

LOWER PAXTON TOWNSHIP
PLANNING COMMISSION

March 12, 2008

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT

Fredrick Lighty
Roy Newsome
Dennis Guise
Ernest Gingrich
William Neff
Richard Beverly
Douglas Grove

ALSO PRESENT

Lori Wissler, Planning & Zoning Officer
Dianne Moran, Planning & Zoning Officer
Stephen Fleming, HRG, Inc.
Chip Millard, Dauphin County Planning Commission

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Lighty called the regular meeting of the Lower Paxton Township Planning Commission to order at 7:01 pm, on March 12, 2008 in Room 171 of the Lower Paxton Township Municipal Center, 425 Prince Street, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO THE FLAG

Mr. Lighty led the recitation of the Pledge.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Newsome made a motion to approve the minutes of the February 13, 2008 regular meeting. Mr. Beverly seconded the motion, and the minutes were approved as submitted.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. Lighty introduced Mr. Douglas Grove, the newest member of the Planning Commission.

Shadebrook
Preliminary Subdivision Plan #07-14
&
Conditional Use Application 08-01
Public Comment Only

Mr. Lighty stated that because of the complexity of the Plan, there are technical issues that have arisen between the developer and the Township. Notices had already been mailed to surrounding residents so Mr. Lighty invited the public to address their comments to the Commission, even though the plan and the conditional use will not be considered at this time. He noted that another notice will be mailed when the plan and conditional use will be heard. Mr. Newsome noted that any comments will be included in the record of the meeting.

Booker Fulmore, 6123 Spring Knoll Drive, stated he wanted more information about the plans and the differences between 4 and 4.5 units density. Mr. Lighty stated the developer will give a presentation and that is something that will be addressed and they will have sketches showing the differences with and without the extra half-acre.

A question was asked if both the subdivision plan and the conditional use are being tabled. Mr. Lighty answered yes. The person asked when the subdivision will be available so he can see that certain provisions are in there that are supposed to be. Mr. Lighty speculated that the presentation should be next month, but a notice will be mailed to the same residents so they know for sure.

Eric Miller, 804 Harrogate Drive, stated he would like to see graphic proposals showing the plan with a density of 4 units per acre and a plan showing a density of 4.5 units per acre. He noted that he did review the plan, but it is so complicated that he cannot see it. His concern was green space and trees. He did not think the plan shows that right now. Mr. Lighty stated it is up to the developer if they can bring two sets of drawings. Mr. Miller asked if just an overall plan can be shown, with both proposals. He suggested they be color coded so they can see the differences clearly. Mr. Lighty will communicate the request to the developer, and noted that the Township does not prepare such drawings. Mr. Lighty further noted that the developer does have a greenspace drawing, showing how much greenspace does exist in the development. Mr. Miller saw the greenspace page of the plan, but questioned whether the greenspace will be increased, decreased or stay the same. Mr. Lighty agreed that was an appropriate question for the developer.

Gary Mills, 6415 Churchill Road, asked what the Township anticipates with regard to road improvements to the area based on the increased traffic that will result from this project or any future development. He asked about a signal or other device at Locust Lane at Fairmont Drive, or at Locust Lane at Nyes Road. Mr. Lighty stated a traffic study has been done with this plan, and it will be presented when the plan is presented.

Mr. Guise made a motion to table the Shadebrook Preliminary Subdivision Plan #07-14 and the Conditional Use Application 08-01. Mr. Gingrich seconded the motion and a unanimous vote followed.

OLD BUSINESS

Rezoning Request

Lingelstown Road, Sportsman Golf Course

Ordinance 07-14

Ms. Wissler stated this was before the Planning Commission already, and moved to the Board of Supervisors as well. The Supervisors did not act on the application within the 60 days required, so it must go through the process again. Nothing has changed since the last time the Commission has seen the request.

Ms. Wissler stated that the Township is proposing an amendment to the Township's Zoning Map for three properties located north of Lingelstown Road, 35-001-004, 35-001-005, and 35-001-006. The

three properties are currently zoned CO, Conservation District, AR, Agricultural Residential District and IN, Institutional District. The amendment would rezone these three properties to CO, Conservation District and IN, Institutional District, moving the IN line to the north and the CO line to the south, eliminating the AR area.

