

**Lower Paxton Township**  
**Zoning Hearing Board**

June 25, 2020

**Members Present:**

David Dowling

Allen Hansen

Greg Sirb

Jeff Staub

Mark Emery

Ron Reeder

Also, In Attendance: James Turner, Amanda Zerbe, Kristi Focht

**Docket 1342**

Applicant: AJ Signs, Inc.

Address: 842 Saratoga Road

Burnt Hills, Ny 11050

Property Owner: Cedar Realty Trust

Property: 4302 Union Deposit Road

Harrisburg, PA

Applicant: For a Variance from sign regulations in connection with changes to the existing signs at the property known as the Point Shopping Center.

Paid: May 28, 2020

Property Posted: June 17, 2020

Advertised: Appeared in the Hummelstown Sun on June 17, 2020 and June 20, 2020. And was advertised on the Township website and Township media accounts.

The Hearing Began at 7:30 p.m.

Mr. Dowling swore in applicants Bridgett Shoemaker and Evan Walsh.

Mr. Dowling questioned Ms. Zerbe on what Township Ordinance is at issue.

Ms. Zerbe answered section 203.714, number, and size of free-standing signs in a planned center, and the size of wall signs in a planned center.

Mr. Dowling questioned Ms. Zerbe if the appropriate fees have been paid.

Ms. Zerbe answered that the applicant paid the fees on May 28, 2020. Mr. Dowling questioned if the application had been properly advertised and hearing notices posted. Ms. Zerbe answered that it was advertised in the Hummelstown Sun on June 11, 2020 and June 18, 2020; and it was posted on June 17, 2020. He noted that it was also advertised on the Township website and Township media accounts.

Mr. Dowling noted that the applicant wishes to replace the pylon signs.

Mr. Dowling requested the Applicant to begin testimony.

Ms. Shoemaker explained that would give an overview of the project. She noted the plan is to renovate the 4 existing pylons on the property. She noted the goal of the renovation is to provide an identity, cohesiveness to the property and represent the tenants on all the major roads. Ms. Shoemaker explained that the biggest detriment to the property is that it sits far back at an angle that the tenants can not be seen from the road. She continued that the Landlord and Owner of the property realized this is a hardship these tenants are facing. She noted that Landlord was willing to invest the money to keep the businesses in Lower Paxton and have better traffic flow. She explained that to help with traffic flow they proposed to convert the one sign by the Highway to a digital sign to provide real time information for consumers. Ms. Shoemaker reviewed the plans to the Board. She noted there were four signs on the property, and they will not be touching the footings or the steel and there is adequate electric. She explained they will be pulling away the old aluminum boxes, the antiquated fixtures and replacing with fresh materials.

Ms. Shoemaker continued to pylon A located at Union Deposit Road. She noted it currently says Staples, Panera Bread and A.C. Moore which is no longer in business. She explained the proposed plan is to provide the top panel to the grocery store and gas station. She noted that there are twenty tenants that can be in the plaza.

Mr. Dowling questioned Ms. Shoemaker how many tenants are there now.

Ms. Shoemaker answered 18, noting 2 vacancies. She explained that they would like to get as many businesses' names out to the road.

Mr. Dowling questioned how long the pole signs have been used routinely at malls.

Mr. Walsh answered that the design at the mall currently is from the 1980's or 1990's.

Mr. Dowling questioned how old the mall was.

Ms. Shoemaker answered she did not know.

Mr. Sirb noted that the first proposed sign is 15 square foot bigger.

Ms. Shoemaker explained that the existing sign is 269 square feet and the proposed is 275 square feet. She noted that the name of the center is 38 square feet. She noted that the tenant signage does not really increase the square footage.

Mr. Hansen questioned if this would be the sign that would give information to the Township.

Ms. Shoemaker answered not this one.

Mr. Hansen questioned if the bank sign would remain or be removed.

Ms. Shoemaker answered that she believed the bank sign can not be removed. She explained that could be part of the lease and she is not involved with that.

