CALL TO ORDER

The Tuesday, January 8, 2013 Derry Township Planning Commission meeting was called to order at 6:00 p.m. in the meeting room of the Derry Township Municipal Complex, 600 Clearwater Road, Hershey, PA, by Matt Tunnell.

ROLL CALL

Commission Members Present: Matt Tunnell; Ned Wehler; Gregg Mangione; Joyce St. John

Commission Member Absent: Glenn Rowe

Also Present: Chuck Emerick, Director of Community Development; Brandon Williams, Assistant Director of Community Development; Matt Bonanno, HRG, Inc.; Diane Krug, Dauphin County Planning Commission representative; Jenelle Stumpf, Community Development Secretary

Public Registering Attendance: Brian T. Evans, Evans Engineering; Curtis Stevens, Penn State Harrisburg PhD student; Jim Rafferty, Tana Properties, LLC; Kenny Hinebaugh, Evans Engineering; Jim DeHoff, Select Medical; Matt Weir, Church Road; Joe A. Burget, Jr., Burget & Associates; Sandy Ballard, 650 Cocoa Avenue; Mike Moravetz, 111 Forest Avenue

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

On a motion made by Member St. John and seconded by Member Wehler, the Planning Commission approved the minutes of December 11, 2012 as written.

REORGANIZATION

Member Tunnell announced that Glenn Rowe was appointed to the Planning Commission at the Board of Supervisors meeting on January 7, 2013. Mr. Rowe fills the vacancy left by Pete Gleason, whose term expired at the end of 2012.

On a motion made by Member Wehler and seconded by Member St. John, the Planning Commission unanimously approved reorganization for 2013 as follows:

Chairman – Matt Tunnell Vice Chairwoman – Joyce St. John Secretary – Gregg Mangione

On a motion made by Member Wehler and seconded by Secretary Mangione, the Planning Commission unanimously nominated Joyce St. John to serve as the Planning Commission's representative on the Design Review Board.

Chuck Emerick noted that Glenn Rowe also currently serves on the Design Review Board as a business owner in the Chocolate Avenue Preservation Overlay district. Mr. Emerick does not believe there is a conflict in having two Planning Commission members on the Design Review Board.

OLD BUSINESS

A. Report of the Board of Supervisors' action regarding the Preliminary/Final Land Development and Stormwater Site Management Plan for Hershey's Chocolate World Building and Parking Expansion, Plat #1218

Mr. Emerick reported that the Supervisors approved Plat #1218 at their meeting of December 18, 2012.

B. The Preliminary/Final Subdivision Plan for Scott R. Ortenzio and Zachary G. and Linda A. Ortenzio, Plat #1220

Mr. Emerick informed the Planning Commission that during their consideration of this plan, he had neglected to provide the Commission a copy of the 'Request for Planning Waiver and Non-Building Declaration'. This Declaration is an acknowledgment that the applicants are complying with the zoning regulations. He asked that the Chairman execute the Declaration on behalf of the Planning Commission.

NEW BUSINESS

A. Review and recommendation of Zoning Petition No. 2012-02 as filed by The Hershey Company to change the zoning classification of a portion of the property addressed as 19 East Chocolate Avenue; and the accompanying request to amend the Comprehensive Plan

Mr. Emerick reported that with the completion of the West Hershey Plant, The Hershey Company has decommissioned production at their facility located at 19 East Chocolate Avenue. While they are presently working on revitalization of a portion of the historic facilities on the property, the productions buildings are slated for demolition. 7.07 acres of the site were rezoned from Industrial to Village Core in 2012.

The subject area of this request contains 24.25 acres of land. It is located on the north side of East Chocolate Avenue, east of the former Hershey Trust Bank and adjacent office building; south of the "Silo Tract"; adjacent to the railroad; and extends to Mansion Road West and to lands of the Country Club. Chocolate Realty is the current owner of the subject property, but The Hershey Company has controlling interest of it. In order to enable redevelopment of this portion of the property, The Hershey Company is requesting that the 24.25 acres of land be rezoned from an Industrial zoning classification to a Village Core classification.

The applicant also requests an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan in conjunction with the rezoning request.

Mr. Emerick's recommendation is that the Comprehensive Plan amendment and the zoning amendment as requested by Petition No. 2012-02 be implemented.