Ms. Wissler noted that the existing uses of the properties are the Sportsman's Golf Course and two vacant parcels to the north of the golf course. The subject parcel is abutted to the north by the Conservation Zone, to the south by the CG, Commercial General Zone adjacent to Susquehanna Township, and the AR, Agricultural Residential Zone (Blue Ridge Country Club) and to the east is the R-1, Low Density Residential District (Forest Hills Development). The 2004 Comprehensive Plan's Future Land Use Map shows the area to be Rural Residential. A courtesy mailing was sent to neighboring property owners indicating that the Planning Commission would review the application on March 12, 2008.

A resident stated that he objected to the whole thing. He asked if anything has changed or if anything has been done with the Department of Transportation.

Paula Leicht, Mette Evans and Woodside, and Peter Gemora, were present on behalf of the property owner. Ms. Wissler noted that the applicant is the Township, and Ms. Leicht represents the owner of the property. Ms. Leicht stated that the Township Planning Commission and the Dauphin County Planning Commission reviewed the application, both of which recommended adoption. The plan would simplify the property, allowing the developer to apply uniform development rules to the Institutional portion of the property. The Conservation District boundary has been moved south to accommodate the topography in the area. Stricter rules will apply to the Conservation area.

Mr. Millard stated that the Dauphin County Planning Commission reviewed the request previously and their comments remain the same. He noted that though the DCPC supports the rezoning request, it wants to emphasize that rezoning the majority of the tract from AR to IN does have the potential to increase the traffic impact in this area. It is important that if one of the higher intensity uses permitted in the IN District is proposed in this area, the internal and surrounding roadway network promotes interconnectivity to better disperse traffic and provide alternatives for roadway users. Land uses directly impact the transportation system, and future Federal transportation funding for any necessary improvements on some of the significant roads that would be impacted by development on the tract, including PA 39/Lingelstown Road, will likely be limited.

Mr. Millard noted that there is a misconception about the State initiatives for roadway funds. That is not the majority of the funding. The majority of the funding that HATS receives, actually comes from the Federal government, and there are issues with Federal transportation funding and the Federal Highway Trust Fund. He noted there is a possibility that those sources may run out of money in the coming years.

Mr. Lighty called for public comment with regard to the rezoning.

Mr. Tim Ritty, 2409 Melbourne Drive, asked Mr. Millard to be more specific with regard to his comment about improvements to be made to handle the traffic. Mr. Millard clarified that his comment

says that if a higher intensity use is placed on this tract, it would be preferable to the Township and surrounding community that the internal and surrounding roadway network promote interconnectivity to disperse traffic and provide alternatives. Mr. Ritty repeated: the internal and surrounding network would need to be improved to support the increased use. Mr. Millard stated it would be preferable if that were the case.

Mr. Ritty asked what that means in terms of road improvement. Mr. Millard stated it would be to the benefit of the community if you have more options in terms of transportation facilities, i.e. roadways, to use. If you have a use that is higher intensity for traffic generation it is better to have more interconnectivity to have more options. If there is major congestion or in incident blocking the only roadway, it would be better to have different ways around the area.

Mr. Ritty asked if interconnectivity means widening Linglestown Road. Mr. Millard explained that the term interconnectivity means that there are connections between roads, it does not mean widening. Mr. Ritty requested to see the plan that shows where that would be. Mr. Millard stated that is a recommendation for the developer, and a comment for the Township to consider.

Mr. Ritty asked if the aforementioned interconnectivity refers to the area within the rezoning. Mr. Millard stated the recommendation refers to the subject parcels as well as the area relatively close to the rezoning. Mr. Ritty understood the comment to say that the Township would not respond in any way by improving the roadways. Mr. Millard stated that is up to the Township. Ms. Wissler stated that after the rezoning is approved, the next step is for the developer to propose a subdivision plan and outline what they propose to do. At that point the Township would review how the roads may connect into the adjacent developments. The Township cannot work with the developer on those issues until it sees what the developer has to offer.

