

STRABAN TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION

Alan Zepp, Darrin Catts, Patt Kimble, Roy Weaner, Sharon Hamm

MEETING OF: November 19, 2014, 7:00 p.m.

The Straban Township Planning Commission met this date, as publicly advertised, at 7:00 p.m. in the meeting room of the Straban Township Municipal Building, 1745 Granite Station Road, Gettysburg, PA 17325 with Board Chairman Alan Zepp presiding. Others in attendance were: Vice Chairman Darrin Catts, Member Secretary Patt Kimble, Member Roy Weaner, Member Sharon Hamm, Township Engineer Erik Vranich, and Zoning Officer Earl Baer.

Others in attendance: R. Lee Royer, R. Lee Royer & Associates; John Shambaugh, FPE Consulting Engineers; Ted Decker, GHI Engineers & Surveyors; Jill Rohrbaugh, Architecture Workshop, Inc.; Bob Sharrah, Sharrah Design Group, Inc.; Terry Sheldon, Beyond All Boundaries, LLC; William Gardiner, (Code Enforcement Officer) Commonwealth Code Inspection Service; Randy Phiel and Molly Mudd, Adams County Commissioners Office; Joe Henry, Littlestown Police Department; L.J. Supenski, Adams County Sheriff's Office; Mike and Ronda Auker, residents; Tony Sanders, resident; and George Kimble, resident.

Minutes:

Ms. Kimble moved, seconded by Mr. Catts to approve the October 22, 2014 minutes as presented. Motion carried unanimously.

Land Use Reviews (Preliminary/Final Plans):

Hampton Inn – Prel./Final Subdivision/Land Development Plan (Rt. 30/Shealer Rd.) – Must act by 03/05/15

No discussion.

Gettysburg Station – Final Land Development Plan (York Rd. – south side Rt. 30 – btwn Peebles and Giant Shopping Centers) – Must act by 01/08/15

No discussion.

Nolt's Mulch Products – Prel./Final Land Development Plan (3587 Old Harrisburg Road) – Must act by 01/06/15

Received revised plans today – November 19, 2014 - which require a review by the Township Engineer (Wm. F. Hill & Associates, Inc.).

Columbia Gas – Prel/Final Land Development Plan (1895 Granite Station Road) – Must act by 03/05/15 -

Mr. Vranich (Wm. F. Hill & Associates, Inc.) gave a brief synopsis of the resubmitted plans, as a result of a 150' front yard setback issue, of the proposed 2,400 square foot building. He reviewed digital plans and Mr. Royer (R. Lee Royer & Associates) presented hardcopy plans to the Planning Commission. These revised plans addressed the two key issues contained in the Wm. F. Hill & Associates, Inc. dated November 6, 2014 which are:

1. ZO 140-42.J – The proposed lighting on the storage building must be depicted. In addition, notation must be added to the plans that any proposed lighting must be shielded to prevent lighting from shining on adjacent properties.

4. The relocated building site is within an area served by existing stormwater management facilities. As the building will partially replace existing impervious area, the impact to the stormwater runoff from the site will be negligible and managed by the existing basin.

Additionally, Mr. Vranich referenced an EMAIL dated November 12, 2014 in which the Adams County Conservation District had no issues with the revised plans.

The waiver request as depicted in the said letter was discussed regarding:

3. SALDO 117-41.C – The section requires the installation of sidewalk for all non-residential uses. The applicant has requested a **WAIVER** of this section.

Mr. Catts moved, seconded by Ms. Kimble to recommend approval of this waiver for the Columbia Gas Prel./Final Land Development Plan as written on the Plan – Note 28 which states “However, if sidewalks are installed on adjacent properties, the Township reserves the right to require sidewalk to be installed along Granite Station Road”. Motion carried unanimously.

The Straban Township Planning Commission recommended approval of the plan since all conditions have been met. Mr. Zepp moved, seconded by Mr. Weaner. Motion carried unanimously.

Auker’s Greenhouse – Prel/Final Subdivision & Land Development Plan (3080 York Road) – Must act by 02/03/15

Mr. John Shambaugh (FPE Consulting Engineers) presented an overview of the existing property and the proposed construction of two 30' x 90' greenhouse structures and a 24' x 60' pole building. Please note that none of these structures will be open to the public. The greenhouses are for hydroponic operation/growing and the pole building is for storage/utility purposes.

Mr. Vranich highlighted the below items (not inclusive) of interest contained in a Wm. F. Hill and Associates, Inc. Letter dated October 23, 2014.

