

SADSBURY TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION

Meeting Minutes Regular Monthly Meeting – May 2009

The regular monthly meeting of the Sadsbury Township Planning Commission was held on Wednesday, May 13, 2009 in the Sadsbury Township Municipal Building Board Room.

Commission Members in attendance:

Theodore Claypoole, *Chair*
John H. Lymberis, *Vice Chair*
Susan Franco, *Secretary*
Dale Hensel, *Supervisors Liaison*
Tom Greenfield
Jane Heineman
Carlyle Rivers

Also in attendance: Mr. Todd Walton

Mr. Claypoole called the meeting to order at 7:04 pm, and led the assembly in a moment of silence and the Pledge of Allegiance.

REVIEW OF PREVIOUS MEETING and APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Ms. Franco summarized the Actions and Minutes of the April 8, 2009 meeting. Minutes of the meeting were previously distributed to Commission Members. Ms. Franco opened the floor for corrections to the Minutes. No changes were made.

MOTION by Mr. Claypoole, seconded by Mr. Lymberis: ***The Sadsbury Township Planning Commission approves the Minutes and Summary of Actions of the April 8, 2009 meeting as submitted.***

MOTION APPROVED by unanimous vote of the Commission.

Sadsbury Township Planning Commission
Meeting Minutes –May, 2009 Regular Monthly Meeting
Page 2

OLD BUSINESS

PROJECT/APPLICANT: Sadsbury Commons (Hershey Tract) Conditional Use Application
Represented by Michael S. Gill, of Buckley, Brion, McGuire, Morris and Sommer LLP, Attorneys
Ronald E Klos, Jr, PE, of Bohler Engineering

Mr. Gill explained the purpose of tonight's meeting with the Planning Commission was to keep the members aware of the ongoing process and look for input from them. He opened the Orientation with an overview of the review letters and reports recently received by them. He also noted that the applicant continues discussions with the Board of Supervisors in Conditional Use Hearings, the last meeting was held on May 5th, 2009. The next meeting is scheduled for June 4, 2009 at 6:30 PM. He stated that these meetings are open to the public. Due to the scope of the project, Mr. Gill would like the applicants to return to the Planning Commission again in the next months in order to gain a collaborative effort with the applicant and the Township. Mr. Claypoole acknowledged this would be acceptable.

Copies of the aforementioned review letters and reports were also received by the members of the Sadsbury Township Planning Commission in advance of the meeting this evening they included the following;

The Sadsbury Township Engineer, Herbert E. Mac Combie, Jr., P.E., dated March 26, 2009
Sadsbury Township Planner, Wayne W. Grafton, A/CP, dated March 26, 2009
Gerald T. Baker, P.E., Project Manager, Traffic Planning and Design, Inc, dated April 3, 2009
Landscape Plan Review #01 from Carol A Menke, AICP, LEED AP Principal Landscape Planner of Menke and Menke LLC. Dated April 30, 2009

Also included in the package received by the members of the commission was a copy of the Petition for Amendments to the current Zoning and Subdivision & Land Development Ordinances of Sadsbury Township with a letter addressed to the Board of Supervisors, dated May 5, 2009.

Mr. Gill Speaking: He asked the commission members to allow him to focus first on the review letter from Mr. Grafton, with some responses to the comments included in that letter.

The applicant will submit the amended Ordinance forms after all reviews are completed and it is reworked to adapt to a form that is acceptable and agreed upon with, grammar and spelling corrected at that time. , as noted.

However, Mr. Gill and Mr. Klos also stated that the Architectural design and the Main Street façade design will remain the same. There will not be the same enhancement in the rear of the commercial development as the Customer Entrances will display on Rts.10 and 30. He did state that those entrances will be subject to some Architectural treatments to enhance and attract customer traffic to the center.

Ms. Heineman asked for a better explanation of the "Customer Entrances" and the applicant replied that this will be included on the final design plan

Several members inquired about the "Gross Lease able Area" referred to in Mr. Grafton's review letter. Section 1, letter F. The applicant and the members discussions included a request for a better description of the "shared parking" used to meet the required 4 per 1000 ' of floor lease able space are in the buildings. Mr. Gill explained the exclusion of some areas such as elevator shafts, stairwells and closets or maintenance areas, trash receptacle areas as illustrations of the areas excluded. Mr. Lymberis asked if these areas uses could change when tenants change in the future thereby creating usable, lease able

Sadsbury Township Planning Commission
Meeting Minutes –May, 2009 Regular Monthly Meeting
Page 3

space. Mr. Gill did not think that this was possible due to the nature of the space. Mr. Gill stated that they will provide 4.93 spaces per 1000' of lease able building floor area by using this "shared parking" method of calculation. In further discussion in response to Mr. Grafton's letter and regarding section 1 letter G the applicant agrees. Regarding letter H, in the same section referring to the Town Center Commercial Development as a replacement to the current zoning for C-2 the applicant stated they thought it better defined the use of the space. In response to the reference to "residential " in this same area the applicant responded although not scheduled now , this could someday refer to second floor apartments over the retail area and they thought it could be included in the future and did not want to rule it out. In reference to the" age restricted ", dwelling question, Mr. Gill noted that it could refer to a "Sunrise Village" type as some town centers currently have in them in other areas. But he did acknowledged, there is not one currently included here now .but thought it could be appropriate to provide for one in the future

.Questions were asked by members regarding the amount of the setbacks for the Office building and the proposed Connector roadway as posed in Mr. Grafton's letter. The applicant did not agree since this is an internal roadway that a setback of 50' should be required

.Ms Heineman questioned why not stay with the current ordinance amounts here and why change this? The applicant responded that the use of space is vital to the usable lease and building areas to this project. Mr. Lymberis asked if a grass median strip to ease the congestion feel and to promote more pleasing aesthetics within the center.