Diane Krug stated that the Dauphin County Planning Commission supports the amendments, but noted that the County tax records show the Derry Township Municipal Authority and PP&L as being the owners of two of the three subject properties. These owners should be included in the rezoning process.

Kenny Hinebaugh of Evans Engineering represented the proposal. He stated that the 19 East Chocolate Avenue property is made up of 7 separate parcels, and one of those parcels is owned by PP&L. The Derry Township Municipal Authority has no ownership of any property in the subject area, and this is an issue that The Hershey Company has been trying to resolve with the County tax assessment office for several months.

Mr. Hinebaugh explained that the main parcel of the site was sold to a real estate company, and The Hershey Company is leasing the western portion of the site for use as office space. At the time of the sale (early 2012), it was anticipated that there would be a subdivision plan to divide the property into 3 parcels, with the center parcel being the property that would retain the leaseback area of The Hershey Company's office space. In preparation for that subdivision and in order to be in better compliance with the Zoning Ordinance, The Hershey Company requested that the western portion of the site be rezoned from Industrial to Village Core. The subdivision line was intended to run through the existing building, which was another reason for the first rezoning request. Later in 2012 the decision was made to demolish the eastern portion of the property and because of that, the property line can be moved away from the building instead of through it. This is why the rezoning requests were submitted at different times. The eastern portion of the site is still for sale and presently it is not known what its future development will be.

Mr. Emerick commented that a portion of this property is severed by the Chocolate Avenue Preservation Overlay district. He suggests that the Township consider extending the overlay district north to the railroad tracks, from the 19 East Chocolate Avenue property west to approximately where the old recycling plant used to be. Doing so would incorporate property that is somewhat staged for development and can be seen from Chocolate Avenue. Mr. Emerick believes that extending the overlay district will help to preserve and protect the integrity of the downtown. He stated that his suggestion is for discussion, not action, by the Planning Commission at this meeting.

Public Comment:

Sandy Ballard, 650 Cocoa Avenue, thought it would be useful for the Planning Commission to hear all of the permitted uses in the Village Core zoning district and asked Mr. Emerick to list them. Ms. Ballard then asked if the effect of the proposal would also be to increase property tax revenue. Mr. Hinebaugh responded that The Hershey Company would have to answer that question. Ms. Ballard commented that this proposal seems to be 'upzoning', allowing for more permitted uses, which usually means the land can be sold for more money therefore resulting in an increase in tax revenue. She thinks it would be beneficial to have feedback from the applicant on her question before the matter is considered by the Board of Supervisors.

Planning Commission comments:

Secretary Mangione asked if the rezoning would make the property more desirable to potential developers. Mr. Emerick responded yes, and added that during the Design Review Board meeting for consideration of the demolition of the eastern portion of 19 East Chocolate Avenue, it was made known that the existing buildings do not have an economic feasibility for redevelopment. The Hershey Company also determined that there are no industrial buyers for a site in downtown Hershey.

Vice Chairwoman St. John asked how the parking areas on the other side of East Chocolate Avenue are zoned. Mr. Emerick stated that because The Hershey Company has taken the manufacturing aspect out of downtown, one might expect that their employees would be relocated to other facilities. However, it is intended that 800-1,100 office employees will work in the leaseback area of the property. Presently, every parking space that was needed for the chocolate plant will now be required for the renovated office space. Mr. Emerick envisions that with redevelopment of the eastern portion of the property, a multi-level parking garage would be proposed. This would be a permitted use in the Village Core district.

Member Wehler asked if there are any land use restrictions in the original deeds for the subject property. Mr. Hinebaugh responded that to the best of his knowledge there are no such restrictions. Mr. Emerick added that he is not aware of any but if they did exist, they were likely inflicted by Milton Hershey, The Hershey Company, or The Hershey Trust Company. He believes that the restrictions could be abandoned if so desired. Member Wehler asked if the original chocolate plant is within the buildings that are going to be demolished. Mr. Hinebaugh stated that Milton Hershey demolished the original plant, but The Hershey Company will be maintaining the 2 oldest buildings on the property. Vice Chairwoman St. John added that per the Design Review Board's approval of the demolition, the stone façade of the building along Chocolate Avenue will also be preserved.