Mr. Ritty restated the previous comments: that with the potential of the high density use, that would increase the load in the area and the Township would have to respond to that. Mr. Millard stated that a higher intensity use would likely increase the load in the area, the Township may then work with the developer. Mr. Lighty stated that a developer would bring to the Township a land development plan. The Township will take the County's advice that interconnectivity and transportation is important, and will look for that item when reviewing their plan. Mr. Ritty asked if that only applies to the land that he is developing. Mr. Lighty answered yes. Mr. Ritty asked if that meant nowhere else. Mr. Lighty stated that the land that they are developing is all that is before them to consider.

Mr. Ritter asked about the impact on the surrounding area and Linglestown Road and the potential for 2,000 units. Mr. Lighty stated that traffic studies are part of land development submission.

Mr. Ritty asked if that would occur before or after the rezoning decision. Mr. Lighty answered they are submitted after the rezoning. Ms. Wissler added that after the rezoning process, the developer contacts the Township with regard to the intersections that have to be studied.

Mr. Ritty made it clear that when the Commissioners make a decision on the zoning of the property, they do not have the benefit of a traffic study.

Mr. Lighty stated that nothing is proposed to be built at this time. Mr. Ritty understood, but noted that everyone knows that something will be built on this site. Mr. Lighty stated that when they want to build something, they must bring plans before the Township. Mr. Ritty stated that after the zoning is changed, the owners of the land can build as they please as long as it is within the zoning regulations. Mr. Lighty confirmed that is correct, but cautioned that they can also build right now, on all of the tract.

Mr. Ritty stated he is not in favor of this plan going through, because he believes that high density housing in that area would adversely impact the neighborhood. He asked if it were appropriate to voice his opinion here, or at the Board of Supervisors meeting. Mr. Lighty stated it is appropriate at both levels. The comments about what level of development are desired is appropriate with this discussion, however, comments about the specific plan may or may not be relevant being that the Township does not have a specific plan for consideration.

Mr. Ritty stated that erosion is a problem in that area because some of his neighbors have difficulty with this. According to Map 8 of the Comprehensive Plan, the proposed CO area is an area of high erosion. The area below is considered to be an area of moderate erosion, as well as hydric soil. He was concerned about increased erosion problems as a result of development.

Mr. Lighty stated that the rezoning application proposes to increase the CO down the hill, above that is the area that the Comprehensive Plan identifies as high erosion, which will have more protection under the CO zoning.

Mr. Ritty suggested a better plan would extend the CO further south so that those areas of erosion are protected.

Mr. Lighty explained that the maps in the Comprehensive Plan are general. The developer does have detailed studies of the slopes of the land in that area.

Mr. Ritter stated that within Lower Paxton Township there are four places shown on Map 4, Average Daily Traffic Volume 2000, that are designated yellow, carrying 15,000 to 30,000 vehicles per day. Of those four places, three are four lane roads, and the fourth is Linglestown Road. Things have changed on Linglestown Road since 2000. He pointed out that this is going to make an already very bad situation even worse.

Mr. Lighty stated that Linglestown Road is a State Road and the State has jurisdiction over any changes to Linglestown Road. Mr. Ritty stated that if it is out of our hands, then perhaps it is our responsibility to protect that area if we cannot modify it to suit the load.

Mr. Ritty stated that the Comprehensive Plan identifies about 50 "key opportunity sites" for development. This site is not one of those. He asked why this area was not identified as an opportunity. Mr. Lighty explained that a key opportunity site is an area identified as where future development could be exceptional or special. It does not mean that development shouldn't happen anywhere else.

Mr. Ritty stated that November 20, 2007 Mr. Zwally represented the developers, said that the neighborhood would be contacted and their opinion about the development would be taken into account. The same sentiment was expressed at the December 11th meeting. Randolph Holmes said that he would work with Mr. Zwally and the neighborhood to contact the neighbors. At the November meeting, Mr. Ritty presented Mr. Zwally with his business card and asked that he be contacted. Mr. Ritty stated that he nor his neighbors have been contacted about any such meeting.

