

LOWER PAXTON TOWNSHIP
PLANNING COMMISSION

March 8, 2006

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT

Richard Beverly
Betsy Sibert
Roy Newsome
Fredrick Lighty
Ernest Gingrich
William Neff

ALSO PRESENT

Dianne Moran
Lori Wissler
Chip Millard

Call to Order

Mr. Lighty called the regular meeting of the Lower Paxton Township Planning Commission to order at 7:05 pm, on February 8, 2006 at the Lower Paxton Township Municipal Center, 425 Prince Street, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania.

Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag

Mr. Gingrich led the recitation of the Pledge.

Approval of Minutes

Mr. Beverly made a motion to approve the minutes of the meetings held on January 11, 2006, January 25, 2006, and February 8, 2006 as submitted. Ms. Sibert seconded the motion. Mr. Neff was absent from the meeting on February 8, 2006 and therefore abstained from voting regarding the minutes for that date. The minutes were otherwise unanimously approved.

OLD BUSINESS

Preliminary/Final Subdivision Plan #05-06

Robert E. Smith

Mr. Lighty stated the applicant has requested the plan be tabled. Mr. Newsome made a motion to table the Preliminary/Final Subdivision Plan #05-06 for Robert E. Smith. Mr. Gingrich seconded the motion, and the motion carried unanimously.

Preliminary/Final Subdivision and Land Development Plan #05-17
Hartman Motorcars

Ms. Moran stated the purpose of this plan is to combine the five existing lots into one single parcel. This will permit the construction of a new Toyota showroom and service facility, additions and alterations to the main building and an addition to the carwash/paint shop building. Curb and sidewalk installation is proposed along the frontage of Allentown Boulevard and extending to the east on a portion of North Mountain Road. Newly paved off street parking facilities are also proposed.

The property is located at the northeast corner of the intersection of Allentown Boulevard and North Mountain Road. The property consists of 6.815 acres and is served by public sewer and private on-lot well. The property is zoned C-1, General Commercial District.

Hartman Motorcars was granted a Conditional Use Permit (#2005-03) for the expansion of the new and used car lot on August 16, 2005.

The Zoning Hearing Board granted a variance (Docket #1167) for the front yard setback requirements in conjunction with a proposed addition.

Ms. Moran stated the applicant has requested the following waivers: Waiver of the preliminary plan requirement; waiver of the curb requirement along the frontage of a portion of North Arlene Street and a portion of North Mountain Road; and waiver of the sidewalk requirement along the frontages of North Arlene Street and a portion of North Mountain Road.

Mr. Jeffrey Staub, Dauphin Engineering Company, was present on behalf of the plan.

Mr. Neff asked what was granted with regard to the front yard setback by the Zoning Hearing Board. Mr. Neff asked if they waived any part of that requirement. Ms. Moran answered yes.

Mr. Staub stated this plan was submitted to the Township last year, in a relatively different form. The applicant requested that PennDOT allow the existing parking currently in PennDOT's right-of-way to remain, however PennDOT would not allow this. This took several months. PennDOT was concerned about the improvements that may or may not happen to North Mountain Road and Allentown Boulevard with the Wal-Mart plan. This plan does remove that parking from the right-of-way. The site will be quite an improvement to what is there now, by increasing the landscaping around the perimeter of the site. The applicant is in the process of getting PennDOT permits for the three curb-cuts. The green space of the overall site is being increased as well. Because of that, they are not required to do stormwater detention. Even though many of the elements of the plan are pre-existing non-conforming, the applicant is trying to comply with the new C-1

ordinance as much as possible. At this point there are only a few comments remaining. Mr. Lighty asked if the applicant has any problem with any remaining comments. Mr. Staub answered no.

Mr. Lighty asked what the variance was granted for. Mr. Staub answered that it was for the building encroachment into the front yard setback, which used to be 30 feet, but is now 55 feet because of the new C-1 requirements.

Mr. Staub stated the applicant is not proposing any shade trees along Allentown Boulevard. Township Staff is asking that trees be provided because it is now a requirement of 1199. Ms. Moran will discuss with Dr. Norman Lacasse regarding what type of tree would be suitable there. The applicant does want to comply with the ordinances, but it is still a car dealership that wants the cars to be very visible, even when the trees are mature.

Mr. Gingrich noted that the staff comments mention trees along North Mountain Road, not Allentown Boulevard. Mr. Staub stated there may not be any room to plant trees along North Mountain Road, particularly north of the access drive, because that is the limited-access right-of-way of Interstate 81. That has also not been included on the applications to PennDOT. A waiver or variance may need to be requested for that requirement. Ms. Moran stated that Mr. William Weaver from the Township Sewer Authority does not want trees along Allentown Boulevard because the roots may interfere with the sewer lines there. Ms. Moran stated she will meet with Mr. Staub and Dr. Lacasse regarding this, and if it is not feasible to put trees along North Mountain Road, a variance will be necessary. Mr. Staub was concerned about putting anything in PennDOT's limited-access right-of-way. That may involve application to the Federal Highway Administration. Mr. Staub stated some trees can be planted in the islands, although there may be something in the ordinance that limits that as well, such as clear sight triangle, height or type of tree allowed in the islands. Ms. Wissler stated something should be able to be worked out without a variance because the ordinance does say the location shall be approved by the Township and the Shade Tree Commission.

Mr. Newsome noted there are two access points on the ramp to I-81, and all three access drives will be signed for right-in and right-out only. Mr. Newsome asked where the traffic would go if it wants to east on Route 22. Mr. Staub stated this is the existing condition, and they currently go to the left-turn lane at North Mountain Road and Route 22 and make a u-turn, or go down to Lincoln Street and make a u-turn. Mr. Newsome asked if a vehicle could turn left out of North Arlene Street onto Allentown Boulevard. Mr. Staub stated a vehicle can turn left from east-bound Allentown Boulevard onto North Arlene Street, but cannot turn left from North Arlene Street onto Allentown Boulevard. PennDOT did stated in their pre-application meeting that Hartman could maintain the three access points.

Mr. Neff stated he is glad to see the waiting area on the east side of the building has been removed.

Mr. Neff stated on the previous drawing an enclosed dumpster is shown, but is not shown on the current plan. Mr. Staub stated he is not sure where the dumpster will go, but the lot does have more parking spaces than is required by ordinance. The contractor will work with Mr. Hartman regarding the dumpster. Mr. Staub added that most of the garbage receptacles are inside the building according to the Conditional Use application. There will be a small fenced area behind the body shop that will be used for outdoor storage, but it is not a dumpster area. Mr. Staub stated there was a concern with the temporary storage of unlicensed vehicles, and Mr. Hartman assured the Board of Supervisors that the turn-around on those is 7 days. On a very regular basis the vehicles are recycled to auctions, so they are not on-site long.