Mr. Sirb questioned Ms. Zerbe on the bank sign.

Mr. Walsh answered they may have a sign for that pad site to identify the bank.

Ms. Zerbe noted that the mall was built in 1972 and there was a renovation done in 1997.

Ms. Shoemaker noted that they did look at the sign structure for stability and they were built for larger signage and their engineer does not have any concerns. She noted they have not changed the height.

Ms. Shoemaker continued with Sign B located on East Park Drive and Union Deposit Road intersection. She noted currently is at 313 square feet and they are proposing 275 square feet. She noted this sign and the proposed sign A will be identical but due to building height you can not see both at the same time.

Ms. Shoemaker continued with the third sign located near the Burger King where the main entrance to the Plaza is. She noted the sign currently says Staples. She noted they propose to keep the same height of 24 feet brings the sign to 213 square feet. She noted their goal is to get as many tenants as possible out to the main roads. She explained if you are coming from out of town it will be helpful to know what is there.

Ms. Shoemaker noted that this is video board Mr. Hansen had questioned about earlier. She noted they propose a cap to provide identity to the Plaza and then have the message board. She explained they have other sights that use these boards and they can run anything from Amber Alerts, Covid information and advertisement information for the businesses.

Mr. Turner questioned the location of the digital board.

Ms. Shoemaker answered the location on the plan reads A.C. Moore. She noted it will be on the back side of the building that runs parallel to 83.

Mr. Dowling noted there are Township Ordinances on these types of signs, how they change and when they change.

Ms. Shoemaker noted that she handles the programming of these signs and they pay close attention to the town requirements. She explained that typically when you have digital messaging there is a third party that manages it. She explained since they are constructing it they would like stick with the town and pay attention to the codes.

Mr. Dowling requested more information about this sign. Mr. Dowling requested how a tenant may use this sign.

Ms. Shoemaker explained an example that Giant may advertise Senior shopping hours with days and times. She noted this is real time information for the consumer so if the Wine and Spirit store adjusts their hours, they can post that. Stores can advertise grand openings as well.

Mr. Dowling questioned if a non-tenant needed to post information on the sign. He questioned how that would work.

Ms. Shoemaker answered that you would just call the Landlord or her company. She explained that if the Township had information that needed posted they would comply.

Mr. Dowling noted that the tenant would pay an additional fee for this.

Ms. Shoemaker answered she does not get involved with the fees, noting that is between the Landlord and the tenant. She noted that for Government and Non-profit groups they are not charged.

Mr. Walsh explained that what is typical that there is a certain amount of time slots for tenants to have to give information or to be able to get their logo on the sign. He continued there could also be a community service slot and a slot for weather, time and temperature.

Mr. Dowling noted that people are looking for those signs and the information on those signs.

Mr. Walsh explained the concept is to keep the content fresh, so people want to look at your sign. Mr. Walsh told a story of a gentleman from Connecticut who purchased a sign to go along side the road for his business but this gentleman found was during the Covid situation, kids were not able to have a graduation ceremony so he decided to post each student that graduated. He noted this gained a lot of attention from the news media for a feel-good story. Mr. Walsh noted that this could not be done with a static wall sign.

Mr. Dowling questioned Ms. Zerbe on how they are listed as wall signs.

Ms. Zerbe answered there are no wall signs.

Mr. Sirb questioned Ms. Zerbe on the number they are exceeding from. He questioned they are looking at five signs.

Mr. Walsh noted four signs.

Mrs. Zerbe answered they are allowed to have one free standing sign for a planned center. She explained the Board has to make a decision, she noted they are already non complaint with the signs they currently have by ordinance today and are increasing the size.

Mr. Sirb noted they are increasing the size by 173 square feet.

Ms. Shoemaker noted that was correct, 173 square feet proposed.

Mr. Sirb noted the proposed signs look much nicer.

Mr. Walsh answered that is nice to see that Cedar Properties is willing to make an investment like this. He explained they are trying to brand the center and a big component of that is the signage.

