x. Mr. Bauder stated that he has looked at other stormwater plan installations at different locations in the Township over the last few years and they do not work properly. Mr. Bauder stated that he felt that this stormwater plan is not satisfactory. The way the stormwater is designed shows water in and water out. Mr. Bauder stated that one of the issues he has is regarding if anyone checks these facilities after they are installed to see if they work. Mr. Bauder asked how much water is expected to be retained on the undisturbed site. Mr. Bauder stated that Box #4 was not checked on the document. Box #4 refers to the plan meeting the Township Stormwater Ordinance. Mr. Smith stated that Mr. Bauder is referring to Act 14, which is a requirement for the NPDS permit that goes to DEP. Mr. Bauder stated that a new Township Stormwater Ordinance was enacted in the last several months and it specifically addresses installations where there is more than 150,000 square feet of impervious surface area and this installation is going to be 500,000 square feet. Mr. Bauder stated that he felt that the specifics of the Township Stormwater Ordinance passed needs to be met. Mr. Bauder stated that he does not understand the meaning of the boxes checked. Mr. Miller stated that the County in the past did all the stormwater management review until the Little Conestoga Watershed was started. At that time, the Township was required to develop our own ordinance, which was state mandated. Mr. Miller stated that when the ordinance was developed, no one on the Commission has the expertise to deal with stormwater, so as a matter of policy with the blessing of the Supervisors it was decided all of the review and meeting the ordinance requirements would be handled by the Township staff and our Township engineer. Mr. Miller stated that the Commission does not deal with any of the stormwater issues so if there are any concerns that you may have, you might want to request a proposal from a consultant to review our current stormwater ordinance to see if it is in fact working. Mr. Bauder stated that Rettew Associates drafted the most recent stormwater ordinance which he believed was adopted 4 or 5 months ago. Mr. Smith stated that he believed it was longer than that but he did not know the exact date. Mr. May stated that he believed it occurred a year or more ago. Mr. Bauder stated that there is not enough information in the application and he wanted to know where he would find the information. Mr. Smith stated that there are two separate matters being discussed. One is the NPDS permit that goes before the State which reviews the plan based on their criteria. The final design then comes back to the Township and our engineer reviews the final design to make certain that it meets our stormwater ordinance. Mr. Smith stated what Mr. Illo is representing tonight is a separate project although it is like a brother to the basin project. Mr. Smith stated that he could not answer specific questions because some of Mr. Bauders

comments were not specific to this site but are specific to the overall basin project. The overall basin project is not to the point where it has an absolute final stormwater review. Mr. Bauder stated that he would simplify the question and asked has the stormwater system for this site been designed? Mr. Smith stated that the stormwater system was only approved for this project. Mr. Smith advised Mr. Bauder that the NPDS permit he was looking at is for the entire Manor Corporate Tract of ground. Mr. Bauder asked what he meant by the entire site. Mr. Illo explained to Mr. Bauder what was meant by the entire site. Mr. Haverstick stated that he agreed with Mr. Bauder that these applications must meet the ordinance and he believed as a Commission, they make the assumption that staff and the Township engineer are making certain that they do meet the ordinance. Mr. Bauder stated that he looked at a property after a 2rain in April, which was a beautiful installation, but it was not working. There was water into the basin and water out of the basin with no reduction of flow. Mr. Haverstick asked if there is a legal mechanism after the fact to insure that systems that do no work a year or two down the road can be made to work. Mr. Smith stated that the systems must meet the approved plan and have to stay in compliance with the approved plan. The particular basins being referred to are on the site of Faith Bible Fellowship Church and they meet the plan and the ordinance. Mr. Smith stated that they do not accomplish things that we may like to see such as recharge regeneration. If we would like to accomplish those things, then they need to be incorporated in stormwater management ordinance and the ordinance needs to be changed to do that. Virtually all the basins throughout the Township when sediment accumulates in them, the Township will go back to the property owner and require them to return it to the profile of the approved plan. Mr. Haverstick asked if these basins are not working then it is the Supervisors who need to change the ordinance. Mr. Bauder stated that he saw no documentation that someone went out and looked at the system to indicate it worked properly. Mr. Miller stated that it is difficult to assess whether they work or do not work based on visual inspection. The ordinance design perimeters require that these basins be built according to the maximum possible lot coverage that could happen on a tract of ground and there are occasions that it happens that way. Even in a residential subdivision, if the permitted lot coverage is 40 or 50 percent of whatever the lot size is, the basin is sized with that potential maximum coverage and in very few residential subdivisions do you even remotely approach the potential design capacity. When you see water in and water out of the basin, it is because they are so over designed and that is what will happen. Mr. OConner stated that he would put it in simple terms that everyone could understand. The ordinance and the engineering design provides pipes that pipe the stormwater run off from lots with 99% or 100% coverage. Yes, the design provides the pipes, the pipes direct the water runoff into the sewer system and down the road one-half mile, the water is bubbling out of culverts and grates from the sewer system because water in and water out does not hack it. It does not hack it, especially when you have tremendous impervious coverage. Whether we spend our time changing the ordinances at the county, state, and local levels that we have created, we still create flooding for our residents, roads, developments, and businesses. Mr. OConner stated that something is wrong with the ordinance and this needs to be addressed. We cannot justify pipes that pipe runoff to some other place where it is not contained and where there is no reduction of the runoff. When you do that, you end up with the problem created when Park City was built. Now the Little Conestoga River water goes over its banks after a slight rain in two hours flooding house basements, backyards, eroding the streams, and sending our top soil down to the Chesapeake Bay. All this occurs because building projects have provided stormwater piping and the design was great. The piping carries the stormwater through the systems to the sources and then dumps the water into the

Little Conestoga River. When the stormwater system is overloaded, then the roads flood. Mr. OConner stated just look at Columbia Avenue after a heavy rain. The manhole covers are popped from the water gushing out of them. That is a problem and that problem has to be addressed. The current stormwater ordinance isnt going to protect our township, developments and homeowners from these problems. Good and responsible engineering addresses these issues. Mr. OConner stated that he does not think it is wrong to require the applicants who present these plans and do the engineering, to assure us that they are not contributing to this problem but rather that they are doing something over and above what the ordinance requires. If the applicant is aware of the problem, that awareness allows us to be a little more proactive about how we handle the stormwater issues. Allen Kreider, 141 Supervisors Road, stated that Mr. Smith mentioned that there would be a catch basin on the site. Mr. Kreider stated that he has a problem with detention and retention. Mr. Kreider stated that some of the basins that do not work are detention basins. Mr. Kreider believes that there should be more retention to hold the water back. Mr. Kreider stated that he disagrees with Mr. Miller that the basins are overbuilt. He believes they are not built correctly to really hold back water. Mr. Kreider stated that he was along with Mr. Bauder the day they looked at the basins. That day it rained 2and there was nothing in the basins. Mr. Kreider stated that anyone with a high school education could look at the basins and see that there is something wrong. Mr. Kreider stated that there are others around the Township that do the same thing and it does not matter how much it rains; there is no water in the basins. There is no collection of water. Mr. Miller stated that if you are going to detain water, in other words maintain some level of water in this basin, you still have to provide the same amount of detention on top of it. You still have the requirements existing for water detention in addition to and on top the water level that you are retaining. Some ponds are designed as wet ponds, but they actually are designed to have whatever the water level is considered the bottom of the pond, so that the same size of the pond has to exist above that water level. Mr. Kreider stated that he understands that concept. Mr. Kreider stated that what he is saying is that if we want to hold water back from going into the streams, the stormwater basins are not doing that. The water is going in and right out of the basins. Mr. Miller stated that that depending on where you are located in the watershed, the current design theory in the general sense, is that the closer you are to the final out point, the less water that you need to detain or retain. You want that water out so that as the upstream water gets downstream, there is capacity for the water. The whole purpose of the study from the bottom of the stream down the Susquehanna to the headwaters, is to try to determine the timing sequence for when water is suppose to be released through the basins. Some of the basins at the lower end are not detaining water as they are at the upper end. Mr. Kreider stated that all he is saying is that the stormwater basins do not work. Bonnie Miller stated that she does not know who is responsible, but the new section of the Hess Development near Gail Kline, flooded Columbia Avenue and no water went into the retention area. Since that time, someone has spent serious money to fix the problem. It was brought to the Townships attention and apparently the Manor Township engineering along with the engineer for the project went in and fixed the problem. There was huge excavating taking place there to correct the situation. That same thing occurred on Weaver Road at the church property when the water was not retained or detained. Mr. Miller stated that no one fixed the basin that was adjacent to the Village at Mountville site. It had nothing to do with the basin. It was all outside of the basin area. John May stated that the comments to the Commission about the stormwater problems are not issues that they can address, but this issue is a problem for the Supervisor and they are aware of it. The Supervisors must go to the engineer and make sure the Ordinance does everything they want it to do. Mr.

May stated that he went to a seminar at PSATS on failed stormwater systems and a lot of them are in existing developments where the developers are no longer around. The basins were not constructed to the requirements and no one knew it or did anything about the problem. Mr. May stated that the Supervisors must go to the engineers and see why they are approving something if it does not work. If the Ordinance does not work the way we want it to, then we need to see what must be changed so it works the way we want it to. Mr. Bauder stated he was at a recent engineering seminar regarding stormwater and the DEP is developing new requirements that will address a lot of these problems. Mr. Henke stated that the applicant has it designed in their basin is designed 1 1/2 below the outfall pipe meaning the first flush of water you will see a 1 1/2 of water in the entire basin before any of it will be discharged into a pipe system into the Townships pipe system. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that they have acknowledged this is a serious issue and perhaps they need to be taking a look at the ordinance requirements and the inspection procedures. Mr. Miller made a motion to recommend to the LCPC approval of the three meeting delay. Scott Haverstick seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously. Mr. Miller make a motion to recommend to the LCPC approval of the plan subject to the replacement of the off site stormwater pipe to the satisfaction of the Township and to insure that the homeowners are satisfied. Beth Herr seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously.

Stonemill Development Sketch Plan - The subdivision is located on a 93 plus/minus acre tract east of Donerville Road and to the west of the Woods Edge Development. The intent is to create a mix of 165 single family detached units, 90 semi-detached units, and the existing farmstead. The property is located in the RM1 Medium Density Residential Flex Zone. There is a waiver request from the LCSLDLDO: Section 602.08 Horizontal Alignment Minimum tangent length between reverse curves of 50 for local access streets. Also, the Applicant is asking for a waiver of the Manor Township three meeting delay requirement for scheduling this sketch plan and horizontal alignment waiver request. The Commission can review and comment on this sketch plan and waiver request. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that a sketch plan is not a required plan that formal action has to be taken on to approve or disapprove. It is really an effort on behalf of the developer to express what they have in mind and see if there are any comments at the beginning of the process. Melissa Kelly, Landscape Architect with RGS Associates, presented the plan. Ms. Kelly stated that she is here with Al Despard, from Stonemill Properties LP, and Joel Snyder, of RGS Associates. Ms. Kelly stated that she is presenting the sketch plan and waiver request for the property hoping to get feedback on the plan. Ms. Kelly stated that the site is located along the east side of Donerville Road about 1500 southeast of the intersection of Weaver and Donerville Roads and the property is directly west of the Woods Edge Development. This site consists of about 93 acres and is in the RM1 Medium Density Residential Flex Zone. The proposal before the Commission is to create a community with a mix of single family detached homes as well as duplex homes. There are approximately 256 dwelling units on the tract including the existing farm, which will remain on a separate 15 acre tract. There are about nine open space lots that are scattered throughout the development and the street system will connect to the existing Stonemill Road at the property line of Woods Edge. Stonemill Road will go through the property and connect at the intersection of Donerville Road. The intersection will be coordinated with the Township and PennDot. The applicant is also proposing another connection to Donerville Road closer to the high point on Donerville Road and a connection to St. Georges Drive, which currently stubs into this property at the Woods Edge Development property line. The applicant is proposing stub streets at the northern line of the property for potential future connection to the

adjoining property. At this time, the applicant is looking at Stonemill Road and proposing a 60-foot right-of-way, which is per the ordinance requirement and a 34-foot cartway which will match what is already designed for in the Woods Edge Development. We are looking at proposing sidewalk along the north side of Stonemill Road only. The local streets within the development will have a 50-foot right-of-way and 28-foot cartway with parking on one side. There are streets within the development where there will be 90 degree angle, which are at the intersection of the two streets. There will be public sewer and water. Stormwater will be through collection conveyance systems and several detention basins will be scattered throughout the site. A phasing plan was submitted and the applicant is looking at the Stonemill Road connection from Donerville Road as being part of Phase 1, as well as some single family homes and semi-detached homes. Ms. Kelly pointed out the phase areas on the map. Ms. Kelly stated that they are requesting a waiver so that they can attend the LCPC's May meeting for the sketch plan and they also are asking for one waiver of the LCSDLDO for horizontal alignment, as it pertains to the proposed St. Georges Drive. There is a section of St. Georges Street that they are looking for relief from the 50-foot tangent between curbs requirement. We have already submitted the plans to the LCPC along with the waiver request. Mr. Ahlfeld asked if the farmstead to the west is part of the plan. Ms. Kelly stated that several buildings will be demolished and she believed Mr. Eshelman was interested in demolishing the existing barn but that the existing farmhouse will remain and be subdivided off on a separate 15 acre lot. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that this lot with the farmhouse could be developed later on. There is nothing on this plan that says it will remain as open space to serve this development. Ms. Kelly stated there are no notes to that effect. The Eshelmans are looking to retain ownership of the parcel. Mr. Haverstick stated that the pocket parks and the retention basins seem to be one in the same. Ms. Kelly stated that the designated areas are strictly for pocket park type development. At this point, we are not showing detention basins on these lots. We do have five basins as part of the site. Mr. Haverstick stated that it appears that the majority of open space will be for the stormwater basins where the proposed pocket parks are located. Mr. Haverstick stated that he wished the plan accounted for more open space. Ms. Glazier wondered if a different kind of development with higher density usage and coupled with more open space would be something that the applicant would consider. Ms. Glazier stated that this is adjacent to highly developed residential areas, commercial areas, and close to public transportation. This is where the development should be concentrated where services and infrastructure exists. Ms. Glazier stated that with higher density, you might have a better development and more meaningful open space. Ms. Glazier stated that this is an opportunity to do the kind of plan that our own Comprehensive Plan promotes. Ms. Glazier stated that she feels that this plan falls short of her expectations. Mr. Haverstick asked what type of house and the projected cost would be. Mr. Despard stated that they have not gotten that far yet. Mr. Haverstick asked if there are sidewalks proposed on both sides of the street. Mr. Snyder stated that sidewalks are proposed on both sides of all the streets with the exception of Stonemill Road. Mr. Haverstick stated while the plan meets the parking requirements of the ordinance, it will be a parking disaster in terms of not enough street parking when the project is completed. Mr. Miller asked what the open space requirements were. Ms. Kelly stated that she does not have the open space requirement numbers with her. Mr. Snyder stated that according to the County Ordinance, they can meet the open space requirements with about one half of the requirement in land for open space and the other half being in fee in lieu of land. Mr. Miller stated that Stonemill Road is intended to be a collector road and he was wondering why they are paving a 36-foot cartway. Ms. Kelly stated that what they are doing is matching what cartway is already established in the Woods Edge

Development. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that the road would become an increasingly used road. When completed, people would travel from Columbia Avenue to Donerville Road on Stonemill Road. Mr. Miller stated that he echoes Ms. Glaziers comment that this piece of land is a perfect piece for maximum density use. Mr. Miller stated that he is getting 3.2 units to the gross acre after removing the farmstead and that is a far cry from the 5.5 units that is the current goal. Ms. Kelly stated that the plan is designed for the current zoning designation. Mr. Snyder asked if the Board could have an ideal density what would they like to see. Mr. Miller stated that the target that will come out of the county is 6 ½ units to the gross acre. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that the site is ideal for high density because there are very few physical limitations and the location is adjacent to excellent transportation. Mr. Snyder asked what is being envisioned when the Commission is saying higher density. Mr. Snyder stated that you would be talking about higher proportion of duplexes and townhouses to achieve that density. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that assuming that there were no barriers and you could rewrite the ordinance to do what you wanted to do, what would you like to do on this tract of land. Mr. Haverstick stated that there needs to be creativity and this plan is not very creative. Mr. Henke asked where in this area are there 90-degree intersections. Mr. Henke was advised that in East Hempfield Township in the development called Veranda off Harrisburg Pike you can find a 90 degree intersection of a street. Mr. Henke asked if they are private or dedicated streets and Ms. Kelly stated that she believed they are dedicated streets, but is not certain. Mr. Haverstick stated that these 90 degree intersections are for calming purposes. What is the bad part about them? Mr. Ahlfeld stated that there is nothing bad about them. Mr. Miller asked if there are any capacity issues with the utilities. Mr. Snyder stated that they are working through that process at the present time. Mr. Snyder stated that the sewer would be flowing in two directions. Mr. Miller asked if Street Fis a temporary cul-de-sac for potential future road alignment to the adjoining tract of land. Mr. Snyder stated that the Eshelmans own an additional tract which extends to Weaver Road. Bonnie Miller expressed concern regarding number of vehicles that will be on the roads in this area. She stated that Stonemill Road is a hazard now and Woods Edge has a phase already approved to build apartments adjacent to this site. Ms. Miller asked who is responsible for improvement of Weaver Road, Donerville Road, and S. Centerville Road. Ms. Miller stated that she would like to see the road improvements catch up to the developments being built. Ms. Miller stated that there are two lanes on S. Centerville but only a one and one-half lane width on Donerville and Weaver Roads. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that you cannot stop development because there may be congestion from the project. The question comes back to everyone in the Township as to how much do we want to pay to improve the roads versus live with the problems. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that what can be done under the current ordinance is being done. If the Supervisors want to strengthen the Ordinance to require more improvements, they need to check to know what legally can be done. Mr. Miller stated that the bottleneck on Centerville Road is really at Route 462. Mr. Miller stated that Donerville Road is a state road and the state works with townships when these projects come in. If it is warranted to expand the road, PennDot would require because it is a state road. The developer needs a highway occupancy permit from PennDot before they are able to do anything with the entrances. PennDot controls Donerville Road. PennDot can only require the developer to make improvements within the limits of his property. Mr. Miller explained the process that occurs when a road needs to be widened. Mr. Smith stated that PennDot does not consider the volume on these roads significant. This is a normal volume of traffic to PennDot for a two-lane highway. Penn Dot uses controls such as the current zoning, the potential number of houses, and volume of traffic, to determine road improvements. Ms. Glazier asked if there is any leadership that the

Township could take in terms of taking on responsibility to widen the roads. Do the Supervisors anticipate putting this on an agenda for five or ten year plan to get money together to make improvements? Mr. Smith stated that the Township identifies on a periodic basis roads that they believe need surface treatment or widening. Mr. Miller explained the process of road system review that takes place. Mr. OConner stated that his question is concerning that someone mentioned the comment of thinking outside the box in terms of the housing density issue. He asked for clarification regarding what the box starts out as and what RM1 Medium Density zoning is? The zoning district was explained to Mr. OConner. Mr. OConner stated that it might not be a good idea to send people off on a design idea that might not come to pass. Mr. Bauder stated a few months ago Mr. Kauffman at Mt. Joy held up a zoning manual and said that they are not going to be restricted by this. If something makes good sense and the zoning does not allow it what do you do? Mr. Ahlfeld stated that you change the zoning ordinance. Mr. Bauder stated that he would like to see activity and recreational parks. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that Mr. Ott will pass on the Commissions comments to Danny Whittle on the sketch plan. Mr. Henke questioned the planners as to whether they tried to make the reverse curve on St. Georges Street work. Mr. Miller made a motion to recommend to the LCPC approval of the waiver request for the Horizontal Alignment of the road. Don Witmer seconded the motion. Mr. Ahlfeld asked why the applicant is not complying since the design is no better because of granting this waiver modification. Mr. Haverstick wondered why we were granting a waiver of the three meeting delay and Mr. Ahlfeld stated that all the Commission is doing is giving guidance as to what the Board would be likely to approve when it is submitted to us as a preliminary plan. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that the Board will see this plan at least two more times and if revised they may see a sketch plan again. The motion was defeated 4-3 with Jim Henke, Beth Herr and Scott Haverstick opposing the motion. Mr. Miller made a motion to recommend to the LCPC the waiver of the three meeting delay for the sketch plan. Ms. Glazier seconded the motion. The motion passed 5-2 with Scott Haverstick and Beth Herr opposing the motion.

Other Business Act 537 Update - Mr. Smith stated that there was nothing new to report. Regional Comprehensive Plan Update - Mr. Ahlfeld stated that the Board received a Draft of the Objectives and Strategies for the plan and tonight the Commission received a revised copy indicating the changes. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that the comments for consideration needed to be in by Friday, May 20. Ms. Glazier indicated she had some comments. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that there will be a future land use plan. There will be two plans. One plan will be a generalized conceptual plan that talks about the kinds of development, such as the urban core versus the agriculture resource area. The other plan will be a more conventional plan and will be a detailed land use plan based on the growth opportunity areas and what is currently in the participating municipalities land use plan. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that everyone received a mailing from Tom Despard regarding the Funk tract. If any Commission members have any comments on the letter, those comments should be given to the LIMC Steering Committee and this would be the time to do that. Ms. Glazier had a request that all the objectives be written out, even when they are repeated, instead of referring you to other pages. She feels that people will be turned off from using the document if they need to go back and forth. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that if it is the consensus of the Planning Commission that they do not want to cross reference but want to see things repeated, it would be worth asking Mr. Ott to write a letter to that effect so that there is something in writing to put into a file and given to the consultants.