Mr. Emerick stated that his suggestion to extend the Chocolate Avenue Preservation Overlay district will be brought before the Planning Commission for consideration as a separate item from the rezoning/Comprehensive Plan amendment that is being considered at this meeting. Vice Chairwoman St. John asked if the railroad tracks are being used as a boundary for the extension of overlay district, or if the boundary would be a certain distance measured from the centerline of Chocolate Avenue. Mr. Emerick responded that the boundary would be the railroad tracks, which is basically the rear property line of the properties in the subject area. Vice Chairwoman St. John asked how the current parameters of the overlay district were determined. Mr. Emerick believes they were based on the location of the alleys that parallel Chocolate Avenue.

Member Wehler asked if The Hershey Company wanted to amend their petition to include Mr. Emerick's suggested extension of the overlay district. Mr. Hinebaugh replied that at the present time The Hershey Company wants to defer comment on the suggestion; however, they do not want it to be part of their petition. Mr. Emerick clarified that he is not linking the extension of the overlay district to The Hershey Company's request.

Mr. Emerick commented that a formal proposal to extend the overlay district would likely include text amendments to the Zoning Ordinance to clarify what is allowed in the district. Chairman Tunnell stated that he would be interested in hearing public comment on the matter prior to the Planning Commission making a recommendation. Member Wehler stated that he is not comfortable with the current Design Review Board guidelines and would be in favor of something more advanced and understandable that comes from a wide variety of outside and Township input.

MOTION ON PETITION NO. 2012-02 AND REQUEST TO AMEND COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

On a motion made by Secretary Mangione, seconded by Member Wehler, and a unanimous vote, the Planning Commission recommended that the Comprehensive Plan amendment and Zoning Map amendment represented by Petition No. 2012-02 be implemented.

B. Review and recommendation of the Preliminary/Final Land Development and Stormwater Management Site Plan for the Select Medical Building Expansion, Plat #1222

Mr. Emerick reported that this plan represents the expansion of the 61,058-square-foot Select Medical rehabilitation hospital located near the western terminus of Old West Chocolate Avenue. This expansion will add 38,150 square feet of new facility, mostly comprised of a 2-story addition. A traffic report was included with the submission.

Waivers are requested from the Subdivision and Land Development regulations as follows:

- a. From Sections 185-12.D.(2) and 185-13.E.(3) Plan scale. Mr. Emerick recommended that the waiver be granted.
- b. From Sections 185-12.D.(3).(a).[7] and 185-13.E.(4).(a).[7] Metes and bounds of street right-of-ways, centerlines, and easements. Mr. Emerick recommended that the waiver be granted for the areas documented on the previous plan, but not for the area previously dedicated for West Chocolate Avenue right-of-way.
- c. From Sections 185-12.D.(3).(a).[21] and 185-13.E.(4).(a).[19] Stormwater plan and profiles. Mr. Emerick recommended that the waiver be granted.
- d. From Sections 185-12.D.(3).(a).[22] and 185-13.E.(4).(a).[20] Sanitary plan and profiles. Mr. Emerick recommended that the waiver be granted, with the exception of providing a sanitary sewer profile between H122A-13 and H122A-14 to depict the new manhole and new sanitary sewer lateral.
- e. From Sections 185-12.D.(3).(a).[23] and 185-13.E.(4).(a).[21] Utility plan and profiles. Mr. Emerick recommended that the waiver be granted, with the exception of the area where the grading has been modified over the existing water lateral.
- f. From Section 185-22.E.(5) Curbing. Mr. Emerick recommended that the waiver be granted.

g. From Section 185-34 – Sidewalks, walkways, and bicycle paths. The applicant requests a deferment of construction of concrete sidewalk for the portion of the site between the intersection of Hersheypark Drive and West Chocolate Avenue and the easternmost drive on the site, for a period of 1 year beginning from the activation of the proposed traffic signal to be installed in the spring of 2013. Mr. Emerick views this request as an extension of time rather than a waiver. As long as bonding for the PennDOT permits necessary to install the sidewalk is included in the bonding for the sidewalk, Mr. Emerick supports the time extension.

A waiver of the standard location is also being sought to allow the proposed sidewalk to work with the existing topographic planimetric features. Mr. Emerick recommended that the waiver be granted.