Mr. Dowling noted they understand that malls are struggling. Mr. Dowling noted these signs are dated.

Mr. Dowling questioned if any members of the Board had any questions.

Mr. Staub commented on the four existing signs. He noted they are all much higher than the ordinance allows currently. He noted his issue is that if the Board allows the signs to be out of compliance as far height, which he does not have an issue with but does with the area. He noted he is uncomfortable with that.

Ms. Shoemaker noted that Mr. Staub's statement is understandable. She explained that when they created the proposed sign if they chopped them off at 20 feet it loses the ability to get the tenants out.

Mr. Staub noted he personally does not have a problem with the height of the sign he is concerned of the increase of the sign from what is permitted. He noted that the smaller tenants do have their own wall signs.

Mr. Hansen noted he agrees with Mr. Staub on the increase of the size.

Mr. Sirb noted to the current signage only represent five of the stores.

Ms. Shoemaker noted that three of those signs say Staples. She explained she thinks Cedar took over this property recently. She explained they brought her to the site two years ago to look over the signs. She explained Cedar wants to get as many of the different business's names out on the road and not just the few that are currently on the sign.

Mr. Dowling noted that he is still not sure about all the stores in this mall.

Ms. Shoemaker noted that is important to know.

Mr. Walsh noted there is visual clutter with the current mall. He noted it is visually aggressive. He noted the proposed looked is update and gives a clean look.

Mr. Hansen noted he thinks the new sign is attractive he just does not like the increase in the size.

Mr. Reeder noted that he has been in this Township for ten years. He explained that when talking with others who have lived in the Township for twenty years, they did not know the mall by the Point Shopping Center but by where the Giant is. He explained that until you drive in there you do not know what all is in there. He noted there is no identification to indicate it is The Point Shopping Center.

Mr. Sirb questioned if both signs B and C are needed. He noted he things sign A is very important to have.

Ms. Shoemaker explained that their hope is that with having the hotel and conference center and when people are leaving the conference center they can see that there is a restaurant or store that they can stop in and get what they need. She noted that sign C is particularly smaller. She questioned if the Board would like to see the sign C proposed sign that is smaller.

Mr. Dowling questioned if sign B is at the entrance.

Ms. Shoemaker answered no. She explained that sign B is a vantage point for the intersection. She noted it is an exit only. She noted that keeping C is at the entrance point.

Mr. Sirb noted he does not feel that both signs B and C are needed. He noted he feels B and C are duplicates.

Mr. Walsh questioned Ms. Shoemaker on what happens with the square footage if you shrink sign C.

Ms. Shoemaker explained they have created an alternate version of C, noting they brought the square footage down to 153 square feet.

Mr. Hansen noted he still disagrees even if they want to reduce the one sign. He noted he does not see having sign B when C would be at the traffic light.

Mr. Dowling noted his thoughts. He noted he is very familiar with driving in that area. He continued he would approve with the smaller version sign. He explained that this is a very tough times for malls and for that reason he would vote in favor of the smaller sign and not to get rid of a sign. He noted it is a stretch, but he would do it because of the mall, the location, and the current times.

Mr. Sirb questioned the smaller version of sign C. He noted C is currently proposed at 213 square feet.

Ms. Shoemaker answered the new proposed version becomes 153 square feet, dropping 50 square feet off the sign.

Mr. Sirb noted the maximum is now at 120 square feet.

Mr. Walsh corrected the measurement. He explained at 153 you are taking 60 square feet off. He noted they are now over 110.

Ms. Shoemaker noted it would reduce the sign to the 20 feet.

Mr. Sirb note he will allow them, but he feels they are duplicates.

Mr. Dowling questioned if the Township has a position.

Ms. Zerbe answered no.

Mr. Sirb questioned if the Township knows where the Point Shopping Center is.

Ms. Zerbe answered yes. She noted that they are doing a lot of work at the Point Shopping Center with building permits.