Mr. Witmer expressed dissatisfaction with the letter regarding the Funk property and what they are proposing to do with the property. Several other Commission members agreed with Mr. Witmers comment regarding the Funk property. Mr. Haverstick felt it was inappropriate to send a letter with a deadline for them to respond. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that there are members of the Steering Committee present tonight. They have heard the Commissions opinion on the proposal. Mr. Smith stated that as a member of the Steering Committee they have not supported or encouraged the request. Bonnie Miller stated that she is not well liked in her profession as a realtor but she loves Manor Township and concentrates on Manor Township. She stated that it is the infrastructure that drives developers and that is what is happening. Ms. Miller stated that if the land and the infrastructure are there, someone is going to develop it.

Correspondence Ms. Glazier received correspondence from the LCPC regarding Price Self Storage Preliminary Plan which was reviewed on April 25th. Other correspondences from LCPC indicated the receipt of a lot add-on plan for J. Thomas & Susan Frey. There was a comment that it may be enrolled in Clean and Green.

Ms. Glazier stated that the Sunday paper runs a government calendar and it includes for some townships the agendas for the Supervisors and Planning Commission meetings. She feels that the agendas for the Manor Township meetings should be in the newspaper.

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 9:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary Glazier Secretary

Recording Secretary Evelyn Rineer

Planning Commission Meeting

06/13/05

Manor Township Planning Commission Agenda

Monday, June 13, 2005 Time: 7:30 P.M.

1. Call to Order
2. Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag
3. Roll Call
4. Approve Minutes of May Meeting
5. Public Comments
6. New Business Manor Oaks Remaining Lands Section 3 - Manor Oaks General Partnership is proposing to develop Section 3 of the remaining lands of the Manor Oaks Remaining Lands

development. This section of Manor Oaks is zoned RH1 and consists of a total of 9.598 acres located at southwest corner of Cartledge Lane and Bradford Street in Manor Township, Lancaster County, PA. The proposed dwelling units will be provided access from the public streets via private access drives. The proposed project will include the construction of 50 condominium-style residences on the tract. This is the final residential section of this development as shown on the approved Preliminary Plan for Manor Oaks Remaining Lands. This subdivision plan is submitted in accordance with the Phasing Plan set forth in the previous Preliminary and Final plans already approved for this development. The Commission needs to recommend and comment to the LCPC on this final plan.

Lancaster County Solid Waste Management Authority (LASWA) Lot Add-On Plan The Lancaster County Solid Waste Management Authority (LCSWMA) has purchased a parcel of ground (1.379 acres) from Frey Dairy Farms, Inc. (FDFI) and is proposing to add the parcel to land currently owned by LCSWMA (the 21.3-acre parcel shown on the drawing and identified as the Herr Tract). The Herr Tract is located adjacent to and between lands owned by both LCSWMA and Frey Dairy Farms Inc. The Commission needs to review and make comments to the LCPC.

7. Other Business - Act 537 Update - Regional Comprehensive Plan Update - Correspondence from Commission Secretary

8. Adjourn

DRAFTManor Township Planning Commission Minutes

Monday, June 13, 2005 Time: 7:30 P.M.

The Manor Township Planning Commission held its regularly scheduled meeting on Monday, June 13, 2005 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, Scott Haverstick, James Miller, Donald Witmer and Mary Glazier. Members Absent: Beth Herr and James Henke Visitors Present: Jim Huber, 113 Shannon Dr. Brooks K. Norris, LCSWMA Jeff Burkhart, David Miller Assoc. Ruth McClelland, Cornerstone Development Group Tom Despard, 220 Eshelman Rd. John May, 100 Red Fox Rd. Danny Whittle, LCPC George Rettew Val Despard, 638 Courthouse Circle

Approve Minutes Jim Miller made a motion to accept the minutes as presented. Scott Haverstick seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously.

Public Comments Tom Despard, President of Despard Associates, stated that he wanted to talk to the Commission about the plan for the Eshelman Farm. Mr. Despard stated that since the last meeting several things have transpired. Mr. Despard stated that they appreciated the Commissions comments and has taken them to heart regarding the density and creativity of the plan. As far as density is concerned, there have been rumors regarding up zoning this property.

Mr. Despard stated that one thing they would consider doing as a compromise would be to take the duplexes, and if the Township would consider changing the Medium Density Ordinance to include townhouses, they would most likely put townhouses in the location of the duplexes. That would increase the density of the development. Many municipalities allow townhouses in the medium density flex zoning district. This way we would not be rezoning the tract but only asking for a change in the zoning ordinance to allow townhouses in the medium density flex zoning district. Another issue was the layout; we have a triangular piece of land and to try to put a village square on that lot configuration was not easy to do. The plan contains pocket parks, the farmstead, a fair amount of green open space and we have fully utilized the medium density flex zoning. We have achieved a density of 3.4 percent that is compatible to what is being done in the market place and on other plans. Mr. Despard stated that the lots are very small. The plan Mr. Despard presented is the plan that he would like to proceed with. Mr. Despard stated that the homestead is historic and they are trying to respect that along with and adjoining agricultural lands. Mr. Miller stated that no one was critical of the plan. It was more the fact that if we are giving up a farm, the Commission wanted to see that the use be maximized. Mr. Haverstick asked if Mr. Despard knew what the price of the homes would be sold for. Mr. Despard stated that there would be different prices for the single family homes and the duplexes. They would range from approximately \$250,000 to \$400,000. Ms. Glazier stated that the Commission has had some conversations regarding Mr. Miller's position that the zoning ordinance shackles people into designing a layout a certain way. Without so many prescriptive zoning ordinances, developers could be more creative and would result in more attractive developments and higher density. Ms. Glazier concurred with Mr. Miller in that the Commission was not saying that this is a bad plan. Ms. Glazier stated that one thing that was asked was will there be a way to include a larger area for playground and recreation. Mr. Despard stated that the Township Staff indicated last fall that they would negotiate with the developer for a fee in lieu of park space subject to approval of the LCPC, this Commission, and the Township Supervisors. Mr. Despard stated that there are sidewalks and front porches on most of the houses. Mr. Despard stated that the Homeowners Association would decide ultimately what they want to do with the open space. The developer has put as much green space as possible with each home because that is still the American dream. Mr. Despard stated that duplexes are not the most popular type of housing. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that they hear comments from the developers that local regulations are a barrier to things that they would like to do. The Planning Commission is saying that if there is something you would like to do and our Ordinance is preventing you from doing it, let us know what it is. Mr. Despard stated that without the flex zoning, they would not have been able to get the density that they have accomplished. Mr. Glazier asked if townhouses are more popular than duplexes and Mr. Despard stated townhouses are easier to layout and they are more popular. John May stated that Mr. Despard spoke to him this afternoon and he then spoke to Barry Smith. Mr. May stated that he would like to sit down with Mr. Despard, R.G.S., and up to two Supervisors to look at different alternatives and to see if up zoning or changing the zoning ordinance would be appropriate. Mr. May stated that they would like to work with Mr. Despard to create a nice layout for the development. Mr. Haverstick stated that they need to have an aesthetic sense of what these developments will look like in five, ten, and fifteen years from now. Mr. Haverstick stated that he feels that they should not turn their backs on the aesthetics and that may mean more open space and a little less density for aesthetic reasons. Mr. Huber had questions on the plan regarding the location of Donerville and Stonemill Roads shown on the plan.

George Rettew, from Rettew Associates, stated that he wanted to talk about a potential building expansion for their office. Mr. Rettew stated that they are looking to optimize the use of the property they own. Their current building is a three story office building. As we look at optimizing the site, if we could increase the height limitations and build a building with four stories on the site, we would maximize the property. Getting the same square footage in a three story building spreads the building out and would lose parking. The LIMC as well as the countys growth management task force are looking at and suggesting that municipalities consider increasing height limitations in zoning ordinances. Mr. Rettew stated that they believed that they could do this in a way that would meet all other site requirements as far as parking, setbacks, and open space requirements. Mr. Rettew stated that they are suggesting that the ordinance have an increase in the height requirement and maybe conditional use hearing for additional height based on certain criteria such as possibly requiring more setbacks in relationship with the increased height of the building and the aesthetics of the building. Mr. Rettew stated that they would be willing to help cover the cost of the Township Attorney making the amendments to the Ordinance. Mr. Miller asked if Mr. Rettew had any suggestions written down to offer. Mr. Rettew stated that they are here tonight to give an idea of what they are looking at doing. He distributed hand outs of the existing building and their proposed building. Mr. Rettew stated that this year they purchased another acre of ground behind their property. Mr. Rettew went over the handout and answered questions from the Planning Commission. Mr. Rettew stated that the new building would be attached to the existing building with a shared stairwell. The new building would have an elevator and stair tower. This building will not have a basement. It will be constructed of steel and concrete and will meet fire codes. Mr. Haverstick questioned the percent of the number of parking spaces that are used currently. Mr. Rettew stated that they are located in the General Commercial Zoning District. They are adequate parking spaces on the site for the existing use. Mr. Miller stated that the height restrictions are outdated and need to be changed. Mr. Miller asked if sprinklers are required and Mr. Rettew stated with the type of construction they are using they are not required to use sprinklers for a four-story building. A five-story building would be required to have sprinklers. Mr. Miller asked if there are within the State Building Code safety mechanisms with respect to height; for example, as the height increases the requirements become greater. Mr. Rettew indicated he was correct. Mr. Ahlfeld asked if Mr. Rettew is suggesting that a four-story building be the new height limitation or are they thinking of a higher height limitation? Mr. Rettew stated that they were not thinking of setting a height. Depending on roof peaks, you could have a two-story building with a very high roof peak that would top out as tall as a three-story building with a flatter roof. We were thinking in terms of a specific height limitation. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that in the Industrial Zone, the Ordinance has set a precedent for different kinds of buildings having different height limits. Mr. Ahlfeld gave some examples from the Industrial Zoning section of the Ordinance. Mr. Rettew stated that if you can build higher, it helps with conserving the land. Mr. Miller stated that when looking at the site, he wondered where the break even point is when you start structuring your parking vertically as opposed to spreading it out horizontally. Mr. Rettew stated that when you start looking at that type of parking, you obviously will need more than a four-story parking garage to make it feasible. Mr. Haverstick suggested subterranean parking and Mr. Rettew stated that one of the reasons they would not consider going down is the geological conditions that exist on their property. Mr. Haverstick stated that he believed that Mr. Millers point is that there is an economic point at which you have to make those decisions. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that this is an issue for a work session and when Mr. Rettew has something specific to talk about regarding on

Ordinance change. Mr. Rettew stated that they were not presenting anything formal at this time but was only seeing if this was something that the Township would consider. Mr. Ott suggested that Mr. Rettew put something together to present as a package for a submission to the Planning Commission so they have something to look at to base their discussion on.

Mr. Haverstick stated that he talked to several Supervisors individually as well as Mr. Whittle and wanted to know if the Commission could coordinate a meeting with the interested parties concerning the Fred Funk property to see what they may or may not want to consider doing. Mr. Haverstick stated that he feels that they may be better off being proactive or the opportunity exists for Mr. Funk to develop the property in a way that would be the worst possible way. Mr. Haverstick stated that there is a possibility of six lots that could be developed and he would hope that the interested parties and the Township could sit down with Mr. Funk and explore alternatives to developing the property under the current rural zoning which would allow six lots. Mr. Haverstick stated that it may mean striking a deal that a portion of the tract is rezoned in exchange for preserving the rest of the tract. Mr. Haversticks concern is that if nothing is done, the Township runs the risk of having the property developed in an inefficient way. Ms. Glazier asked if Mr. Haverstick was referring to a public meeting and Mr. Haverstick stated that he felt a work session with representatives from the Planning Commission, some Supervisors, and Mr. Funk himself or a representative, to see if there is a solution that can be reached. Ms. Glazier stated that she is concerned about being reactive to peoples suggestion of what they want to do to their land. Ms. Glazier stated that she is concerned if a meeting is the best way for everyone to use their time or should we be looking at what the Ordinance requires. Ms. Glazier stated that she feels there are many things with the Ordinance that may not be realistic in terms of what we want to do in the Township and how we move forward. Maybe it is time to look at a number of issues and look at the Ordinance in a more general way. Ms. Glazier stated that there was a rationale to have it zoned Rural and in order to make a change, there will be a bigger leap from Rural to whatever it is rezoned to. Ms. Glazier stated that she feels that there must be a public process. Mr. Miller stated that he thinks it is healthy and appropriate when other entities point out shortcomings and failings in an ordinance. Mr. Miller stated that he does not feel that the time to rezone this parcel is now. One reason is that the Countys Growth Management update has to be finished because there is a tool box section to that with many recommendations and thoughts and they may not all be appropriate. Mr. Miller stated that the LIMC is not done with their Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Miller stated that before they should do anything, this plan needs to be completed. There will be suggestions from the plan and a future land use map component that will need to be addressed. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that all the issues brought out were valid and he agreed now is not the time to take a comprehensive look at the Ordinance. It still is worth getting together as to whether they want to consider any changes relating to the issues that have come up with to date. Mr. Whittle stated that there will be nights to come where the Commission will be thinking about making the land development plans, ordinances, and zoning more closely fitting with the county wide growth management plan and particularly the growing together plan for the central part of Lancaster County. There was extensive discussion.

New Business Manor Oaks Remaining Lands Section 3 - Manor Oaks General Partnership is proposing to develop Section 3 of the remaining lands of the Manor Oaks Remaining Lands development. This section of Manor Oaks is zoned RH1 and consists of a total of 9.598 acres located at southwest corner of Cartledge Lane and Bradford Street in Manor Township,

Lancaster County, PA. The proposed dwelling units will be provided access from the public streets via private access drives. The proposed project will include the construction of 50 condominium-style residences on the tract. This is the final residential section of this development as shown on the approved Preliminary Plan for Manor Oaks Remaining Lands. This subdivision plan is submitted in accordance with the Phasing Plan set forth in the previous Preliminary and Final plans already approved for this development. The Commission needs to recommend and comment to the LCPC on this final plan. Jeff Burkhart, from David Miller Associates, presented the plan. Mr. Burkhart stated that this is the last residential section of the approved preliminary plan. Mr. Burkhart stated that this area is a townhouse development that was approved in the preliminary plan and is on the same piece of land that contains the existing stormwater management basin. The townhouse units are laid out exactly as the preliminary plan had them approved. There were some minor adjustments to utility lines with the installation of one of the main feeder lines that went through the development to connect to the older existing units with the main line but beyond that everything is almost an identical rubber stamp of the preliminary plan. We did submit the plan to the Township Engineer. They had two comments; one comment had to do with the post development drainage area map that they did take from the old submission and sent to the engineer and the other item was to provide the approval letter from the Lancaster County Conservation District. Mr. Burkhart stated that they are expecting the Conservation District approval letter any day and they received notification from the Township Engineer this morning that the engineer did acknowledge the receipt of the changes and were satisfied with the information shown on the drainage area map. Mr. Burkhart stated that LASA is moving ahead with their review and they do not have any difficulty with the project. If everything is successful this evening, we will be sending the cost estimate to the Township Engineer. Mr. Burkhart stated that the streets were stubbed in at the end of the previous phases. Mr. Burkhart stated that this plan fronts along Letort Road. Mr. Huber questioned where Duke Street was on the plan and Mr. Burkhart explained the location of Duke Street and Letort Road and pointed out how the access to the development will take place on the plan. Mr. Haverstick asked what is being done with the Local Commercial tract. Mr. Burkhart stated that at this point it is set aside on a previous subdivision plan. There is a thought process in the works for doing something with that tract. Mr. Haverstick asked if the developer has made an attempt to do anything with it. Mr. Burkhart stated that it is not being marketed actively at this time. Mr. May asked if it will ever be done. Mr. Burkhart stated that it might be more appropriate for residential zoning. Mr. Haverstick asked what the size of the commercial tract is. Mr. Burkhart stated that it is approximately 3½ acres. Mr. Miller stated that he would like to see residential above the commercial use. Mr. Miller made a motion to recommend to the LCPC approval of the final plan. Don Witmer seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously.

Lancaster County Solid Waste Management Authority (LCSWMA) Lot Add-On Plan The Lancaster County Solid Waste Management Authority (LCSWMA) has purchased a parcel of ground (1.379 acres) from Frey Dairy Farms, Inc. (FDFI) and is proposing to add the parcel to land currently owned by LCSWMA (the 21.3-acre parcel shown on the drawing and identified as the Herr Tract). The Herr Tract is located adjacent to and between lands owned by both LCSWMA and Frey Dairy Farms Inc. The Commission needs to review and make comments to the LCPC. Brooks Norris, Senior Manager of Technical Service for the Authority, presented a drawing by Rettew Associates. LCSWMA is proposing to add a 1.3 acre triangle to the Herr Tract as an add-on to the Landfill property in Manor Township. The reason for the property

acquisition is to provide permanent access for their vehicles to service the area for the methane gas project. The land is zoned industrial and will stay industrial. The Herr Tract is surrounded on all sides by Frey Dairy Farms. Mr. Norris stated that the access would be from their existing access road. Mr. Norris stated that it allows them to stay off the wetlands. Mr. Miller asked how the Herr Tract is used today. Mr. Norris stated that Mr. Herr has been retired for several years and at the end of the month he will be moving out. Mr. Norris stated that LCSWMA purchased the property several years ago. There are no plans to change the property with the sole exception of taking the northwest corner of the property which they entered into a lease agreement with PP&L for the methane gas project. Mr. Herr has dedicated his life to being a forester. He has ponds on the property and it will all stay. Mr. Haverstick asked Mr. Norris to point out the area of the gas project. Mr. Haverstick made a motion to recommend approval of the lot add-on as proposed. Ms. Glazier seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously.

Other Business Act 537 Mr. Ott stated that Mr. Smith left a memo for him to read to bring the Commission up to date. Mr. Ott stated that the memo indicated that the 537 Joint Regional Planning Group met this morning to review the status of the project. Manor Township has held its individual public hearing process, as have all the members with the exception of Manheim Township that probably will meet in June. The following activities are on a project schedule: 1. the draft plan will be reviewed by LASA in mid June; LASA will have their official review late June early July; 2. a public advertisement that will occur early in July; 3. the final plan will be produced early to mid July; 4. a joint public hearing will occur in late July; 5. Manor Township Supervisors will plan to adopt a resolution approving the plan in August or September; 6. the Plan will be submitted to PADEP for their approval in early to mid October.

Regional Comprehensive Plan Update Mr. Ahlfeld stated that at the last Steering Committee meeting the comments were discussed. They are still working on the future land use plan. Mr. May stated that the Funk Farm letters were delivered to the project managers, to Manor Township and to Mr. Whittle. Mr. Whittle stated that the only thing LIMC Steering Committee has said so far is that expanding the UGB is not necessary but there is the possibility for individual juggling taking something out and putting something into the UGB. The total acreage does not need to be changed. Mr. Whittle talked about the Funk request and indicated 60 percent of the acreage will be left in one tract and it will be the best of the acres. Mr. Whittle stated that he is generally pleased with the purposes of the Rural District. Mr. Whittle stated that there might be a little too much Rural Zoning and Mr. Haverstick agreed. Mr. Ahlfeld asked Mr. Haverstick if he was saying that more acreage should be zoned for agriculture and Mr. Haverstick indicated that is how he felt. Mr. Whittle stated that over the next few years, if Manor Township decides that they should put more land in agriculture and less in the rural zone, you would be consistent with the LIMC plan in doing that. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that the draft LIMC Future Land Use Plan has an agricultural resource category, which is more intensive agricultural, and a rural residential category. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that the Manor Township representatives decided to put what is Rural in Manors current plan into the agricultural resource category on the new plan. Mr. Haverstick asked Don Witmer his opinion since he is a farmer. Mr. Witmer stated that it depends on which side of the fence you are on. Mr. Witmer stated what is designated as rural is the lower quality of soil and the steeper sloped ground in the Township. Mr. Miller stated that is what zoning is all about. The last time around, the Planning Commission took a lot of flack when they did change a lot of the rural to agricultural zoning. Mr. Miller stated that the

other thing going on currently is the Blue Ribbon Ag Commission that the County Commissioners put together. The Commission is about to give their final recommendations. Mr. Miller stated that the whole thing was put together under the guide lines as to what is it going to take to preserve agriculture in the future. One of the items mentioned is that the farm community does not want to lose their development rights. Mr. Miller stated that if you do not want to see development in the agriculture community then someone must pay them for those rights. Mr. Witmer made the statement you own the land, you bought the land, you paid for the land, and now I cannot do what I want with the land. Mr. Witmer stated that people want to keep their land in agriculture but others do not. The idea that you worked and paid for the land and all the sudden you're not part of the decisions on what you can do with the land is not right. Mr. Miller stated I want to color it green, sorry. Mr. Witmer stated that is the problem. There was discussion on the request regarding the Funk property. Mr. Haverstick stated that it is a shame that there is not the flexibility to be able, for example, to let a farmer spin off the five lots and if he decides he is going to sell these building lots at 2 acres a piece to negotiate with him and say we will allow you, if it makes sense and the land is in the proper spot for it, to do a density ten acre project. Mr. Haverstick stated that he wondered how insightful we are being. Mr. Miller stated that in his view that is a philosophical point that is coming out of the Countys Growth Management Update and that is the dynamic today is that planning follows zoning. Mr. Miller stated that if a plan comes in that is a great idea but the zoning says you cannot do it, and then the zoning requirements need to change to allow the development to occur. Mr. Miller stated what is coming out of the County is that zoning must follow planning. Mr. Miller stated that if something is a good idea then figure out a way to make it happen and put that into the ordinance. The ordinance needs to allow for good planning to occur. Mr. Glazier stated that it needs to be more than one property and Mr. Miller stated he is referring to a general sense not just one property. Mr. Miller stated that it is good that an individual property owner poses the question because the Commission would never pose the question themselves. Mr. Miller stated that they may disagree with him, but it is necessary to have the question posed. Ms. Glazier stated that no has come in and questioned the Commission. Mr. Miller stated that the reason for that is that the individual is going through the Comprehensive Plan and they will have a future land use map so the proper process is for him to go through that plan before coming to us. Mr. Miller stated that in his view it was proper for the land owner to go through the LIMC at this point in time. There was discussion regarding the draft of the Comprehensive plan, the presentation of the draft and the adoption by the municipalities.

