

Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

June 13, 2017

The regular meeting of the East Lampeter Township Planning Commission was held on Tuesday, June 13, 2017 at the East Lampeter Township Office, 2250 Old Philadelphia Pike, Lancaster, PA 17602. Chairman Keylor called the meeting to order followed by the Pledge of Allegiance. Other Commissioners present were Mr. Roger Rutt, Mr. Dan McCuen, and Mr. Randy Ranck. Also present was Tara A. Hitchens, Director of Planning/Zoning Officer, David Sinopoli, Assistant Zoning Officer, and Alecia Hair, Administrative Assistant for Planning/Building/Zoning.

The following persons signed in as being present:

Charles M. Suhr, Esquire-Stevens & Lee
Christos N. Dinoulis-Bohler Engineering
Eric Mountz-Transportation Planning & Design (TPD)
David Kane-LIDL, US Operations
Jay States-Township Engineer for traffic from Grove Miller Associates

Minutes:

The minutes of the May 9, 2017 meeting were approved with correction on a motion by Mr. Ranck and second by Mr. McCuen with all voting in favor.

Old Business:

None

New Business:

- A. LIDL, US Operations, 2331 Lincoln Highway East #2017-07: Subdivision and Land Development Plan.

Mr. Charlie Suhr of Stevens & Lee had two items to discuss the land development comments per the DM/A letter dated May 11, 2017 and the Traffic Impact Study Scope. Mr. Suhr indicated that he didn't believe it was necessary to go through all of the DM/A items because LIDL is working on a revised Land Development plan to address these items. Mr. Suhr said he would like to come back to the July Planning Commission meeting with the revised Land Development plan and new DM/A review. Mr. Keylor commented that LIDL could ask for a few waivers/modifications, and they could ask for those ahead of the next Planning Commission meeting so that the Township Engineer can weigh in on the issues. Mr. Dinoulis of Bohler Engineering added that some items still need to be worked out at the construction level and that he will request any waivers and modifications will be requested before the next meeting.

Mr. Suhr moved onto the scope of the traffic impact study stating that at this point there is no agreement about the scope between the applicant and Township staff; the Township Subdivision And Land Development Ordinance (SALDO), Section 519.B.1, puts the Planning Commission in the middle, and states the Board of Supervisors is to solve any disputes and that this is the first time that Mr. Suhr has ever been in this type of position. Mr. Eric Mountz of Transportation Planning & Design (TPD), LIDL traffic engineer, addressed the scoping application and time periods in which PennDOT wanted two intersections studied, one at Millcreek Square and Witmer/Pleasant Roads. Mr. States indicated that the Township usually has the full coordinated system studied when the project started to move forward. Mr. Suhr explained the Ordinance discusses adjacent intersection thus LIDL is agreeable to moving forward with the light to the west at Host/Golden Corral. LIDL/TPD believe Township is studying the whole corridor for the upgrade to adaptive so why duplicate efforts. Mr. Mountz added TPD is not inclined to expand the

study to the full corridor; for Tanger, RETTEW did not study entire corridor to meet PennDOT's requirements.

Mr. Mountz explained that TPD was involved with new signal proposal at Millstream and said PennDOT wanted the entire corridor to be studied. TPD does not anticipate this site having a great impact on the entire corridor with the adaptive system in place. The right turn lane will need to be installed and the Route 30 Streetscape design will be incorporated. Mr. States included that after the scoping meeting, he never saw a finalized scope and thus thought the project was cone or cancelled. Millcreek Square and Tanger looked at 896 to Strasburg as the scope. Apple Realty (2505 Lincoln Highway East) scope was the same of Millcreek Square because of trip generation, this has been a consistent request from the Township.

Township is not studying the intersections with upgrade to adaptive system. LIDL has similar trip generation as the Apple Realty and thus looked for scope to include the whole corridor. The PennDOT grant was provided to move the system to responsive. Township has maintained same scope as has been done for recent development.