Mr. Walsh questioned if the Township could name more than two tenants.

Ms. Zerbe listed Giant, Panera, Plato's Closest, Liquor Store, Infinito's, Burlington, The Dollar Tree.

Mr. Dowling questioned if the Board had any further questions.

No response was heard.

Mr. Dowling questioned if any member of the Board wished to take action on Docket 1342.

Mr. Dowling noted that if the Board wished to take action there will be a condition imposed upon any advertising on sign D that the Township, the School District, Police Department or Church there would be no fee.

Ms. Shoemaker answered absolutely.

Mr. Dowling questioned if any member of the Board would like to make a motion.

Mr. Dowling motion that the Board approve the plan as submitted with the smaller version of sign C.

Mr. Dowling noted they need to add the modification of plan C into exhibit. He noted the plan will be marked exhibit 1 and the new proposed square footage will be exhibit 2.

Mr. Dowling continued with the motion, adding the condition that was mentioned before, no cost for the for the digital sign.

Mr. Dowling questioned for a second.

Mr. Sirb seconded the motion. He noted that for the record B and C are duplicate signs, but a good faith effort was made.

Mr. Dowling questioned if there were any further discussions from the Board.

Mr. Sirb noted that for the record the increase was 110 square feet.

Mr. Turner answered it was 113 square feet increase.

Mr. Dowling requested Mr. Turner to conduct a roll call vote: Mr. Hansen, no; Mr. Emery, aye; Mr. Staub, no; Mr. Sirb, aye; Mr. Dowling, aye.

Mr. Dowling noted the application has passed with a vote of 3 to 2.

This hearing ended at 8:30 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Kristi Focht

Recording Secretary

Lower Paxton Township  
Zoning Hearing Board

June 25, 2020

**Members Present:**

David Dowling

Allen Hansen

Greg Sirb

Jeff Staub

Mark Emery

Ron Reeder

Also, In Attendance: James Turner, Amanda Zerbe, Kristi Focht

**Docket 1431**

Applicant: Leah Class

Address: 311 Woodruff Way

Harrisburg, PA 17112

Property Owner: Leah Class

Property: 4204 Linglestown Road

Harrisburg, PA

Applicant: For a Variance from design requirements for 2-way traffic and plant screening requirements in connection with the proposed development.

Property Posted: June 17, 2020

Advertised: Appeared in the Hummelstown Sun on June 11, 2020 and June 18, 2020. And was advertised on the Township website and Township media accounts.

The Hearing Began at 7:00 p.m.

Mr. Dowling swore in applicants Leah Class and Robert Shaffer.

Mr. Dowling questioned Mr. Shaffer in his role with the applicant.

Mr. Shaffer answered he is the engineer with Act 1 and Associates.

Mr. Dowling swore in Amanda Zerbe, Zoning Officer.

Mr. Dowling questioned Ms. Zerbe on what Township Ordinance is at issue.

Ms. Zerbe answered section 603.C.2 requirement for two-way traffic and section 803 D.6.D.1 required plant screenings.

Mr. Dowling questioned Ms. Zerbe if the appropriate fees have been paid.

Ms. Zerbe answered that the applicant paid the fees on May 28, 2020. Mr. Dowling questioned if the application had been properly advertised and hearing notices posted. Ms. Zerbe answered that it was advertised in the Hummelstown Sun on June 11, 2020 and June 18, 2020; and it was posted on June 17, 2020. He noted that it was also advertised on the Township website and Township media accounts.

Mr. Dowling requested the Applicant to begin testimony.

Ms. Class explained that she is requesting a variance for the property at 4204 Linglestown Road. She explained the driveway is not large enough for two-way traffic and the side yard set back on the side of the property do not conform. She noted this is due to the unique physical circumstances of the property. She explained the property is long and narrow and has a sloping topography. She continued that on the side opposite of the driveway there is on site well system and all of these factors contributed to the need for a variance. She noted this property is zoned Business Campus, noting many of the neighboring properties have already converted to Commercial on this area of the road. She noted the existing structure is about 1900 square feet and it would only be able to accommodate four people so it would be a minimum use driveway from PennDOT.