Correspondence from the Commission Secretary Ms. Glazier noted letters from the LCPC as follows: The LCPC, on May 23, disapproved the requested modification of the requirement of a minimum 50 between reverse curves for the Stonemill Subdivision. They indicated that there are no physical restraints described on the application to prevent meeting the requirements of the Ordinance. There appears to be no compelling reason for the reverse curve. The LCPC, on May 23, considered the final plan application for the Price Self Storage and approved subject to the Applicants acceptance of the advisory that the entire property be fenced and applicant is reminded that site preparation, building construction, and ultimate occupancy are all dependent upon construction of the off-site stormwater facilities by others. The LCPC gave the date of June 27 to hear the land development plan for Manor Oaks Remaining Lands. Ms. Glazier stated that she received the Vantage Point, which is a bi-monthly newsletter of the PA Planning Association. Ms. Glazier stated that she had a brochure for a course regarding the Duties of a

Zoning Officer if anyone was interested.

Mr. Ahlfeld stated that there was to be a course on Multi-Municipal Planning that was cancelled due to low registration. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that the LIMC is organizing the sponsorship of a course for Local Planning Commission members and others this fall. It is a course put out by the PA Municipal Planning Education Institute. The course will be offered on three Tuesday evenings September 27, October 4 and October 11. Mr. Ahlfeld states that he strongly encourages the Planning Commission members who have never attended one of the courses do so. Mr. Ott stated that there maybe a conflict with the October 11 date, because that is the Townships Planning Commission meeting night.

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

07/11/05

DRAFT

Manor Township Planning Commission Minutes

Monday, July 11, 2005 Time: 7:30 P.M.

The Manor Township Planning Commission held its regularly scheduled meeting on Monday, July 11, 2005 at 7:30 p.m. at the Manor Township Municipal Building, 950 West Fairway Drive, Lancaster, PA. Mr. Ahlfeld introduced the Commission members and led the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.

Members Present: John Ahlfeld, Scott Haverstick, James Miller, Mary Glazier, Beth Herr, and James Henke. Member Absent: Donald Witmer Visitors Present: Jim Huber, 113 Shannon Drive Mark Magrecki, Steckbeck Engineering Pat Denaudo, Steckbeck Engineering Elli Jones, Lancaster Newspapers Jim Stauffer, Weaver Road Bonnie Miller, 113 Bent Tree Dr Steve Skrocki, Penn Manor School District John May, 100 Red Fox Road

Minutes Scott Haverstick made a motion to approve the minutes as presented. Jim Miller seconded the motion and the motion carried. Beth Herr and James Henke abstained.

New Business Mr. Ahlfeld stated that Crossgates Phase VII - Sketch Plan & Waiver Request has been withdrawn from the agenda.

Penn Manor Maintenance Building Final LDP & Waiver Request The project is located at the Penn Manor Middle School along Ironstone Ridge Road south of the intersection with

Charlestown Road. The site currently contains an existing barn and related access drives. The project includes the construction of a 7,900 square foot maintenance building, related infrastructure and stormwater conveyance and facilities. Approximately two acres will be disturbed during construction. The waivers of the LCSDLDO include the following: Article IV, Section 403.03 Existing Features; Article VI, Section 602.06 Sidewalk Requirement; Article VI, Section 602.24 Lighting Requirement. Also, a waiver of the three meeting delay is requested. The Commission needs to review the final LDP and the three waivers of the LCSDLDO as well as the waiver of the three meeting delay and make recommendation to the LCPC. Mark Magrecki with Steckbeck Engineering, Lebanon, PA was present on behalf of the School District as the site plan civil engineer for the project. Also present was Steve Skrocki, Director of Planning Operations, for the School District. Mr. Magrecki stated that they have filed a land development plan with the LCPC and have been through the stormwater management review with the Township Engineer and have received a clean letter. Mr. Magrecki stated that they also have the Lancaster Conservation District approval letter. Mr. Magrecki stated that there is a current farm building located on the property along Ironstone Ridge Road and a current access drive. All the improvements currently exist on the lower half of the site. The School District is proposing to take down the barn, which is being deconstructed currently. The barn will be rehabbed under a separate demolition contract. The School District will replace the barn with a 7900 square foot maintenance building. It will have a loading dock on the lower end and nine parking spaces as per the zoning criteria for this type of use with an office and warehouse use located in the building. The School District has been before the Zoning Hearing Board to receive their variance for the lot coverage. The lot coverage exceeds what is permitted in the Rural (R) zoning district. The project will relocate the existing shipping and receiving area currently located in the rear of the middle school; it will move this function as well as consolidate a few other functions and put them in one location. The staff currently is housed in the administration building, so there are no new employees and no new truck trips being generated on the site. It is a necessary expansion for the District in order to centralize its services and serve the district better. Mr. Magrecki stated that they have three waiver requests from the LCSDLDO as well as a request for the three meeting delay waiver. Beth Herr asked if it is the only place on the property that the proposed building could be located. Mr. Magrecki stated that was discussed at the Zoning Hearing and in their opinion it is located at the closest point to the access drives leading to the roads. The remainder of the site is mostly fields and used heavily not only by the school district but the community as well. This seemed to be the logical location to remove impervious coverage, redesign, and put back impervious coverage. Mr. Magrecki explained that the one criterion that the School District needed to comply with and could not was met by applying to the Zoning Hearing Board and obtaining a diminutive variance for lot coverage, putting in the least amount of pavement that was possible for the project to work. In replacing existing impervious and installing new impervious, they have minimized the impervious area by decreasing it 7,000 square feet. Ms. Herr asked what would happen to the barn. Will it be totally destroyed? Mr. Skrocki stated that it has not been destroyed yet but is in the progress right now of deconstruction. Ms. Herr asked if it is being deconstructed and will it be bought and placed some place else. Mr. Skrocki stated that was correct. Ms. Herr asked where it would be reconstructed and Mr. Skrocki stated he did not know. Mr. Skrocki stated that they have contracted with an organization called Barn Saver. Mr. Skrocki stated that he did not know whom that organization is selling the barn to. Ms. Herr asked if Barn Savers are local and Mr. Skrocki stated from Narvon, PA. Mr. Ahlfeld asked if the barn would be reconstructed as a barn

or would Barn Savers just sell the lumber and the other elements. Mr. Skrocki stated that he could not answer that question. Mr. Miller asked if they had the Countys historical organization approval. Mr. Magrecki stated that they had the Pennsylvania Historic Museum Commission (PHMC) clearance letter, as well as there were studies done by the District to look at reusing the barn from a structural standpoint. It is the Districts understanding that it was not possible to reuse the barn. The District has been looking for a location for this type of use for possibly four years. Ms. Herr stated that if they had a letter from the PHMC, they probably anticipated that the barn would be reconstructed in some form. Mr. Skrocki stated that the barn is not on any historic registry. Mr. Skrocki stated that they had spoke with individuals in the Lancaster County Historic Preservation Trust and their recommendation to the School District was to get a historic record of the barn before it is deconstructed. It was optional and not a mandatory requirement. Mr. Skrocki stated that they did contract with an individual to have a historic record. Mr. Skrocki stated that last week they had received a preliminary report from the individual and he will continue with photographic documentation of the deconstruction as it takes place. Mr. Miller asked if the District looked into retrofitting the barn for use as a maintenance facility. Mr. Skrocki stated that they did look at that possibility and the cost were exorbitant. They decided, at that time, that deconstruction and rebuilding was the best approach. Ms. Herr stated that the School District had only one estimate and she felt they should have gotten other estimates. Mr. Skrocki stated that he was not with the School District at that time. It is his understanding that the figure was for renovation of the barn and not to convert the barn into a maintenance facility. The Districts position was that they did not feel that \$800,000 for renovation of a barn was prudent. Mr. Skrocki stated that the location is optimal. The District is facing a field shortage and looking into several options to expand athletic field usage and to take away existing athletic fields was not in the best interest. Ms. Herr stated that if there is a shortage of fields, why was the District contemplating selling land to Sheetzs at Comet Field? Mr. Skrocki explained the Districts reasoning behind the possible sale of the land. Mr. Miller commented on the two basins that were shown on the plan. The one is a type of infiltration basin and putting the basin in that area would impact the athletic field. Mr. Miller asked if it is not feasible to put everything out front and extend the size of the existing basin. Mr. Miller stated that there is a lot of open area but no fields were designed. Mr. Miller stated that the adjacent field to the basin functions well to play on and he wondered if they are giving up too much ground in that area. Mr. Magrecki stated that there is not an abundance of area to locate the basin. Mr. Magrecki explained that the reason that area was chosen adjacent to the field was because there are no inlets in the parking lot. The stormwater will sheet flow across the parking lot and with a depressed curb at the end, the water will go into a grassed area. All this has to do with the MPDES permit process. They were just over the threshold of one acre and they had requirements regarding infiltration, recharge, etc. One of the requirements is to get the water to a basin not to a pipe. This was negotiated at a meeting that we had with the Lancaster Conservation District who approves the plans prior to being approved by the Township Stormwater Engineer. Also, there are two watersheds. This explains the two basins. We argued that there was only one watershed in an area, but we were told there are two watersheds requiring two basins. Mr. Magrecki stated that they are following the rules. Mr. Magrecki explained the issues that would arise with the other areas for the basin. Mr. Magrecki stated that they tried to minimize the slope to a 4 to1 ratio and there is about a two foot high berm. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that he noticed the relocation of the access walking path to John Herr Park and asked if it will be accessible at all times during the construction of the project. Mr. Magrecki stated that he believed that the whole area would be

fenced off but that has not been brought up at this time. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that the Township does a good job of keeping the walking path clear even in the winter, but if there is no way to get to it, there will be a problem. Mr. Miller asked if it would be paved before winter and Mr. Magrecki stated that he did not see how it would be paved before this winter. Mr. Haverstick asked what the duration of the project would be. Mr. Magrecki stated six to eight months. Mr. Skrocki stated that construction should start in September of 2005 and they are expecting final completion by February 2006. Mr. Haverstick questioned the comment regarding that the traffic count would not be affected. Mr. Haverstick stated that if they are consolidating functions from both Comet Field and the high school campus to this site, how is it possible traffic would not change? Mr. Magrecki stated that he should qualify peak hour traffic trips. There will be no new tractor-trailers that are not making deliveries already to the site.. There will be District trucks back and forth and these trucks may make more trips than currently. Mr. Skrocki stated that the back is now used as a distribution point, so there is really no change. Mr. Skrocki stated that there will be four primary employees housed in the facility and the other maintenance staff will be stopping in as needed to consult with the Director of Buildings and Grounds. Basically, that is what happens now. The vehicles will be parked on the site on occasion or could make stops during the day, but it is no different that what currently happens. Mr. Miller asked if the outlet to the infiltration basin will have any kind of orifice or is it at grate elevation. Will it have two and one-half feet of water in it? Mr. Magrecki stated that there is an orifice in the bottom of the basin. There will be stone buried underground and there will be a five foot wide exposed stone trench down the middle of the basin. Below the basin, a 30 wide by 2 deep trench of stone will exist; the theory is that the water goes into the stone but there is also an orifice control on the outlet structure. There is a constant head pressure moving the water out. There was explanation by Mr. Magrecki as to how the stormwater would be handled. Mr. Miller asked if there are any sinkhole issues. Mr. Skrocki stated that there was no geotechnical study done on the property. Mr. Henke asked if a fence would be installed on the corner and Mr. Magrecki stated that there would be a fence during construction that fence will be removed after construction is completed. Ms. Herr asked why a permanent fence is not being installed when there are students in the area. Mr. Magrecki stated that there is no fencing around the existing basin. Mr. Miller stated that this basin is not designed to hold water. Mr. Miller stated the deepest spot would be four feet. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that the slopes on the sides of the basin are designed so a child will not fall down; you could walk down the slope. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that basins are becoming so numerous that they are used for recreation and landscape design. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that he did not want to see them all surrounded by fences. Mr. Henke questioned how the smaller basin along Ironstone Ridge Road operated and if there are any erosion issues. Mr. Magrecki stated that there are no erosion issues that he has seen. The stormwater runoff has been reduced beyond 50%. Mr. Magrecki listed the waivers that the applicant is requesting: 1) Section 403.03 Requirement for Existing Features. The applicant has a 50 acre property with a two acre area being developed. Under the criteria of the LCSDLDO, the applicant would have to survey all 50 acres. Since the campus LDP was approved in 1992 and there are no changes that they are requesting, the applicant is requesting a modified survey to show the limits that are needed for construction. 2) Section 602.06 Sidewalk Requirement Interpreting the LCSDLDO, the County could request sidewalks along the Ironstone Ridge and Charlestown Road frontage of the property and the applicant is requesting a waiver of that requirement so the applicant does not have to construct a sidewalk along Ironstone Ridge and Charlestown Roads in conjunction with the project. The applicant notes that there are no other pedestrian generators in the area and they are not

proposing pedestrian generators with this project. The applicant has accommodated this with a sidewalk around the new building to the park and no new functions are planned at the school. When it was developed in 1992, the sidewalks were not mandated and there is no new development in the area. 3) Section 602.24 Lighting Requirement What the applicant is specifically asking for is not to provide a lighting plan for the parking and loading area. There is adequate existing lighting at the points of access that currently exist and previously approved through the same process. There is a light fixture at the curb cut. The applicant is asking not to have to illuminate the parking and loading area, as it will only be used between 7 a.m. and 5 p.m. There is no second or third shift. There will be building lighting for security reasons only. The applicant does not want to over illuminate the area that is rural. The applicant also is requesting a three meeting delay waiver. Mr. Ahlfeld asked if the general public is free to walk on the school property and use the drives and sidewalks at any time. Mr. Skrocki stated that people actually park on the site now and walk either the path or cut through the field to get down to the park and that has not been a problem. Ms. Glazier asked if when the school was originally developed, was there a requirement for sidewalks and was that requirement waived. Mr. Ott stated that the LDP does not show any sidewalks on the original school plan. Mr. Ott stated that the LCSDLDO does go back to 1991 and was revised in late 90s. Mr. Ott stated that sidewalks may not have been required at that time. Ms. Glazier stated that the Commission has required other businesses along Charlestown Road to put in sidewalks, and when the population is there that require sidewalks, will the School District voluntarily install sidewalks. Ms. Glazier stated that she is thinking ahead to make sure there is safe access. Bonnie Miller, 113 Bent Tree Drive, stated that several months ago someone had asked for a waiver of sidewalk and it was not granted. There is sidewalk along Charlestown Road in the commercial and industrial area. Ms. Miller stated that her question is how can we require them to have sidewalks on Charlestown Road for children who do walk? Ms. Miller asked Mr. Magrecki if everybody comes to the school by bus or car. Ms. Miller stated that she feels that sidewalks should be required. Mr. Miller asked if the Supervisors are prepared to connect the sidewalks in the future. In order to make the sidewalks usable, are the Supervisors prepared to spend the funds to do that? Mr. Haverstick stated that he agreed with Mr. Miller. Mr. Miller stated that there is a walking path to access the park. Ms. Glazier stated people drive because they cannot walk. Ms. Glazier stated that do you waive sidewalks because it looks like it is piece meal? If you never make the beginning step, it is always going to be piece meal. There will be nothing to connect. Ms. Herr questioned if any students walk to school. Mr. Ahlfeld questioned what development is anticipated west of the site. Mr. Ott stated that he did not know. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that people coming from the south can cut in to the site at an access drive on Ironstone Ridge Road and likewise there is access from the north through the driveway off of Charlestown Road. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that another aspect different here is it is a public property and the Township can cooperate with the School District both in developing the school property and the adjacent park property. If the Township feels that someday there is a need for a sidewalk, it will be easier to get the sidewalk constructed on a site like this then it is to go to a private industry and say you have to put in a sidewalk. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that he feels it could be done on a cooperative basis as needed at this location. John May stated that he is only one Supervisor and cannot say if all the Supervisors would be willing to connect them or not. Mr. May stated, for himself, he is not as much an advocate for sidewalks as everybody else. He stated that he believes that it is more impervious surface, more expense, and it must be maintained; it will be easier to put sidewalks in when the time comes. Mr. May continued to say that he does not feel sidewalks are attractive at all. Mr. May stated that they are

useful as a safety feature but that they do not enhance the appearance of an area and he does not feel that they will be used that much. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that it would be one more loop that an individual could walk. Ms. Glazier stated that in ten years, it would not be irrelevant; so maybe the School District should think about a plan to extend a network of pathways. Ms. Glazier stated that she feels that pedestrian access is important, especially for a school, if they intend to draw people in and impose the idea that driving to the school and park is bad planning. Mr. Miller stated that he would agree that the tracts to the west need to connect to this property in some fashion and to the Townships property. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that there could be a plan note that sidewalks be added when the Township would request it. Mr. Magrecki stated that he would prefer a handshake agreement rather than a note on a plan because peoples opinions change. Sometimes plan notes that you can see on a plan are sometimes for no other reason than to enact a note on a plan. Mr. Magrecki stated that he believes that the School District recognizes if there is substantial residential development to the west that it would be beneficial to them to have connection points. The County would mandate that with any new subdivisions that they connect into the site. Mr. Miller made a motion to recommend to the LCPC approval of the four waiver requests: existing features, sidewalks, lighting and the three meeting delay. Mr. Haverstick seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously. Mr. Miller made a motion to recommend to the LCPC approval of the final land development plan for the Penn Manor Maintenance Building. Ms. Herr seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously.

Other Business Mr. Miller questioned the waiver request for Crossgates VII that was approved by the Supervisors. He stated that typically the Commission is asked to make a recommendation to the Supervisors before they act on the request. Mr. Miller was curious why it seems that sometimes an opinion is asked for and other times it is not asked for. Mr. Miller stated that the MPC actually requires that if there is a Planning Commission, the Commission makes recommendations to the governing body on all land use decisions. Mr. Miller stated that he is curious why in this instance the process was handled differently from the majority of the instances. Mr. May stated that when it came up, Mr. Smith said there are two options; the Supervisors could either approve the request or refer it to the Planning Commission. Mr. May stated that since he was a Supervisor, they have always referred everything to the Planning Commission but they felt in this particular case, it made a lot of sense to not refer it to the Planning Commission. The Supervisors examined it thoroughly and made sure that there were no emergency traffic, access, and parking problems and they felt that the Planning Commission probably would have approved the waiver request. The Supervisors felt that this particular item did not require referral to the Planning Commission. Mr. May stated that they felt they were saving the Planning Commission some work. There was further discussion on the issue.

Act 537 Mr. Ott stated that there was nothing new to report.

Regional Comprehensive Plan Update Mr. Ahlfeld stated that there is very little new information to report. The draft Future Land Use plan was discussed at the last Steering Committee Meeting. The draft is going to be digitized and then it can be reviewed more broadly and revised easily if there is a need to. It may take through October to finalize the draft Future Land Use Plan. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that sometime in the fall they should be ready for the next round of public meetings.

Correspondence from Commission Secretary A letter was received June 22 from the LCPC regarding the conditional approval of the lot add-on plan for Thomas and Susan Frey. A letter was received June 21 from the LCPC regarding the approval of a revised final subdivision plan for Woods Edge Phase 2 Section 2B. A letter was received regarding the approval of the final plan application for the Remaining Lands for Manor Oaks Section 3.

Mr. Miller stated that the Countys draft of the first couple of sections of the update of the Growth Management Plan came out on June 30. Mr. Miller encouraged everyone to comment on it.

Mr. Ott stated that Ron Beam has submitted, for next months meeting, the amendment for the general commercial zoning district height requirements. At last months meeting, the Commission had asked that he put together something for the Commission to review. Mr. Ott passed out the amendment proposal for the Commission to review and have their comments ready for next months meeting. Mr. Miller verified this request is for the GC District only.

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 8:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary Glazier Secretary

Recording Secretary Evelyn Rineer
Planning Commission Meeting
08/08/05

Manor Township Planning Commission Agenda

Monday, August 8, 2005 Time: 7:30 P.M.

1. Call to Order
2. Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag
3. Roll Call
4. Approve Minutes of July Meeting
5. Public Comments
6. New Business Text Amendment to the Zoning Ordinance - Sec. 207.6 Maximum Permitted Structural Height in the General Commercial Zoning District. 3020 Associates is requesting a change to the zoning ordinance to allow certain uses in the general commercial zoning district a maximum structure height of 60 with certain setback requirements. The Commission needs to review this text amendment and comment to the Manor Township Board of Supervisors.

Final Subdivision for Millstone Village (Formerly Hershey Mill Road Property East) Final Land

Development Plan for Hershey Mill Manor (Formerly Hershey Mill Road Property West) - The projects are located on Hershey Mill Road. The Millstone Village property covers 10.95 acres. The property is zoned RH-High Density Residential. The proposed use will be 69 fee simple townhouses for sale and 3 open space lots. The Hershey Mill Manor property covers approximately 5 acres of land. The property is zoned RH-High Density Residential. The proposed use will be 33 townhouses for rent and 3 apartments for rent located in the existing farmhouse. Public water and sewer serve both properties. The applicant is requesting a waiver of the three meeting delay for both projects. The Commission needs to review these plans and make comments to the LCPC.

Eshelman Farm Rezoning - The property is located on approximately 92 acre tract of land east of Donerville Road and west of the Woods Edge Development. The tract is zoned Medium Density Residential Flex (RM1) and the applicant is requesting to rezone the tract to High Density Residential Flex (RH1). The rezoning is being requested to allow higher density development to take place. The Commission needs to review and make recommendation to the Township Board of Supervisors.

Preliminary Subdivision Plan Timson Place - 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.

7. Other Business - Act 537 Update - Regional Comprehensive Plan Update - Correspondence from Commission Secretary

8. Adjourn

DRAFT Manor Township Planning Commission Minutes

Monday, August 8, 2005 Time: 7:30 P.M.

