

STRABAN TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION

Alan Zepp, Patt Kimble, Sharon Hamm, George Mauser, John Boblits

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 George Mauser, Member Secretary Patt Kimble, Member Sharon Hamm, Member John Boblits, Township Engineer Erik Vranich, and Zoning Officer Jamie Harbaugh.

Others in attendance: Bob Sharrah, Sharrah Design Group, Inc.; Robert Thaeler, Adams County Office of Planning and Development; Gil Picarelli, KPI Technologies; Dominic Picarelli, KPI Technologies; David Lazas, ATAPCO; James Strong, Esquire of McNees, Wallace & Nurick, LLC; Christopher Knarr of McNees, Wallace & Nurick, LLC representing Members 1st Credit Union; and Barb Mowery.

Public Comment/Agenda Items:

No discussion.

Minutes:

Mr. Mauser moved, seconded by Ms. Kimble to approve the June 22, 2016 minutes as presented. Motion carried unanimously.

Land Use Reviews (Preliminary/Final Plans):

Battlefield Hearth – Preliminary/Final Land Development Plan (1745 York Rd.) – Must act by 08/29/16

Sharrah Design Group, Inc., in a letter dated July 27, 2016, requested an extension of time for approval of the Preliminary/Final Land Development Plan to September 15, 2016.

Ms. Hamm moved, seconded by Mr. Mauser to recommend approval of the extension of time to September 15, 2016. Motion carried unanimously.

Lincoln Commons – Final Subdivision and Land Development Plan (north east corner of York Road (SR 30) and Shealer Road, just west of US 15)-Must act by 09/14/16

Mr. Gil Picarelli informed the Board that they were not here tonight to discuss Lincoln Commons. Actually, revised plans were submitted today to the township and the township engineer for review. A workshop with the township engineer and zoning officer is scheduled for Wednesday, August 10, 2016 to review comments and hopefully come back next month.

At this point, Mr. Zepp stated that a quorum may be an issue for next month's meeting to be held on Wednesday, August 24, 2016.

Mr. Zepp moved, seconded by Ms. Kimble to move the Planning Commission meeting next month to Wednesday, August 31, 2016 at 7:00 p.m. Motion carried unanimously.

Appearances:

None.

Old/New Business

1) Members 1st – Potential Text Amendment – primary façade (140-12.E(2) and financial institutions (140-19.B(5))

Mr. Sharrah explained that Members 1st is proposing to re-develop two (2) lots at the southwest quadrant of the intersection of York Road and Natural Springs Road with a drive-through financial institution. There are two (2) specific items that may cause problems with the project due to the security-oriented nature of the business, the size and configuration of the lots involved, and access to the site.

Mr. Strong and Mr. Knarr summarized the issues faced by Members 1st Credit Union on this corner lot.

Section 140-12.E(2) – requires a door that is open to the public on each primary façade of a building that is located on a corner lot. The Zoning Ordinance has been interpreted to require that each primary façade of the proposed Members 1st building must have a door that is open to the public (which in this case would be two doors open to the public) in addition to the building’s main entrance which is not located on a primary façade. Suggested language “In the event that a building’s main entrance is not located on a primary façade, the primary façade shall be required to provide architectural elements, including but not limited to bays, windows, doors (doors do not have to be open to the public) or cornice. Corner lots with more than one primary façade shall be required to provide similar architectural elements, including but not limited to bays, windows, doors (doors do not have to be open to the public) or cornice, on each. Elevation views of the primary facades shall be submitted in the land development plan set.”

Mr. Strong reiterated that more than one access to the facility imposes security problems. Instead of having a door open to the public architectural design could be offered.

Section 140-19.B(5) – this section is specific to drive-through facilities and specific to bank or financial institutions. The proposed drive-through facility for the Members 1st building is located on the side of the building that faces Natural Springs Road. The Zoning Ordinance has been interpreted to require that the proposed drive-through facility must be located on a side of the building that does not face York Road or Natural Springs Road. This section provides restrictions on the location of a drive-through facility that only apply to banks or financial institutions. All other businesses in the Township with drive-through facilities, including restaurants, pharmacies and convenience stores, are not subject to this restriction on the location of the drive-through facility. The suggestion is to delete this section in its entirety.