Mr. Neff stated there is a large auto-body repair and painting operation. Mr. Neff asked if there is an area set aside for flammables storage. Mr. Staub was unable to answer the question, but stated that the painting facility is state-of-the-art, so the management of paints and thinners and other products is legitimate. Mr. Neff stated that anywhere vehicles are painted, the NFPA generally requires a separate storage and allows the fire department to know there is an area with those goods. Mr. Staub stated those are not stored outside.

Mr. Neff suggested the trees could be clumped together periodically throughout the lot to break it up.

Mr. Neff noted the plan shows the billboard being removed and relocated. Mr. Neff asked if Lamar intends to relocate that billboard, and if that would require a site plan. Mr. Staub stated Mr. Hartman did request a variance to relocate the billboard closer to the ramp to the highway, and that was denied. Since the billboard cannot be relocated, it has to be removed in order to do the renovations and additions proposed. Mr. Neff stated the word "relocate" should be removed from the plan.

Mr. Lighty noted that the plan shows two handicapped spaces. Mr. Staub showed the Commission where the 6 handicapped spaces are located in the vicinity of the two dealership buildings, and one at the auto-body and paint area. Mr. Staub stated additional spaces were added to address the County's comment.

Mr. Newsome asked about the curbing along North Mountain Road past the radius of the access. Mr. Staub stated that is the portion that the waiver is being requested for, including part of the ramp for sidewalks. Mr. Newsome noted the request for waivers regarding sidewalks is listed separate. Mr. Newsome felt the curb should be extended up North Mountain Road, and asked why the waiver was requested for curbs in that area. Mr. Staub stated that in the vicinity of the limited-access right-of-way there is no curbing along North Mountain Road. Mr. Newsome stated there are curbs along the other side of North Mountain Road in front of the gas stations. Mr. Staub agreed, but the limited-access stops when you leave the ramp. Mr. Staub stated there is about 150 feet where curbing could go before the ramp. Mr. Newsome requested sidewalks be

continued to an equivalent place on the other side. Mr. Staub will contact PennDOT to see if the HOP can be revised.

Mr. Neff noted the parking area for service was along where the waiting area is being removed, and there was handicapped spaces there. Mr. Neff asked where the entrance for the service area will be. Mr. Staub showed on the plan where the bump-out will be, and noted it is a covered entrance for Toyota. For Chrysler Jeep, the waiting room and the service write-up is relocated near where the two handicapped spaces are. Both service areas are accessed by the driveway that runs between them. Mr. Neff expressed his understanding that at the Toyota area, the customer drives the car to the covered area, and a technician takes the car from there and the customer goes into the waiting room from there. Mr. Staub noted there are some handicapped spaces next to that service drop-off area.

Mr. Millard did not have any additional comments. There was no comment from the audience.

Mr. Newsome made a motion to recommend approval of the Preliminary/Final Subdivision and Land Development Plan #05-17 for Additions and Alterations to Harrisburg Toyota, Chrysler, Jeep, Hartman Motorcars at 6060 Allentown Boulevard, subject to the resolution of the comments, and approval of the waivers for preliminary plan requirement and sidewalk requirement along North Arlene and the portion of North Mountain Road, and waiver of the curb requirements along the frontage of North Arlene Street, and denial of the waiver request for curbing along North Mountain Road. Ms. Sibert seconded the motion. The motion carried by a unanimous vote.

Preliminary Subdivision Plan #05-52
Montrail

Ms. Wissler stated the purpose of the plan is to subdivide the overall tract into 60 lots, 57 lots are proposed to be single-family building lots, and three lots are proposed to be passive recreation open space lots. The tract consists of 44.3101 acres, is located north of Union Deposit Road and east of Central Dauphin School District, and will be served by public water and public sewer.

The property was rezoned from R-1, Low Density Residential District to TRND, Traditional Residential Neighborhood District. The 57 lots were established based on the yield plan that was submitted and reviewed by Staff.

One of the comments from the first review was that minimum lot width of 90 feet is required in the TRND. Smaller lot widths have been proposed, and therefore, a variance request has been submitted to the Zoning Hearing Board.

Ms. Wissler stated the applicant requested the following waivers: waiver of the minor street right-of-way width requirement from 60 feet to 50 feet and the minor street width requirement from 36 feet to 28 feet for minor streets for Skylon Drive and Redhawk Circle; waiver of the horizontal curve radius requirement for minor streets from 275 feet to 125 feet for two curves for Skylon Drive, from 275 feet to 150 feet for Skylon Drive and from 275 feet to 160 feet for one curve for Redhawk Circle; waiver of the maximum length requirement for cul-de-sac streets from 600 feet to 735 feet for Redhawk Circle; waiver of the requirement to provide vertical concrete curb; waiver of the requirement that prohibits landscaped areas in cul-de-sacs for Redhawk Circle; and waiver of the requirement that storage capacity for the 25 storm is 5,000 cubic feet or less, the method of storage be underground facility (Infiltration Basin C).

Mr. Jeffrey Staub was present on behalf of the plan. Mr. Staub stated he has received copies of all the comments, and would like to discuss the issue of the two waiver requests for minimum horizontal curve radius of 125 for Skylon Drive. When this plan was before the Board of Supervisors being rezoned to TRND, this issue was discussed that this plan and its street geometry was done in such a fashion as to not disturb any wetlands or steep slope. In order to do that, these waivers are necessary. HRG and the Public Works Department do not recommend that those waivers be granted.

