

## Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

Monday, March 8, 2021

7:00 p.m.

Chairman Jay Provanzo called the meeting to order on Monday, March 8, 2021 at 7:00 p.m. Mr. Provanzo led those in attendance in the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag and introduced the Board.

Members Present: Jay Provanzo, Pamela Shellenberger, Martin Peak, Keith Hoover, Mark Harman, James Henke

Members Absent: Don Mann

Staff Present: Nate Taggart, Adrienne Kautz

Visitors Present: See attached sign in sheet

### Public Comment –

Leah Bacon, 194 Springdale Lane, brought to the Boards attention concerns regarding the development proposed at Bender Mill Road. In particular, she voiced her concern with the amount of communication that has been given with regards to that proposed development. Ms. Bacon is not a direct neighbor of the property; however, there are members of the public here this evening that are. There are many surrounding property owners who now know about the development and would like to make sure their concerns are heard. These members of the neighborhood are concerned that not many people knew about the proposed development before the February 3, 2021 Zoning Hearing Board meeting. The residents have arguments and concerns that they might like to present to the Township. Ms. Bacon commented that she is willing to assist the people who have not heard of that meeting before it took place or about this development. However, there are residents that have not heard about it or only heard about it a few days before the meeting. This situation is lending itself to limited participation from the citizens and neighbors. Ms. Bacon does not doubt that the Township complies with what is required by the Sunshine Act and Freedom of Information Act. Ms. Bacon feels that the Township can do better with communicating more than just the minimum and making sure people who are in the surrounding development are aware of those things and can be part of the process of looking at the plans and participating in the meetings.

John Beaumont, 145 Carol Drive, stated that there are several reasons why the development is going to impact the area in which we live. The proposed development borders Mr. Beaumont's property and will impact the water runoff. If there is any more runoff in the area, the creek will not be able to handle it (West Branch of the Little Conestoga). Mr. Beaumont is also concerned about connecting to Bank Barn Lane as an access to the new development. The road has not been dedicated to the Township. Mr. Beaumont thinks that if this issue is not addressed now it will never be able to be addressed. This item should be on the Township's radar. With the addition of 204 homes, it will forever change the atmosphere for the surrounding neighbors. On the corner of his property, there are plans for a walking path with a bridge across the creek. This is on the new township map. This is a huge floodplain area. The area where the bridge would attach is essentially a land locked floodplain with nowhere for the water to go. This will be an enormous expense because it cannot be just a little bridge that you walk across the creek on. It would have to be an enormous structure and Mr. Beaumont feels that it would not be a benefit to the Township as far as expenditures go. Mr. Beaumont believes that the

development does not benefit the constituents. It really only benefits the developers, which are not the majority of the constituents.

Steve Alderfer, 187 Carol Drive, decided to move here from Mountville to get away from traffic, noise, and lights. There are some properties relating to the proposed development that will back up against Mr. Alderfer's property. This development will change the outlook of the area forever. When Mr. Alderfer thinks about 7-10 years of construction with 204 houses being put in, living here will be a very different experience.

Ian Beaumont, 145 Carol Drive, wanted to reiterate that he is finding out more and more that nobody knew about any of these meetings. Mr. Beaumont realizes that they were advertised in the newspaper but is not sure how many residents actually read the newspaper. At the Zoning Hearing Board meeting, Mr. Beaumont felt as though it was very one sided. The developer had at least a year to prepare for the meeting. They had lawyers and professional representatives to testify. One of the representatives that the developer brought to the meeting was a traffic expert. The traffic expert simply stated what any one of us could have Googled. The traffic expert testified that traffic patterns would work without really having factual data. One of the items that the traffic expert did not bring was any data on Bank Barn Lane. This is our biggest point of contention. Currently Bank Barn Lane does not belong to the Township, thus it is not being considered. The developer also said that Bank Barn Lane would be approved. The developer is putting the road through but not presenting information about it. The engineer stated, under oath, what is being brought into the area is 204 homes on very small plots of land which would match the surroundings. Mr. Beaumont found that, not including the 100 acres or the church in that area, there are 77 homes on 271 acres. That makes the average of 3 ½ acres per home. The smallest direct bordering property is on .4 acres. The new properties are going to be about half the size that are in the area now. This means that there will be 380 homes on 371 acres, this is going to be dramatically different from what is there now.