The Manor Township Planning Commission held its regularly scheduled meeting on Monday, August 8, 2005 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, Scott Haverstick, James Miller, Donald Witmer, James Henke and Mary Glazier. Member Absent: Beth Herr Visitors Present: Joel Snyder, RGS Assoc. Mark Johnson, RGS Assoc. Robert & Yvonne Musser, Donerville Rd. G. Shuman, Donerville Road Jim Huber, 113 Shannon Drive Allen Kreider, 141 Supervisors Rd Ron Beam, 3020 Columbia Ave. Elaine Jones, 670 Hershey Avenue Gordan Crouse, 785 Stehman Church Rd. David Charles, 26 Millersville Rd George Rettew, 3020 Columbia Avenue Earl Hess, 15 Meadow Lane Bonnie Miller, 113 Bent Tree Dr Danny Whittle, 50 N. Duke St. Bill Murry, 1899 Lititz Pike

Minutes Jim Miller made a motion to approve the minutes. Jim Henke seconded the motion and the motion carried. Don Witmer abstained.

New Business Text Amendment to the Zoning Ordinance - Sec. 207.6 Maximum Permitted Structural Height in the General Commercial Zoning District. 3020 Associates is requesting a change to the zoning ordinance to allow certain uses in the general commercial zoning district a maximum structure height of 60 with certain setback requirements. The Commission needs to review this text amendment and comment to the Manor Township Board of Supervisors. Jim Miller stated that he did not understand several of the sentences in the request that referred to height and indicated exceptions. Ron Beam, from 3020 Associates, explained that he patterned the text after the Townships Industrial Zoning District. Mr. Beam stated in the Industrial Zoning District certain uses are allowed to have height by right and all other uses permitted in that district have different criteria. Mr. Beam stated he basically took the recommendations that were made two months ago and looked at the Industrial Zoning District, did a nationwide search, and drew up the text amendment that is before the Commission. There was discussion on the text amendment. Several Commission Members felt the amendment should be for all the uses in the zoning district. Mr. Miller asked what Labor and Industry requires in regards to the height used. Mr. Beam indicated what is required for a four story building. Mr. Miller asked if the UCC has any say in the requirements since it is a commercial building. Mr. Miller was advised that sprinklers are not required for a four story building but are required if the building is five stories high. Jim Huber, 113 Shannon Drive, asked who initiated the amendment and he was advised that Rettew Associates had presented this request several months ago and the Commission expressed an interest in considering some change. Mr. Huber asked Mr. Ahlfeld where he had read from. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that he was reading from Section 207.2 which is the permitted uses in the General Commercial District in the Zoning Ordinance. Bonnie Miller, 113 Bent Tree Dr., asked where these type buildings would be built. She was advised that this type of building would be a permitted use in the General Commercial Zone. Mr. Ahlfeld listed where the General Commercial Zoning Districts in the Township were located. Mr. Miller stated that he liked the idea that the areas adjacent to the residential area have greater setbacks. Bill Murry, Lititz Pike, Lancaster, stated that he thinks it is a great idea to go up and believes it would be more appropriate to limit the occupied height rather than worry about what the overall height of the building. Mr. Murry feels the eave or bearing point of the roof structure should be used to determine the height requirement. Allen Kreider, 141 Supervisors Road, stated he had concerns and felt it is an excellent time to talk to the LIMC and find out what other townships are doing regarding the height of buildings. Mr. Kreider stated that he is also concerned if the fire equipment would be able to reach the proposed height. Mr. Kreider stated that there is nothing to keep the property developer from going down and using a basement floor for an occupied area to keep the heights down. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that the Commission had a letter from the Rohrerstown Fire Company Fire Chief indicating that they have equipment to accommodate the proposed building height. Mr. Miller stated that regarding the LIMC, he does not believe any other township has stepped forward in this regard as of yet. Mr. Miller stated the County is going to be pushing very hard to increase the intensity and the density of uses. Mr. Miller stated that we can not continue to build as we have been with low density and low intensity as a general rule throughout the County. Mr. Miller stated that the County is going to be encouraging to build up in the future. Mr. Haverstick stated that he believes the intent of the amendment is to rewrite it so that the Township can have four story buildings and agree that they need to allow creativity. Mr.

Haverstick feels it should be recommended to the Supervisors that they take action on this request. Jim Henke asked Mr. Beam if they were going to go with a story below ground for storage or filing. Mr. Beam stated that they would like to but they have soil and water problems on the site. Mr. Huber asked where the location of the property that Mr. Beam was referring to was located. Mr. Beam stated that it is in the rear of 3020 Columbia Avenue. Don Witmer stated that if they give the developer more roof height that he does not want to see it become extreme. Mr. Witmer stated that he feels there should be a limit on roof height if the height of the building is 60. Mr. Haverstick stated that he prefers the ordinance to apply to any use in the district and not be restricted as in the proposed amendment. Ms. Glazier agreed with Mr. Haverstick. Danny Whittle stated that 60 is probably not out of the question in the commercial district as a rule. He could see that a provision for a greater height under some circumstances could be approved by special exception might also be warranted as part of this ordinance, unless it is covered in some other part of the ordinance. Mr. Whittle gave an example of a building in East Lampeter that is 70 and that was allowed by special exception. Mr. Whittle stated that another thing he wanted to bring to the Commission's attention is the fact that if you make any change between the time you send a proposed amendment out to LCPC for review and the time the Supervisors get it to hold a public hearing, you have to start the process all over again which means another 45 day review period. Mr. Whittle stated that he just urges the Commission to make sure they have the proposed amendment the way they want to recommend it to the Supervisors. Mr. Miller made a motion to recommend to the Manor Township Supervisors a change to the General Commercial Zoning District to the maximum permitted height in Section 207.6. The amendment would read as follows: Height shall not exceed seventy feet (70) above finished grade. Structures exceeding forty feet (40) shall be set back an additional one foot (1) for every two feet (2) increase in height over forty feet (40) from side and rear property line setback requirements in Section 207.5. However, if the lot is adjacent to a residential zone, the minimum yard dimension for the yard immediately adjoining the residential zone shall be increased by two feet (2) for every one foot (1) of building over forty feet (40). This increase shall be in addition to all other minimum yard dimensions set forth in Section 207.5. Ms. Glazier seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously. Mr. Ahlfeld asked if the comment from the fire company would be different if they knew the Commission was talking 70 instead of 60. Mr. Ott stated that he did not know because he did not solicit the letter. Barry Smith contacted the fire company for the letter. Mr. Murry stated that one thing that needs to be understood that we have just passed one year with the state wide building code. Mr. Murry stated that all commercial structures and all multi-family residential are required to have sprinklers. Mr. Ahlfeld asked Mr. Ott procedurally if the Supervisors would be inclined to seek information on the height as it relates to fire protection or would they expect the Commission to do that before the recommendation is passed to them. Mr. Kreider stated they would do it if the Commission did not. Mr. Huber asked if the motion included a maximum four floor height and he was advised no.

Final Subdivision for Millstone Village (Formerly Hershey Mill Road Property East) Final Land Development Plan for Hershey Mill Manor (Formerly Hershey Mill Road Property West) - The projects are located on Hershey Mill Road. The Millstone Village property covers 10.95 acres. The property is zoned RH-High Density Residential. The proposed use will be 69 fee simple townhouses for sale and 3 open space lots. The Hershey Mill Manor property covers approximately 5 acres of land. The property is zoned RH-High Density Residential. The proposed use will be 33 townhouses for rent and 3 apartments for rent located in the existing

farmhouse. Public water and sewer serve both properties. The applicant is requesting a waiver of the three meeting delay for both projects. The Commission needs to review these plans and make comments to the LCPC. Mark Johnson, from RGS Associates, was present to represent the plans as well as Earl Hess, who is also involved in the development. Mr. Johnson stated that the Hershey Mill Manor property is a five-acre parcel with 33 new rental town homes and three existing rental apartments. The Millstone Village plan consists of 69 fee simple town homes on a public road on 11 acres. These plans are identical to the preliminary plans that were approved. These are single phased projects so no modifications had to be made. We added some recording information and submitted them as final plans. Jim Henke had some questions as to how the individuals in the middle units would access their back yards for maintenance. Mr. Johnson stated that it would be written in the homeowners document the provision for the maintenance across the units. Mr. Henke also had questions regarding clear sight on the east side of Millstone Drive, on the detention basin, and the sidewalks. Jim Henke made a motion to recommend the final subdivision plan for Millstone Village be approved as presented. Don Witmer seconded the motion and the motion carried with Jim Miller abstaining. Jim Henke made a motion to waive the three meeting delay. Mary Glazier seconded the motion and the motion carried with Jim Miller abstaining. Jim Henke made a motion to recommend for approval the final land development plan for Hershey Mill Manor as presented. Mary Glazier seconded the motion and the motion carried with Jim Miller abstaining. Jim Henke made a motion to recommend approval of the waiver of the three meeting delay as it relates to the final land development plan for Hershey Mill Manor. Don Witmer seconded the motion and the motion carried with Jim Miller abstaining.

Eshelman Farm Rezoning - The property is located on approximately 92 acre tract of land east of Donerville Road and west of the Woods Edge Development. The tract is zoned Medium Density Residential Flex (RM1) and the applicant is requesting to rezone the tract to High Density Residential Flex (RH1). The rezoning is being requested to allow higher density development to take place. The Commission needs to review and make recommendation to the Township Board of Supervisors. Mr. Eshelman was present and stated he felt it is a shame that the Commission is looking at rezoning this property and could not make recommendations on the original plan. The rezoning should have happen before any deal was reached. Jim Huber asked who requested the rezoning. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that there was a sketch plan presented several months ago and the Planning Commission had discussion if this tract was going to be developed it may be good to develop it at a higher density. Mr. Haverstick stated that the plan proposed was not very imaginative and the Commission discussed it might be better to develop at a higher density and allow the developer more creativity. Mr. Henke stated that the consultant provided what the code allowed. Ms. Miller stated that when the person bought the property, he is sure that he felt that it will be a continuation of the concept of the Woods Edge Development and that is probably why he brought that concept to the Commission. Ms. Miller stated that the Commissions suggestion for him to go back and be more creative has taken his original concept and erased it completely. Now he is purchasing land where he cannot build what he envisioned. Mr. Ahlfeld asked Mr. Ott if there is anything in the RH1 district that would preclude the developer from doing the other proposal. Mr. Ott stated he could do what he proposed or he could do more. Mr. Ahlfeld stated it is giving the developer more options but it does not preclude him from what he proposed initially. Ms. Glazier stated that it was several meetings ago that the plan was looked at. Ms. Glazier stated that when she looked at the sketch plan what struck her was the issue of density.

Ms. Glazier raised the question that if you were not constrained by the zoning ordinance, would you do the same thing as proposed. It led to a discussion of the goal of achieving more density in an area that is close to other densely populated areas and public transportation. This is where higher density is wanted. Ms. Glazier stated that she does not see the proposal as something to thwart what the property owner wants to do or hand the property owner some sort of bonus in terms of up zoning. Rather, we are looking at it and saying are we sacrificing 50 acres of agricultural land somewhere else in the Township in order to keep it at medium density. Ms. Glazier stated that she agrees it might be better to be looking at all of the zoning in the Township and making some effort to bring it more in line to what is best for the Township over all. Ms. Glazier stated since this has come up and it is going to be developed, she personally would like to see it developed more densely so the Township is getting closer to the goals that the Smart Group directs them to have. Mr. Kreider stated that this started with the Planning Commission and they mentioned the fact of possibly going to a higher density. Mr. May and Mr. Kreider met with Mr. Despard and asked him if he would be willing to revisit this plan and see if he can work out something using a higher density and he stated he would be willing to. Mr. Kreider stated that they have not yet seen a revised plan. Mr. Kreider stated that he had a problem because there were only a few tot lots shown on the plan that were in green open space areas and he was asked to come up with something with more usable space. Mr. Kreider stated that the Supervisors were all in agreement that it is a perfect location for higher density but they want to see something creative. Ms. Glazier stated that when Mr. Despard attended the meeting, he suggested they would rather build town homes than duplexes in the medium density flex area. Mr. Despard stated town homes are more appealing. Mr. Despard was asking to add town homes to the permitted uses. Ms. Miller stated that her concern is in November Mr. Murry wanted an acceptance for what was proposed as condominiums next to the wetlands in Woods Edge. The plan was approved in January or February and the people who bought into that area of Woods Edge in single family homes are now encroached upon by these condominiums. When that was proposed in his plan originally, the wetland issue came up. Mr. Murry came back in and got acceptance for those 60 or 80 condominiums at a later date. Ms. Miller asked what Woods Edge is zoned as? Ms. Miller was advised her that Woods Edge is zoned High Density Residential. Mr. Miller stated in those minor changes the overall density from what was initially proposed did not change. There are no more units then what were initially proposed for the whole subdivision of Woods Edge. Ms. Miller stated that there is very little open space in Woods Edge other than the wetlands and the little park dedicated to Manor Township. Mr. Miller advised Mr. Kreider that he believed that there would not be a new sketch plan until the tract was rezoned. Mr. Miller stated if the Supervisors chose not to rezone this and the zoning remains what currently it, he believes they will end up using the sketch plan that was presented originally. Mr. Haverstick stated that he agrees with Mr. Kreider in terms of the open space and part of his reason for wanting to rezone the property along with the creativity part is to have both higher density and some creativity in using open space. That means something other than water swales. Mr. Haverstick stated that if the builder has some flexibility they could nudge him into providing some meaningful open space. Mr. Witmer stated his problem with this spot rezoning is whenever anybody comes in are we going to change the zoning. Mr. Witmer stated that everyone knows what the zoning is when they start a project. Mr. Witmer stated that he does not know if he agrees with changing the zoning in midstream. The rezoning should this have been done five years ago. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that it might have been appropriate to do it five years ago. Mr. Henke stated it is not spot zoning; the zoning district being considered is contiguous to this

property. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that the land immediately to the east and the southern part of Woods Edge, is already Residential High Density Flex and the rest of Woods Edge is already Residential High Density. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that the change would not preclude the developer from doing what he proposed before if he wants to do that. Mr. Haverstick stated something that was not done five years ago should not prevent us from doing it now if it is the right thing to do. Mr. Witmer stated that as a landowner it is not fair that all the sudden your land gets rezoned; that happened to me four years ago. Mr. Witmer stated that rezoning changes everything and indicated some of the changes that can occur. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that it is correct the rezoning makes changes and that is why it is required and must be based on good planning and done by elected officials. Mr. Ahlfeld stated in this case it does not preclude what he is planning to do and, in fact, as Mr. Kreider reported he met with the potential landowner who seemed interested in having other options. Ms. Glazier stated the problem with the rezoning Mr. Witmer is referring to is that it was a form of down zoning. This proposal is a form of up zoning and there has been public discussion and consideration and there will be more public discussion on it. Ms. Glazier stated she is sensitive to issues associated with not having visibility and transparency in what is being done. This emerged from a conversation about is this really the best way to use this land and has gone forward in the correct direction. Ms. Glazier stated that the public is invited to comment and the press is here to report on it. There will be a meeting next month and it will be on the Supervisors agenda. Bob Musser, Donerville Road, stated he agrees with rezoning to high density because it is consistent with Woods Edge but one of his concerns is where high density comes into contact with land that is in the agricultural preserve. Mr. Musser stated that he feels there should be some kind of buffer. Mr. Musser would like the Planning Commission to look at any land that is going to be developed up against agricultural preserved land create that some natural buffer is created, such as on North Donerville and Stoney Battery Road. Mr. Miller stated in this case the 15 acres are remaining with the existing homestead and essentially that is the buffer. Mr. Ahlfeld stated there is an agricultural setback of 100 feet. Mr. Musser stated that in the development of Parkfield next to his property, he would like to see a buffer along the property line because there will be 15-20 homes abutting his land. Mr. Ahlfeld stated there is something in the ordinance that may not allow Mr. Musser's request. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that the ordinance states there should not be any shrubs within 20 of the agricultural zone and no trees within 30. Dave Charles, Letort Road, Millersville, asked if one of the ways to increase density on a site would be for some kind of amendment for the medium density zone on this tract to provide for townhouses under that zone. The high-density zone is for mixed apartments, townhouses, etc.; being a developer at Eagle Heights, we built a lot of duplexes and Mr. Charles agreed that there is no market for duplexes and it is a waste of land. Mr. Charles stated that even if you change zoning to high density, it does not guarantee there will be more open space. Mr. Charles stated if the zoning provided for town houses by special exception, the Zoning Board would have a little more hands on with regards to open space. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that there was some informal discussion regarding Mr. Charles suggestion and they felt it was better to keep two distinct zones rather than allowing more uses in the medium residential zoning district. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that there may be some places where it would not be appropriate to have town houses and if they change what is allowed in the zone then every where there is medium residential zoning would allow townhouses. Mr. Ott stated there are some areas that are medium density residential that are already built with a few vacant lots and if change to allow townhouses you may get townhouse in a development that is already all duplexes or single family units. Mr. Miller stated it is a good thing to allow a mix of housing which adds diversity, creativity, interest,

etc. Ms. Miller asked how Donerville is spelled. She was advised it is one n in Manor Township. Ms. Miller stated that the road signs are wrong. Mr. Miller made a motion to recommend to the Manor Township Supervisors that the property known as the Eshelman Farm be rezoned to High Density Residential Flex (RH1). Ms. Glazier seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously.

Preliminary Subdivision Plan Timson Place - The project is located on the west side of Donerville Road, 300ft 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. Joel Snyder, from RGS Associates, was present to represent the plan along with Dave Charles. Mr. Snyder stated this is a 5 ½ acre property fronting on Donerville Road and abuts Hampden Drive currently a stub. Mr. Snyder stated it is about 300 south of where Columbia Avenue intersects. There is a stream crossing at the corner of the property. There is a sanitary sewer line that runs across the northern part of the property and there is a water line that runs from Hampden Drive across the southern boundary of the property and then out to Donerville Road through the fields. The site is zoned High Density Residential. Mr. Snyder stated that they are proposing to extend Hampden Drive out to Donerville Road and construct one single family lot and 10 fee simple town house lots that front on the extended Hampden Drive. On the north side of Hampden Drive is the bulk of the site where 43 apartments will be constructed. There are a total of 53 units on 5 ½ acres. There will be sidewalks on both sides of Hampden Drive. There have been no comments from the Township engineer and the plan has not been before the LCPC. There are two stormwater basins on the property that will be discharged into the stream that runs along the north side of the property. Mr. Haverstick asked if all three of the apartment buildings are identical. Mr. Snyder stated that they are not long flat buildings and that they will be stepped. Mr. Haverstick asked questions on the size of the units and the layout. Mr. Miller asked if this were in the high density residential flex zone what you would have been able to do. Mr. Snyder stated that it would not have made any difference. Mr. Miller asked if the three inner buildings would be fee simple or rental. Mr. Charles stated that they would be rentals. Mr. Henke asked if the access onto Donerville Road would cause any problems. Mr. Snyder stated that they are working with PennDot. The site distance is not a problem. Mr. Henke asked if there was any problem with sewer capacity and he was advised there is no problem. Mr. Snyder stated that regarding the water, they might need to install booster pumping to make sure there is adequate pressure on the third floor for the sprinkler system. Jim Miller made a motion they recommend to the LCPC approval of the preliminary plan for Timson Place. Scott Haverstick seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously.

Other Business Act 537 Plan - Mr. Ott stated Barry Smith indicated they are waiting for last public hearing before they go through the adoption process.

Regional Comprehensive Plan Update Mr. Ahlfeld reported there were meetings of the Steering Committee when they firmed up the schedule for getting the complete plan in hand. The consultants have been working on everything except the future land use plan with an eye toward having it complete draft form by mid October. The future land use plan sub committee is going

to be working on issues relating to the land use plan and have that ready by the end of October. The consultants will mesh the two together by the end of October and present the draft to the Steering Committee at its November 3rd meeting. There will be one or two public forums either in late November or early December and the plan will be in final form by the end of the year. The agreement the municipalities signed to enter into this project does call for a fairly complicated review process where the complete draft goes out to municipalities.

Correspondence Ms. Glazier has a letter from the LCPC regarding Penn Manor Maintenance Building final plan approval subject to several conditions.