Mr. Staub noted another critical issue to this plan, is that many of the lots have a lot width of less than 90 feet. Mr. Staub stated that in the Township zoning ordinance, there are two zoning overlay districts, one is the RC, and the TRND. In the RC, the lot minimum lot size may be reduced of the underlying zone by 50%, which would allow this one to go from 20,000 to 10,000 square feet. The minimum lot width is allowed to be reduced by a similar percentage. In the TRND, the ordinance does not speak directly to the minimum lot width being reduced at all, neither allowing nor prohibiting it. It does say the minimum lot size can be reduced from 20,000 to 10,000 square feet. Many of the lots have a lot width at the building setback line of around 80 feet. This plan is faithful to the rezoning plan that was submitted to the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Staub noted that there is only one other TRND development in the Township, that plan is Huntleigh. That plan was approved with a number of lots having a lot width of less than 90 feet. Since that, Fine Line Homes has been notified that in the future, final subdivision plans will have to have variances for this, even though the preliminary plan was approved this way. Mr. Schmel will recommend to the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors that the TRND ordinance be revised to allow the minimum lot width to be reduced, similar to what is in the RC district. Mr. Lighty noted that there will be no "TRND", but it will then be called "Open Space Development." Mr. Staub noted that whatever it is called, this provision will be added. Ms. Wissler added that this is an oversight. The TRND and the RC are almost exactly the same except that TRND does not allow townhomes. The TRND does not mention lot width reductions, so you have to use the underlying zone which has a minimum lot width of 90 feet. In the new Open Space Development, there will be provisions for reduction of minimum lot widths.

Mr. Lighty asked if this a correction is being addressed. Ms. Wissler answered yes. Mr. Staub noted that what happens is that since the lot size can be reduced, an R-1 lot usually has a width of 90 feet, and a depth of 210 feet. Now under the current TRND you can have a width of 90 feet, and a depth of 110 feet, and that does not work. Mr. Staub stated this will go to the Zoning Hearing Board March 23, 2006.

Mr. Staub stated he did receive revised comments from HRG, and reviewed them with Staff, and most of them have been addressed or can easily provide the additional information to satisfy the comment.

Mr. Staub asked about HRG comment #16 that lot 60 does not comply with minimum lot size requirement. This lot is an open space that will be planted with trees, it is a long narrow strip along Redhawk Circle. The applicant is not sure whether to dedicate it to the Township as part of the right-of-way of the street, or whether it should be split in half. It is an open space lot and is less than 10,000 square feet in size, but will be landscaped and owned and maintained by the Home Owners Association. The developer does not really want to divide it between two lots, and is looking for guidance from the Planning Commission on that issue. Staff will look into this, because the minimum lot size is 10,000, but there may be a provision that allows open space to be less than that. Mr. Lighty suggested either going for a variance or giving half to the abutting lots. Mr. Staub suggested making it part of the right-of-way and dedicating it to the Township.

Mr. Staub noted that as part of the rezoning application, the plan is required to provide minimum 40% open space, and this plan shows about 55% open space.

Mr. Staub stated the applicant met with the school district, Mr. .Luetchford, Director of Parks & Recreation for the Township, the cross country coach and the assistant principal. The attorneys are working out the details as to how the school district can use some of the open space on the Montrail property for the cross country team and perhaps some of the other extra-curricular activities. S&A is willing to grant access, and the school district is interested in having that access, a resolution has not been found yet.

Mr. Gingrich asked about the Highway Occupancy Permit to Union Deposit Road. Mr. Staub stated the traffic impact study has been completed and reviewed by Grove Miller Engineering at the time, and they made revisions to the traffic impact study based on Mr. Terry Grove's comment letter and resubmitted a revised traffic impact study. The biggest issue with the revision was that the applicant will be required to show and provide a left turn lane eastbound on Union Deposit Road into Montrail Boulevard. This is shown on the plan. The HOP will be submitted in about 3 weeks for the proposed work in Union Deposit Road. Terry Grove was satisfied with the responses. Ms. Wissler confirmed that.

Mr. Neff thanked Mr. Staub for following through with letting the school have access to the open space. Mr. Staub added that the school district was very happy with

using it. Mr. Neff stated this will keep some of the burden off the homeowners. Homeowners associations are difficult after the developer has pulled out. Mr. Neff stated that next to the fire house and between the existing homes, there is a strip of land shown as a flag. The question was raised in the past if that strip could be offered to the fire company. Mr. Lighty stated that the fire company has sold that building. Mr. Staub stated that flag lot is an open space lot. That is lot 59, and the plan shows a paved pedestrian access from Skylon Drive directly to the school district property. The school district was happy to see that connection. Mr. Neff agreed.

Mr. Newsome asked what the zoning of the fire house lot was. Ms. Wissler stated it is R-1.

Mr. Lighty asked why Mr. Jim Snyder is not recommending approval of some of the waivers. Mr. Snyder stated the right-of-way width comment was thought to pertain to the cul-de-sac. Mr. Snyder thought the requirement was for 50 feet, but if the requirement is for 60 and the applicant is asking for 50 feet, Mr. Snyder stated he would support that waiver. Mr. Staub noted that in similar-density developments, the Township was not interested in more right-of-way than is needed for the street and sidewalks. Mr. Staub stated he can comfortably provide cartway and sidewalks in the 50 foot right-of-way. Mr. Snyder agreed.

Mr. Snyder's concern with a 60% reduction in horizontal curve radius is that, coupled with a reduced cartway width, it will not permit on street parking, which may need regulated with a parking restriction. Mr. Lighty asked about a turning analysis. Mr. Snyder stated he would want that, since the 125 feet may not meet the design speed criteria required for local roads. Mr. Lighty asked Mr. Staub if a school bus or fire truck get through there on such a radius. Mr. Staub stated without a question they can. Mr. Staub stated they did provide turning templates from Union Deposit onto Montrail Boulevard, and also around the cul-de-sac in Redhawk Circle with a city bus, which is larger than a school bus, and it does work. Mr. Snyder asked if Mr. Staub looked at emergency vehicles. Mr. Staub stated that Suzanne Hoffer, the traffic engineer, selected the city bus as the vehicle to be most the appropriate design vehicle. Mr. Lighty asked if a city bus is bigger or smaller than a large fire truck. Mr. Snyder stated the turning radius for the curves in question should be looked at, keeping in mind the ability to keep the truck in the lane, and if parked cars are a factor. These issues, in combination with the 28-foot cartway requested, are a concern. Mr. Lighty asked what Mr. Snyder would recommend to the Planning Commission. Mr. Snyder recommended entertaining it, and granting it conditioned upon the factors mentioned.