Christine Brubaker, 22 Birch Court, would like to inform the Board that the West Branch of the Little Conestoga has a linear park designation from 1977. The West Branch of the Little Conestoga was designated as a linear hiking trail. Ms. Brubaker gave the Board a Bioswale Lititz Reserve Land studies newspaper article that explains that bioswales are superior to retention basins. Ms. Brubaker would like us to rethink the sidewalks and paths that are external and internal in this development. Ms. Brubaker would hope that the Board would make sure that they do their best to honor the linear path that was proposed in 1977, that you also consider the existing path from Spring Meadow Lane to Letort School and try interconnecting any future path. Ms. Brubaker indicated the Township needs an open space plan; the residents will need places to go.

Steve Dickerman, 1119 Central Manor Road, shared that his life investment is bordering this property. The developer applied for special exceptions. The concept plan has to include graphic description of the zone and existing properties adjoining to the site. We do not feel that this development matches the existing properties. The physical characteristics include steep slopes, wetlands, and significant stands of tall trees and acknowledgement of minimal of disturbance of significant environmental topical graphic features.

Mr. Provanzo commented that some of the items that have been brought up from the residents to the Planning Commission, the Board does not have answers to. The Planning Commission will not know until we see an actual plan submitted that is engineered. The meeting in October was purely a concept

plan for the purpose of discussing the vesting period for the special exception. There was not a lot of detail provided and the items that are being brought up (traffic, swale, etc.) will come further down the line.

Mr. Taggart, the Zoning Officer for Manor Township, commented that there is going to be a meeting on March 17, 2021 where the Zoning Hearing Board will render their decision. As a staff member, we are in the office Monday through Friday 8:00am-4:30pm if anyone has any questions on the ordinance interpretation. The Township residents can feel free to stop in and ask any questions.

Ian Beaumont stated that it seems like the Township does not know what the developer is doing, but yet the Township is allowing them to have these exceptions. Mr. Beaumont stated that the Township is willing to give them a five-year extension on whatever the zoning is right now. There seems like there is a lot hidden, which Mr. Beaumont understands that is how it works, but asked that the Township take a look at the developer's plan first.

Rob Benner, 112 Catapala Lane, asked about the low-density cluster housing. He asked, what exactly does low density mean and how are the houses going to be situated over the plan? Will there be rental properties or an HOA and how will it impact the adjacent communities? The residents do not want for the development to completely change because a new development is being thrown into an existing nice community.

Approve the Meeting Minutes from January 11, 2021 – Chairman Provanzo entertained a motion to approve the January 11, 2021 minutes. Pam Shellenberger so motioned, James Henke seconded, and the motion carried unanimously.

### **New Business**

21-001 – Preliminary/Final Subdivision Lot 2 – 1086 Central Manor Road – The applicant is proposing to subdivide Lot 2 from their property. Lot 2 is a proposed 2-acre residential lot that will be subdivided from the existing approximate 50-acre parent tract. The property is zoned Agricultural.

The applicant is requesting a modification(s) to the following sections: 388-19.A (Plan Scale).

Kent Weaver with Harbor Engineering is present to represent Steve and Donna Jones. Mr. Weaver has been working with Mr. Taggart and Ms. Kelly on the Lot coverage for Lot 2. Mr. & Mrs. Jones are asking for a modification on the Plan Scale. Lot 1 was subdivided in 2019. Currently the plan is showing the as-built conditions. The Jones built their own houses under the Clean and Green Act, with the stipulation that they did not subdivide the second lot until 2021.

Mr. Provanzo commented that we have seen the plan before. With the Clean and Green Act, you can only do one subdivision per year, however, the Jones did all their permits to build both homes. The Jones are asking to subdivide and add the lot lines around Lot 2.

Mark Harmon made a motion to recommend approval of the requested modification for Section 388-19.A (Plan Scale) based on the justification provided in the Rettew letter dated February 17, 2021. Martin Peak seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

Mark Harman made a motion to recommend for approval provided that the remaining comments on the Rettew letter dated February 17, 2021 are satisfied. Keith Hoover seconded, and the motion carried unanimously.

21-002 Revised Final Subdivision for Crossgates Phase 4, Lot 1-4 – The applicant is proposing to revise the configuration of lots 1-4 from four townhouse units to four semi-detached (duplex) units. The property is zoned High Density Residential Flex.