Alan Thompson, 2406 Melbourne Drive, stated he has lived there for about 20 years. His concern is with fire in the area. There have been two incidents with fire in the area, and there is no fire protection other than sending in a truck above Continental Drive. Mr. Thompson understood that Continental Drive is to be extended through the development, and he is concerned about fire protection for the senior housing and any further expansion. He commented on the beautiful mountain that was there, that continues to get torn up. He noted that other areas have ordinances about removing trees with regard to development. Mr. Thompson stated his main concern is fire protection, water supply, and sewer supply to support this area, with or without the zoning change.

Ms. Leicht stated that the Text Amendment, Ordinance 08-03, is a result of the meeting to address some citizens' concerns. She explained that there was such a meeting on December 21st and they left the meeting with an agreement on additional protections. Mr. Lighty asked how it was decided who got invited to the meeting. Mr. Gemora stated Randolph Holmes volunteered to be the contact point for the neighborhood. Ms. Leicht stated that about 17 residents did come to that meeting, which lasted about 2.5 hours. Based on the discussions at that meeting, the developer made several recommendations to the Township. Ms. Leicht stated that she contacted Mr. Holmes to let him know the rezoning and the text amendments would be on the agenda for tonight's meeting. Mr. Lighty thanked them for conducting such a meeting, and noted the Township appreciates when developers make the extra effort to work with existing neighborhoods. Ms. Leicht expects the dialog to continue between the developer and the neighbors as the development process goes on. Some other interests were connection of bike and walk paths. The developer has indicated they will work on those additional concerns.

Mr. Fulmore asked if it has been decided or shown, or is there an idea what type of building will take place. Mr. Lighty stated that the Township has seen plans of what they intend to do. Those plans are not formal and they are not part of the rezoning request. Land development plans will be submitted when the developer is ready to develop that land. Mr. Lighty stated that residential retirement is the intent of the developer.

In response to Mr. Fulmore's questions, Mr. Ritty stated that the same question was asked at a previous meeting, and the answer at that time was a mixture of residential and high density housing, up to 12 units per acre. Some of that will be retirement. Ms. Wissler noted that an amendment is proposed to reduce that density to 10 per acre, as a result of the discussions. Mr. Ritty stated that since there are 189 acres, they can have 1,890 units. Mr. Lighty stated that is not necessarily true, much of the parcel is undevelopable. There are prohibitions related to steep slopes, flood plains, and other sensitive areas. Mr. Ritty quoted Mr. Zwally from the November meeting, "a topographical map was made of the land and it shows that the AR area is relatively flat with slopes of less than 15%, that are suitable for

residential development.” Mr. Guise stated there is no evidence to suggest that the property, as rezoned, will result in a higher number of units than they could build under the current zoning.

Mr. Ritty asked if it was true to say that because of the grade that the density would be lower. He asked what the rule is for under 15% slopes. Mr. Lighty stated that if there is a severe slope, you cannot build on it. Ms. Wissler stated that regulation is 25%. Mr. Lighty explained that you cannot simply multiply the acres by maximum allowed units.

Mr. Ritty asked why Mr. Zwally would make a point that the area is 15% or less, in the AR region, which is the most steep part of the land in question. Mr. Guise stated that the CO area is the steepest, it is on the mountain. Mr. Ritty agreed, but noted that since it is CO it is not going to be built on anyway. Mr. Guise explained that building is allowed in the CO District, but it has stricter regulations. Mr. Ritty stated they are not talking about building in the CO District. Mr. Guise cautioned that building is permitted in the Conservation District, and speculated that the developer has plans to develop that land also. Mr. Ritty asked if it was true that increasing the Conservation District doesn't in any way limit where things can be built. Mr. Guise stated that the requirements for building are different, and change substantially from the AR to the CO District. Many fewer units can be built in the Conservation District than in the Agricultural Residential District. Mr. Ritty thought that the Conservation District was an area that was to be protected and cannot be built upon.