Mr. Lighty asked why Mr. Snyder is opposed to slant curbing. Mr. Snyder stated that is more of a Public Works concern with long term maintenance. Public Works is concerned with the reveal, and the overlaying of the road. Mr. Lighty speculated that if there are concerns with widths and radiuses, it may make sense to have the slant curb, since a larger vehicle could drive over. Mr. Snyder stated curbs are not intended to be driven over. Mr. Snyder stated some advantages of slant curb are aesthetics, and not

restricting the location of driveway cuts. Public Works is concerned with overlaying the street, because with slant curbs, they may get one overlay on before they have to mill the street to put down an overlay, which is much more costly. Another factor is if the Township is willing to deviate from what their standard has been. The arguments will be the same for any project coming to the Township. Ms. Wissler noted that when Mr. Sutor was the Township Engineer, the Township was recommending slant curbs, and that is when this particular project was started. Ms. Wissler stated because of that, the Township does support it in this case and maybe some other ones, simply because staff recommended it to the developer. Now that there is someone different in charge, they do not prefer slant curb. Mr. Newsome stated that changing heads should not change the standards. Ms. Wissler agreed. Mr. Snyder brought up rolled curb and Belgian block and other types of curbing. Mr. Snyder stated the issue is what is the Township's standard. Mr. Lighty agreed that as a matter of fundamental fairness, this developer put these curbs in at the request of the Township.

Regarding the 28-foot cartway waiver request, and the landscaped island in Redhawk Circle cul-de-sac waiver request, Mr. Staub stated that when you attend the workshops about the NPDES requirements now being enforced regarding stormwater infiltrating the two-year storm, these are ideas they push very hard. The less pavement or impervious area on the site, the happier they are, and they want areas that infiltrate. This is a major reason both of these waiver requests were submitted. Mr. Staub stated there is no reason to not change the waiver request on the cartway width from 28 feet to 32 feet. The issue with the two radiuses on Skylon Drive being 25 feet less than the old standard and 60% less than the new standard, but would like the support of the Commission for at least 38 feet to 32 feet, and also for the landscaped island in the center of Redhawk Circle cul-de-sac. That island will be maintained by the homeowners association and S&A is very happy with that and with maintaining the boulevard entrance off of Union Deposit Road.

Mr. Snyder asked if that is proposed as an infiltration bed or if they intended to pipe past that. Mr. Staub stated that is only intended as green space, there is no water specifically directed into that area. Mr. Snyder asked Mr. Staub to consider using it as an infiltration bed.

Mr. Snyder noted that he would recommend a 30-foot cartway as opposed to the 28-foot cartway. That is consistent with other projects the Board recently granted waivers on similar to this application.

Mr. Snyder asked if the streets will be parked on. Mr. Staub stated the plan shows no parking in the two curves of Skylon Drive, and also in the cul-de-sac, because of the 28-foot cartway. If the turning template shows a need, the cartway will go to 32 feet, two feet wider than the standard.

Mr. Lighty clarified that Mr. Snyder's recommendation is that waiver request number 1 from 36 to 28 feet, should be from 36 to 30 feet, and Mr. Staub agreed to go as high as 32 feet if needed.

Regarding HRG comment 12, Ms. Wissler asked if Mr. Snyder is asking for something more specific than when the engineers typically put a block on the plan regarding the permits required for this project. Mr. Snyder answered that comment is mostly for "housekeeping" since he is not sure what permits he specifically needs with regard to the stream crossings et cetera. The extent of those permits should be known at the time of the preliminary plan. Mr. Staub agreed to show that on the plan.

Mr. Snyder asked Mr. Staub if he looked at the feasibility of providing a second means of ingress and egress. Mr. Staub stated they did look into that, and the first option was to go north and connect with Debbie Lane, the topography did not allow it because it is too steep. The second option was to use the panhandle to connect to Firehouse Lane, the problem with that is Firehouse Lane is not a Township Road. The Township and school district both own some property in and along Firehouse Lane, but it is not a dedicated street. Mr. Staub stated that when the land development plan was done for East High School, there were issues with rights-of-way and encroachments of existing Firehouse Lane onto Township owned property and also to the property on the west side of Firehouse Lane. All of those issues were resolved with the Township by granting easements from the Township and adjoining property owner to officially allow the access from Union Deposit Road into the fire house and to East Junior and East Senior.

Mr. Neff asked if there will be infiltration used for stormwater. Mr. Staub stated that this particular site is in the multi-creek watershed basin or Beaver Creek basin. Because of that, it is a provisional no-detention area, so stormwater detention does not need to be provided for the design storms, however, because of the size of the project, the applicant needs to comply with the DEP requirements to infiltrate the 2-year storm. The difference between the volume of the 2-year storm post and 2-year storm pre, for the project site. Because of that, the plan has to provide facilities on-site to infiltrate the difference of that stormwater volume and get it back in the ground. There are 3 infiltration basins on the site. Dry wells are also proposed to infiltrate roof water off the homes for those portions of the roofs that do not discharge into the three infiltration basins.

Mr. Neff asked if, because of the wetlands shown, the hydrology of the soil permits good infiltration, or are there areas where there is a perched water table or other problems. Mr. Staub stated there has been no infiltration testing yet, but that will be required by the County Conservation District. The areas that are proposed with drywells, and also the three infiltration basins, they are above the hydric (??) soils that are shown on the soils map.

Mr. Lighty stated that when he walked the Stray Winds Farm, the neighbors showed him how there used to be a wetlands area in the low lying area, and now there is nothing. The neighbors wanted to know where it went. Mr. Lighty speculated that Quail Hollow is infiltrating all the water that used to run down there. Infiltration may have some unintended consequences.

Mr. Staub agreed with Mr. Lighty, that whether it is good or bad, right or wrong, this development will impact the wetlands down along these streams delineated on the site. Mr. Lighty stated that in the summer that area dries up, and if that will all be infiltrated, those wetlands will not be the same.

There were no further comments from the County, or from the audience.

Mr. Gingrich made a motion to recommend approval of the Preliminary Subdivision Plan #05-52 for Montrail, subject to the comments provided, approval of the waiver of the minor street right-of-way width from 60 to 50 feet, and the minor street cartway from 36 to 30 feet, subject to change, for Skylon Drive and Redhawk Circle, and the waiver of the horizontal curve radius requirement for minor streets from 275 to 125 feet for two curves on Skylon Drive, from 275 to 150 for Skylon Drive, and 275 to 160 feet for one curve on Redhawk Circle, subject to verification on further study of the turning radiuses of some sort of emergency vehicles to be agreed upon with Township Engineer and Staff, waiver of the maximum length requirement of the cul-de-sac street from 600 to 735 feet for Redhawk Circle, waiver of the requirement to provide vertical concrete curb, and the waiver of the requirement that prohibits landscaped areas in cul-de-sacs for Redhawk Circle, and waiver of the requirement that storage capacity for the 25 year storm is 5,000 cubic feet or less, the method of storage be underground facility, and conditioned upon the granting of the variance for minimum lot width. Mr. Newsome seconded the motion. Regarding the curbing, Mr. Newsome stated he has seen some subdivisions that were built this way and there are some problems that should be ameliorated with some traffic calming prior. The motion passed unanimously.