Finally, the applicant requests a deferment for the portion of the site between the easternmost driveway and the eastern limits of the property until such time as development to the east of the site warrants the installation of the path. Select Medical would agree to install the path within one year of notification from the Township. The applicant proposes to work with the Township staff to plan for and develop an asphalt path in this area. Mr. Emerick recommended that the deferment be granted, as long as a pedestrian access easement is provided.

Member Wehler commented that the location of the proposed concrete sidewalk seems to have an unevenness. Brian Evans, Evans Engineering, responded that they only provided a concept and will work with staff to specify the exact location of the sidewalk. The unevenness is due to the proposed location following the site's topography so that steep areas can be avoided. Mr. Evans stated that the concrete sidewalk would connect to an 8'-wide asphalt path. He explained that it would be cheaper to install a long length of asphalt in this area instead of concrete.

Secretary Mangione asked if the applicant will be responsible for keeping the asphalt path clear in the event of inclement weather, as they are required to do with concrete sidewalk. Mr. Emerick answered yes.

- h. From Section 185-42 Traffic study. The applicant has submitted an abridged traffic study. A waiver is requested because a full traffic study was performed as part of the original land development plan in 2009.
- i. From Section 174-13 of the Stormwater Management Ordinance Volume controls. This waiver is requested due to the results of infiltration testing and the recommendations of a geologist.

Mr. Emerick reviewed his list of corrections to be made to the plan, which he stated are fairly minor in nature. He recommended approval of the plan, provided that the issues brought up by the new waiver requests ('g', 'h', and 'i') are resolved.

Matt Bonanno of HRG went over some of his review comments. He stated that his request that the applicant provide volume controls precipitated the waiver request, and he noted that the stormwater management report submitted with the 2009 plan indicated infiltration throughout the site. Mr. Bonanno added that regarding the applicant's request for a waiver from providing a full traffic study, he would support the submission of a limited study but would still like to see the traffic signal plan to ensure that the signal timings and the geometry of the intersection are consistent and appropriate with the traffic additions proposed by Plat #1222.

Diane Krug went over the Dauphin County Planning Commission review comments.

Mr. Evans stated that they do not have any issues with the review comments. Regarding the traffic study waiver request, the applicant does not see a need to re-study the area but they do not have an issue with working with Township staff and HRG to provide the information requested.

Chairman Tunnell asked who is designing the traffic signal. Mr. Evans stated that it was done by Trans Associates, who designed the signal on behalf of Select Medical. The design has already been approved by PennDOT.

Mr. Evans stated that regarding the stormwater waiver request, when borings were done rock was hit very quickly. In order to get everything to drain, they would have to excavate. Infiltration is not recommended. The waiver request was missed in the initial submission.

Public Comment:

Sandy Ballard, 650 Cocoa Avenue, asked if trees are being provided as required within the new parking area. Mr. Emerick answered yes.

Matt Weir, a resident of Church Road, commented that he likes the plan, the open space, and the walking path. He hopes the parking area can use either a vegetative swale or curb cuts to drain water into the area where the trees are rather than raise the planting beds. Mr. Evans stated that it is a graded slope so the use of curb cuts is not an option.

Planning Commission comments:

Member Wehler asked how water drains from the new detention pond and discharges from the property. Mr. Evans highlighted the discharge path on the plan. It is the intent to slow the water down and release it through a level spreader. Member Wehler asked if the drainage area is almost entirely the Select Medical property and parking area. Mr. Evans responded yes.

MOTION ON WAIVERS

On a motion made by Member Wehler, seconded by Secretary Mangione, and a unanimous vote, the Planning Commission recommended that waiver requests 'a' through 'i' be granted, with the exceptions to waivers being those qualifiers that staff added to the waiver requests 'b', 'd', 'e', and 'g'.

MOTION ON PLAT #1222

On a motion made by Member Wehler, seconded by Vice Chairwoman St. John, and a unanimous vote, the Planning Commission recommended approval of Plat #1222, subject to the comments noted

in items 2 and 3 of the staff report; all of the HRG comments; all of the DTMA comments; and comments 3 through 7 of the Dauphin County Planning Commission being satisfactorily addressed.