Mr. Ritty stated that Mr. Zwally stated at the December meeting that they do not envision building single family houses, and surmised that all of the development that would occur here would be high density. Mr. Lighty corrected it to be residential retirement. Mr. Gemora stated that residential retirement may include single family houses. Mr. Ritty understood the regulation, but has not heard anyone say that they propose single family homes.

Mr. Newsome stated that the Commission has considered the zoning on this property for some time, and has heard from some residents tonight, and there may be a misunderstanding as to what exists and to the current zoning on the property. The Township is considering adjusting the zoning to make it a more useful piece of property. Even with no zoning change, there can still be high density residential development there. After considerable discussion, Mr. Newsome made a motion to recommend approval of the rezoning request, 35-001-004, 35-001-005, and 35-001-006. He explained that this would expand an area currently zoned CO, Conservation District, eliminate an area currently zoned AR, Agricultural Residential District, and it would expand the Institutional District. Mr. Gingrich and Mr. Beverly seconded the motion. Mr. Lighty called for discussion on the motion.

Mr. Guise noted that he does live in this area, and shares a lot of the concerns that were expressed, but he believes that they will be addressed in the planning and land development process; the rezoning appears justified and logical. He also hoped that the developer continues to work with the neighbors and also noted that he was not contacted and lives on Forest Hills Drive. A unanimous vote followed.

NEW BUSINESS

Rezoning Request
Holbrook/Fritchey Street
Ordinance 08-04

Ms. Moran stated that Ordinance 08-04 would amend the zoning of the property located at 100 Holbrook Street, parcel number 35-052-070, and 4611 Fritchey Street, parcel number 35-052-280, from R-1, Low Density Residential District to CG, Commercial General District. She has provided the Commission with additional information regarding the history of this property. The Township has prepared this rezoning to return it to its previous zoning classification.

Mr. and Mrs. Mosher, owners of 100 Holbrook Street, as well as Mr. Bowden owner of 4611 Fritchey Street, were also in attendance.

Mr. Bowden explained that he has been at 5 Miller Road, across the street from 4611 Fritchey Street, as an employer for over 25 years, as well as a Township resident for the same length of time. His business was there when the other subject parcel was a coal yard, and it was always a C-1 zoning designation. He explained that the area was changed to residential in error, and this ordinance is to put it back to the way it was. He noted that most rezonings are requests for exception, and this one is to keep things the way they are.

Mr. Tim Mosher stated he fully agrees with Mr. Bowden's comments. He operates a business on the property, and would like to be able to maintain that business.

Mr. Millard reviewed the Dauphin County Planning Commission's comments and stated that after reviewing the proposed revisions, the DCPC recommends the proposed zoning change from R-1, Low Density Residential to CG, Commercial General not be approved. Although the existing uses on both tracts are commercial in nature, allowing commercial uses on the south side of Fritchey Street in this area could set a bad precedent for the immediate area by expanding the width of the commercial zoning corridor south of US 22. Rezoning the two tracts to CG could also have a negative impact on the adjacent church and other nearby, non-commercial properties, especially those south of the tracts, and on the ability of Fritchey Street to act as a parallel access road to the US 22 corridor.

Mr. Lighty asked if Mr. Millard would agree that a deeper commercial zone off of Route 22 would be advantageous for future redevelopment of a commercial nature. Mr. Millard answered that it would be. He added that everything north of Fritchey Street is zoned CG, Commercial General District. His concern was with setting a precedent by rezoning these two tracts on Fritchey Street, that other properties south of Fritchey Street may potentially request to be commercial as well. Mr. Lighty stated that rezonings are discretionary, and are not based on precedence.

Ms. Wissler stated that the south side of Fritchey Street further west is already commercial, in the neighborhood of Sonny's Garage. Sonny's is the only commercial property on the south side commercial, and that is why that strip was left as residential zoning.

Mr. Lighty called for comments from the audience.

With regard to traffic, Mr. Bowden stated that what has increased traffic is actually the commercial activity on Route 22. He felt it was very unlikely that anything could be built on the property, even if they sold them together. It is also unlikely that whatever is built there would create more traffic than is there presently. Mr. Bowden noted that it is an odd piece of property, given that Fritchey Street is fragmented.