Bruce out handed out two agreements, one which is the Townships current improvement guarantee agreement and the other is a land development agreement proposed by the Board of Supervisors. Mr. Smith would like the Commission to look at the agreements and if the Commission members have any comments, they can get them to Barry Smith or John May by September 1. Mr. Miller asked who drew up the document. Mr. Haverstick stated that John May drew up the land development agreement. Mr. Haverstick stated that Mr. Kreider might be able to shed light on the documents. Mr. Kreider stated one of the reasons for this proposal is because land development is really important. Mr. Kreider stated that what is happening is that these developments are going in and we can get money from the developer and place it in escrow into a separate account for parks and recreation and road construction. Mr. Kreider stated that if it had been enacted when Woods Edge was built Woods Edge Development would have paid for S. Centerville Road. Mr. Kreider stated that is some of the reasons for the proposed document. Mr. Kreider stated they are trying to get more of the money from the developer for things that impact the Township. Mr. Kreider stated it is a fee that can only be spent for specific purposes. Mr. Miller asked if this is basically an impact fee ordinance and Mr. Kreider stated he would not call it that. Mr. Miller stated he would point out that a developer does not pay these fees. They are simply a middleman because the new homeowner pays the fees. Mr. Miller stated part of the problem with that philosophy is that say Ms. Miller lived in the Township for over 30 years and he buys a new home. He pays this fee and yet he has been paying his taxes here for 30 years. Mr. Miller stated the person who moves into his home that came from Denver does not pay that fee and they are the new resident. Mr. Miller stated there are many existing residents who move to a new home within the Township. Mr. Kreider asked if there is not more people coming into the new developments from outside of the Township and Mr. Miller stated in this whole County over 60% of the growth is internally generated from people who live here. Mr. Kreider stated the alternative then is to raise taxes and pay for the extras. Mr. Miller stated he is not saying that they should pay their fair share because it does make a burden. Mr. Miller stated an example is Centerville Road. How many people from Pequea Township Drive Centerville Road to bypass Rt. 741 to go to Route 30 in the morning. Mr. Miller stated a lot of people and it is not Bill Murrays responsibility to take care of the people from Pequea that use our roads nor the residents and Ms. Miller is one of those. Should she be paying for Pequea Township people to use Centerville Road? Mr. Miller stated he does not think so. Mr. Miller stated they need to make sure that anything that is done is considered fair share, as the new homeowner is not the one creating the entire burden. Ms. Glazier asked how this compares to other municipalities. Mr. Kreider stated most of the townships in one way or another have something like this. Mr. Kreider stated right now the developer is pocketing money from individuals who are bidding to pay more than the developer is asking. Mr. Kreider stated that money should be going to the township

because of the road requirements, open space requirements, and the park and recreation requirements. Mr. Kreider stated right now he does not think it is fair for all the present residents to pay all the fees that are happening because of the new developments. Mr. Miller stated that is part of the misnomer because the new development where Ms. Miller lives when will Manor Township have to put any money into those roads. She paid for her portion of the roads when she bought her home and she is paying the prorated share as a percentage of the value of her home to the township for the road maintenance to go down and pave Anchor Road, South Centerville Road or the roads in Mr. Millers development. She is paying for that in her taxes so she is being double burdened because she is not taking any things from the Township in terms of maintenance other than snow plowing. Mr. Miller stated essentially she is paying more because she built her own roads and they will not have to be maintained for 25-30 years so in the meantime we are all benefiting from that. Mr. Kreider asked about the liquid fuel tax that is what is paying for the roads and that is coming from all of us. Mr. Miller stated liquid fuels pays for the maintenance of the road not the building of the road. Mr. Kreider stated South Centerville Road was all but \$300,000. We all paid for that where Woods Edge could have paid a big part of that in fact most of it. Mr. Miller stated Ms. Miller would have paid that not the developer. Mr. Kreider stated there are always exceptions to the rule. Mr. Miller stated if it is fair they should pay their fair portion that is the American way. Mr. Kreider stated that is not the way this country is going we do not all pay our fair share anymore in reality. Mr. Miller stated if we are going to require some to pay more than others then we are not going in that direction. Mr. Kreider asked if Mr. Miller feels it is okay for the developer to put the extra \$20,000 in his pocket that he could have used to come to the Township or parks and recreation. Mr. Kreider stated they are pocketing the money because homes are selling for \$20-30,000 than they are originally listed for. Mr. Miller stated he couldnt say that as it is a market condition but the reality is the developer is going to charge for the home whatever he needs to charge for the home to make a fair profit. Mr. Miller stated you have to understand the price of land and the cost to improve that land are largely responsible for the final sales price. Mr. Ahlfeld stated the discussion for the documents will be at the next meeting but Mr. Ott stated he understood the Supervisors are going to visit this at their September 6 meeting and they may take action because your comments are due back to them by September 1. Several Commissions expressed problems with that action and after some comments Mr. Kreider stated they would not be taking action before the next Planning Commission meeting. Mr. Ott stated he wanted to give clarification on the documents. Mr. Ott stated the one marked improvement guarantee agreement is currently what the township uses and is based on the County subdivision/land development ordinance. The other document is what is being proposed.

Mr. Ahlfeld stated he circulated to the Commission members announcing an Accumulative Planning Workshop the LIMC will be sponsoring on September 27, October 4 and October 11. Mr. Ahlfeld stated the workshop is oriented toward understanding the planning code and the responsibilities of the planning commission and procedures that are to be followed and how to operate a planning commission as efficiently as possible. Mr. Ahlfeld stated the October 11 date is in conflict with the regular Planning Commission meeting so the October meeting date may be changed to October 12 or October 17. The date will be announced at a later time.

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 9:30 p.m.

Sincerely,

Mary Glazier Secretary

Recording Secretary Evelyn Rineer

Planning Commission Meeting

09/12/05

DFAFT Manor Township Planning Commission Minutes

Monday, September 12, 2005 Time: 7:30 P.M.

The Manor Township Planning Commission held its regularly scheduled meeting on Monday, September 12, 2005 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, Beth Herr, Scott Haverstick and Mary Glazier. Members Absent: James Miller and Donald Witmer. Visitors Present: John May, 100 Red Fox Rd., Millersville Dick Bauder, 130 Sheep Ln., Millersville Allen Kreider, 141 Supervisors Rd., Lancaster Gary Shirk, 581 Friendship Ave., Lancaster Elaine Jones, Lancaster City Bob Musser, 200 Donerville Rd., Lancaster Danny Whittle, LCPC Jim Stauffer, 365 Weaver Rd., Lancaster

Minutes Mr. Henke made a correction to the minutes stating that he was present at the meeting. Mr. Haverstick made a motion to approve the minutes with the correction. The motion was seconded by Mary Glazier and the motion carried. Beth Herr abstained.

New Business Bernice Knight Final Plan - The subdivision is located on Hempfield Street, Washington Boro. Lot #1 containing 58,618 square feet (1.3457 acres) will be subdivided off the main tract Lot #2. 33.3546 acres will remain after Lot #1 is subdivided off. Public sewer and on lot water will serve the lots. The property is located in the Rural Zoning District. Gary Shirk from Weber Surveyors presented the plan. Mr. Shirk stated that this was a simple subdivision of 1.3 acre subdivided off a 44 acre tract of land for the owners son to build a dwelling. Mr. Henke asked Mr. Shirk if the County requires an actual grading plan. Mr. Shirk stated that the grading is shown on the E & S Plan and the only grading will be a small amount of area for the driveway. Mr. Henke asked questions regarding the sewer lateral and flood plain. Mr. Shirk stated that David Miller Associates did the flood plain study. Mr. Henke stated that there were no notes on the plan with this information. Mr. Henke also asked questions regarding the wetlands. Mr. Shirk stated that David Miller Associates also did a study. Mr. Henke questioned the nitrate level. Mr. Shirk stated that David Miller Associates had completed that study. Mr. Henke asked if there are development rights after taking off this parcel. Mr. Henke asked if this is the first subdivision and will any other subdivisions be allowed. Mr. Shirk stated that the farm is in the Clean and Green Program and they have a letter from the tax assessors office that this small parcel will not affect the property status in the Clean and Green program. Mr. Haverstick stated that this subdivision should trigger a rollback regarding the taxes under the Clean and Green program. Mr. Shirk stated that this would not have an affect on the Clean and Green requirements. Mr.

Haverstick stated that it would not have an affect on the requirements but he was sure that there would be a rollback of those tax savings that have occurred over the time that they have been in the program. Mr. Ahlfeld asked if there is a discrepancy in the zoning that under the Rural Zoning District; it states on your plan that you have the Agricultural District disclaimer note. Mr. Ahlfeld was advised that the agricultural disclaimer applies to both the Rural and Agricultural zoning districts. Mr. Haverstick had a question regarding general note #7 on the plan that indicates that there are two off street parking spaces existing on lot #2, which is the large remaining lot. Mr. Haverstick asked what the plan note meant. Mr. Shirk stated that it is more of a formality than anything else indicating that there is parking at the farm. Mr. Haverstick asked how many parcels would be able to be divided off the remaining 33 ½ acres. Mr. Ott stated 40% of the total acreage would be able to be subdivided under the Rural Zoning District. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that about 14 acres could be developed. Mr. Shirk stated that depended on the hydro study. Mr. Ott stated that you could subdivide one lot for every five acres of land under single ownership and up to 40% of the total lot size. Mr. Henke made a motion that the final subdivision plan for the Bernice Knight tract be recommended for approval on the condition that it goes through the appropriate approvals at the County level and other agency reviews including LASA. Beth Herr seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously.

Proposed Land Development Agreement - This proposed land development agreement was handed out at last months meeting for the Commission to review and make comment. The Commission needs to review and make comments to the Board of Supervisors. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that the Commission had received a three page letter from Commission member Jim Miller who could not be here this evening. Mr. Ahlfeld asked if someone could explain procedurally where the Board of Supervisors stands on this issue. Mr. May stated that this is an actual agreement from Mount Joy Borough and he has seen two or three other documents worded identically. Mr. May stated that he likes some of the things that this agreement does but is not suggesting that we adopt everything in the agreement. Mr. May stated that there might be some things in the agreement the Township cannot do since we use the County Ordinance. Mr. May stated that what he would like is to hear from the Commission as to whether they like the kinds of things the agreement presents. He continued by stating that if they do like the things in the agreement, then it would be up to the Township Solicitor working in conjunction with Danny Whittle to determine what the Township can and can not do under the existing situation or whether the Township has to have their own subdivision/land development ordinance to adopt such an agreement. Mr. May stated what he is interested in hearing from the Commission is their comments regarding whether they like what the agreement accomplishes more than if it is feasible to accomplish. Mr. Ahlfeld asked if the Mount Joy Borough agreement follows what is contained in their subdivision/land development ordinance. If that is the case, than this document reflects the requirements in their subdivision and land development ordinance. Mr. May stated that may not necessarily be the case. Mr. May stated that he does know this is a standard agreement that is used between the Borough and the developer in almost every development situation. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that if there are things not covered in their ordinance, than what is the enabling legislation allowing them to enforce this document. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that the planning code states certain things should be done through a subdivision and land development ordinance. Mr. Ahlfeld asked the question, How can Mount Joy Borough be requiring additional things through an agreement that is not part of their ordinance?Mr. May stated that he will provide a copy of the Mount Joy Borough Ordinance for the Commission. Mr. Ahlfeld asked Mr.

May if what the Supervisors wanted to accomplish was the substance of the ordinance or was it more the procedure. Mr. May stated that he did not know if we had agreements with developers. Mr. Smith stated that there is an improvement guarantee agreement process in use that is synonymous with the document before the Commission. Mr. Smith stated that the improvement guarantee agreement is not as extensive of a document as this document before you, but it accomplishes almost as much because it says you must conform to the plan. Ms. Herr asked how the improvement guarantee is monitored. Mr. Smith stated by the Township. Mr. Smith stated that there are several components of the plan and the Township Staff reviews various aspects of the implementation of the plan. As certain aspects of a development are put in, such as stormwater, streets, and public works, Township Staff or the Township Engineer goes out and inspects the project. Mr. Smith explained how the Township is notified during the different phases of the project that need to be inspected. Ms. Herr asked if the Township can insist things be done on a schedule and Mr. Smith stated that is not possible. The Township can insist that the developer must meet the approved plan. Mr. Smith stated that the developers are tied to a sequence of events not to a calendar of events. Mr. Whittle stated that Barry mentioned the sequence of events and Mr. Whittle used the building of a road as an example. Mr. Whittle stated that all the steps must be in an order that the construction industry and trade area aware of. Mr. Whittle stated that when the Township Staff or Township Engineer goes out and sees the sequence is not being followed, they have the ability to require the developer to pull samples (do a core) to find out the compaction. Mr. Whittle also gave an example how the inspections are handled if the County does them. Mr. Whittle stated that there is a warranty period in case something goes wrong. Mr. Whittle stated that there are some things that can be added to the Ordinance. Mr. Whittle stated that some of the Township Ordinances are stricter than the County Ordinance. Mr. Whittle talked about the way that the parks and recreation land is calculated and stated that is totally up to the Township. Mr. Whittle stated that the state legislation states that you cannot just think up an amount of land that you want; it must be supported by your own parks and recreation plan. Mr. Whittle pointed out that the Townships Park and Recreation Plan is old and the Township would end up requiring less land than the County Ordinance requires. The LIMC Growing Together Plan needs to be used as a springboard to upgrade and reevaluate and redo the Township Park and Recreation Plan and make it specific to Manor Township. Mr. Whittle also talked about the parkland that will be needed in the future and the fees having to do with roadways. Mr. Whittle stated that he has not reviewed the entire draft, but what he has looked at so far is well worth the Townships time to begin to look into. Mr. Haverstick asked Mr. Whittle if he saw a problem from the Countys standpoint of having an agreement like the agreement before the Commission. Mr. Whittle stated that the big problem is that the agreement is repeating what is already in the County Ordinance and what shows on the plan. If the plan is approved based on the subdivision and land development ordinance and standards in the ordinance and this is agreement going beyond what the ordinance requires, than something is missing in the Ordinance. If you say you will build it according to the plan that has been recommended for approval by this Commission, then that is how it is built. Mr. Whittle stated that he does not think that the County Subdivision Ordinance and improvement agreement, which is what you are using now, until such a time you get around to adopting your own subdivision ordinance, is a bad process. Mr. Haverstick asked why the Township has not adopted a subdivision and land development ordinance. Mr. Smith stated that the Township did consider adopting an ordinance. Mr. Smith stated that Bruce and himself did extensive research and compiled information for a prior Board of Supervisors. Mr. Smith stated that it probably was

approximately five years ago. At that time, the Board decided they did not want to go in that direction but rather remain with the County Ordinance. Mr. Smith stated that from an administrative standpoint, the staff stopped doing anything relative to that because they were directed not to. Mr. Smith stated that this Board has seen value in looking at our own ordinance and they have had discussion about it. Mr. Smith stated that the staff has begun to revisit adopting our own ordinance by gathering documentation and trying to assist the Board in moving forward. Ms. Glazier asked what was the rationale to not proceed with a Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance five years ago. Mr. Smith stated that there were several factors and he listed them. Mr. May stated that there has been meetings where something has come up and the Township cannot really do anything about it. Mr. May gave some examples. Mr. Bauder asked Mr. Haverstick if he had looked at any other subdivision/land development ordinances and Mr. Haverstick stated he had not. Mr. Bauder stated that according to a Penn State Course, 100 percent of the townships that are our population, have their own ordinance. Mr. Bauder stated that he has gathered some ordinances from surrounding townships. Mr. Bauder stated that they must have a subdivision/land development ordinance that is compatible with their Comprehensive Plan and the Parks and Recreation Plan and then rules can be enforced. Mr. Bauder stated that the Board in place now is looking at the whole issue. Mr. May stated that the charge that is given to the Commission is not to advise to adopt a subdivision and land development ordinance, but indicate points from the agreement that should be considered and whether the Township should have own subdivision/land development ordinance. Ms. Glazier stated that some of the specific things this example provides are apparently more than currently required. She asked, Do we want to ask for and justify more recreational parkland and could we justify contributions toward growth improvements. Ms. Glazier stated that there are two issues: the first issue is the substance of the agreement and the second issue is do we want to have an agreement that brings all the parties together who have an interest in a project to sign a document. Ms. Glazier stated that the next issue is do they want to be sure that everybody involved with each development accept the project in a formal way. Mr. Kreider used one example, Parks and Recreation, and stated that right now the Township is ready to do a \$50,000 investigation as to what do the Township needs in regards to parks and recreation. Mr. Kreider stated that it must come out of the general fund and the Township just started their capital reserve funds. Mr. Kreider stated that the fund really is made up from landfill money; however, the way that he looks at this issue is that without an ordinance, when the developer wants to give a portion of land to the Township, it might be wetlands which can not be used or it might be areas in a flood plain which can be used but not used efficiently. What happens when new developments come into the Township? These developments are the ones that require the parks and recreation be expanded. If the Township had more control over the amount of money coming from the developer and could put the money into a special escrow account, the money could be used in a more positive way as to do what is best for the Township and not what is best for the developer. Mr. Kreider stated, for instance, if a recreation building is needed, this money could be directed towards that use; money should not be coming from the taxpayers to build a recreation building. Mr. Kreider stated that it should be coming from the new residents moving into the Township. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that the issue of the use of the County Ordinance versus a local subdivision/land development ordinance goes back decades at least 40 years. There was about 15 local ordinances and about 45 municipalities worked under the County Ordinance. Mr. Whittle stated that it is opposite now. He believes there are less than 20 municipalities that are under the County Ordinance. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that he believes one misunderstanding is that if

there is a local ordinance, you can do more. Whether there is a local ordinance or a county ordinance, you can only enforce what is specifically stated in the ordinance and no more or no less. Mr. Ahlfeld used the example of parkland dedication stating that it clearly indicates in the County Ordinance that if land is going to be dedicated to the Township, the Township must be willing to accept it and agree it is appropriate land to accept in accordance with all the local planning documents. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that he thinks there are two totally different issues: one is a procedural issue whether we use the county ordinance versus a local ordinance; the other issue is the substance of the standards. Are we unhappy with some of the standards in the County Ordinance currently in effect and should we be talking about some changes in those standards, whether we try to encourage the County to change their ordinance or for us to adopt an ordinance instead. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that there are all kinds of reasons local municipalities have not adopted ordinances. You need a certain amount of engineering expertise and plan review expertise that the County now has on staff and the developers fees pay for that expertise. If the Township had an ordinance, we would have to have somebody with that expertise on the staff or hire consulting engineers. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that if we go with a local ordinance, we need to make sure that it is for sound reasons and not because of the conception that some people think you can do more with a local ordinance than with the county ordinance. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that you must be just as objective in administrating a local ordinance as the county ordinance, as they are both enabled by the exact same line in the planning code and work the same way. Mr. Smith stated that Bruce and he have briefly discussed how they are going to start assembling information. Once you determine philosophically that you may want to make a change to our own ordinance, we look at the mechanics of how the specifics are done at an office level determining who does what, in what sequence, and what the process is. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that another thing to look at is the role of the Planning Commission. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that he is sure there are municipalities where Planning Commissions go down a checklist and basically are reviewing the plans to see if they meet all the standards of the ordinance. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that he believes a Planning Commissions broader expertise and interest is better devoted to spending less time on the nuts and bolts of subdivision plans and more time on other kinds of things be it park planning or whatever else. Mr. Smith stated that he wanted to make it clear that the stormwater agreement given to the Commission is a different document; it is a stand-alone document and is not part of this discussion. It is a whole other matter because the Township does have its own stormwater ordinance. Mr. Smith stated that we are not talk stormwater as much in relevant terms when dealing with land development and subdivision aspects. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that he feels that they must go through the agreement presented to see how the standards in the agreement differ from the standards in the County Ordinance, if there are differences. Ms. Glazier asked what the differences are, for example, on the parks, open space and recreation requirement. Mr. Smith stated that, to summarize it, it is dependent on three documents including the current park and open space plan which has language that does not require as much dedicated land as the County Ordinance does. The agreement before you, as a draft, requires far more land. As Danny stated earlier, you need a basis in which to say that the developer will be required to set aside five acres per whatever formula as well as fee in lieu of relative to whatever formula. Ms. Glazier asked, if right now, does the requirement follow our plan or the Countys Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance. Ms. Glazier was informed that the County Ordinance is followed at this time. Mr. Kreider stated that if what was done in the past is so great, where is the money. The Township has no money for a recreation building and the \$50,000 they are using for the study came in last year and there is no other money set aside. If this system is working so

well, where is the money for the future growth of our parks and recreation? Mr. Kreider stated that he is only using this as an example. He stated that taxes would not be raised during his term at least if he has anything to say about it. He stated that any new parks and recreation requirements will be based on new people moving into the Township and that is where the money should be coming from. Mr. Henke stated that when he read the land development agreement that was presented it raised hackles. Mr. Henke stated that he looks at ordinances every day throughout this county, Lebanon County and the State of Ohio and he sees developers agreements. Mr. Henke stated that he has been on the other side of these agreements and has had to sign them. Mr. Henke stated that he could say that this agreement has a lot of the information that you would find in a subdivision/land development ordinance. Mr. Henke stated that he feels that it is wrong to try to implement this agreement without having the support of an ordinance. The improvement agreement mentioned earlier is a document, as Mr. Smith identified it, and it is similar in nature to what the land development agreement is trying to do. It has language that speaks to the process, the sequence, has the cost estimate that lists all the improvements and a dollar amount associated with them so when the improvements are done the developer request a reduction. The reduction does not happen until the Township Engineer, the County Engineer, or the consultant hired goes out and inspects it and only then, after the professionals that are paid to be on your side makes the inspections and supports the reduction, is the reduction offered. There is protection in the fact that you have a binding document that gives you teeth to get the plan built as designed. Mr. Henke continued by stating that if the reason for this agreement is to pull in more money for more parkland, collect more fees, and traffic improvements, than I think doing that through the subdivision/land development ordinance is probably better suited. Mr. Henke stated that there are some things in the document, in his opinion, that is completely illegal; Mr. May did indicate that the Township Solicitor did not look at the document yet. Mr. Henke stated that maybe it is the right time to start talking about an ordinance. Mr. Henke stated that he has been involved from the other side of the table working with other counties and getting their approval versus a municipality that has their own codes; there are pros and cons to each one but from the municipal standpoint, the administration fees as it was attested to, would be incurred. Mr. Henke gave an example. There was some discussion on the fees involved. Mr. Henke stated that, in his opinion, without an ordinance to back up the agreement, adopting a land development agreement first is not the right sequence for this to occur. Ms. Glazier stated that there is a down side to all the regulations and requirements in that it is much harder to build affordable housing today than it was fifty years ago when you could put up anything. The reality is that today there are not many people that want to go in and build something that is low cost. Mr. Ahlfeld asked the officials present as to where they wanted the Commission to go tonight with this agreement. Mr. Smith stated that the Board directed staff to expedite the process of reviewing having our own subdivision/land development ordinance. This is the document that would follow having the ordinance. Mr. Haverstick made a motion that the Commission encouraged the Supervisors to thoroughly study the issue as to whether or not the Township should adopt our own ordinance. Mr. Haverstick recommended to the Board of Supervisors that they continue their interest in a study of some kind as to whether or not it would behoove the Township to adopt a subdivision/land development plan of their own. Mary Glazier seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously. Mr. Bauder asked the question of how the Planning Commission visualized being involved. Mr. Smith stated that staff will look at not only what is being done in some other municipalities but literally go to some people who are familiar with the MPC process so that the Township will know whose role is what. Mr. Haverstick stated that

clearly their role is a recommending body. Mr. Bauder asked if the Supervisors are to bring the pros and cons before the Commission. Mr. Bauder stated that he felt that will prolong the process. Mr. Bauder stated that he thinks they should move forward. Mr. Smith stated that their target is to have concise information for the October Supervisors meeting. Mr. Smith stated that it is within the power of the Board of Supervisors to decide, if they choose to, to have staff recommendation or Planning Commission recommendation. Mr. Haverstick stated he does not think having this done by October is particularly critical. Mr. Smith addressed the stormwater agreement stating that a document was given for their consideration. Mr. Smith stated that there are technical issues that need to be reviewed by the solicitor and engineer. Mr. Smith asked that the Commission take a look at it and give recommendation as to whether they agree or disagree with the agreement. Mr. Smith stated that in this case the Township has its own Ordinance. Mr. Smith asked that not a lot of time be spent on detail. Mr. Henke asked if issues that have developed on plans that have been built precipitate this agreement and Mr. Smith stated that he could not answer that question. Mr. Bauder stated that he believes the intent is in the maintenance of stormwater facilities.