Mr. Mountz stated traffic being generated already by restaurant and hotel, not significantly increased and does not anticipate this site will directly affect the corridor. Tanger looked at timing improvements only and then offered to fix the timing. There is not a lot to be done with physical improvements and the adaptive system will help most. Mr. Suhr added it does not make sense to do a study when the result is implemented by adaptive. Mr. Mountz said at Witmer Road, expect turning movements; Golden/Corral/Host signal mostly through volume site is reuse and generated traffic with existing uses.

Mr. McCuen said not a whole lot of traffic now is produced from the site, however this use will be all day long. A lot of traffic already is within the corridor, one more thing could cause a gridlock. Aren't you hoping you have a lot of traffic? Mr. States added that this will be a destination and the Township wants to know what the impact is, as this is already an over-capacity corridor. Mr. Mountz said about 300 (enters and exits) morning and evening; 250 on Saturdays (enters and exits) with a total of 500; passerby is 30% of traffic; assuming an equal split will be adding 1-2 cars per cycle with current cycle length. Mr. States said part of adaptive system is to alternate with volume using algorithms. But, we don't know what the impact would be. Mr. McCuen asked what will be done if the study tells us nothing, to which Mr. States replied it could help to change timing plans that would remain as back up in the adaptive system. Mr. Suhr added studying the whole corridor is helpful to the Township. Mr. States said we have the design because Tanger did that, now LIDL comes in and changes that.

Mr. Suhr remarked that just because one project comes in does not mean the project should pay for the new information. Mr. Keylor said all the lights in that corridor affect this project because their patrons need to get there. Mr. Suhr pointed out that those are indirect effects; the TIS should look at direct effects, as required by the ordinance. Mr. Keylor stated if the Planning Commission does not approve the scope, then Board of Supervisors steps in. Mr. McCuen sees where Mr. Suhr is coming from, but the Planning Commission does not make this type of decision, and would rely on Township engineer, Solicitor, and Board of Supervisors; Mr. McCuen does not see how Planning Commission can come up with this decision. Mr. Ranck added they cannot make a decision as the Planning Commission. Mr. Rutt also added when Millcreek Square was presented, there was an overloaded highway and thought that there would be a change and now we still have an overloaded highway. Mr. Keylor said if they did the study then there would/could be changed to the Level of Service at intersections. Mr. States added that it is important to know the impact on base plans and timings for responsive and adaptive system.

Mr. Mountz agreed to give information to incorporate into the Township model but does not feel it is reasonable to do all new traffic counts. There would not be significant change to consider which other intersections would see potential increases such as other developments, Golden Corral and Sonic, where they required to do full study.

Mr. Suhr stated that at some point there was a discussion of a fee in lieu, this may be appropriate here, the developer would have to make an offer, this cannot be forced upon the applicant. Mr. Keylor replied it seems Tanger did the same thing. Mr. Keylor asked how much for a study? Instead of doing full study, then we'd like to offer "X" amount of dollars. Mr. McCuen said he always thought impact fees should be required. Recommendation is a good one but does not want to sound like the Planning Commission or Township is being paid off. Mr. Suhr clarified this would not be an impact fee, it would be voluntary contribution to the Township. Mr. McCuen inquired if the funds could be earmarked for traffic. Mr. Suhr asked to study 3 intersections, what would the cost be to study all 11 intersections? Mr. Mountz replied he will provide all data that LIDL comes up with and how long it takes Mr. States to get information in to the model. Mr. States explained the model is already done, all of the traffic analysis work is done, and that it is not just plugging in the data. The models have not touched timings for at least a year and Mr. States does not want to short change how much work this would be. Mr. Mountz added he does not really know what we, TDP, would be contributing to. Mr. States said something we need to work out with PennDOT as well. Mr. Mountz said he reached out to PennDOT for informal feedback and PennDOT does not want full blown traffic study but PennDOT would be okay with additional intersection.