Preliminary/Final Subdivision Plan #06-02
5710 Union Deposit Road

Mr. Lighty stated that there have been no revised plans received by the Township. Mr. Lighty asked what the deadline is and if the plan can be tabled or denied. Ms. Wissler stated the plan has 90 days, and has only been to the Commission once, so it may be tabled.

Mr. Newsome made a motion to table the Preliminary/Final Subdivision Plan #06-02 for 5710 Union Deposit Road, and Mr. Gingrich seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

NEW BUSINESS

Preliminary/Final Subdivision and Land Development Plan #06-06
David Punt-6009 Jonestown Road

Ms. Moran stated the Township has received a plan to subdivide the property at 6009 Jonestown Road into two lots. This plan was before the Planning Commission on October 13, 2005 and the Planning Commission recommended approval. The plan went no further at that time, and Mr. Punt is now ready to proceed. The construction of a new office building is proposed for Lot 2. Lot 2 will contain 20,990.92 square feet. Lot 1 will consist of 14,969.87 square feet and currently contains a single-family dwelling. Both lots will be served by public sewer and public water. The property is zoned C-1, General Commercial District.

Ms. Moran stated the applicant requested the following waivers: requirement to install curb and sidewalks, however a note has been placed on the plan that sidewalk and curbing adjacent to Jonestown Road will be installed in the future at such time that adjacent development occurs; waiver of the preliminary plan requirement; and waiver of the requirement to provide road widening along Jonestown Road. These waivers were requested the first time the plan was presented in October. The Planning Commission did recommend these waivers be granted. The Planning Commission recommended denial of the waiver of the requirement to install curb and sidewalks. The Commission recommended that a note be placed on the plan that sidewalk and curb be installed in the future at such appropriate time that adjacent development occurs; the commission also recommended that a note be placed on the deed with regard to future construction of curb and sidewalk.

Mr. Neff asked if the plan that was before the Planning Commission in 2004 was for only one of these lots. Ms. Moran stated there is a home on one lot and Mr. Punt is proposing an office building as it is now, and this plan is basically exactly the same plan.

Mr. Doug Gamber, Raudenbush Engineering, 29 South Union Street, Middletown, PA 17057, and Mr. David Punt, owner, developer, and ultimate user of the property, were present on behalf of the plan.

Mr. Gamber asked about the traffic study as mentioned in Staff Comments. This was not requested with the previous submission and note #16 on the plan states what the approximation of the average daily trips would be. That is a modified version of the traffic modeling and Mr. Punt's experience at the property. Mr. Gamber asked what the cut-off number of trips would be for a traffic study. Mr. Snyder answered 100. Mr. Gamber stated this project should have about 67-68 for that square footage, and will provide that to avoid having to do the traffic study.

Mr. Gamber stated there is an existing fire hydrant, note #6, immediately adjacent to the home, so no new hydrants are proposed at this time.

Mr. Gamber stated a landscape plan has been drawn, with some questions regarding street tree quantities. Mr. Gamber was unsure if street trees needed to be provided along the entire frontage, or only the portion that is being developed. There are some existing trees near the existing home, and the developer would like credit for those, but will also provide street trees.

Mr. Gamber stated that note 8 of HRG's memo asks for the person responsible for the curbing and sidewalk work, that person would be the owner.

Regarding note 11, Mr. Gamber asked if it is required to have a dumpster enclosure. Mr. Punt feels that an enclosure is over-kill for the amount of trash generated. Mr. Snyder stated that it was shown on the plan, and seems to conflict with the parking space. If it is not required, and it is removed, that would address the comment. Mr. Punt would prefer to remove the dumpster and use conventional bags and smaller receptacles.

Regarding note 12 about the basement floor, Mr. Gamber stated that is an unleaseable space, and will only be mechanical space and a small amount of maintenance, and possibly file storage, but it is not storage and is non-leaseable. Mr. Snyder asked that that be stipulated on the plan. Mr. Gamber agreed.

Mr. Gamber asked about comment 16. Mr. Snyder directed him to disregard that comment, he had a different version of the ordinance.

Regarding note 17, Mr. Gamber asked about the 10 foot landscape area requirement. Mr. Snyder stated that comment can also be disregarded.

Mr. Gamber stated that he is comfortable with the rest of the comments.

Mr. Gamber stated he has received Conservation District approval previously. The devices in place are still valid, and the Conservation District will provide correspondence to affirm that.

Mr. Gamber stated stormwater management will be provided around the rear of the building. Testing has been done to verify that infiltration does occur quite well.

Mr. Neff stated the 2004 version of the plan showed sidewalks and storm drains. At that time, it was said that there were no storm drains to connect to. Mr. Gamber stated there is one that exists on the school property. Mr. Gamber stated it may be unnecessary to connect because the stormwater management objectives can be obtained without going to the school property.

Mr. Neff stated there is a storm drain at the northeast corner of South Arlene Street and Old Jonestown Road. There is a second drain almost directly in front of the subject property on the other side of the road. Mr. Neff asked why they could not connect to those. Mr. Gamber stated that cannot be done because they would go against the grade. The site naturally flows toward the back of the site. That would also entail opening up the street. Mr. Gamber stated the drains are extremely shallow, making it extremely difficult to get the water to it.

Mr. Neff asked about the sidewalk waiver, noting there are sidewalks already in place in front of the school, and also in front of the old LP High School. Mr. Gingrich noted that sidewalks would be desirable because of the proximity to the school, however it is sandwiched in between other properties, so at this location it may not be a good idea. Mr. Punt and Mr. Gamber agreed, and a note will be put on the plan to say that when adjacent properties are made to install curb and sidewalks, they will install them at that time. Mr. Gingrich stated this should be one of the first places the Township should require it, because of the school.

Mr. Lighty stated the Commission could either require sidewalks to go in when adjacent properties install sidewalks, or require it now. Mr. Lighty stated the goal of this stretch of street needs to be that it has curb and sidewalks along the whole thing, but the issue is how it should be done.