Mr. Dowling questioned if any members of the Board had any questions.

Mr. Sirb questioned Ms. Class if this is her residence.

Ms. Class answered no.

Mr. Sirb questioned if the property is currently vacant.

Ms. Class answered yes.

Mr. Dowling questioned Ms. Class if she ever lived there.

Ms. Class answered no.

Mr. Dowling questioned Ms. Class if she owns the property.

Ms. Class answered yes.

Ms. Sirb questioned the residency due to what was stated on the application.

Ms. Class explained the last person used it as their residence.

Mr. Dowling questioned Ms. Class on when she purchased the property.

Ms. Class answered November of 2019.

Mr. Dowling questioned Ms. Class that she purchased the property to convert to a business.

Ms. Class answered yes.

Mr. Dowling questioned Ms. Class on the business she attends to have at the property.

Ms. Class answered that she has an attorney interested in renting it from her.

Mr. Dowling noted it has unique characteristics and it is no different from any of the other lots. He questioned Ms. Class that she would like to have a small business in the ranch home.

Ms. Class answered yes.

Mr. Dowling questioned Ms. Class that the only place to put the parking is behind the house.

Ms. Class answered yes.

Mr. Dowling noted that you have to have a driveway to get there.

Ms. Class answered yes.

Mr. Dowling questioned Ms. Class that the township informed her she has to driveway wider than the property will allow.

Ms. Class answered that is correct.

Mr. Dowling questioned Ms. Class if he was getting this correct.

Ms. Class answered correct.

Mr. Dowling noted that the Township has a driveway requirement for in and out traffic wide enough for two cars.

Ms. Class answered yes.

Mr. Dowling noted that because of the width of the lot and the well Ms. Class cannot do that.

Mr. Sirb questioned the required parking.

Ms. Zerbe answered it depends on the square footage.

Mr. Shaffer noted he has it by the square feet. He explained he has it calculated one for every 300 usable space.

Ms. Zerbe noted that is correct.

Mr. Dowling questioned that there is seven on the plan.

Mr. Shaffer answered they have nine spaces and a handicap.

Mr. Dowling noted that seven are required.

Mr. Dowling questioned how wide this driveway will be that accesses the back.

Mr. Shaffer answered the narrowest will be twelve feet. He explained that will allow for a four-foot buffer between the sideline, property line and the building itself. He noted they will place a vinyl fence or screening of some kind.

Mr. Dowling noted the way the plan is prepared is confusing.

Mr. Shaffer noted there is a landscape planner that is under the shading. He noted the existing paved drive runs along there as well.

Mr. Dowling requested the applicant to describe in detail the kind of buffer that is planned or proposed between the property in question and the property owned by Jayson Cowden.

Mr. Shaffer answered they are open for input from the Board. He explained what they have proposed in the four-foot strip would be a six-foot fence to screen and apply with plantings where they can on the property, either on that sideline or the rear. He noted to the numerous trees on the plan and pine trees.

Mr. Dowling questioned if the trees are going to stay unless indicated on the plan.

Mr. Shaffer noted to one tree that is indicated to be removed because it is in the proposed parking.

Mr. Sirb questioned if the plan is for the Elm tree.

Mr. Shaffer answered the plan would be for the 24 Popular. Mr. Shaffer was not sure with the plan if the Elm would remain.

Mr. Dowling questioned if the 18 x 18 would be for parking.

Mr. Shaffer answered yes. He explained the applicant added the two spots out front.

Mr. Emery questioned the plan for lighting.

Mr. Shaffer noted he had not gotten that far yet. He noted that what the Board requires by Township regulations.

Mr. Emery noted the property is close to a neighbor.

Mr. Shaffer noted it would have to be lighting on short poles or walkway lighting.