C. Review and recommendation of the Preliminary/Final Subdivision/Land Development Plan for Curry Mill, Plat #1223

Mr. Emerick explained that this plan depicts the development of the former Curry Mill located on Old West Chocolate Avenue, in the vicinity of the intersection of Old West Chocolate Avenue and North Hockersville Road. Relief was sought from the Zoning Hearing Board for the use of the property as a full-service restaurant with a nightclub element, and also from certain dimensional requirements. As part of the renovation, restoration, and preservation of this structure, the applicant will be adding 72 parking spaces, and a substantial subsurface stormwater management facility and 2 means of egress will be provided. The plan also proposes the combination of existing lots owned by Tana Properties; a land swap with the adjacent property of E.W. Properties, LLC; and vacation of a portion of Hockersville Road right-of-way. A traffic study was not included in this submission.

Mr. Emerick stated that he is recommending rejection of the plan in its current condition, and the applicant is aware of this. The applicant is in attendance at the meeting to discuss the waivers only. Revisions will be made to the plan based on the review comments noted.

Waivers are requested from the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance as follows:

- a. From Sections 185-12.D.(3).(a).[21] and 185-13.E.(4).(a).[19] Storm sewer profile scale. Mr. Emerick recommended that the waivers be granted, and that the applicant correct the request to indicate a waiver of showing profiles for existing facilities and include relief for vertical scale.
- b. From Section 185-25.B Driveway grade within 20' edge paving. Mr. Emerick recommended that the waiver be granted.
- c. From Section 185-12.D.(2) Plan sheet scale. Mr. Emerick recommended that this waiver be granted. Although the applicant asked for a waiver to show the plan at a scale of 1'' = 50', Mr. Emerick believes it is meant that they are requesting to show the plan at a scale of 1'' = 60'.
- d. From Section 185-22.D.(3) 60' minimum right-of-way for minor road. Mr. Emerick considers Old West Chocolate Avenue to be a collector road, requiring a minimum right-of-way width of 65 feet. Additional dedicated right-of-way would, in this case, limit the developability of the subject premises. The property being developed is uniquely shallow, necessitating some of the various variances granted by the Zoning Hearing Board. Therefore, for consistency with the relief granted by that Board, Mr. Emerick recommended granting the waiver.

- e. From Section 185-22.D.(3).(c) 34' cartway for minor road. Mr. Emerick recommended that the waiver be granted. He considers Old West Chocolate Avenue to be a collector road, which would require a 40' paved cartway width.
- f. From Section 185-22.E.(5) Curbing along West Chocolate Avenue. Mr. Emerick recommended that the waiver be granted as a deferment, since this is a PennDOT road and is subject to PennDOT requirements.
- g. From Section 185-42 providing a traffic study. Mr. Emerick recommended that this waiver be denied. He stated that the applicant has provided no information as to the increase in traffic projected by this project. If information is provided and is acceptable regarding anticipated traffic increases not requiring improvements at the site and a contribution is provided toward the anticipated traffic signal at the intersection of West Chocolate Avenue and Hersheypark Drive, then this waiver may be able to be supported. Mr. Emerick suggested to the applicant that a fair traffic contribution would be in the amount of what a full traffic study would cost.

Joe Burget, Burget and Associates, represented the plan. He explained the plan so that the Planning Commission could better understand the reasons for the waiver requests.

Mr. Burget stated that they did not request a waiver from installing sidewalk because they intend to defer the construction until later date. He outlined the proposed location of the sidewalk.

Jim Rafferty represents Tana Properties and will be managing the restaurant site. He is concerned about encouraging pedestrian traffic at the railroad overpass. The eastbound traffic lane underneath the overpass is quite narrow, and the existing sidewalk in this area is in disrepair. To the east of the overpass, the sidewalk terminates and then picks up again at Swatara Avenue. Mr. Rafferty stated that if a solution can be found, they would be happy to repair their portion of the sidewalk. He believes that most people will drive to the site and that this portion of Old West Chocolate Avenue is not suited for a continual sidewalk. There is also a lack of lighting underneath the overpass.

Mr. Emerick has asked the applicant to consider reopening the existing pedestrian corridor under the railroad tracks. He believes people will want to walk to and from this site and the area in general, and he is reluctant to support a sidewalk waiver. Mr. Burget stated that he did not submit this waiver request because he did not know how it would be received by the Planning Commission, but he would like to get their thoughts on the matter.