Mr. Neff stated that the property is close enough to the school, only missing a small link, and those three houses will at some point probably be recycled, so this property should put them in now. Mr. Gingrich stated he does not like piece-mealing it together. Mr. Neff stated there is only a quarter mile. Mr. Newsome agreed that piece-mealing is not appropriate, but does not feel this is that situation. Mr. Newsome felt that intersection radiuses should be tied down ahead of time, but that is also not this situation. Mr. Newsome stated he is hesitant to establish precedent to have future developments come in saying they will put a note on the plan, before long there will be notes all over the Township and no sidewalks or curbing. Mr. Lighty agreed, that the administrative burden of keeping track of all the notes may be impossible. Mr. Punt offered to put a note on the deed as well. Mr. Punt expressed his agreement in putting in sidewalks, but noted that there really is very little walking going on. Mr. Gamber noted the difficulty in installing the sidewalks because of the existing stairs in front of the house.

Mr. Newsome asked about the removal of the rolled curb. Mr. Gamber stated there is just asphalt edge. Mr. Gamber stated there are no plans to widen Jonestown Road, but if there were, that would impact the placement of the sidewalks.

Mr. Neff asked about the property lines. Mr. Gamber stated the original property goes out to the middle of the road. The monuments were placed on the plan where the proposed right-of-way will be. Mr. Snyder added that older properties like these were described to the center of the right-of-way line in the center of the street, subject to that right-of-way crossing the property. Plans done now compute lot area and legal

description to the right-of-way line, then that essentially becomes the new property line. The way this plan is done is proper. The offer of dedication would include from where the monuments are to the center of the street. Mr. Neff asked how the size of the lot is determined. Mr. Snyder stated it would be from the new right-of-way line.

Mr. Newsome made a motion to recommend approval of the Preliminary/Final Subdivision and Land Development Plan # 06-06 for David Punt, subject to the resolution of the comments, granting of the waiver for preliminary plan requirement, waiver of the road widening requirement along Jonestown Road, and grant a waiver for the construction of sidewalks with a plan being placed on the plan that sidewalks will be installed when additional development takes place on adjacent properties, but maintain the requirement that curbing be installed along the new lot to replace the existing roll curb. Mr. Neff seconded the plan, and the motion carried unanimously.

Preliminary/Final Subdivision Plan #06-07
Sunny Hill Farms South

Ms. Wissler stated the purpose of this plan is to subdivide the existing 35.81-acre Lot #1 into 32 single family lots. The property is zoned R-1 Low Density Residential District, C-1 General Commercial district, FP Flood Plain Conservation District, and SS-1 Steep Slope Conservation District. The proposed development is located along the southern side of Lyters Lane and to the western side of 67th Street. The property will be served by public sewer and public water.

Ms. Wissler stated the applicant requested the following waivers: waiver of the requirement to submit a preliminary plan; waiver of the minor street cartway width requirement of 36 feet, a 28-foot cartway is proposed which is consistent with sunny Hill Farms-North; waiver of the centerline radii requirement for minor streets from 275 feet to 200 feet and 250 feet for Wheatstone Drive; waiver of the requirement to provide adequate minimum distance between street intersections, the applicant proposes to provide 295 feet (+/-) of the 400 feet required from the intersection of 67th street and Olde Pond Lane; waiver of the requirement to provide vertical concrete curb, the applicant is proposing slant curbing along Olde Pond Lane and Wheatstone Drive; waiver of the requirement to provide curb and sidewalk on Lyters Lane; waiver of the requirement that datum to which contour elevations refer shall be US Coast and Geodetic Survey Datum; and waiver of the requirement that storm inlet tops have a 10" curb reveal.

Mr. Aaron Navarro was present on behalf of the plan. Mr. Navarro stated he has received comments from staff and HRG, and had no issues with any of the comments.

Mr. Navarro stated this is the second phase of Sunny Hill Farms. The north side of Sunny Hill Farms is on the north side of Lyters Lane and this plan is on the south side of Lyters Lane, and to the west of 67th Street, with access to the development along 67th

Street. There are 32 single family lots proposed. Mr. Lighty stated the back of some of the lots are very steep. Mr. Navarro agreed, stating the homes on those lots are pushed as far to the front of the lot as possible.

Mr. Snyder noted that the applicant is requesting a FEMA Letter of Map Revision (LOMR). Mr. Navarro stated they are modifying the flood plane area. Mr. Gingrich asked if Mr. Navarro anticipates a significant reduction. Mr. Navarro answered yes, this could take about a year to a year and a half.

Mr. Lighty asked what happens if the plans are approved subject to this revision, and FEMA denies it. Mr. Snyder stated the plan has to be redrawn.

Mr. Snyder stated there is a waiver request to 28 feet, and the slant curbs. Mr. Snyder would prefer 30 feet, but has to take into consideration that Sunny Hill North and Maiden Creek were approved with the 28 foot cartway. Mr. Lighty stated that narrow cartway widths are natural traffic calming.

Mr. Snyder asked if the applicant is restricting parking. Mr. Navarro stated they can restrict parking if it is desired.

Mr. Millard asked if there has been any consideration given to connecting Wheatstone Drive to Lyters Lane, even with the slope issue, to create a four-way intersection with Grove Road. Mr. Navarro stated he did look at that, but the slope and sight distance are big issues at that location.

Mr. Millard asked if there was any consideration given or if there is even the possibility to connect Winwood Court to the development in Swatara Township. Mr. Navarro stated the developer would be required to purchase lots to make that connection.

Mr. Millard asked where the home will be built on Lot 1. Mr. Navarro showed the proposed location on the map, and stated the lot will access 67th Street.

Mr. Millard noted comment 11, and asked if there is any wetland impact. Mr. Navarro stated lot 11 has a lot of wetlands on it, and that will be affected with the roadway in, and with grading, and the applicant is working with the Army Corps of Engineers to get those wetlands mitigated.

Mr. Neff asked if the wetlands are 2/1 or 1/1. Mr. Navarro stated the Corps wants 2/1. Mr. Neff asked where the mitigation will be. Mr. Navarro stated it would be on this tract. Mr. Neff asked if there is sufficient area to accomplish the mitigation without affecting the current lot design. MR. Navarro answered yes.

Mr. Beverly made a motion to recommend approval of the Preliminary/Final Subdivision Plan #06-07 including the approval of the waivers, subject to the comments. Ms. Sibert seconded the motion. Mr. Neff asked if the motion should include the cartway

width at 28 feet or 30 feet. Mr. Lighty stated 28 feet matches everything around it. The motion passed unanimously.