Mr. Emery questioned that the vinyl fence would be four feet from the neighboring property.

Mr. Shaffer answered two. He explained there is four feet to install it.

Mr. Sirb questioned Ms. Zerbe if anything had come into the Township. Mr. Sirb questioned if Mr. Cowden is residential.

Ms. Zerbe answered that property is residential.

Mr. Hansen questioned the applicant if they have spoken to Mr. Cowden.

Ms. Class answered yes. She noted he mows the grass for her.

Mr. Hansen questioned Mr. Cowden's opinion.

Ms. Class noted he had not expressed that he was upset.

Mr. Sirb questioned Ms. Zerbe if anything came into the Township.

Ms. Zerbe answered no.

Mr. Dowling questioned if he received anything in the mail.

Ms. Zerbe answered yes.

Mr. Sirb noted he is concerned with the Elm tree being removed because it is a natural buffer.

Ms. Class noted she could not remember if that tree was full all the way down.

Mr. Shaffer noted they can look at sliding the driveway over to the East in attempt to preserve the Elm.

Mr. Dowling questioned if this changes to a business use would PennDOT need to approve.

Mr. Shaffer answered they would have to submit paperwork to PennDOT.

Mr. Dowling questioned if there were any plans to change the square footage of the building.

Ms. Class answered no.

Mr. Shaffer noted that after the outcome of this meeting they will be submitting for a stormwater management permit.

Mr. Hansen questioned the applicant if the Applicant knew what kind of signage the Attorney would be using.

Ms. Class answered they had not discussed that yet.

Mr. Sirb questioned Ms. Class if she had a contract with the Attorney.

Ms. Class answered no. She noted she wanted to get through this first before a lease was signed.

Mr. Staub noted that he is having a concern about the driveway and that it is located on the side where the residence is. He explained that on the East side of the property it is next to an existing commercial use. He noted that it seems to him to have the driveway on the East side of the property and he noted there would be additional room to add the width to the driveway. He noted that there would be a way to place a casing around the well. He noted it makes more sense to make a wider driveway on the East side of the building and the resident on the West would be minimally impacted.

Mr. Shaffer noted that his concern is to the amount of grading that would need to be done and the slope for storm water management. He noted that is why the plan is laid out this way.

Mr. Dowling noted that the rain would go towards the East and the slope is to the East.

Mr. Shaffer answered correct.

Mr. Dowling questioned about a detention basin.

Mr. Shaffer answered they did not plan anything yet, but there would be trenches or bed underground. Mr. Shaffer noted they will have to compensate for the driveway spaces and the utilities coming in.

Mr. Dowling questioned if there were any plans showing the driveway on the East side.

Mr. Shaffer answered no. He explained because of the existing driveway location and the grading and utilities on the bank.

Mr. Sirb noted moving the spots to the East to have minimal impact on the resident other than where the driveway is now.

Mr. Shaffer noted they still would need a variance.

Mr. Sirb noted they may would be able to get rid of one of the variances.

Mr. Dowling questioned Ms. Zerbe what business is located next to the property.

Ms. Zerbe answered it is a real estate office.

Mr. Sirb noted to sliding the parking to the East.

Mr. Shaffer noted they can move the parking farther.

Mr. Sirb noted there would be work with the driveway.

Mr. Shaffer noted that the parking could slide to the East and could save the trees.

Mr. Dowling questioned the Applicant if they would have any impervious issues if they would move the driveway.

Mr. Shaffer answered that in this scenario the plan is at 38% and the maximum allowed coverage is 60%.

Mr. Dowling questioned Mr. Staub on what he thought the impervious coverage would be if they moved the parking to the East.

Mr. Shaffer answered it would be a couple hundred square feet.

Mr. Dowling noted that it sounds like there are several ideas floating around; one, to leave it how it is; two, keep the driveway where you have it proposed and move the parking lot to the east and three, move the drive way to the East to come in that way. Mr. Dowling explained he felt the easiest way is to take a vote up or down of the submission or table it and resubmit based on the alternate plans that were discussed. Mr. Dowling questioned Mr. Turner.