The Board members at last month’s meeting had not yet received the County comments. The County comments dated July 11, 2016 were received on July 18, 2016. Mr. Thaeler from the Adams County Office of Planning and Development was present and summarized the County comments. *Section 140-*

12.E(2): The township is currently evaluating the standards of the Zoning Ordinance that preclude the placement of parking spaces between primary facades and adjoining road rights-of-way. If the township is interested in considering changes to the site design standards of this district (EC-1), the changes should be developed cohesively rather than in individual amendments. *Section 140-19.B(5)*: The County anticipates that this may have been a mistake made in the original drafting of the Zoning Ordinance, and that this section was intended to be applied to all businesses. The County would support an amendment to this section to clarify that all drive-through facilities are subject to the location provision. The County also recognizes that this standard makes the development of businesses with drive-throughs on corner lots difficult, particularly when paired with related standards requiring that drive-through lanes be separated from parking lots and parking aisles. The County would support, in accordance with the township's ongoing evaluation of parking placement standards, evaluating options to allow some additional flexibility in drive-through placement for corner lots provided that the overall effectiveness of the township's design standard package can be maintained.

Mr. Vranich pointed out the two (2) issues here: 1) Door open to the public; 2) does it have to appear as a main entrance? In using Tractor Supply and Starbucks as examples, the question was asked, do those doors actually open to the public?

Since this was officially filed, some action needs to be taken by the Planning Commission. **Ms. Hamm moved, seconded by Mr. Zepp to table this text amendment request and incorporate it into the parking requirements and other areas in question for a combined amendment.** These amendments should go forward together but it may not be as quickly as Members 1st Credit Union would like. **Motion carried unanimously.**

2) Review and Comment on Adams County Office of Planning and Development Informal Review of Zoning Ordinance §140-12.E. - Location of Parking

Mr. Vranich (Wm. F. Hill & Assoc., Inc.) facilitated the discussion on location of parking. How much does the Planning Commission want to change? Parking is all that was discussed, however, when receiving comments from designers the scope widened. Some of the issues raised were: 1) walkability – streetscape; 2) Parking in front of building; and 3) side roads – let people park in front of buildings to name a few. If we keep the scope to parking only the amendment will go quickly, however, if the scope is widened to these other issues, it could take longer. The Board needs to decide how wide they want to open the scope. Since two (2) of the three (3) respondents were present, Mr. Vranich thought it would be a good idea for them to summarize their responses for the Board.

Dave Lazas, ATAPCO; Dominic Picarelli and Gil Picarelli – They feel the township's vision for the US Route 30 corridor is to have a walkable connectivity among all the businesses. The specific issues they see implementing this vision are the setbacks, parking, duel entrances, off-street loading and other design criteria. They recommended reducing the large setbacks and consider a build-to line for all structures if the township is looking for this to be a walkable business district. Parking should be modified to allow spaces around the building, promote/require shared parking at a reduced rate, and allow for smaller parking spaces. Duel entrances should not be mandatory. Off-street loading needs to work with the parking regulations for all lots. Modify the landscaping and be more flexible with current development style to accomplish the goals of the township.

Robert Sharrah, Sharrah Design Group – He felt that the original ordinance writers intended to create a more pedestrian friendly area along York Road. He too pointed out the requirement of sizable front yard setbacks which push the buildings further from the road right-of-way. By pushing the building back further, usable land is “wasted” to meet a requirement that seems to be in conflict with the desired pedestrian orientation. Also, most retailers want to see parking in front of their buildings so that some vitality can be seen from the roadway. Keeping patron parking in the front of a retail building allows the back of the store operations to be more obscure and out of view from the patron. Allow the present “no parking in front of the front façade” to remain for the York Road only. Allow parking in front of the front façade of buildings on minor streets that are either corner lots or have frontage only on the minor street. This would eliminate an additional layer of regulation, thereby making individual development layout easier.

Eric Gladhill (summarized by Erik Vranich) – The requirement for sidewalk and streetlights along Route 30 is unnecessary. He understands the desire for connected streetscape, but is this really going to happen. Parking restrictions listed for properties along Route 30 should not be different than other areas. Some screening is desirable for parking along a roadway; however, motorist who are searching for a business as they drive along the road should be able to see the building, some of the parking and definitely any signage that identifies a business.

Mr. Zepp moved, seconded by Ms. Hamm to request a workshop with the Board of Supervisors, Planning Commission and township consultants. Motion carried unanimously.

3) Central Adams Joint Comprehensive Plan

Mr. Mauser stated that the committee is done meeting and the County has taken the information and will be meeting with the elected officials and the public. The plan is getting closer to completion. Look at this as an outline. The public will be involved in the recommendation so it is going in the right direction.

Public Comment/General:

None

Adjournment

Mr. Zepp moved, seconded by Ms. Kimble to adjourn the meeting at 8:17 p.m. Motion carried unanimously.

NEXT MEETING: SUPERVISORS: August 1, 2016
PLANNING COMMISSION: August 31, 2016

Respectfully Submitted,

Robin K. Crushong, Office Manager/Treasurer