Mr.Hensel voiced his concerns regarding traffic and especially along route 30 as it has been a problem in the past in this area and will get worse with this project

Ms Franco again spoke about concerns regarding speed on the connector road and the effect of co mingled truck and car traffic along with the pedestrian traffic.

Mr. Hensel again asked about traffic calming measures that could be incorporated here. The applicant promised to review the issue with Chris Williams of Mac Mahon Associates, their traffic consultants.

Mr. Rivers expressed his interest in the pedestrian walkway and its location also how this will function and have security. Lighting was addressed as being an idea for the ground along the walkway.

Questions were asked about how to provide security but not be offensive to the residents. The applicant will locate this walkway on future plans and it will be located between buildings A and B at grade. Mr. Lymberis noted his concerns for pedestrian safety throughout the center. Comments from several members were made regarding the Plaza areas asking for additional benches to provide more seating than the proposed 10 benches. Ms. Heineman proposed 20 and the membership agreed. . The applicant agreed to this request

.Several members asked for a review per Mr. Grafton's notation of the size of the Kiosk. The applicant will review.

Several members asked about adding more green spaces with in the center and along the connector roadway.

The issue of lighting was opened and the applicant stated a Lighting Consultant recommended by the Board will be addressing and working to include some proposed ideas.

Signs were touched upon the applicant noted that 1 sq ft per 2000 ratio is to be used and 2 sides counted as one, for sizing calculations.

A discussion ensued regarding the retaining walls, Mr. Klos joined in the discussions and spoke to this issue as well as the property right of way stating the east side to 75' and the height variances from 20 to 14' and 10 to 0' ,that Hershey Lane will be buffered with landscaping . Mr. Lymberis asked about how Rt. 30 could use landscape buffering as well. Mr. Lymberis questioned the need for the size of the

**Sadsbury Township Planning Commission
Meeting Minutes –May, 2009 Regular Monthly Meeting
Page 4**

proposed wall along Route 30 stating it will be stark and massive and not attractive .He requested they review it further including some softening effects such as landscaping and staggering the height of the walls instead of one large wall.

Mr. Rivers included the review of the wall along Hershey Lane and some softening effects. Some members asked about the maintenance that will be required for the wall and it's landscaping and the applicant stated the association within the center will have that responsibility for it's upkeep. The issue of sewer extension arose; noting the sewer down Route 10 to Parkesburg to the treatment facility was more feasible that buildings PO and Q in Phase 1 build out can use this and the rest will go through Sadsbury Township along route 30 .Members asked if sewer extension could benefit any residents? It was noted that the gravity follows the stream, crossed the least number of obstacles as possible. A request was made to estimate the cost difference for a run through Sadsbury and West Sadsbury Townships.

The discussion moved to the Act 209 impact fee and the applicant would like to have a credit towards the fee as the construction of the "Connector Road "was not included in the update to the Act 209 recently completed. Mr. Lymberis asked if they calculated the fee without the roadway and the applicant stated they were completing that with the traffic consultant currently. Although they acknowledged that PennDOT does require this road be included in the project, for calculation purposes it would be helpful to exclude it. Chris Williams will research and advise both ways for an offset from the Act 209 fee. It was noted that Mr. Williams was the traffic consultant to the Township for the Act 209 recently completed.

It was agreed by all that we stop this discussion here to resume later as other parties are to be heard this evening and we have so much more to cover .

Mr. Claypoole noted here that we only recently received all this information and we will need more time to review it completely. The applicant acknowledged this fact. .Ms Franco asked if the entire membership of the Planning Commission could have a complete binder similar to the one sent to Mr. Claypoole with all the inclusions. The applicant agreed.

NEW BUSINESS

PROJECT/APPLICANT: Valley View Business Park Lot 3 Preliminary/Final Plan Subdivision Application

Represented by Allen Zimmerman, Project Manager Commonwealth Engineering

Noted here is the location on the east side of Washington Lane and north of Hoffman Avenue plan dated 3/18/09 and revised on 4/23/09. It is the southwestern portion of the lot and extends between the existing residential properties and will transfer the resultant parcels of land to those lot owners. The lands will then become an integral part of the existing developed lots. The members received the Township engineer's letter of recommendation of approval, the county as well. No new build able lots were created. The members of this commission are in agreement and have no questions.

MOTION: by Theo Claypoole , seconded by Jane Heineman : The Sadsbury Township Planning Commission recommends that The Sadsbury Township Board of Supervisors approve the plan titled. Valley View Business Park Lot 3 Preliminary/Final Plan Subdivision Application.

MOTION APPROVED by unanimous vote of the Commission.

Sadsbury Township Planning Commission
Meeting Minutes –May, 2009 Regular Monthly Meeting
Page 5

PROJECT/APPLICANT; Maple Avenue Subdivision Preliminary Subdivision /Land Development Application
Represented by Arthur Herling

Mr. Herling proposed a 3 lot subdivision with two lots having sewer use and one lot will have an on lot septic system. The members have received the copies of the title plan in advance of the meeting.

Mr. Herling has not yet received any review letters and will return when they are received for further discussions with this commission.

OTHER BUSINESS N/A

ANNOUNCEMENTS and CORRESPONDENCE N/A

MOTION TO ADJOURN

With no further business before the Commission, Theo Claypoole moved to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Mr Greenfield. MOTION APPROVED by unanimous vote of the Commission at 9:35 pm.

Respectfully Submitted
Susan Franco, *Secretary*
Sadsbury Township Planning Commission