Bill Swiernik, with David Miller/Associates, gave an overview of the project. There were four units previously grouped as a townhouse complex. The applicant would like to break the four units into two semi-detached groupings. This would make it two 2-Unit buildings. They would be serviced off of the same driveway. These four lots were not built with the rest of the lots. Most of the dwellings in the area have all been constructed. The lots are going to be serviced by water and sewer. There is a minor change in the amount of impervious, so stormwater management is basically the same. David Miller/Associates have received the review comments from the Township Engineer and have resubmitted to address those comments.

Mr. Harman asked if there are any issues with the access drive. Mr. Swiernik said there is adequate sight distance.

Mr. Henke asked Rettew if they have responded to their February 19 resubmission. Ms. Kelley commented that they are currently in the process of doing their reviews. Ms. Kelley believes there isn't going to be an issue. Most of the items are from the previous plan that just need to be brought forward to the new plan.

Mark Harman made a motion to bring this item from a Briefing Item to an Action Plan. Pam Shellenberger seconded, and the motion carried unanimously.

Mark Harman made a motion to recommend approval of the project based on the satisfaction of the comments in the Rettew letter dated February 8, 2021. James Henke seconded, and the motion carried unanimously

21-003 – Preliminary/Final Land Development Plan for Peace of Mind Self Storage – The applicant is proposing six new storage buildings and a relocated parking storage area on their existing property. The property is located in the Industrial Zone.

The applicant is requesting a modification(s) to the following sections: 388-11.A (Preliminary Plan)

Ed Fisher, with Light-Heigel & Associates, stated that this is the first review. This is a continuation of an existing use for the property on Charlestown Road. This use has been in existence for roughly 15 years and on Lot 1. Lot 2 was developed approximately 7 or 8 years ago. This is the last phase of the development. The plan would indicate that approximately 175 self-storage units (maximum) could be added to the property. This number could decrease depending on what size unit customers need. We sized the parking lot for the maximum number of units. Parking is normally a moot point in these units because people do not come to park. On a daily basis you could have 3-5 cars that come in and park for maybe 10-15 minutes. However, the Zoning ordinance does require parking, so Mr. Fisher did provide that as required. Mr. Fisher did receive a review letter from Rettew Associates. There really is not

anything that he saw that cannot be addressed. One of the items that Rettew letter noted was that we can withdraw the modifications waiver request and change the plan to a revised finalized plan.

Mr. Fisher mentioned that the stormwater detention basin was built at the onset of this development. It is a large detention basin for the entire Industrial complex. We are not modifying or changing the basin. The detention basin was sized for maximum amount of impervious coverage. We will have to obtain an NPDES permit because of the amount of disturbance. The original one was closed out. We will have a lengthy report from the Conservation District on this matter.

Mr. Henke asked Mr. Fisher if he could describe what the chain link fence will look like. Would it be the kind of fence that would block the view, so you do not see the trailers and boats? Mr. Fisher commented that the fence across the front is ornamental. There is an iron ornamental fence there currently. The size of the chain link in the back on Lot number 1 is actually a 6' high privacy fence. We are proposing screening that will be associated with this new frontage. There will be a landscape screen between the right of the way and the area of the property with the new units.

Ms. Kelly commented that the first comment on their letter under zoning is asking for demonstration of how they are complying with the ordinance requirement on high/low level screening along the front. When Rettew looks at the plans they are seeing the larger size trees, but nothing on the plan to provide low level screening. Mr. Fisher would have to provide this on the plan. Mr. Taggart commented that the proposed project changes the way the existing landscaping screens the property. The road sits a little lower and it creates a little bit of a screen naturally with the mound that is present on the front of the property. This will go away with the proposed improvements.

Mr. Henke and Mr. Peak indicated that they would like to see the plan cleaned up a little before it moves on. The Board members believe there should be more details provided to the engineer to make sure it is satisfying the Rettew comments.

Mr. Provanzo indicated that this is a Briefing Item and the Planning Commission will see the plan next month.

**Other Business – None.**

With no further business to discuss Mr. Provanzo made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Shellenberger seconded, and the motion carried unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 7:45 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Don Mann  
Secretary

Recording Secretary  
Adrienne Kautz