Other Business Act 537 Mr. Smith stated Act 537 is still on hold primarily because Manheim Township has not had their public hearing. Regional Comprehensive Plan Update Mr. Ahlfeld stated that the consultants are still headed toward having a complete draft by the end of October. There is a subcommittee working on the future land use plan to do some refinements. At the Steering Committee meeting last week, we talked about the draft resolution by which municipalities will be asked to adopt the plan when completed and in effect they will be adopting the plan as part of their local plan, which may also include an existing local comprehensive plan and any other documents as a package that will make up the new plan. Correspondence Ms. Glazier stated that she had the Pennsylvania Rural Development Conference Rural Summit brochure if anyone is interested and the Governors Center for Local Government Services Municipal Training Calendar for the year if anyone is interested. A letter was received from the LCPC regarding the final plan for Bernice E. Knight which will be considered on October 11 for final approval. A letter was received from the LCPC regarding the final plan approval of Millstone Village and Hershey Manor with conditions.

Mr. Ahlfeld stated a reminder that the Community Planning Course is coming up starting on September 27.

Mr. Ahlfeld stated that the next Planning Commission meeting would be Monday, October 17, 2005. There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 9:00 a.m.

Respectfully submitted

Mary Glazier Secretary

Recording Secretary Evelyn Rineer
Planning Commission Meeting
10/17/05

initially scheduled for Oct 11

DRAFT Manor Township Planning Commission Minutes

Monday, October 17, 2005 Time: 7:30 P.M.

The Manor Township Planning Commission held its regularly scheduled meeting on Monday, October 17, 2005 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, James Miller, Donald Witmer and Mary Glazier. Member Absent: Beth Herr Visitors Present: Joel Snyder, RGS Assoc. Craig Hohman, 2109 Manor Ridge Dr. Todd Shoaf, Rettew Associates Melissa Kelly, RGS Assoc. Jay Ebersole, Weber Surveyors David Breneman, 3346 River Rd. Elaine Jones, Lancaster Newspaper Danny Whittle, LCPC Eric Eberly, Arrow Consulting Bryan Gerlach, Manor BIC Church John May, 100 Red Fox Rd.

Minutes Mr. Haverstick made a motion to approve the minutes as written. Mr. Henke seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously.

Public Comment Danny Whittle stated John Ahlfeld was recognized at the Pennsylvania Planning Association meeting for his distinguished service to the planning profession. Mr. Whittle stated Mr. Ahlfeld was instrumental in organizing the Pennsylvania Planning Association as known today and Mr. Ahlfeld has served in many offices in the association. He has served as the Executive Director of the Lancaster County Planning Commission and the Executive Director of the Lancaster Inter-Municipal Committee.

Old Business Mr. Ott stated last month that Mr. Smith passed out a stormwater management agreement. Mr. Ott stated since then he was informed that due to Act 167 which deals with the Conestoga River that they will be doing an update to the stormwater ordinance and at that time this agreement can be considered. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that there is a copy of a letter from Solicitor, Tom Goodman, which has the specific proposal for the amendment to the zoning ordinance that was recommended previously having to do with the ability to increase the permitted height of buildings in the commercial zone in exchange for increasing the setbacks for the property lines. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that the wording is consistent with the recommendation that the Planning Commission made. This will now go to the Supervisors for their action.

New Business William & Shirley Rice Lot Add-On Plan - The property is located at 153 Pittsburg Valley Road, Conestoga, PA. The plan shows Lot A containing 4,660 square feet (.107 acres) is being added to the parcel owned by William & Shirley Rice containing 326,285 square feet (7.49 acres). The property is located in the Rural Zoning District. The Commission needs to review and make comments to the LCPC on this lot add-on plan. Eric Eberly, from Arro Consulting, represented the plan. Mr. Eberly stated that the plan is basically a minor subdivision plan to allow the shared use of the driveway between the Schopf property and the Rice property. There will be an easement to allow both properties to use the joint driveway. There was a

correction in the dimensions on the plan. Mr. Ahlfeld asked if the sharing of the driveway has been done over the years and now they just want to formalize it and Mr. Eberly stated that was correct. Mr. Eberly stated that the Rices are looking at the possibility of an addition to their home and this would allow them to have the appropriate setbacks. Mr. Henke stated that while changes are being made, Mr. Eberly might want to look at some of the review certificates because the certificates on the plan may not all be applicable. Mr. Witmer questioned if there was a right-of-way on the west side of the property left off the plan. Mr. Eberly stated that he was not aware of the right-of-way. Mr. Witmer stated that there is a right-of-way and it needs to be shown on the plan. Mr. Henke made a motion to recommend to the LCPC approval of the Rice lot add-on subject to the investigation of the right-of-way located along the northwest boundary. Ms. Glazier seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously.

Stonemill Development Sketch Plan Waiver Requests: Three Meeting Waiver Delay and Section 604.04.b Specific Lot Configuration Req. Side Lot Lines - The property is located on the east side of Donerville Road, plus/minus 1500 feet south of Weaver Road. This site is adjacent to the Woods Edge Development. Stonemill subdivision is located on plus/minus 93 acres in Manor Township. The subdivision will consist of 209 single family lots, 108 townhouse lots and the existing farmstead. The design complies with the Manor Township Zoning Ordinance for RH1 High Density Residential Flex Zone. The Stonemill Subdivision is located within the Lancaster County urban Growth boundary and achieves a density of 3.40 units per acre. The design intent is to create a mix of single family detached units and townhouse units with some pocket parks scattered throughout the site. The existing farmstead will remain on a single 15-acre lot located adjacent to Somerville Road. The Commission needs to review and make comments on the sketch plan and waiver request Sec. 604.04.B Specific Lot Configuration Requirements - Side Lot Lines. Also, the Commission needs to take action on the waiver of the three meeting delay. Joel Snyder, from RGS Associates, presented the plan. Melissa Kelly, from RGS Associates, was also present. Mr. Snyder stated that the sketch plan is very similar to what was presented at a previous meeting. Mr. Snyder stated that the Township went through the process of rezoning this tract to high-density flex zoning from the medium density. Townhouses are proposed in the area adjacent to the newest phase of the Woods Edge Development. The applicant is looking at a density within the overall developed area of four units to the acre. The applicant is looking at building 24 foot wide town homes. The area was reconfigured so that one of the streets actually has a terminus with one of the open spaces which is central to the townhouse portion of the development. The open space is approximately one-half of an acre. The smaller single family lots are 60x 110. Adjacent to the fifteen (15) acre farmstead, the applicant is looking at single family lots that are 80x 110. We had examined ways to increase density because that was one of the things discussed the last time it was before the Planning Commission. The applicant designed two central open spaces each approximately one acre in size. There is one small tot lot that will be provided. The ordinance requires two acres of recreation space and we are providing 2 ½ acres; with the stormwater basin areas there is another six acres of open space intermixed throughout the development. Stonemill Road is still proposed to be extended to Donerville Road. The applicant has met with PennDot regarding the intersection of Donerville and Stonemill Roads to start the dialogue with PennDot and the one thing they are continuing to look into is the farm to the south (Elizabeth Shertzer Farm), which is in agricultural preserve. Currently, we have looked at a street design that lines up the road at the intersection although some of the road and right-of-way is located on the preserved farm. We

may or may not be able to line up the intersection. The applicant is meeting with the local agricultural preserve office at the end of the month. Also, we have continued to work with LASA on the off site sewer. We would like to use a gravity system to the pump station at the intersection Weaver and Donerville Roads. LASAs long term plans are to build a gravity line down through the Musser and Charles farms to Habecker Church Road. Mr. Eberly stated that there is an old easement that exists through the two farms. Mr. Miller asked what the change was in the unit count and Mr. Snyder stated that they were around 256 units before and is now up to 317 units. Mr. Ahlfeld asked what the break down was between the two single-family lot sizes. Mr. Snyder stated that there are 157 of the small lot singles and 52 of the larger lot singles. Mr. Snyder stated that it is roughly 77 ½ acres and they are at approximately four units per acre in the developed portion. Mr. Haverstick asked where the parking is for the most part and Mr. Snyder stated the driveway and the garage. They are exploring some alternatives in the townhouse. They have looked at the possibility of getting on street parking with the bump out configuration. Mr. Haverstick asked about garages and Mr. Snyder stated that all the units will have garages with some being single and others will be double. Mr. Henke asked if the discharge of Basin C must be addressed and Mr. Snyder stated that they have explored it and fortunately there is a conservation plan for the farm and there is a grass water way that extends up roughly to their property line and with that in place they are able to discharge into the grass water way without any further approvals from the Agricultural Preserve Board. Mr. Henke questioned Basin A and B to the north and asked if there are defined discharge points. Mr. Snyder stated that they have looked at piping Basin B through Basin A over to Donerville Road and down Donerville Road to the stream in the event they are unable to work out discharge easements on the Stauffer property. They have also talked to the County Conservation District to make sure they were aware they might not be able to get downstream easements. Mr. Snyder stated that they had talked to Mr. Smith about the easements. Mr. Ahlfeld asked who would own the open space. Mr. Snyder stated that it could be dedicated to the Township or be owned by a homeowners association. The basins would most likely be a homeowners association responsibility. Mr. Ahlfeld asked if the open space would be open for the public use and Mr. Snyder stated that could be arranged. Mr. Ahlfeld asked where the sidewalks would be and Mr. Snyder stated that the sidewalks will be on both sides of the street. Mr. Ahlfeld questioned what was envisioned for the remnant piece of land at the southern most point. Mr. Snyder stated it may be landscaped or they could offer it to the neighbors. Mr. Miller stated that one of the comments from the Builders for the Bay was they are not encouraging sidewalks on both sides of the street and Manor Township was one of the participants in that. Mr. Miller stated that he is not saying it is not warranted in some situations, but the Builders for the Bay are very much opposed to sidewalks on both sides in a general sense. Mr. Haverstick made a motion to approve the waiver of the three meeting delay. Mr. Miller seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously. Mr. Miller made a motion to recommend to the LCPC approval of the waiver for the radial lot line requirement. Mr. Haverstick seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously. Mr. Miller stated he was making a general comment stating that they did appreciate that the applicant took the Commissions comments with respect to the density and the reconfiguration. Mr. Miller stated that an increase of 60 lots is a vast improvement but it still only hits the average that is occurring today in Lancaster County and will fall short of what the Growth Management Update is going to recommend. Mr. Haverstick stated that he agreed with Mr. Miller and Mr. Haverstick indicated he would have liked to see more open space. Mr. Ahlfeld asked if they looked at combining the two smaller open spaces into a larger area. Mr. Snyder stated that they looked at

that but went with the option of the two parcels so the open space was more spread out. Ms. Glazier stated that linear open space would be narrower but would give access to more people and allows for walking or biking around the perimeter. Ms. Glazier stated that she agreed with Mr. Miller. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that maybe they could look at some possibility of easements for the people in the townhouses on the northern edge of the townhouse area to be able to cut through to get to the little park instead of having to go around the block. Mr. Snyder stated that there are some opportunities in further refinement of the plan for those pathways. Mr. Whittle asked how the sum of the open space compares to the required dedication calculations. Mr. Snyder stated that the requirement would be two acres and the park sites themselves provide 2 ½ acres of open space. The ordinance does allow them to use a little of the detention basin type open space. Mr. Snyder stated that there are nine acres of open space intermixed within the development. Mr. Snyder stated that one of the things they heard in the previous meetings was active recreation was not necessarily what some people were looking for. Steven Shue, 127 Stable Drive, asked how the open space is determined. Mr. Snyder stated it is based on population. Mr. Henke asked if the basins would be useable as open space. Mr. Snyder stated there is a good chance the basins will be wet. Craig Hohman, 2109 Manor Ridge Drive, asked Mr. Snyder to identify the roads that actually go into the development. Mr. Henke asked questions on the streets and the cul-de-sacs.

Manor Brethren-In-Christ Lot Add-On - The property is located on Central Manor Road at Manor Church Road. The plan shows Lot 3 containing 6.8846 acres being added to the lands of Manor Brethren-In-Christ Church. The total lot will contain 23 acres. The property is located in the Agricultural (A) Zoning District. The Commission needs to review and make comments to the LCPC on this lot add-on plan. Jay Ebersole from Weber Surveyors presented the plan. Mr. Ebersole stated that this is a lot add-on for Manor Brethren-In-Christ Church that is approximately seven acres and runs the full length of the church. The purpose of the lot add-on plan is primarily for recreational use. Mr. Ahlfeld asked if there would be a land development plan in the near future. Mr. Gerlach stated that this is a recreation space area that will be available for the community. Prior to the addition several years ago at the church, they had a ball field on the property. Mr. Gerlach stated that because it is seven acres and sloping quite a bit there will be some need to move dirt around. They are in contact now with David Miller Associates to look at land development, stormwater management, etc. It is very likely the next step will be land development in that area. Mr. Haverstick made a motion to recommend to LCPC approval of the lot add-on as submitted. Mr. Miller seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously.

David E. & Aimee T. Breneman Lot Add-On Plan The property is located 184 Pittsburg Valley Road, Conestoga, PA. The plan joins in common the lands currently owned by David & Aimee Breneman, marked Lot 2 containing 1.14 acres, with Lot 2A containing 4.1478 acres to create a combined lot containing 5.28 acres. The property is located in the Rural Zoning District. The Commission needs to review and comment to the LCPC on this lot add-on plan. Jay Ebersole, from Weber Surveyors, presented the plan. Mr. Ebersole stated that when the project began, the Brenemans owned a 1.8 acre tract and had an agreement with Robert Wise who owned an 8 acre parcel to do a lot add-on. Since then, Mr. Breneman purchased the 8 acre tract and is now continuing with the lot add-on plan. Mr. Brenemans intention is to add the four acres he originally planned to add to his property and probably sell the remaining four acres with the

existing house and barn on it. The Breneman property has no road frontage and there is a right-of-way agreement from the rear of the property to River Road shown on the plan in the lower left corner. This lot add-on plan is mostly wooded and it splits the 8 acres in half. There will be four acres with the house and barn. It also would give Mr. Breneman a 30 wide access strip of ownership if he would chose to put a driveway in from Pittsburg Valley Road at some point in the future. Mr. Haverstick made a motion to recommend to the LCPC approval of the lot add-on plan. Mr. Witmer seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously.

111 Millersville Road Final Land Development Plan & Waiver Requests - The proposed plan involves a single 1.06 acres subject tract as represented on the plans. The subject tract provides for an existing commercial/business facility including an existing office, garage, and associated parking facilities. The lot is located on the southeast corner of Temple Avenue and Millersville Road in Manor Township, Lancaster County, PA. The plans propose an additional two story 4,155 square foot building for an expansion of the existing sites use. Associated with the property building will be required parking, existing parking modifications, circulation facilities, and stormwater management facilities. Access to the subject tract is currently served by a public alley fronting on Temple Avenue and the existing access drive from the alley. The proposed plans maintain this existing access to the site. The proposed land development of the subject tract will continue to be served by existing public sanitary sewer and water facilities. The property is located in the Commercial Office Zoning District. The following waivers from the LCSDLDO are being requested: - Article 3, Sec. 302 Preliminary Plan Application - Article 5, Sec. 602.06 Sidewalks - Article 5, Sec. 602.05.A Curbing/Parking Compounds - Article 5, Sec. 603.03 Bicycle Parking Facilities - Article 5, Sec. 609.06 Hazards Associates with Carbonate Rock Also, the Planning Commission is being requested to waive the three meeting delay requirements of the LCPC. The Commission needs to review and comment on the Final LDP and waiver requests from the LCSDLDO and take action on the waiver of the three meeting delay. Mr. Ahlfield stated that Mr. Henke would be excusing himself from the discussion since he is the owner of the property. Todd Shoaf, from Rettew Associates, presented the plan. Mr. Shoaf stated that the subject tract consist of approximately one acre and is located on the southeast of the intersection of Temple Avenue and Millersville Road. It is currently occupied by one commercial building that is occupied by two separate consulting firms as well as a freestanding garage and approximately 11 parking spaces. The remainder of the site is landscaped and covered in grass. The current access to this site is from Temple Avenue by way of an existing alleyway off Temple Avenue. The existing parking lot accesses onto that access alley drive. The Applicant is proposing to construct a two-story office building consisting of approximately 8300 square feet total as well as providing 35 parking spaces. Other site improvements would include a dumpster pad, on-site stormwater management and a detention basin. The plans were submitted to the conservation district and plans have been submitted for the stormwater connection into the existing stormwater conveyance facility in Millersville Road. Those plans were submitted to PennDot. Public sewer and public water currently service the site. The Township Engineers comment letter regarding the stormwater management has been received and there were four or five comments and none of the comments were technical. With that letter, the Township Engineer did recommend approval of the one waiver request from the Township Stormwater Management Ordinance. Mr. Shoaf went through the following waiver requests: 1) Stormwater Management Waiver Request that waiver is Article 4, Sec. 453.7 involving the 1 free board within the spillway. The detention basin located in the southwestern corner of this tract is an

above ground basin. This basin was sized using the SCS method as required by the Township Ordinance. The SCS method is mostly reviewed for watersheds that are rather large versus small watersheds such as this site. The actual watershed going into this basin is approximately .6 acres. Mr. Shoaf stated that it is their belief that the basin is a little oversized but they are meeting the requirements of the Township Ordinance as it relates to detention for storms up to a 100-year storm event. The actual waiver request is for the amount of free board within the spillway. Provided currently is 4 of free board. Mr. Shoaf explained how the flow was calculated and gave a description of the basin. Mr. Shoaf stated that the amount of volume coming out of the spillway during a 100 year storm is 5.5 CFS that is actually a small number as it relates to the overall site. We feel the 4free board is adequate and the Township Engineer has recommended approval of the waiver. 2) Request is being made for the three meeting delay waiver. Mr. Shoaf stated that they are requesting the following five waivers from the County Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance: 1) Preliminary Plan Application Section 302. We have submitted plans including all required information for a final plan submission versus just a preliminary plan. We have met with the Township Staff and the County Planner to discuss this project prior to the actual engineering of the site before the submission. Being this is a small site with an existing access and served by public utilities, we feel the County can adequately review this plan as a final plan. 2) Sidewalks Sec. 602.06. The applicant is requesting no proposed sidewalks along Millersville Road; however, the applicant is proposing to provide sidewalk along Temple Avenue. Mr. Shoaf stated that it is their belief that providing sidewalk along Millersville Road could actually create an unsafe condition. The PennDot roadway is classified as an arterial road and currently there is no sidewalk on the entire frontage. There is a somewhat steep embankment along the frontage of Millersville Road and shaving back a portion could disrupt the root system of the mature trees on the site. Mr. Haverstick asked if there is any other sidewalk on Temple Avenue. Mr. Henke stated that there is a small portion along the frontage of the school on Temple Avenue that is bituminous. Mr. Ahlfeld asked if there is any sidewalk along Millersville Road and he was informed that there is a small section on the west side near the corner of W. Fairway Drive where you turn to the Township Building. Ms. Glazier stated that she does not understand how having a sidewalk would make it more dangerous then not having a sidewalk. Mr. Miller stated do you want to encourage pedestrians to walk on that road where to date they have not and do they have any plans to put sidewalks on that road. Ms. Glazier stated that her concern would be that if you do not begin to put sidewalks in, there would never be any incentive to put them in. People do walk along that road from time to time. Ms. Glazier stated that if you were able to get off the road at any point it would be beneficial. Mr. Haverstick stated that he would never consider walking there nor does he see a market for anybody walking there. Mr. Ahlfeld asked if the applicant would consider a plan note that if sidewalks would be required to be installed in the future that they would provide them. Mr. Shoaf stated that note could be added. 3) Curbing and Parking Section 602.05A Currently the existing parking lot is not curbed and there is no curbing on the site. Mr. Shoaf stated that they are proposing to curb the new parking facility on the south side of the existing parking area. Mr. Shoaf stated that it is their belief that if proposed curbing would have to be placed on the existing parking lots there would be some elevation differences that would have to be negotiated. The existing grade comes right onto the pavement and by raising the existing grade up 8, it would adversely affect the pavement in front of the garage. There would have to be curb cuts in front of the garage and in various areas for the sidewalk connections as well as the paved area beside the garage itself. Mr. Miller asked if bumper blocks would be proposed in lieu of curbing. Mr. Shoaf stated that they do not

propose bumper blocks. Mr. Haverstick asked what the function of the curbing is in a parking lot like this one. Mr. Shoaf stated that the curbing provides some sort of separation between possibility pedestrian traffic and parking traffic. Mr. Shoaf stated that it is his belief that bumper blocks, in this instance, creates a hindrance for snow plowing.

