

Lower Paxton Township
Planning Commission

Meeting Minutes

April 6, 2016

Commissioners Present

Fredrick Lighty
Steve Libhart
Roy Newsome
Doug Grove
Lori Staub
Lisa Schaefer

Also Present

Amanda Zerbe, Lower Paxton Zoning Officer
Nick Gehret, Lower Paxton Codes Officer
Jason Hinz, HRG. Inc.
Andrew Bomberger, DCPC

Call to Order

Mr. Lighty called the regular meeting of the Lower Paxton Township Planning Commission to order at 7:00pm on the above date in room 171 of the Lower Paxton Township Municipal Center, 425 Prince Street, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania.

Pledge of Allegiance

Mr. Libhart led the recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance.

Approval of Minutes

Mr. Lighty asked if there were any questions or changes for the Minutes of March 2, 2016. Mr. Newsome made a motion to approve the March 2, 2016 Planning Commission Meeting minutes. Mr. Libhart seconded the motion and a unanimous vote followed.

New Business

Conditional Approval for Schoffstall Associates #16-01, 5940 Linglestown Road

Mrs. Zerbe stated that the Lower Paxton Township had received an application for Conditional Use Permit that would allow the demolition of the structure located at 5940 Linglestown Road. The structure is considered a Historic Building under Section 316 of the Lower Paxton Zoning Ordinance and requires a Conditional Use in order to be razed. The applicant proposes to demolish the building that was damaged by fire and construct a new structure on the parcel. The parcel is located in the V, Village District. Currently, the building on the parcel is a 1600 SF, two-story structure. The parcel is .28 acres.

Section 318, Additional Requirements of the Village District, requires that demolition of an existing building in the Village District follow the requirements of Section 316, Historic Buildings. Section 316.D requires the following:

Section 316.D. Approval of Demolition.

1. A building regulated by this Section 316 shall not be demolished, in whole or in part, unless the applicant proves to the satisfaction of the Board of Supervisors as a conditional use that one or more of the following condition exists:

- a. The existing building cannot feasibly and reasonably be reused, and that such situation is not the result of intentional neglect of demolition by neglect of the owner;
- b. The denial of the demolition would result in unreasonable economic hardship to the owner, and the hardship was not self-created.
- c. The demolition is necessary to allow a project to occur that will have substantial, special and unusual public benefit that would greatly outweigh the loss of the building regulated by Section 316. For example, a demolition may be needed for a necessary expansion of an existing public building or to allow a street improvement that is necessary to alleviate a public safety hazard;
- d. The existing building has no historical or architectural significance and the demolition will not adversely impact upon the streetscape.
 1. To meet this condition, the applicant may present information concerning the proposed design of any replacement building or use to show that the proposed building or use will result in a net improvement to the streetscape.
 2. For approval of a demolition, the standards of this Section 316 shall apply in place of the general conditional use standards. In reviewing the application, the Board of Supervisors shall consider the following:
 - a. The effect of the demolition on the historical significance, streetscape and architectural integrity of neighboring Historic Buildings and on the historic character of the surrounding neighborhood.
 - b. The feasibility of other alternatives to demolition.
 3. A complete application for the demolition shall be submitted by the applicant in writing. This application shall include the following:
 - a. The name, address and daytime telephone number of the owner of record and the applicant for the demolition.
 - b. Recent exterior photographs of the building proposed for demolition. If the Applicant is alleging that the building cannot be reused or rehabilitated, then interior photos and floor plans shall be provided as needed to support the applicant's claim.
 - c. A site plan drawn to scale showing existing buildings and the proposed demolition.
 - d. A written statement of the reasons for the demolition.
 - e. The proposed use of the site, and a proposed timeline for development of that proposed use.
 4. Evidence. The applicant shall provide sufficient credible evidence to justify any claims that a building cannot feasibly be repaired or reused.

Supporting information from the applicant relative to this application has been provided for review by Commission members.

This office has provided written notification to all surrounding property owners within the neighborhood and provided a copy of the Public Notice to the Village of Linglestown Committee.

The parcel involved in the application was posted.

Mr. Marty Schoffstall was present to represent the plan. Mr. Schoffstall presented a slide presentation in which he showed the building now as it is and the building how he would like it to appear. The building 5940 Linglestown Road, is in the Village District, and has no real historical or architectural value.

Mrs. Staub questioned in which location would be the brewing pub? Mr. Schoffstall stated that 5940 Linglestown Road will be the brewing site of some Linglestown brews.

Mr. Libhart questioned the historical significance of the property and if there were any brownstone or age of the structure concerns? Mr. Schoffstall stated there were none.

Mr. Lighty explained the conditional use process to those in attendance.

Mr. Bill Bostic, 6204 Elmer Ave, agreed with the applicant and the architect and stated that the back of this building needs to come down and is not practical at this point.

Mr. Mark Everest, 5943 Linglestown Road, stated that he is an entrepreneur and that rebuilding would be a good thing for Linglestown and Lower Paxton. It would help stimulate business and economy and have a unique look for the church.

Mrs. Staub questioned if they are required to do land development or can they proceed to the building permit. Mrs. Zerbe answered that they have the right to a building permit.

Mr. Lighty and Mr. Newsome appreciated the positive feedback from the public instead of always being against plans and the public turning out and hearing the proposal. Mr. Lighty stated that with no historical or architectural significance and the detail to the roof it will be a positive improvement.

Mr. Newsome made a motion to recommend approval of the Conditional Use #16-01 for Schoffstall Associates, 5940 Linglestown Road. Mr. Grove seconded the motion and a unanimous vote followed.

Alternate Member to the Planning Commission Discussion

Mr. Lighty stated that Mr. Wolfe prepared a memo and the Board of Supervisors made a recommendation regarding the position of Alternate to the Planning Commission. Two new applications were received.

Mr. Newsome, Mr. Grove and Mr. Libhart all were concerned if the previous applicants were contacted regarding this position being available. How and was this position advertised? The previous applicants were given the word that they would be kept informed of other positions when available. Would like the previous applicants contacted before a decision is made, than all applications will be reviewed.

Comprehensive Plan Discussion

Mr. Lighty stated that the Planning Commission was invited to the Board of Supervisors Workshop on April 10, 2015 or May 10, 2016 at 6:00 pm. The decision was made to arrive at 5:30pm on May 10, 2016 to discuss and be prepared for the workshop.

Commissioners Comment

Mrs. Schaefer had a question of the date of the next Planning Commission. The next meeting is May 4, 2016.

Next Regular Meeting: May 4, 2016

The next Lower Paxton Township Planning Commission Meeting is May 4, 2016.

Adjournment

Mr. Libhart made a motion to adjourn the meeting, Mr. Grove seconded the motion. The meeting adjourned at 7:30pm.

Sincerely submitted,

Michele Kwasnoski
Recording Secretary