Public Comment:

Sandy Ballard, 650 Cocoa Avenue, thinks a waiver from sidewalk installation should not be granted. She believes people will want to walk to the site, and that future development of the surrounding area should be taken into consideration.

Planning Commission comments:

Secretary Mangione asked if the tunnel is the responsibility of the railroad. Mr. Emerick stated that the railroad believes it is not their responsibility; however, he thinks the railroad will play a role in the reopening of the tunnel and that is why he asked the applicant to explore the possibility.

Mr. Rafferty stated that he had spoken to someone at Norfolk Southern, and their position was that they would not permit any passage over or under the railway now or in the future. He has asked that a representative of Norfolk Southern visit the site because the tunnel is a liability. It currently has 6" to 1' of water in it and is not secured on one end. Mr. Rafferty thinks the tunnel would be an attractive feature for the site, and he would be happy to provide security gates on either side of the tunnel that can be locked after their building is closed.

Regarding the traffic study waiver request, Vice Chairwoman St. John asked if Mr. Emerick's recommendation of denial of the waiver is in regards to a full study, or to only giving some kind of indication of what the traffic is. Mr. Emerick stated that the applicant has not provided enough information to determine whether or not a study is required and therefore he cannot make an informed recommendation. Mr. Burget stated that information was submitted to PennDOT who determined that a study was not necessary, but Mr. Burget failed to submit this information to the Township. He asked that this waiver request not be discussed at this meeting.

Member Wehler questioned what the hardship is regarding the driveway grade waiver, and whether the project constitutes a change in use and volume in association with the use of that driveway. Mr. Burget responded that the driveway grade is currently about 14% and they are proposing to make the grade flatter, but they cannot achieve the 20' requirement because there is not enough distance from the road to the back wall of the building. This driveway will only be used for delivery trucks and trash pickup. Member Wehler asked if it will be used by emergency services. Mr. Burget stated that he expects they would park along the road. Member Wehler asked how the relief will affect the ability to convey a sidewalk across the driveway. Mr. Burget stated that sidewalk is proposed along the existing right-of-way where the property is flatter. Also, there will be signage at this driveway indicating that it is not for public use. PennDOT approval is still required for both of the driveways.

Chairman Tunnell thinks that regardless of whether or not the Commission grants waiver requests 'd' and 'e', PennDOT will have a larger say as to what is required.

Member Wehler asked if the driveway will divert runoff onto Old West Chocolate Avenue. Mr. Burget responded yes. Member Wehler asked if anything is proposed to avoid this situation in the future. Mr. Burget stated that it is a good point but this is a hard place to control the water because there are no inlets. They can look into correcting the situation. Member Wehler stated that he is not in favor of waiver request 'b' from both a stormwater runoff and grade standpoint.

MOTION ON WAIVERS

On a motion made by Vice Chairwoman St. John, seconded by Secretary Mangione, and a unanimous vote, the Planning Commission recommended that waiver requests 'a', 'c', 'd', 'e', and 'f' be granted as recommended by Township staff.

Mr. Emerick requested that the applicant provide an extension of time for the Township to act on the plan.

Chairman Tunnell commented that the Planning Commission has offered commentary to the applicant regarding the two waiver requests that were not acted on ('b' and 'g'). Regarding a potential sidewalk waiver request, he believes that it has been increasingly difficult for applicants to receive approval for sidewalk waivers or even deferments because of the interest in having a walkable community.

OTHER BUSINESS

A. Comprehensive Plan discussion

Brandon Williams gave a brief overview of Chapter 2 (Demographics) of the Comprehensive Plan regarding regional population trends; social characteristics; race and ethnicity; school enrollment and educational attainment; employment and income characteristics; household characteristics; and housing construction by decade.

Mr. Williams asked the Planning Commission to submit their review comments regarding Chapter 2.

ADJOURNMENT

On a motion made by Vice Chairwoman St. John, seconded by Secretary Mangione, and a unanimous vote, the meeting adjourned at 8:54 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregg Mangione Secretary

Submitted by:

Jenelle Stumpf Community Development Secretary