Mr. States said he could not comment tonight on what additional work would need to be done. Mr. Mountz said if we get scope tonight, cost of building upon model and redoing model is very different. Mr. Keylor doesn't believe this board has expertise or desire to make a decision. Mr. McCuen asked if there could be a two-stage approach; if impact at two adjacent intersections then study the whole corridor. Mr. Mountz repeated the adaptive is going in no matter what and that's the solution. Mr. States reiterated that PennDOT was concerned with Apple Realty timing in corridor; when LIDL is introduced, it will affect the intersection and Mr. States is not going to come up with a dollar amount tonight. Mr. Rutt added LIDL is not taking raw land, these trips are at least somewhere counted in already, but we do not know how much because we are not experts. Mr. Mountz explained he is not getting credit for any existing trips.

Mr. McCuen asked Mr. States if he is recommending all 11? Mr. States said "Yes." Mr. McCuen said that's what we will agree with. Mr. Suhr asked if the Planning Commission would be agreeable to Mr. States and Mr. Mountz talking over the next week about the scope of work and the cost it would take to update the model for the applicant to consider as a fee in lieu of doing a full study. Mr. McCuen agreed, and added there is just not enough information for a decision tonight. Mr. Suhr asked if the Planning Commission would agree to Township Staff and Engineer working with the applicant to determine a resolution.

Mr. Keylor explained with input from tonight's meeting and the three groups, Township Staff, Township Engineer, and application-if three groups cannot come to an agreement by June 19, then LIDL will go to Board of Supervisors. Mr. Ranck said the Planning Commission could resolve this tonight by just requiring all 11 signals to be studied. Then he asked, what happens if there's more than the study says? There is too much traffic already and as a taxpayer, he does not want to have tax money go to this type of study.

On a motion by Mr. McCuen and second by Mr. Ranck with all voting in favor to table the request for the scope of the Traffic-Impact-Study meeting unless the Township Staff, Township Engineer, Applicant, and Applicant's Engineer come to a resolution by June 19th. If a resolution is not met, then the Applicant would proceed to the Board of Supervisors for resolution. As for the land development plan, on the same motion, with all voting in favor, the plan was tabled to the July Planning Commission meeting.

Briefing Items:

- A. PennDOT Vehicle Wash Facility, 2105 Lincoln Highway East #2017-08: Land Development Plan

- i. Ms. Hitchens briefly described the PennDOT wash facility will be presented in the future as they have more work to complete/add to the Land Development Plan.

Other Business:

- A. LUAB – June 1, 2017 was the first meeting in 11 months-City of Lancaster Implementation item of Zoning Ordinance Amendment; more information can be found at Lancaster Online
 - i. East Hempfield Township is no longer participating in LUAB
 - ii. LCPC Places 2040 Update: Scott Standish of LCPC will provide an update on their Places 2040 Plan
 - iii. Mr. Keylor said he is disappointed to hear when a Township drops out because interconnections are important.
 - iv. The next LUAB meeting is scheduled for Thursday, July 6, 2017 at 5:30pm.
- B. TIF Resolution: Ms. Hitchens explained the Tax Increment Financing and the need for the resolution. She also indicated that the Board of Supervisors requested that the Planning Commission consider the resolution language and map with the intent to take action at the July meeting.

Announcements:

- A. September 7 and 14 Zoning Administration PMPEI Course 10am-3:30pm at the Training Center, 101 Champ Blvd.
- B. Introduce Alecia Hair, Zoning/Planning/Building Administrative Assistant
- C. Mr. Keylor explained the role of the Planning Commission to the Boy Scout in the audience.

Adjournment:

On a motion by Mr. Ranck, a second by Mr. McCuen and a unanimous vote, the meeting was adjourned at 9:30pm. The next Planning Commission meeting will be held on Tuesday, July 11, 2017 at 7:30pm in the East Lampeter Township Office, 2250 Old Philadelphia Pike, Lancaster, PA 17602.

Respectfully submitted,

Tara A. Hitchens, AICP
Director of Planning/Zoning Officer