Mr. Turner explained that if you take a motion and deny the application.

Mr. Dowling questioned if they would reapply, they would have to pay another fee.

Mr. Turner answered yes.

Mr. Dowling requested to get some informal thoughts of the Board members.

Mr. Emery noted he is inclined to vote nah because there seems to be better ways to. He noted he would be inclined to approve it with the comments that have been made.

Mr. Dowling questioned the Applicant on what he would like to do.

Mr. Sirb noted to move the driveway to be able to save the trees and buffer.

Mr. Shaffer questioned if that would be a condition of the board.

Mr. Sirb noted the Board would have to take a vote on that.

Mr. Shaffer questioned if he moved fifteen feet to the East.

Mr. Sirb asked Mr. Staub if fifteen feet would give them enough space.

Mr. Shaffer noted that would put the edge of the parking to the building setback line. Mr. Shaffer noted ten feet would put it there, fifteen feet would be more than enough.

Mr. Dowling noted there are two scenarios. He explained that if Mr. Shaffer would withdraw the current applicant and table. He explained that the first scenario is to push the parking lot to the East and the second is to relocate the driveway to the East. He noted that would leave them with the old driveway on the West.

Mr. Staub commented that PennDOT would most likely not allow two driveways.

Mr. Dowling noted they would probably not be allowed to have two driveways.

Mr. Staub agreed and noted that the only way they might is if they had one-way traffic.

Mr. Dowling noted to the Applicant that the Board can not tell them that if they do A, B, or C, they will approve it. He explained that if the Applicant is willing to withdraw it the Board seems

to be recommending either one the driveway move to the East or keep the driveway where it is and shift the parking lot to the East. He noted that one of those plans would have a better chance of passing than the plan that is before them.

Mr. Sirb noted he would vote against the plan now.

Ms. Class noted that makes sense to her.

Mr. Sirb questioned what the detriment would be to moving the driveway. He questioned if it is the cost or something other than that.

Mr. Shaffer answered that there is a pretty good slope coming up the driveway that would require grading and there are utilities and the well on that side as well. He continued that trees would need to be removed and he has not looked at the sight distance with moving the driveway.

Mr. Reeder questioned the clean out on the East side.

Mr. Shaffer answered he is not sure.

Mr. Reeder noted it was just next to the well.

Mr. Shaffer explained the surveyors noted it was a clean out cap, but they are not sure what it is for.

Mr. Reeder questioned if the well is above the ground or an old well that is burred.

Mr. Shaffer answered it has a well cap.

Mr. Reeder noted his concern that if it is moved to the East side, will PennDOT allow and moving a well head is not easy. Mr. Reeder questioned if the parking lot can be squeezed in and save the trees.

Mr. Shaffer answered most defiantly. He explained this was the lay out they chose but they can push it over ten to fifteen feet away from the trees.

Mr. Dowling questioned if the Applicant was able to approach PennDOT and have them come out and do a preliminary site analysis of the driveways.

Mr. Shaffer answered yes. He explained he would have to submit the applications.

Mr. Dowling explained he would like to know if PennDOT would approve both or if PennDOT would only approve one.

Mr. Shaffer noted he knows there is site distance at the current one.

Mr. Dowling questioned if the Applicant is agreeable to table it. He noted to the Applicant to get a letter from PennDOT and they come out and look at it, either moving the driveway or keeping it where it is.

Mr. Shaffer questioned that with tabling the application there is no resubmission fee.

Mr. Dowling answered that is correct. Mr. Dowling explained that is why the Board did not vote on it, so the Applicant would not have to pay another fee.

Ms. Class answered she would agree to that.

Mr. Dowling noted they will table this until the Board hears from the Applicant.

Mr. Dowling questioned if any members of the audience had any questions or comments.

No response was heard.

This hearing ended at 7:30 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Kristi Focht

Recording Secretary