5. ZO 140-46 through 140-49 - These sections establish the requirements for off-street parking and related design criteria. The plans must provide clarification on whether additional parking areas are

required due to the new buildings or additional employees. If any spaces are required they must be installed in accordance with these sections.

9. SALDO 117-20.A - Clarification must be provided with respect to the impacts of the buildings and the existing on-site septic system. If flows will be increased to the existing system due to additional employees, the Sewage Enforcement Officer must be contacted and/or appropriate Sewage Facilities Planning obtained prior to Plan approval. If there is an estimated increase in the number of employees, this must be listed in the site data.

26. Clarification must be provided on the use of the proposed 24'x60' pole building and whether this building and the greenhouses will be open to the public. If the public will be able to drive to these buildings, the access drives must be improved to handle two-way traffic.

Mr. Vranich clarified through Mr. Auken (resident) and Mr. Shambaugh that for items 5, 9, and 26 no new employees will be hired and that the proposed greenhouses and storage building will not be open to the public.

31. SWM 109-17 – This section establishes the volume requirements for stormwater management. Calculations must be provided to establish the increase in runoff volume in the 2 year storm event and the BMPs used to infiltrate or otherwise treat the runoff. Mr. Shambaugh stated the re-use of water (approximately 4,000 gallon for each building) would not increase the runoff volume.

Mr. Shambaugh stated that a few waivers for parking areas, sidewalks, landscaping and a buffer yard between properties are requested. Mr. Vranich needs to review revised plans as well as soliciting guidance from Mr. Baer, Zoning Officer on any land development and zoning ordinances. Both the Township and Client Engineers must get together to get a clean plan with minimal to no conditions existing.

Adams County Human Services Building – Prel/Final Land Development Plan (east side of Major Bell Lane) – Must act by 02/12/15

Ms. Rohrbaugh (Architecture Workshop, Inc.) gave an overview of the plan to construct a 42,275 square foot building along with associated site plans for access drives, and parking areas. The new building will house multiple services which include children and youth, county probation and parole, domestic relations, mental health and a hearing/court room. She showed the new building layout that depicts these services and structure as open, secure and defensible.

A few issues addressed by Ms. Rohrbaugh and Mr. Decker (GHI Engineers & Surveyors):

(1) Traffic Impact Study (Gannett Fleming) was completed in the year 2005. The question to answer is to determine how viable the figures are today; (2) determine number of parking areas for staff and visitors with 150 spots for staff and 17% for visitors. Meeting scheduled next week to discuss this issue; (3) waiver of requirement of terminal landscape islands in the parking areas based on security for personnel and wanting to use the parking areas for tactical training (requiring open space); (4) five parking spaces in the “Sally Port” (used to transfer prisoners) are within the 10 feet requirement of the principle structure. This may require a variance to be requested before the Township Zoning Hearing Board.

Mr. Zepp and Mr. Catts agreed that items 3 and 4 may have merit and might be defensible.

Richard H. Schumm, Trustee – Prel/Final Subdivision Plan (west side of Shrivvers Corner Road) – Must act by 02/17/15

Mr. Sharrah (Sharrah Design Group, Inc.) gave a historical background on the Adams County SPCA circumstances of sewage flows being too high and the existing system malfunctioning. They needed a second site for a second sand mound to remedy the situation. A parcel of the subject property is being donated to the SPCA. The current owners were presented with three different plans and the proposed plan is the owner's site preference.

Mr. Vranich has received revised plans today – November 19, 2014 and led the discussion of the remaining outstanding items outlined in the Wm. F. Hill & Associates, Inc. letter dated November 6, 2014.

The first item to consider is:

4. SALDO 117-20.A – A non-building declaration (former Form-B) must be signed and approved in coordination with the Plan. Subject document was presented to the Planning Commission.

Mr. Weaner moved, seconded by Ms. Kimble to recommend approval of the Planning Waiver & Non-Building Declaration. Motion carried unanimously.

The Straban Township Planning Commission recommended conditional approval based on the review of the letter of Wm. F. Hill and Associates, Inc. dated November 6, 2014 to be satisfied as follows:

2. SALDO 117-19.B(18) & 117-27.B(29) – Both Landowner acknowledgements must be signed prior to signature by the Supervisors.