4) Bicycle Parking Facilities Section 603.03. Mr. Shoaf stated that two consulting firms occupy the existing building and it is anticipated the same use would be proposed within the proposed building. Currently, individuals do not ride to work on their bicycles nor do visitors. The prospect clients coming to this facility all arrive by vehicles and the applicant feels that a parking lot bike rack is not needed for this use. Mr. Glazier asked what the down side would be of having a bicycle rack that someone could use if they did ride a bicycle. Mr. Shoaf stated the price of purchasing a bicycle rack. Mr. Shoaf stated that bicycles could be put in the existing garage. Ms. Glazier asked if the ordinance states that it must be a rack. Ms. Glazier was advised just some sort of parking facilities are required.

5) Hazards Associates with Carbonate Rock Section 609.06. The applicant looked at the study mapping and performed a site visit and in both instances there was no indication of any sinks holes. A note was added to the cover sheet stating that, if during construction any types of sinkholes are encountered, the engineer for the Township would be notified and a professional geologist called on site to make a determination. Mr. Haverstick asked if screening was an issue and Mr. Shoaf stated screening is provided. Steven Shue asked if an additional building is being proposed on the lot. Mr. Shue was advised that a building is proposed. Mr. Shue asked what the distance was between the new building and the existing building. Mr. Shue was advised that there would be approximately 110. Craig Hohman expressed concerns regarding the alleyway being used by the increased traffic from the site as well as the water runoff from the proposed improvements. Mr. Hohman stated that he would like to see some type of natural barrier that would prevent vehicles from driving through the alleyway but allow for walking. Mr. Miller stated that Mr. Homans concern regarding the alley would have to be directed to the Supervisors, because if it is a recorded public street, vacating that or obstructing that has to come from the Supervisors. Mr. Ott stated that he believed that Mr. Smith allowed Mr. Henke to be paved part of the alley. Mr. Henke stated that he contacted the neighbors and advised them of his intentions of paving and asked if they would like extra paving put in so that they would have access to their driveway. Mr. Miller asked Mr. Ott if there is a definition for a public alley and Mr. Ott stated he is not aware of a zoning definition. Mr. Hohman stated that the alleys were designed for residential areas and now the frontage on Millersville Road has all been rezoned for commercial which backs up to the residences back yards. Mr. Ahlfeld asked for clarification for the purpose of this land development plan. He asked if the applicant has the right to use this alley as their access and Mr. Ott stated he believed so. Mr. Ahlfeld asked who is responsible for any improvements to the alley and Mr. Ott stated that our solicitor would have to look at that. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that the plan says public alley so that must be clarified as to what the alley is. Mr. Shoaf advised Mr. Hohman how the run off is being handled and stated there would be a 50 percent reduction in the water runoff. Mr. Miller made a motion to recommend to the LCPC the approval of the preliminary plan. Ms. Glazier seconded the motion and the motion carried with Mr. Henke abstaining. Mr. Haverstick made a motion to recommend to the LCPC that they grant the waiver for sidewalk with a plan note that if sidewalks are ever placed in this area, they must be constructed. Mr. Witmer seconded the motion and the motion carried 3-2 with Mr. Henke abstaining. Mr. Miller made a motion to recommend to the LCPC the waiver of the curbing and parking compound requirements. Ms. Glazier seconded the motion and the motion carried with Mr. Henke abstaining. Mr. Miller made a motion to recommend to the LCPC the waiver of

outside bicycle parking but that it is provided somewhere. Ms. Glazier seconded the motion and the motion carried with Mr. Henke abstaining. Mr. Miller made a motion to recommend to the LCPC the waiver of the Carbonate Rock with a note put on the plan that was suggested by the applicant. Mr. Witmer seconded the motion and the motion carried with Mr. Henke abstaining. Mr. Haverstick made a motion to waive the three meeting delay. Mr. Miller seconded the motion and the motion carried with Mr. Henke abstaining. Mr. Miller made a motion that we take our engineering consultants recommendation and grant the waiver request for the stormwater management plan. Mr. Witmer seconded the motion and the motion carried with Mr. Henke abstaining.

Other Business - Letter from David Miller Associates Act 14 Notification for the connection to existing sanitary sewer for the Manor Oaks Remaining Lands Phase 3 Plan. This is an information letter only.

- Act 537 Update There was nothing new to report.

- Regional Comprehensive Plan Update - Mr. Ahlfeld stated that they are expecting a complete draft from the consultants at the end of this month. They will probably have a public forum in December and send out the municipal adoptions after the first of the year.

- Correspondence from Commission Secretary Ms. Glazier stated that she received a letter from the LCPC regarding the approval of the preliminary plan for Timson Place with conditions.

Mr. Whittle stated that regarding the Act 537 Plan, the Manheim Township portion has been submitted to the County for review and so it is completed and on the agenda for next Monday. Mr. Miller asked if DEP needs to comment on the plans as they come up for adoption. Mr. Whittle stated that DEP will comment when the whole plan is done.

Mr. Haverstick stated at the October Supervisors meeting an issue came up relevant to the newly enacted Burning Ordinance. Mr. Haverstick stated that while it does not affect the Commission directly, he would like some input from the Commission. Mr. Haverstick stated that an individual who has a 100 acre farm zoned Industrial and the property is farmed is prohibited from burning by statute. Mr. Haverstick stated that he feels that if the usage would otherwise allow him to burn, then he is not sure it is right not to allow the individual to burn. Mr. Haverstick stated that he feels it is a land use issue and that is what this Commission deals with. There was discussion on the issue and it was determined that the Supervisors are the only ones who can make changes or exceptions.

Mr. Miller read two sentences from the August Supervisors minutes. Mr. May stated that in the past the Supervisors failed to pass some waiver requests onto the Manor Township Planning Commission for their comments before making a decision and he feels that these agreements should be passed onto the Manor Township Planning Commission for their review comments. Mr. Bauder felt that the agreements have been past due, and he wanted to move ahead with them now and did not want to get bogged down and waste time with other Boards reviewing them. Mr. Miller stated that his question is the Manor Township Planning Commission a waste of time and if so then they should be disbanded. Mr. Miller stated that he is extremely disappointed by that

statement and he is looking for a way to address this. Mr. Miller stated that the whole question speaks of two things: 1) it was the first time that the agreement was on the agenda so were there conversations about that agreement before it got to that agenda that people made up their minds about it without our input, and 2) Are we superfluous here? Mr. Haverstick stated that they had a frank discussion with the three Supervisors that were here last meeting about that very thing and Mr. Haverstick stated they were satisfied with their answers. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that there was agreement that they sort of jumped the gun and moved too fast before they understood exactly how everything relates to each other. Mr. Miller stated that the comment happened to be in that context so is the Commission comments a waste of time. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that is one Supervisor speaking on one issue. Mr. Haverstick stated that he does not think so and he does not get the impression that the Board by enlarge feels that way. Mr. Miller stated that he agrees with that statement but on the other hand we have a Supervisor who thinks we are a waste of time. Ms. Glazier stated that she would hesitate in reading too much into one comment where the phrasing may have been unfortunate but the general intention might not. Ms. Glazier stated that the best way to resolve it would be to ask him what he thought. Mr. Miller stated that he would like to invite him to a meeting and ask him just that question. Mr. Ahlfeld stated to Mr. Miller to go to a Supervisors meeting and Mr. Miller stated he could do that but then he is not representing the Planning Commission. Ms. Glazier stated that she went to the Community Planning Workshop and it was very interesting. Mr. Henke stated that John May was there and it would have been better if the other Supervisors could have heard what a Planning Commission is suppose to do. Ms. Glazier stated that is her point that the Supervisors can ask quite a bit of the Planning Commission if they choose to and the Planning Commission could be involved quite a bit more than we currently are in this Township. Mr. Haverstick asked Danny Whittle where the Commission fits in as an advisory capacity compared to some other townships. Mr. Whittle stated with regard to land development and subdivision issues, this Commission probably, at this moment, exercises much more direction than any other Planning Commission of a comparable size of activity simply because you are recommending to the County, which controls the final on subdivision/land development. It does not have to go back to your Supervisors so your comments that come out of the meeting tonight to the LCPC gets written into the reviews and to the approvals or conditions. Generally, except for a couple of circumstances, you are probably being listened to quite a lot. Mr. Haverstick stated that he feels that the Supervisors are respectful of the Planning Commission.

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 9:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary Glazier Secretary

Recording Secretary Evelyn Rineer

Planning Commission Meeting

11/14/05

Manor Township Planning Commission Agenda

Monday, November 14, 2005 Time: 7:30 P.M.

1. Call to Order
2. Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag
3. Roll Call
4. Approve Minutes of October Meeting
5. Public Comments

6. New Business B.C.Brubaker Lot Add-On Deferal Request The property is located at Prospect & Seitz Roads, Columbia, PA. The attached plans show a proposed two-lot subdivision, the lot add-on parcel and the remaining lands. Highlighted on the plan are the proposed lots and the portion of the remaining lands that is within Manor Township. The proposed lots and all improvements will be located within West Hempfield Township, over 400 feet away from the township line. There is approximately 14 acres of the farm within Manor Township. The applicant would ask that Manor Township agree to defer subdivision and DEP Sewage Planning Module approvals to West Hempfield Township. The Planning Commission needs to act on this request.

Marion M. Weaklim Trust Waiver Request of Sec. 303 of the LCDSLDO The property is located at 603 Shultz Road, Washington Boro, PA. On behalf of the owner of the above referenced property, the applicant is requesting a waiver of Section 303 of the Lancaster County Subdivision & Land Development Ordinance of 1991, as amended. This waiver is being requested in order to allow the creation of separate deeds for two tracts of land that were divided in 1951 by the purchase of a strip of land by PPL, 150 feet in width through the parent tract. The Commission needs to take action on the waiver request.

3868 Columbia Avenue Frank Hess Property & Waiver Requests - Mr. Frank Hess is proposing to construct a 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. As the enclosed sketch plan shows, there will be one access drive connection to Columbia Avenue. Because Columbia Avenue is a State Route, a Highway Occupancy Permit for a low volume driveway will need to be obtained from PADOT. The site will be served by public water and sewer. A Stormwater Management Plan will also be prepared and submitted at the Land Development Phase of the project. As part of this sketch plan submission, we are requesting three (3) waivers of the Lancaster County Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance. - Section 302 Preliminary Plan - Sec. 602.06.A Sidewalks - Sec. 602.20.B Intersection Separation The planning Commission needs to make recommends to the LCPC on the three waiver requests.

7. Other Business - Act 537 Update - Regional Comprehensive Plan Update - Correspondence from Commission Secretary

8. Adjourn

DRAFT Manor Township Planning Commission Minutes

Monday, November 14, 2005 Time: 7:30 P.M.

The Manor Township Planning Commission held its regularly scheduled meeting on Monday, November 14, 2005 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, James Miller, Donald Witmer and Mary Glazier. Member Absent: Beth Herr Visitors Present: Steve Gerkely, Harbor Engineering Inc. Elaine Jones, Lancaster Newspapers Jay Ebersole, Weber Surveying Bob Musser, 200 Donerville Rd Allen Kreider, 141 Supervisors Rd David Keener, Diehm & Sons Jim Huber, 113 Shannon Dr Bonnie Miller, 113 Bent Tree Dr Richard Bauder, 130 Sheep Ln Jim Stauffer, 365 Weaver Rd.

Minutes Mr. Henke made a motion to approve the minutes from the October 17, 2005 meeting as written. Mr. Haverstick seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously.

Public Comment There was no public comment.

New Business B.C.Brubaker Lot Add-On Deferral Request The property is located at Prospect & Seitz Roads, Columbia, PA. The attached plans show a proposed two-lot subdivision, the lot add-on parcel and the remaining lands. Highlighted on the plan are the proposed lots and the portion of the remaining lands that is within Manor Township. The proposed lots and all improvements will be located within West Hempfield Township, over 400 feet away from the township line. There is approximately 14 acres of the farm within Manor Township. The applicant would ask that Manor Township agree to defer subdivision and DEP Sewage Planning Module approvals to West Hempfield Township. The Planning Commission needs to act on this request. Dave Keener from Diehm & Sons presented the plan. Mr. Keener stated that this is part of the Brubaker Farm located along Seitz Road and Prospect Road. There is a proposal to subdivide the farm. Two small lots are to be taken off the tract which is located in the West Hempfield Township portion of the tract and the remaining lands are in West Hempfield and Manor Townships. There are no improvements being proposed on the portion located in Manor Township; therefore, what is before the Commission is a request to defer the planning to West Hempfield Township. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that Mr. Ott spoke to him regarding this property indicating the major part of the property is in West Hempfield Township and all the proposed activities are in West Hempfield Township. There is a precedent for the Commission to waive their right of review and giving West Hempfield Township total review authority for this kind of plan. Mr. Miller made a motion to defer the planning review to West Hempfield Township. Mr. Witmer seconded the motion. Mr. Haverstick asked what the legalities are of developing on the portion of the tract that remains in Manor Township. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that if they wanted to do something on the lot as it stands they could do it. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that the Township line is not a property line. Mr. Miller indicated that the portion of the tract in Manor Township would have

to abide by the Manor Township zoning regulations. Mr. Kreider stated that the application came before the Supervisors and they voted on it. Mr. Kreider stated that it does say on their copy (he did not know why the Supervisors got it before Planning Commission) that dwellings or other improvements upon the remaining land may not be placed within Manor Township. There was some question as to the zoning of the property and it was determined that it was zoned Agriculture. Ms. Glazier read a note from the plan regarding placement of the buildings. There was discussion on the request regarding the zoning that would apply to the tract. The motion carried unanimously.

Marion M. Weaklim Trust Waiver Request of Sec. 303 of the LCDSDLDO The property is located at 603 Shultz Road, Washington Boro, PA. On behalf of the owner of the above referenced property, the applicant is requesting a waiver of Section 303 of the Lancaster County Subdivision & Land Development Ordinance of 1991, as amended. This waiver is being requested in order to allow the creation of separate deeds for two tracts of land that were divided in 1951 by the purchase of a strip of land by PPL, 150 feet in width through the parent tract. The Commission needs to take action on the waiver request. Jay Ebersole from Weber Surveyors presented the plan. Mr. Ebersole stated that they are requesting a waiver of the subdivision procedure for an eight-acre tract and a tract just less than six acres on Shultz Road. These two tracts were created in 1951 when PP&L purchased a strip of land basically through the middle of the property, thereby, subdividing the parcel into two tracts. The deed was never changed or rewritten for the parent tract. This is now in an estate and we are working for the son, who is the executor of the estate. Mr. Ebersole stated that they are not creating a subdivision. Mr. Ebersole stated that they met with Bruce Ott and they agreed this was not subdivision. Mr. Goodman gave an opinion letter that this did not create a subdivision. Mr. Whittle stated that to make sure that there are no title issues or someone perceiving this as a violation of subdivision ordinance, he suggested that they submit a waiver request. The executors need to define the parcel with the existing house on the eight acres and the other tract has no buildings and is being offered for sale. Mr. Haverstick asked if the properties collectively were in Clean and Green. Mr. Ebersole state that he did not believe that they were in Clean and Green. Mr. Henke asked if the potential buyer of tract two would recognize that it is their obligation to find a suitable location for a sewer system. Mr. Ebersole stated yes and the buyer would be made aware. Mr. Ebersole stated that Mr. Weaklim had a probe inspection scheduled with Dave Lockard. Mr. Miller made a motion to recommend to the LCPC a waiver of the requirement for the subdivision plan for the Weaklim Trust Property. Mr. Henke seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously.

3868 Columbia Avenue Frank Hess Property & Waiver Requests - Mr. Frank Hess is proposing to construct a 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. As the enclosed sketch plan shows, there will be one access drive connection to Columbia Avenue. Because Columbia Avenue is a State Route, a Highway Occupancy Permit for a low volume driveway will need to be obtained from PADOT. The site will be served by public water and sewer. A Stormwater Management Plan will also be prepared and submitted at the Land Development Phase of the project. As part of this sketch plan submission, we are requesting three (3) waivers of the Lancaster County Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance. - Section 302 Preliminary Plan - Sec. 602.06.A Sidewalks - Sec.

602.20.B Intersection Separation The planning Commission needs to make recommends to the LCPC on the three waiver requests. Steve Gerkely from Harbor Engineering presented the plan. Mr. Gerkely stated that the property is in the Local Commercial Zoning District. It is approximately .06 acres and is currently vacant. Mr. Hess is proposing to construct a three-story building which will contain several uses. There will be four apartment units with two apartments on the upper floor and two on the lower floor and the middle floor will be a retail flooring show room and office. Associated with this, there will be 14 parking spaces and one access drive onto Columbia Avenue. There will be a stormwater management plan as per the Manor Townships Stormwater Ordinance and the LCPC Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance. Three waivers are being requested as well as a waiver of the three meeting delay requirement. Mr. Gerkely stated that the first waiver is for the waiver of a preliminary plan. It is just over the threshold for the preliminary plan requirement for the LCPC. The building is about 2400 square feet in floor plan area. It is a relatively minor plan and straightforward. There is only one point of access and there is no proposed sewer or water mains only the laterals. The traffic flow will be light from this development. Mr. Gerkely stated that all the information needed can be shown on the final plan. Mr. Ott and Mr. Whittle were in agreement. A waiver is being requested not to install sidewalks along Rt. 462. In the applicants opinion, it is not advantageous to put sidewalks in this area since they would not connect to any other sidewalks. A waiver is being requested for the intersection separation. According to Lancaster County Ordinance, it is a driveway, but it is subject to the same requirements as any street intersection. The requirement is 600 between intersections and in this case there is approximately 400 to Hershey Mill Road to the east and about 180 to the west for a future access road that is part of another subdivision that is occurring in that area. This is the only point of access to this site. Mr. Gerkely stated that Rt. 462 is a state road and the access drive will be subject to PennDot requirements for a low volume driveway. Mr. Gerkely stated that they are also requesting a waiver of the three meeting delay. Mr. Gerkely stated that the plan will go before the LCPC on December 12th and would probably be before this Commission in January. Mr. Miller questioned Mr. Gerkelys statement that the plan was just over the threshold. Does this statement refer to the size of the building? Mr. Gerkely stated that it refers to the size of the building. Mr. Henke asked where they envisioned the detention basin to go. Mr. Gerkely stated that there is not a lot of room on the site, but the basin would probably be in the lower southeastern corner. There maybe a combination of a detention basin and underground recharge underneath the parking lot. There currently exists a 15 stormwater pipe coming from across the street that must be rerouted and incorporated in the stormwater system. Mr. Haverstick asked if it is a flat lot and Mr. Gerkely stated it is sloped to the south. Mr. Ahlfeld asked if there are sidewalks on any adjoining properties and Mr. Gerkely stated that there is not any on the immediate adjoining properties. Ms. Glazier asked if there is not a high-density development directly to the west. Mr. Miller stated that the Manor Heights Development is being developed to the west. Ms. Glazier asked if that development would have sidewalks. She was advised that there are sidewalks being installed as part of that development. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that Mr. Ott mentioned there might be bus riders who want a place to stand. Mr. Gerkely stated that if that is a concern, they could provide a pad for bus riders. Mr. Gerkely stated that they did not feel sidewalks made sense at this time when they stop at both ends of the property line and do not connect. Ms. Glazier stated that someday they may connect and she feels they need to start somewhere. Mr. Miller stated that this is a project where he would not disagree with the need for sidewalks, because there is the retail center to the west and there is a sidewalk on one side of the street that is part of the access drive to Manor Heights. Shana Hess, wife of Frank

Hess, stated that regarding the sidewalks as it stands now, they would be more of a hazard because the sidewalks where they end now are half way up a hill and do not come down to Rt. 462. Ms. Hess stated that there is a sidewalk near Hershey Mill Road but then it stops abruptly. She wonders if it would be a safety issue. Mr. Miller stated that there are sidewalks that come all the way down from the shopping center to Rt. 462. Mr. Miller stated that the sidewalk would be a minor thing; it is not a lot of money and could easily be extended to connect to another network. Mr. Miller made a motion to recommend to the LCPC a waiver of the preliminary plan process. Ms. Glazier seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously. Mr. Miller made a motion to recommend to the LCPC that they do not grant the waiver of sidewalks. Ms. Glazier seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously. Mr. Haverstick made a motion to recommend to the LCPC a waiver of the intersection separation. Mr. Miller seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously. Ms. Glazier made a motion to recommend to the LCPC a waiver of the three meeting delay. Mr. Witmer seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously.

Other Business Act 537 Update Mr. Laudien stated that there was no update. Regional Comprehensive Plan Update Mr. Ahlfeld stated the first complete draft of the plan has been received approximately two weeks ago. Each municipality has received one copy of the draft and additional copies are being printed. The Steering Committee will be reviewing the draft and then there will be public forums. The intent is all the feed back from the Steering Committee and the public forums be taken into account and there will be a revised complete draft by the end of the year. Correspondence from the Commission Secretary Ms. Glazier stated she has notices of LCPC receiving requests and they are available if anyone would like to look at them.

Mr. Haverstick stated since there are two Supervisors present they may want to give an update on their deliberations about the Townships own subdivision plan that was discussed at the Supervisors meeting. Mr. Bauder stated that they passed a motion to pursue their own subdivision/land development ordinance. Mr. Kreider stated that they are turning it back to the Commission. Mr. Kreider stated that they feel strongly that they need their own ordinance. Mr. Bauder stated that they compared with surrounding townships that have their own ordinance that are similar to Manor Township and the County is inadequate in certain areas particularly in regard to parks, open space and infrastructure requirements. Mr. Laudien stated that the motion passed by the Supervisors was that the staff is to prepare with consultation of an engineer and solicitor a draft of the land development/subdivision ordinance that would then be turned over to the Supervisors and Planning Commission to go through the process of evaluation. Mr. Ahlfeld asked if they envisioned the consultants meeting with the Commission at one or more of the meetings to get input and discuss issues seen over the years need attention. Mr. Kreider stated that would be his recommendation. Mr. Kreider stated that another issue is what is going on right now regarding streetlights. Mr. Kreider stated that the County tells them where to put streetlights and if the Township had their own ordinance the developer would be responsible for putting street lights in and also to meter them and charge the people in that development. Mr. Kreider stated right now the astronomical cost of streetlights is getting out of hand and that is another example of things that could be controlled. Mr. Bauder stated that he looked at East Lampeters ordinance regarding streetlights. They have some options. Mr. Bauder stated that streetlights like in Woods Edge are useless and they are only decorative because one little tree can obstruct the light. Mr. Haverstick stated that the street light issue has really been a debacle from the start. Mr.