Mr. Guise asked what would be the significant difference if it were zoned CN, instead of CG. Ms. Wissler noted that the abutting property is ON, not CN, and that would be a significant difference.

Mr. Guise stated that in 2004 the Township wrote a letter to the owner stating that the property is commercial. Ms. Moran answered that that is correct. Mr. Guise asked if both properties were considered C-1. Ms. Moran answered yes.

Mr. Neff made a motion to recommend adoption of Ordinance 08-04. Mr. Newsome seconded the motion and a unanimous vote followed.

Mr. Newsome thanked Mr. Millard for the County's comments, and he felt that they were well thought out.

Ordinance 08-03
Text Amendment
Articles 307, 319, 803
Regarding the Institutional District

Ms. Wissler stated that the proposed ordinance amends three sections of the article: 307.B.2, decreases the maximum building height in the IN, Institutional District, for residential retirement development buildings from 70 to 60; 319.G.5, with regard to building height and setbacks in the Institutional District, the minimum is to be increased by 5 feet for every foot over 40 feet of building height; 319.G.17, decreases the maximum density in the Institutional District from 12 to 10 dwelling units per acre; and 803.D.8, with regard to buffer yards in the Institutional District, is 30 feet for single family dwellings that are contiguous to residential, and 60 feet for other than single family dwellings that are contiguous to residential.

Mr. Millard stated that the Dauphin County Planning Commission has reviewed the request by the Township to make various text amendments to its 2006 Zoning Ordinance. The DCPC offers the following comments:

1) The DCPC supports the Township's recommendations to reduce the maximum building height in the Institutional District from 70 feet to 60 feet for uses besides residential retirement buildings and to reduce the permitted development density in the Institutional District from 12 to 10 units per acre.

2) The Commission recommends the proposed regulations in Section 319.G.5 governing residential-retirement developments in the Institutional District not be adopted. The proposed

incremental setback requirement mandating a 5 foot setback increase for every 1 foot additional building height above 40 feet appears to be too onerous for Institutional District landowners wishing to develop residential retirement developments in the district. Also, the existing IN District regulations in Section 307.A specify the side and rear yard setbacks need to be increased from 25 feet to 50 feet if the lot has a building that is two or more stories tall and is “contiguous to an existing residential lot that is not in common ownership”. If the township wants to modify the existing regulations, it may be a good idea if the more restrictive side and rear yard setback regulations are also applied in cases where IN District development is adjacent to an undeveloped lot or lots in various lower density residential zones (AR, R-1, R-2, R-C, and possibly CO).

3) The Commission recommends the proposed regulations in new Section 803.D.8 not be adopted. The existing regulations in Section 803.D.1 address buffer yard size requirements for non-residential uses contiguous to existing residential use lots or lots zoned for residential uses; the buffer yard width requirement in those cases is 30 feet. Based on the list of uses shown in Section 306.B.1, it appears only the uses shown in Section (a) would be considered residential uses; the uses shown in Sections (b), (c), (d), (e), and (f) would be classified as non-residential uses. Within Section 306.B.1.a, the only permitted uses in the IN, Institutional District are residential retirement developments and group homes that are not treatment centers. Residential retirement developments have development patterns most similar to uses in the R-3, Medium-High Density Residential District, which does not require buffering from adjacent, lower density residential uses. Group homes are required in Section 402.A.23.i to have an appearance similar to nearby homes and not have any signs identifying the use as a group home. The Commission believes the proposed buffering regulations would be overly restrictive and not be consistent with other existing regulations. In addition, most permitted uses in the IN District are classified as non-residential and would be subject to the buffer yard regulations in Section 803.D.1.

M. Lighty asked about section 803.D, and if a single family residence being built beside another single family residence, would it require a 30 foot buffer. Ms. Wissler stated that if the district beside it is R-1, Low Density Residential District, and this is IN, then that would be the case. She noted that the rear yard setback is 25 feet.