Preliminary / Final Re-Subdivision Plan #06-08
Arletta Suhr

Ms. Wissler stated the purpose of the plan is to combine four existing lots into one parcel. The tract, consisting of 0.4894 acres, is zoned C-1 General Commercial District, and is located at 107 South Johnson Street. Public sewer and private well water will serve the site.

Ms. Wissler stated that the applicant has requested the following waivers: waiver of the preliminary plan requirement; waiver of the sidewalk and curb requirement along the frontage of South Johnson Street; waiver of the requirement a stormwater management plan; waiver of the requirement to provide an E&S plan; waiver of the requirement to provide roadway widening along the frontage of South Johnson Street; waiver of the requirement to provide a detailed hydro-geological study; and waiver of the requirement to provide two permanent concrete monuments.

Mr. Neff asked about the unopened streets, if the Township wants to keep or vacate these streets. If the Township vacated the alleys, the applicant could get additional property.

Mr. Jeffrey Staub, Dauphin Engineering Company, was present on behalf of the plan. Mr. Staub stated the applicant is not interested in that because of the attorneys fees involved. Mr. Staub stated Ms. Suhr wanted to erect a shed, but found out that it would be on an undeveloped lot, and that is not permitted. Poplar Street is one of the alleys, and is located between the property and the Paxtonia Fire House and Mr. Staub felt that was probably left unopened on purpose. Mr. Neff speculated that the Township could just issue a document and then the homeowner could extend their property line. Mr. Staub stated other developers have done that, and it is prepared by an attorney, then an engineer prepares the plot and legal descriptions, and there is an expense involved.

Mr. Newsome asked if the alley is used. Mr. Staub answered yes.

Mr. Staub stated he has no problems with any of the problems. Mr. Staub stated he would like to remove the waiver request regarding the concrete monuments, because the surveyor found four or five existing concrete monuments.

Mr. Newsome asked if this area is proposed C-1 under the new ordinance. MR. Lighty answered no, it will be Neighborhood Commercial. Mr. Staub added that C-1 extends 400 feet back from Jonestown Road.

Ms. Sibert made a motion to recommend approval of Preliminary/Final Subdivision Plan #06-08 for Arletta Suhr, including granting the six waiver requests, and subject to the comments. Mr. Newsome seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously.

Preliminary/Final Land Development Plan #06-09
New Office Buildings-4075 Linglestown Road
Sean Mudgett & Charles Zumbo

Ms. Wissler stated the purpose of the plan is to permit the construction of two one-story office buildings, a total of 3,850 square feet, and new off-street parking areas. The property is located at 4075 Linglestown Road and is zoned BC, Business Campus District. The tract of land possesses approximately 0.6619 acres and is served by public sewer and public water.

The applicant has requested a waiver of the requirement to submit a preliminary plan. Ms. Wissler stated the applicant will also be asking for a waiver of the sidewalk requirement. Mr. Lighty stated that request must be in writing.

Mr. Jeffrey Staub, Dauphin Engineering Company, and Sean Mudgett were present on behalf of the plan.

Mr. Staub stated this is the first plan to come before the Commission in the Business Campus zoning district. The building on the west side will be a UPS store which is a permitted use in the BC zone. Mr. Mudgett was involved in the rezoning process in this area. The office on the east side is anticipated to be used for some sort of office use. It will not be a medical use because there is not sufficient parking.

Mr. Staub stated they can address every comment.

Mr. Staub stated Mr. Mudgett is requesting a waiver from the sidewalk requirement because there are no other sidewalks in the vicinity. The Township has been granting waivers for this along Linglestown Road, mostly along the south side. The two most recent ones are Kurtz Rentals and Homza Chiropractic. The Township has not been granting any waivers for sidewalks on the north side of Linglestown Road, such as Commerce Bank, Dunkin Do-Nuts, Just Cabinets, Lingstor, and Strock Insurance. Mr. Lighty stated that if the intent of BC is self-contained office parks then sidewalks along Linglestown Road is not necessary, and it is not a pedestrian friendly road.

Mr. Neff asked if the UPS store is where you would bring in packages to have them shipped. Mr. Mudgett answered that this is part of the business, as well as the copy business.

Mr. Neff asked about a dumpster. Mr. Mudgett answered yes, even though they do not generate much trash, so the two building will probably share one. Mr. Neff stated a dumpster is not shown on the plan. Mr. Staub stated it is not shown because they do not yet know where it will go. There is a residential district, Kings Pointe, to the south of the property so the dumpster is not permitted on the rear of the site.

Mr. Neff asked if the “no parking/overhang” area is where the truck would come in and make pick-ups. Mr. Mudgett answered yes, at the rear door. Mr. Neff asked if there is enough room for the trucks to get in and out even with the parking spaces. Mr. Staub stated there is a 20 foot fire lane and that is used for the loading and unloading.

Mr. Lighty asked if the UPS store will generate less than 100 trips per peak hour. Mr. Mudgett can provide a customer count by day, but is fairly certain it is less than 100. Mr. Lighty stated it would make a difference what store and location that count would come from. Mr. Mudgett stated there is presently a store one mile away at Beaufort Farms Plaza in Susquehanna Township. Mr. Lighty stated that should be relevant, and asked if that generates less than 100 per peak hour. Mr. Mudgett answered that it would be less than 100 per day. Mr. Staub stated that since there will be an HOP for this project, Terry Grove will do an ITE trip generation analysis for PennDOT.

Mr. Millard stated that Mr. Staub did address comment #1. Regarding comment #2, Mr. Millard asked if there will be any safety issues in terms of the parking lot in the area of the entrance. Mr. Staub agreed the parking lot is laid out a bit different, but with the light traffic there should not be any conflict. Mr. Newsome stated there should not be high growth in the island. Mr. Lighty felt the opposite that the point of the island was to hide the cars from the view of Linglestown Road. Mr. Lighty added the dangerous part would be at the intersection with Linglestown Road, not behind the island. Mr. Lighty speculated the only issue would be if someone was backing out of the first two spaces and someone else was coming in off Linglestown Road.

Mr. Millard stated that comment #3 talks about roadway access to the rear of the lot. The purpose of that comment was in the creation of the BC zone, interconnection was emphasized with amenities being near or on site. This could also be addressed with some sort of pedestrian pathway.

Mr. Millard asked if there is anywhere on the lot that meets the steep slope ordinance. Mr. Staub answered that there are steep slopes on the lot, but according to the ordinance, they do not have to be delineated if the area is 2,000 square feet or less.

There was no comment from the audience. Mr. Dan Altemose asked various questions, but verbally refused his name and address, and is therefore not on the record.