3. SALDO 117-19.B(32) & 117-27.B(23) – Information regarding the lot areas for both subdivided properties must be added to the plans. Specifically the existing acreage and new, proposed acres of Lot 1 and the SPCA parcel. Presently, Sheet 1 indicates acreage for Lot 1 of 58.931 acres and Sheets 2 and 3 indicated 59.105 acres.

7. The Stormwater Management Note on Sheet 1 must be revised to reference Lot 1.

Mr. Zepp moved, seconded by Mr. Catts. Motion carried unanimously.

St. John United Church of Christ – Final Land Development Plan (2243 Hunterstown- Hampton Road) – Must act by 02/17/15

Mr. Sheldon (Beyond All Boundaries, LLC.) presented the plan depicting construction of a 30' x 60' pavilion on the subject property. Mr. Vranich referenced the outstanding items (1-14) listed in the Wm. F. Hill & Associates, Inc. letter dated November 6, 2014. The two significant items for discussion were:

9. SALDO 117-19.B(34) – The approximate location of the existing septic system is depicted on the Plans, however after discussion with the Straban Township Sewage Enforcement Officer, there is concern that the proposed pavilion may be closer than 10' to the existing septic system. A field investigation must be performed to confirm that the pavilion will not be within 10 feet of the septic area. It is recommended that excavations/probes be dug 10 feet from the proposed pavilion location, along the length of the pavilion, to determine if any aggregate from the septic area is encountered. Mr. Sheldon stated that St. John United Church of Christ is getting a backhoe on the property to find out the answer to this location.

13. SALDO 117-41.C – The section requires the installation of sidewalk within the right-of-way for all non-residential uses. The applicant has requested a **WAIVER** of this section.

Mr. Catts moved, seconded by Mr. Zepp to recommend approval of the waiver for the St. John United Church of Christ - Final Land Development Plan providing the note written on the Plan states “However, if sidewalks are installed on adjacent properties, the Township reserves the right to require sidewalk to be installed along Hunterstown-Hampton Road”. Motion carried unanimously.

Due to the uncertainty of condition #9 the Planning Commission did not want to vote on recommending approval until this uncertainty is resolved.

Appearances:

None

Old/New Business

Review and Comment to Consider Adoption of an Ordinance Amending the Code of Ordinance Concerning Unenclosed Storage

Mr. Gardiner, Code Enforcement Officer gave background information on the subject matter of Recreational Vehicle (RV) storage on landowner's property. This seems to be the source of contention of this ordinance. In rural areas, residents seem to be okay with neighbors storing RVs on their own properties. Residential areas are another concern. Presently, the ordinance does not allow RVs to be stored on the front yard of any residential or mixed-use district. They can be stored on the driveway, behind the plane of the primary façade for no more than 14 days (to load, unload, and maintenance of vehicle) in any twelve-month period. Proposed ordinance is more flexible allowing parking in driveways located in front or side yards for the above purpose of maintaining vehicle for no more than 14 days each calendar year. Keep in mind that storing an RV in the backyard is permissible within property setbacks; however, sometimes this is not physically possible for landowners according to Mr. Catts. Mr. Gardiner also mentioned that in some cases when trying to enforce the existing ordinance to a property owner they point out other violators within the Township, as well. Lastly, an understanding of property owners not wanting to have a view and visibility of an RV right out their front door must also be taken into consideration.

Discussion ensued as possible remedies were thrown into the mix of the dialog (i.e., Home Owner's Association within residential areas to address into their rules and regulations; a more lax approach to the scenario(s) for RVs).

Mr. Zepp recommended no motion to recommend approval of this ordinance.

Mr. Zepp moved, seconded by Ms. Hamm to recommend the Township Solicitor, Zoning Officer, and Township Board of Supervisors look at alternative solution(s) to the above ordinance for Unenclosed Storage. Motion carried unanimously.

Review and Comment to Consider Adoption of an Ordinance Amending the Municipally-Owned Law Enforcement Range, and Different and Additional Standards for Development and Operation

Ms. Mudd (Adams County Commissioners Office) addressed the Straban Township EMAIL dated November 7, 2014 containing three questions concerning the proposed ordinance change.

Question 1 – There are enough gun clubs in Adams County that would probably welcome the law enforcement to use its facility. Was this option considered?

Yes, this was considered. However, these private ranges are designed for sports or informal shooting events, not law enforcement training which does limit opportunity for various set-up of training scenarios. Space, and design layout also hinders law enforcement firearms/shotgun qualifications. Scheduling of range times is problematic (priority is given to its members). Coordinating training opportunities with different law enforcement organizations and having a central location are key factors.