Mr. Lighty agreed with Mr. Millard’s comment about the new setback regulations, and asked where that came from. Ms. Wissler stated that came from discussions with the Board of Supervisors. They were hesitant to rezone the Sportsman’s area until these issues were cleared up.

Mr. Guise did not think it was a bad change, and looked at it from how it could be applied to a multi-story building next to a single family home. He agreed there should be additional setback from such a building next to a residential zone. Mr. Guise felt it was logical even if it is complicated. He felt that there should be additional protections for residential neighborhoods next to the Institutional District, and this is a method of doing it.

Mr. Guise asked the difference between the buffer yard and the yard setbacks. Ms. Wissler stated that they overlap, the rear yard setback is 25 feet and the buffer is 30 feet, so it would increase the rear yard setback to 30 feet, because the building cannot be in the buffer area. Ms. Wissler noted that screening is also required in a buffer, not in a rear yard setback.

Mr. Lighty asked if that kind of screening is really desired between two single family houses. Mr. Guise asked if that is really the intent. Ms. Leicht stated that the buffer requirements came out of discussions with neighboring homeowners. She confirmed that it really was the intent of the ordinance to have a buffer between anything in the Institutional District and a residential district, even between two houses.

Mr. Guise asked how this may affect other Institutional zoned areas in the Township. Ms. Wissler stated that this is the only vacant piece of Institutional zoning, all the others are schools and parks.

Mr. Guise stated that given the purpose behind the changes, they may not be too onerous.

Mr. Lighty called for comments from the audience.

Mr. Jeffry Starsinic, 4077 Rosewall Court, explained that the neighbors that attended the meeting were under the impression that the 30 foot buffer was before the Institutional District started, not necessarily just 5 more feet to a house. They thought that there would be a buffer space of 30 feet before the development would start. Mr. Lighty stated there will be 30 feet before anything is built. Mr. Guise noted that there will not be an additional yard setback. Mr. Starsinic asked if that meant that a house could go 30 feet from his property. Ms. Wissler noted that Mr. Starsinic's house is also 25 feet from the property line, so it would be about 60 feet from house to house. Mr. Lighty stated that a buffer also includes screening. Mr. Starsinic stated that the neighbors hope that they will keep the existing trees. Mr. Gingrich noted that they cannot control that. Mr. Guise added that they can keep exiting vegetation in lieu of planting new.

Mr. Guise made a motion to recommend approval of ordinance 08-03. Mr. Grove seconded the motion and a unanimous vote followed.

Estates of Autumn Oaks
Discussion regarding SWAN Comments

Mr. Lighty stated that he and Ms. Moran and Mr. Grubic met to go over the SWAN letter. The response was included in the packet. Mr. Guise stated the letter looks good. Ms. Moran stated the letter with a copy of tonight's agenda were mailed to Mr. Epstein, and noted that he is not present. Mr. Lighty asked if the Commission agreed that he could handle future letters in the same way. The Commission agreed.

Public Comment

There was no further public comment.

Commissioner & Staff Comment

Mr. Millard announced that he has resigned from Tri County Regional Planning Commission. He has accepted a position with the Federal Highway Administration in Washington, D. C. He stated he

has been assigned to Lower Paxton Township for about 6 years, and has enjoyed the work. Mr. Lighty thanked Mr. Millard for his service on behalf of the Commission.

Mr. Neff asked if there was a certain aspect of the Shadebrook plan that they should focus on. Mr. Lighty stated that this plan is the most complicated development in the history of the Township, and one area he is not strong on is the architectural standards. Ms. Wissler agreed that will be a very difficult item to control when it gets to be building permit time. Mr. Lighty asked if something has to be changed in the building permit process. Ms. Wissler did not feel that was necessary.

Adjournment

The next regular Planning Commission meeting is scheduled for April 9, 2008, at 7:00 pm at the Lower Paxton Township Municipal Center, Room 171.

Being no further business, Mr. Gingrich made a motion to adjourn. Mr. Neff seconded the motion, and the meeting adjourned at 8:40 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Michelle Hiner
Recording Secretary