Mr. Gingrich made a motion to recommend approval of the Preliminary/Final Land Development Plan #06-09 for Sean Mudgett and Charles Zumbo, subject to the comments provided, including the waiver of the requirement to submit a preliminary plan

and waiver of the requirement for sidewalks, provided that request is put in writing to staff by March 9, 2006. Mr. Beverly seconded the motion, and the motion carried unanimously.

Sketch Plan
Blue Bell/Blue Valley Avenues

Mr. Jim Cieri, Act One Consultants, and Bruce Right, the equitable owner of the property, were present on behalf of this sketch plan. Mr. Cieri stated this tract is located on the corner of Blue Valley and Blue Bell Avenues. This site was subdivided into 6 lots in 1934. The tract was originally subdivided in a north/south direction and was prepared by Howard Levan. The applicant would like to subdivide the lots in a east/west direction, fronting on Blue Bell Avenue. The problem is that it is just under the requirement of one acre. According to the ordinance, 4 lots would be permitted, but 4 lots are not economically feasible.

Mr. Cieri stated the reason this plan is before the Commission is to get their opinion regarding the lot being resubdivided and pursuing 5 lots for townhouses, or if the Commission prefers they stick to the original plan of 6 lots in the other direction. The applicant would need a variance, but does not want to apply for one if the Planning Commission is not agreeable to the idea of the plan.

Mr. Lighty stated the parcels are delineated on the projection, and it does not show 6 lots, it only shows one. The tax parcels reflect what is recorded with the County. Mr. Cieri stated that to do the five lots in the east/west direction, a variance is required. Mr. Lighty asked what the hardship is with 4 instead of 5. Mr. Cieri answered it is not economically viable. Mr. Lighty stated that might not be good enough for a variance. Mr. Cieri stated the variance would be deminimized in taking it down from 6 to 5 lots.

Mr. Newsome asked if the north/south lots were 30 feet wide. Mr. Cieri answered yes. Mr. Newsome asked about the reconfiguration to east/west lots, their frontage would be 28 feet. Mr. Cieri stated they are 2 feet smaller, but that allows bigger side yards and makes them more aesthetically pleasing, and will also solve the issues with storm water management. The plan would include subsurface recharge.

Mr. Lighty asked about the legal status of the road along this property and the next property. Mr. Cieri stated the right-of-way has been abandoned and the other right-of-way has not. Mr. Lighty asked about the road eventually going through. Mr. Newsome stated that Blue Bell Avenue does exist as the front of the property. Ms. Wissler stated that particular section of Blue Bell Avenue is not a Township road. Ms. Wissler stated the issue has come up in the past, and it is paved, but was done by mistake. The road is definitely not a Township road. Mr. Gingrich stated the plan shows the road at T-732. Ms. Wissler stated other parts of Blue Bell Avenue that are a Township road. Mr. Cieri stated it is still a right-of-way. Ms. Wissler agreed.

Mr. Newsome asked about the east/west road. Mr. Cieri stated that was originally planned to be a street, but the right-of-way has since been vacated. Mr. Newsome stated that there is now a question of access to a public way for this property. Mr. Cieri stated it is a public Township right-of-way. Ms. Wissler stated this is the problem the plan had when Mr. Bell tried to develop it. Mr. Cieri stated it is a public right-of-way. Ms. Wissler agreed, but stated that it has not been dedicated to the Township. Everybody that was a party to the original plan has the right to use it as the lots exist today.

Mr. Newsome asked for clarification as to whether the lot is one or six lots, and if it is six lots, why are they not shown on the tax parcels. Ms. Wissler speculated that in the past, attorneys used to rewrite deeds and remove lot lines. Ms. Wissler stated someone consolidated these lots in that way. Ms. Wissler stated that according to Solicitor Stine, they would have to do a subdivision to make it one lot, because the official recorded plan still shows it as five lots. Mr. Lighty stated the tax maps should match the deeds, and is then wrong in the Recorder of Deeds office. Ms. Wissler stated the maps probably do match the deeds, but not the recorded plan. Ms. Wissler stated a good example of this is Ms. Arletta Suhr, who probably has a deed that shows her 4 lots as one, but Township records show it as 4 lots.

Mr. Stine has directed Ms. Wissler that the Township has to follow the latest plan as recorded, and the latest plan shows six lots.

Mr. Cieri stated the point of coming to this meeting is to see if the Township would be receptive to changing the plan to show five lots in the other direction, or if the plan should be kept with 6 lots.

Mr. Lighty asked the zoning of the property. Ms. Wissler stated the lot is R-2, Medium Density Residential District.

Mr. Cieri stated the two end units will have wider yards and will meet the setback requirements. The existing plan has non-conforming lots on the ends. By changing the configuration, it would bring the plan into conformance with the ordinance, other than the fact of 5 lots rather than 4 lots.

Mr. Gingrich stated the plan shows a 14-foot wide driveway going to another home, but it does not show the property line going to that driveway. Mr. Gingrich asked who owns up to that driveway. Mr. Cieri stated that is the area that was vacated and was unsure who owns it. Mr. Gingrich asked if the applicant could obtain that if it is vacated.

Mr. Cieri stated that with the lots facing west, the drainage could be put in more nicely along the back of the units. Mr. Lighty asked where the water would go. Mr. Cieri showed on the map where it would connect to a storm sewer drain.

Members voted as follows regarding the number of lots for this sketch plan: Mr. Beverly: 5; Ms. Sibert: 4; Mr. Newsome: 4, or if they are able to maintain the density then maybe 5; Mr. Lighty: 4 or 5, but they should connect and improve the streets; Mr. Gingrich: 4; Mr. Neff: 4, unless they could come up with a unique design to accommodate the 5 lots, and the 2 roads need to be improved.

Public Comment

There was no public comment at this time.

Commissioner Comment

Ms. Wissler stated there is a new committee being formed, Greenway Plan Committee. Mr. Lighty instructed the Commission to read over the description and they can discuss at the next meeting who would be willing to volunteer.

Adjournment

The next meeting for the Planning Commission is a joint meeting with the Board of Supervisors at 5:30pm, to be held on Tuesday, March 14, 2006. This meeting is to continue discussing the proposed zoning ordinance.

The next regular Planning Commission meeting is scheduled for April 12, 2006, at 7:00pm at the Lower Paxton Township Municipal Center, Room 171.

Being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 10:15 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Michelle Hiner
Recording Secretary