Question 2 – There was nothing in the document indicating that there would be no shooting on Sundays just Federal Holidays. Is it proposing to allow shooting on Sundays?

Ms. Hamm and Mr. Weaner commented on this concern and Mr. Henry (Littlestown Police Department) stated part-time and 9-5 personnel sometimes can only shoot on weekends. They would be willing to compromise with a shortened time slot (i.e., 1-5 p.m.) or re-word the verbiage to only allow Sunday shooting in case of an emergency situation.

Question 3 – Do you have a copy of a range planning guide that can be provided to the Township?

Mr. Supenski (Adams County Sheriff's Office) fielded this question on the use of the New Jersey state Outdoor Firearms Range Facility Standards. These standards are designed for law enforcement range. The National Rifle Association standards are for sporting/recreational range. It was also mentioned that the design of the mounds built for law enforcement, wooded surrounding area(s) and the projection/angle of the sound would help muffle noise.

Ms. Kimble moved, seconded by Mr. Catts to recommend conditional approval based on rewording Section 1.(2)(n) concerning Sunday shooting contained in the proposed adoption of ordinance amending the Municipally-Owned Law Enforcement Range, and Different and Additional Standards for Development and Operation. Motion carried unanimously.

Review and Comment to Consider Adoption of an Ordinance Amending the Sign Regulations

Ms. Hamm gave a historical perspective on the initial reason behind the modification of this ordinance. A developer (ATAPCO) wanted to amend the Township sign ordinance several years ago. After the Township worked through the requested amendments ATAPCO felt the changes were too divergent from their original request. Subsequently, the Township decided the amendment before us not only addressed some of ATAPCO's needs but also would improve the sign ordinance presently in place, i.e., the current ordinance lacked information required to approve design, quantity, location, and placement standards for certain instances and types of signage (e.g., guidelines for wall signs for commercial, business, industrial; drive-through menu boards; and planned center sign standards).

Mr. Weaner thought the ordinance was overwhelming with information. Ms. Hamm stated that the entire Article II. Definitions was sent to everyone because of few definitions added and modified.

Mr. Zepp moved, seconded by Mr. Catts to recommend approval of the Ordinance Amending the Sign Regulations. Motion carried with majority of the vote with one opposition from Mr. Weaner.

Act 209 – Land Use Assumption Report (LUAR) –

Mr. Zepp briefed everyone on the workshop that was held November 19, 2014 prior (6:00 p.m.) to the Planning Commission Meeting. Discussion on the update of the Act 209 – Capital Improvement Plan which will be required to update in order to push the projected construction/completion dates into the future for CIP improvements. The LUAR is used to describe existing land uses and to reflect projected changes in these land uses and it is one of three parts of the Act 209.

Ms. Evans (McMahon & Associates), at the workshop, provided options available to complete this portion of the Act 209. The options to consider are:

- Option 1 – Do not require the LUAR to be updated – can keep as is (status quo);
- Option 2 - Update LUAR by PC Members, Township Staff or County Planning;
- Option 3 - Hire a consultant.

The Planning Commission recommended that the members read the existing LUAR for Straban Township. Reconvene next month to discuss whether update(s) are warranted and which of the above options may be applicable.

Proposed Route 30 and Hunterstown Road Intersection –

Mr. Zepp also mentioned the other workshop topic of the Township contributing to the cost of transportation (i.e., traffic signal) and the use of Act 209 funds which are used for capacity (Level Of Service) not safety issues. The proposed relocation of CSX tracks and new realigned Hunterstown Road/Route 30 intersection is more for safety reasons. Additionally, the Township cannot perform work and then get reimbursed.

So, with these constraints, logical discussion would be the developer(s) with vested interest providing money to do transportation projects and get credit for impact fees or the developer(s) provide money and

the Township creates an agreement outlining conditions to get credit for impact fees along with goals of development. This may be a possibility for multiple developers in that area to have common intent/ interest because of affected projects.

Mr. Zepp moved, seconded by Mr. Catts to recommend that the Township Solicitor and Traffic Engineer look into (investigate) for public/private partnership of funding some of the traffic projects.

Public Comment:

None

Adjournment

Ms. Kimble moved, seconded by Mr. Zepp to adjourn the meeting at 9:10 p.m. Motion carried unanimously.

NEXT MEETING: SUPERVISORS: _____ December 1, 2014

PLANNING COMMISSION: _____ December 17, 2014

Respectfully Submitted,

Tina M. McNaughton