Haverstick stated that it is his understanding as of now that streetlights were required and he assumes the Township pays for them. Mr. Haverstick was advised that the developer pays for them. Mr. Laudien stated that the fees from PP&L are a combination of infrastructure charges to the developer and other charges that are attached to the bill. Mr. Haverstick stated his point is the township should not be on the hook for anything. Mr. Haverstick stated if the developer is required to have streetlights then that should be at the developers cost and however you deal with the electricity is another issue. Mr. Haverstick stated that the Township should not bear the burden of the construction or maintenance of streetlights. There was extensive discussion on the streetlight issues. Mr. Ahlfeld asked if the Supervisors have a consultant in mind or are they going through a consultant selection process and do they want the Commission to be involved. Mr. Kreider stated that has not been discussed. Mr. Kreider stated that it has been turned back to staff and hopefully they will submit things to the Commission. Mr. Laudien stated that their contention is to expedite the process and there are some fundamental foundations that every land development/subdivision ordinance needs in its preparation. There are some things that will not be controversial that will not need to be looked at and we want them to prepare those things for the review so the Commission can focus on things that will affect change or provide more control. Mr. Laudien stated the first step is to compile information they have, get the basis of a draft ordinance started and then proceed from there. Mr. Ahlfeld feels when a consultant is selected they should meet with them to brainstorm issues that have come up over the years that need to be addressed. Mr. Laudien stated the same process is occurring for the Park and Open Space Plan and they are in the process of putting it out for proposal. Mr. Ahlfeld stated despite the fact there is a Park and Recreation Board does Mr. Laudien envision that consultant meeting with the Commission to get some of their thinking regarding park and recreation issues and Mr. Laudien stated he hoped so.

Bonnie Miller asked if the Township ever questioned the bill from PP&L. Ms. Miller was advised to bring her question up at the Supervisors Meeting the Commission is not involved in that. Mr. Kreider stated they have talked to PP&L.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary Glazier Secretary

Recording Secretary Evelyn Rineer

Planning Commission Meeting

12/12/05

Manor Township Planning Commission Agenda

Monday, December 12, 2005 Time: 7:30 P.M.

1. Call to Order

2. Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag

3. Roll Call

4. Approve Minutes of November Meeting

5. Public Comments

6. New Business Kenneth G. & Terry W. Asche Lot Add-On The property is located on Spring Meadow Lane, Washington Boro, PA. Lot #5 is owned by David Charles and contains 15,007 sq. ft. Kenneth G. & Terry W. Asche own Lot #6. After the lot add-on, Lot #6 will contain 15,973 sq. ft. The lot add-on is being done so that the well for Lot #6 will be located on the lot. The property is zoned low density residential (RL). The Commission needs to review and make comments to the LCPC.

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. The Commission needs to review and submit comments to the Township Supervisor.

7. Other Business - Act 537 Update - Regional Comprehensive Plan Update - Correspondence from Commission Secretary

8. Adjourn

DRAFT Manor Township Planning Commission Minutes

Monday, December 12, 2005 Time: 7:30 P.M.

The Manor Township Planning Commission held its regularly scheduled meeting on Monday, December 12, 2005, 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, Scott Haverstick, James Henke, Donald Witmer and Mary Glazier. Member Absent: Jim Miller Visitors Present: Ken Asche, 116 Spring Meadow Rd. Jeff Butler, DM/A Planning Group Jim Huber, 113 Shannon Dr. Larry Kratz, Manheim Guy Eshelman, Donerville Rd Allen Kreider, 141 Supervisors Rd Bonnie Miller, 113 Bent Tree Dr John May, 100 Red Fox Rd Elaine Jones, LNP Jim Stauffer, 365 Weaver Rd Anton Kunkles, 3348 River Rd.

Minutes Mr. Henke made a motion to approve the minutes of November 14, 2005 as written. Mr. Witmer seconded the motion and the motion carried with Ms. Herr abstaining.

Public Comment There was no public comment.

New Business Kenneth G. & Terry W. Asche Lot Add-On The property is located on Spring Meadow Lane, Washington Boro, PA. Lot #5 is owned by David Charles and contains 15,007 sq. ft. Kenneth G. & Terry W. Asche own Lot #6. After the lot add-on, Lot #6 will contain 15,973 sq. ft. The lot add-on is being done so that the well for Lot #6 will be located on the lot. The property is zoned low density residential (RL). The Commission needs to review and make comments to the LCPC. Larry Kratz stated that he was representing Mr. Asche. Mr. Kratz stated that they have two lots and are taking some land away from the vacant lot and adding it to Mr. Asches lot in order that the existing well is on the correct lot. Currently, the well is on the vacant lot. The area of the lot remaining exceeds the minimum lot area required. Mr. Witmer asked if the well was put on the other property by mistake and Mr. Kratz stated that was correct. Mr. Kratz stated that it was only realized when the other property that is owned by Mr. Charles was surveyed. Mr. Haverstick asked if there are existing structures on both lots. Mr. Haverstick was advised that there are only structures on Mr. Asches lot. Mr. Henke asked if there is any sort of requirement from DEP regarding the lot line and distance that a lot line must be from the well. Mr. Kratz indicated that there are no restrictions on the distance that a well must be from the property line. Mr. Haverstick made a motion to approve the lot add-on plan as described. Ms. Herr seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously.

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. The Commission needs to review and submit comments to the Township Supervisor. Jeff Butler stated that he is a planner with David Miller Associates and represents the petitioner; the petitioner requesting the rezoning is the Murry Companies and Sher-Wal Inc. The lots in question are part of the revised final plan for the Woods Edge Development. Mr. Butler pointed out the location of the lots on a drawing. Mr. Butler stated that the two subject properties are on the north side of Cornerstone Drive. The total acreage requested for rezoning is 2.4 acres, which is comprised of two lots. Lot 1 is approximately 1.3 acres and the other lot adjoining to the east of Lot 1 is 1.1 acres. The surrounding land uses is the Woods Edge Development to the south, Interiors 2000 to the north, the rear of the Woods Edge shopping center to the east and Weaver Road to the west with some scattered single family residential and some commercial businesses that have access onto Weaver Road. The lots are in the general commercial (GC) zoning district; the zoning district includes the land from Columbia Avenue south to Cornerstone Drive and east to South Centerville Road. To the south is the high density residential (RH) zoning district in Woods Edge, to the west is the mixed residential commercial (MRC) zoning district that encompasses the area from Weaver to Donerville Roads, and southwest of the subject property there is medium density residential (RM) zoned properties. The site was part of a previously approved subdivision plan. There is public water and sewer available to the site. The stormwater system for Woods Edge Development accommodates the lot coverage that is permitted in not only the general commercial zoning district but also the proposed high density residential flex zoning district. The property is located within the urban growth area designated by the Township as well as in the draft LIMC Comprehensive Plan. The applicant is requesting a rezoning to high density residential flex to allow for the development of the tract as multi-family housing. They have

included in their application a sketch plan that depicts the potential development for the tract showing 28 residential multi-family units in three separate buildings. The applicant is asking for the high density residential flex district to allow for a reduction in the front yard setback, allowing the units to be located closer to Cornerstone Drive and present more of a residential feel to Cornerstone Drive. The parking area acts as a buffer from the commercial district to the north as well as the high density residential district to the south. The Township Comprehensive Plan does designate this particular tract as a commercial district; however, some of the identifiers of commercial area within the Comprehensive Plan indicate that this may not be one of the areas that was really discussed or targeted for a general commercial zoning district. This is the only general commercial zoning district tract that does not have direct access onto a collector or arterial roadway, which is one of the descriptors in the Comprehensive Plan for the general commercial zoning district. Access to this tract would probably be limited to Cornerstone Drive because of the site distance, configuration, and the distance from the intersection of Weaver Road and Post Oak Drive. It would be highly unlikely that an access drive for a commercial development could be gained off of Weaver Road. That access would have to come off Cornerstone Drive which is mostly residential. The petitioner believes that the proximity of the intersection, some of the open site constraints, and the fact that the residential character of the street would be maintained by allowing the residential district are reasons to approve the rezoning. We believe that the rezoning would be more fitting with the Comprehensive Plan although the plan does not designate this tract as such. Mr. Henke stated it was mentioned that these two parcels were apart of the original Woods Edge Plan. Mr. Butler stated that they were part of a revised final plan and was not part of the original plan. Mr. Butler stated that the two vacant lots were assumed to have lot coverage of 70% for the purpose of stormwater. Mr. Butler stated that there was no other land development plan done for the two parcels. Bonnie Miller, 113 Bent Tree Drive, stated that she would consider rezoning this piece of land spot zoning. To the north of the site is commercial, to the east of the lots is commercial, and to the west of the lots on the other side of Weaver Road the properties are zoned commercial even though they are residential. If there would be an additional twenty-eight (28) multi-family units put in, that is at least 56 additional cars. Interior 2000 does have an entrance and an exit onto Weaver Road from the back loading dock of the property. If the Planning Commission allows this, it is absolutely ridiculous. This is zoned commercial and should stay that way. Mr. Haverstick asked Ms. Miller if she was talking about the site from a traffic standpoint. Ms. Miller stated that she was talking about the site from a traffic standpoint. Ms. Miller stated that she feels if these units are going to be rental units, then they should be designated as such in the rezoning request. If these units are going to be property that is being sold, who is going to buy something that abuts Interiors 2000 and looks out on the east side to the back alley of Woods Edge Shopping Center? Ms. Miller stated that she feels that these units are going to be rentals units which will create at least 56 additional automobiles and that is absolutely ridiculous. Jim Huber, 113 Shannon Drive, asked what the plans are for the stormwater. Mr. Butler stated that at this point, the stormwater facilities for the entire Woods Edge Development accommodate any impervious surface that would be proposed on these particular lots. It would be collected and conveyed down to the existing ponds. Mr. Huber asked how the water would be conveyed. Mr. Butler stated that presently there is an end wall on this site that connects into the stormwater system for the development. A system would be designed that ties into that pipe that carries the stormwater down to the existing detention facilities. Mr. Huber asked if the applicant had asked for permission from the Woods Edge Homeowners Association. Mr. Butler stated that he believed

that this was part of the original plan and the owner has the right to utilize those facilities based on the design that was previously approved. Mr. Butler stated that this would be an issue that would be brought up during the land development process but at this point it was his understanding those two lots are part of the Woods Edge Development and were accommodated in that stormwater design. Mr. Butler stated that this property is currently zoned general commercial which is the most intensive commercial district. It allows the greatest range of commercial uses possible under the existing zoning ordinance. The applicant feels although Interiors has a drive onto Weaver Road, we do not believe a second driveway would be feasible onto Weaver Road because of the proximity to the intersection. There is less than 100 to the intersection of Weaver Road and Post Oak Drive from the property line. Mr. Butler stated that they did run some preliminary traffic numbers based on twenty-eight (28) apartment units or multi-family units versus a low intensity office use. We picked a 20,000 square foot office building for a comparison. The twenty-eight (28) dwelling units generate approximately 188 trips per day and the 20,000 square foot office building would generate 386 vehicles per day. If you get into something like a medical facility, where there is a higher turn over of people, those numbers go up greatly. Mary Glazier asked Mr. Butler if it is not too complicated, can he explain how he came up with the numbers for the traffic. Mr. Butler stated that the numbers are based on the Institute of Traffic Engineers Trip Generation numbers. It is an organization that studies traffic and various uses throughout the country. Traffic engineers as they are doing projects they do traffic studies on post development and report it back to the ITE. Those reports and numbers are compiled and on an average a 20,000 square foot office building generates X number of trips. This is published data and we then take that data and plug in the numbers. It is based on a national average for those types of land uses. Ms. Glazier stated that depending on what is in the 20,000 square foot office building, the trips could be more or fewer and Mr. Butler stated that is correct. Mr. Butler stated that the use can be much more defined in the type of use but they picked a generic office space. Mr. Butler stated that they believed that the 20,000 square feet of generic office space is probably one of the lowest numbers you would see if you would look at every use in the general commercial zone. Ms. Glazier asked how it would be different if the applicant looked at mixed residential commercial (MRC) instead of high density residential flex (RH1). Mr. Butler stated that they have not looked at that zoning district use. Ms. Miller stated that she has lived in Woods Edge for eighteen years and from the day the community was built that land was known to be commercially zoned. All the people who bought town homes bought them with the knowledge that across the street from them one day was going to be commercial. With this plan these people would be looking at twenty-eight (28) rental units rather than a commercial building. Ms. Miller stated that if a commercial building was placed there, the access could come out on Weaver Road like Interior 2000, or the access could be on the back alley that connects to the Woods Edge Plaza. Ms. Miller stated there is a water retention basin between 105 and 109 Bent Tree Drive that absolutely gets filled up now and if this site becomes blacktopped with twenty-eight (28) units, the stormwater will become absolutely crazy. There is no basin in the town homes on Cornerstone Drive for that reason. Jim Stauffer, 365 Weaver Road, stated that he agrees with Ms. Millers statement that the property was zoned commercial from day one. PennDot was going to put an office in there at one point and he read in the paper that they were going to do a drivers learning licensing center there. Mr. Stauffer questioned the number of units per acre and asked how many units per acre were across the road. Mr. Butler stated that it is probably the same. Mr. Butler stated that the only difference between the zoning district to the south and what they are proposing is that the high density residential flex district would allow

them to reduce the front yard set back. That way the applicant could put the units towards the road instead of having the parking area facing the roadway. Mr. Stauffer asked if sidewalks were included and Mr. Butler stated that they are showing sidewalks along Weaver Road that would tie into the sidewalks along Interior 2000 property. Mr. Stauffer stated he knows individuals trying to buy numerous houses to get lots for commercial property. Mr. Stauffer stated knowing that is happening he does not know there is a need to build townhouses when there are people trying to get commercial lots of land right next to it. Mr. Stauffer asked when Interiors 2000 has a tent sale where will they park cars. Will they be able to park cars on Weaver Road? The Commission asked where they park now and Ms. Miller stated that they park on the property before the Commission for rezoning. Mr. Ahlfeld asked if Interiors had permission to use the land for parking for the tent sale from whoever owns the land. Ms. Miller stated that probably they do. Mr. Stauffer stated that if it was a commercial office complex most likely there would be parking spaces available. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that one thing that must be remembered is once a tract is zoned whatever the zone is it can be used for any permitted use within that zone. While we might think it is general commercial and it might be a nice place for a doctors office or insurance office, it could equally be used for fast food, laundromat or anything permitted in the general commercial district. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that he is surprised with the comments made, because he thought the people on the south side of Cornerstone Drive would prefer to have a residential use across the street than the potential for the worse commercial that would be allowed in a commercial district. Ms. Miller asked if it would be possible to let the people know that there is a rezoning request so that they can come to the meeting. Mr. Haverstick stated that this meeting had been advertised. Mr. Ott stated that before the Supervisors would take action on the rezoning, the property would be posted. Mr. Haverstick stated that he agreed with Mr. Ahlfeld. Mr. Haverstick stated that a very good case was made to make this a residential block and he would assume the neighbors would have been very pleased. Ms. Miller stated that is assuming. Ms. Miller stated that no one was aware of this rezoning request. Mr. Ahlfeld asked Ms. Miller if she knew that the residents would be opposed to the rezoning. Ms. Miller stated that she could not speak for the residents. Mr. Haverstick stated that there would be an opportunity, before a decision is made by the Supervisors, for the residents to give their opinions. Mr. Witmer stated that as far as the commercial ground in that area, the Township is down to a limited supply. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that is another question. Mr. Butler stated there is about 180 acres zoned general commercial but he did not know how many acres were actually available. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that virtually all commercial property is on arterial and major collector roads; these tracts are not and he stated that he does not know if this tract has been available but obviously it has not been developed for 15 years. Mr. Ahlfeld asked if it has been a part of Mr. Butlers clients activity to get a legal opinion on the issue of spot zoning and Mr. Butler stated they have not. Mr. May stated that a question was raised regarding how much general commercial is left and Mr. May point out that Crossgates and the tract being discussed is what land is left as zoned general commercial. Mr. Witmer asked if the property has been for sale as a commercial lot. Mr. Butler stated he does not know that answer. Mr. Ahlfeld asked Mr. Butler if it would be possible to do close to what they wanted to do if it was zoned high density residential or MRC. Mr. Butler stated high density residential would give them the exact same project except it would put the parking out front along the street and put the units further back. Mr. Butler stated there is not enough lot depth to get the front yard setback and still get the parking in the back of the units. Mr. Butler stated that he is not familiar with the MRC District. Mr. Ahlfeld asked about the set back of the units on the south side of Cornerstone Drive and Mr. Ott replied

that they are set back 25. Ms. Miller stated from 5:00 p.m. on there are cars parking on both sides of Cornerstone Drive and you can only get one vehicle driving down the street. Mr. Butler stated they are not proposing to eliminate any parking spaces. Mr. Haverstick stated that the Commission is beginning to believe that the number of parking spaces is too light any way. They seem to be running into parking problems with the current statute so he believes realistically whatever parking problems exist now will be worse with meeting the Townships required formula. Mr. Henke asked the size of the units. Mr. Butler stated the units are the same as being built at this time near the pond and he does not know what the size is. Mr. Henke asked if there are driveways onto Weaver Road or Cornerstone. Mr. Butler stated everything would be internal and the only access drive would be through the parking lot onto Cornerstone Road. Mr. Henke asked if there would be garages and Mr. Butler stated no. Mr. Haverstick stated that this goes before the Supervisors and Mr. Ahlfeld advised the Commission that this is their opportunity to make recommendations to the Supervisors if they wish. Ms. Glazier stated that after hearing comments she is concerned that there is too little commercial space and she was concerned about what the impact would be on the neighborhood. Mr. Haverstick stated that his guess would be there really has not been interest in this property commercially or it would not have sat for 15 years and that to him would be an indicator that somebody did not feel it was viable to develop. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that people would have to know up front that whatever zoning district is being talked about, they will have to look at the impact of the worst case. If it is going to be flex residential you have to consider it is going to be developed at the highest density and if it is going to be general commercial you have to consider it is going to be the kind of commercial that generates the most possible traffic. Ms. Miller stated that she feels the units will be rental because no one would buy townhouses when they are looking over the roof of Interiors 2000. Mr. Haverstick stated that is an assumption. Mr. Huber stated the logical thing to do, as suggested, would be to postpone it for a month. Mr. Haverstick made a motion they ask Mr. Ott to put the rezoning request on the agenda again next month so they can have input from Township residents. Mr. Henke asked if residents could be notified in advance. Mr. Ott stated that the Commission is not rezoning. Mr. May stated to place it on the agenda that will be on the web site and maybe the Township would send a letter to the Homeowners Association. Mr. Stauffer stated that he had a question on notification issues. He stated he is confused with the urgency of the Township trying to rezone properties without notification such as the Eshelman tract beside him. He stated he has not received a notification and he sees it is posted. Mr. Ott stated that the MPC requires the property to be posted and the property owner gets notification not the adjoining property owners. Mr. Stauffer stated that when Cliff Charles put his farm in preservation he received notification and he does not even touch his property, but he receives no notification when the adjoining land is rezoned to build 500 houses beside him. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that different kinds of actions have different notification requirements. Mr. Ott stated that the Zoning Hearing Board requirements are different than a rezoning request. Mr. Ott stated that Mr. Smith sent a notice to Mr. Eshelman about the rezoning of his property. Mr. Eshelman made statements as to how he felt regarding the rezoning of his property. Mr. Ahlfeld stated that the Township did not initiate this request. Any property owner has a right to ask for a rezoning of his land. It has gone through the proper channels, went to the Supervisors who referred it to the Planning Commission for comments, the meetings where it is discussed are public meetings, and the agendas are posted in the office. Maybe we do not like the law, but the law does not require individual property owners to be notified of a rezoning request of this sort at this point. After extensive discussion, numerous comments and statements, Ms. Herr seconded the motion and the

motion carried unanimously.

Other Business Act 537 There was no update. Regional Comprehensive Plan Update Mr. Ahlfeld stated that the Steering Committee had sessions and reviewed the first complete draft of the plan and there were public forums. The consultants are taking back all the comments and they are still looking at a final draft by the end of the year or very early next year that will then be forwarded to the municipalities for formal review. Correspondence Ms. Glazier stated that there were several pieces of correspondence including the following: There was a letter from the LCPC approving the preliminary plan for 111 Millersville Road. There was a letter from the LCPC regarding the B. C. Brubaker plan that is a 77 acre tract mostly located in West Hempfield Township giving approval of the waiver requirement for plan processing. There was a letter from the LCPC regarding the B. C. Brubaker plan indicating that the plan should specify that any dwellings or pertinences such as sewage disposal system might not be constructed in Manor Township without subdivision and land development approval. There was a letter indicating that the LCPC examined the increase of the maximum structural height in the General Commercial District from 40 to 70 and they recommended Manor Township adopts the zoning text amendment. There was a letter regarding the Sketch Plan for Stonemill Subdivision that the LCPC approved the modification requirement that the side lot line shall be radial to the street right-of-way lines to allow higher density townhouse lots to be built along linear streets. There was a letter from LCPC requesting that future plan applications include a set of 8 ½ x 11 black and white reductions of the plan sheets. There was a letter from LCPC indicating the meeting dates and submission deadlines for the year 2006. There was a letter stating that the LCPC review of the 3868 Columbia Avenue project was on the agenda for today. There were additional brochures from the Hour Glass Foundation and the Smart Growth Coalition that were available if anyone wanted to look at them.

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 8:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary Glazier Secretary

Recording Secretary Evelyn J. Rineer