

LOWER PAXTON TOWNSHIP
PLANNING COMMISSION
Reorganizational Meeting
March 14, 2012

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT

Fredrick Lighty
Ernest Gingrich
Roy Newsome
Dennis Guise
Douglas Grove
Robin Lindsey

ALSO PRESENT

Dianne Moran, Planning & Zoning Officer
Steve Fleming, HRG Inc.
Al Bain HRG, Inc.
Tim Smith, Dauphin County Planning Commission

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Lighty called the reorganizational meeting of the Lower Paxton Township Planning Commission to order at 7:00 pm, on March 14, 2012 in Room 171 of the Lower Paxton Township Municipal Center, 425 Prince Street, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO THE FLAG

Mr. Lighty led in the recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance.

ELECTION OF OFFICERS

Mr. Newsome made a motion to continue with the officers as they are: Mr. Lighty-Chairman, Mr. Gingrich-Vice Chairman and Mr. Guise-Secretary. Mr. Grove seconded the motion, and a unanimous vote followed.

**ESTABLISHMENT OF
MEETING DATE, TIME AND LOCATION**

Mr. Lighty suggested continuing with the second Wednesday of each month, at 7:00 pm, provided there is work to justify it. Meeting location will continue to be Room 171 of the Lower Paxton Township Municipal Center, 425 Prince Street. Mr. Grove so moved, and Mr. Gingrich seconded the motion. The motion carried with a unanimous voice vote.

ADJOURNMENT

Being no further reorganizational business, the meeting adjourned at 7:03 pm with a unanimous vote.

Respectfully Submitted,



Michelle Hiner
Recording Secretary

LOWER PAXTON TOWNSHIP
PLANNING COMMISSION

March 14, 2012

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT

Fredrick Lighty
Ernest Gingrich
Roy Newsome
Dennis Guise
Douglas Grove
Robin Lindsey

ALSO PRESENT

Dianne Moran, Planning & Zoning Officer
Steve Fleming, HRG Inc.
Al Bain HRG, Inc.
Tim Smith, Dauphin County Planning Commission

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Lighty called the regular meeting of the Lower Paxton Township Planning Commission to order at 7:03 pm, on March 14, 2012 in Room 171 of the Lower Paxton Township Municipal Center, 425 Prince Street, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO THE FLAG

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited during the Reorganizational Meeting, therefore Mr. Lighty passed on this agenda item.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Ms. Lindsey made a motion to approve the meeting minutes from December 14, 2011. Mr. Gingrich seconded the motion, and a unanimous vote followed.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Lighty asked for comments from the audience on anything not on the agenda. There were none offered.

NEW BUSINESS

**Preliminary/Final Subdivision & Land Development Plan #12-01
Miniature Golf Course and Batting Cages at Meadows Frozen Custard**

Ms. Moran stated that the Township has received a plan for construction of a miniature golf course, batting cages, clubhouse and associated site improvements. The purpose of this plan is to combine parcel #35-042-035 and #35-042-043 and consolidate them into Lot #1, containing 2.05 acres. The property is currently developed with a Meadows Frozen Custard. The property is zoned

CG, General Commercial District, and is served by public water and public sewer. The property is located north of Jonestown Road and west of Houcks Road.

The applicant has requested a waiver of the requirement to provide a preliminary plan submission, road widening and sidewalks along Jonestown Road and Care Street, and the requirement to provide a minimum one foot of freeboard through the spillway.

The applicant is seeking a variance from the Zoning Hearing Board to allow outdoor recreation activities (batting cages and miniature golf) to be located within 150 feet of an existing dwelling and to allow parking within 75 feet of an existing residential property line. The Zoning Hearing Board heard the variance request at its February 23, 2012 meeting and granted the variance with the following conditions: installation of a privacy fence, installation of material in the batting cages to assist in shielding the light from the residential properties, and reduced hours of operation.

This plan was scheduled for the February Planning Commission meeting, but the applicant requested it be tabled at that time to allow them to address comments provided by Staff, County and Engineer.

Ms. Lindsey asked if the residential neighbors on Care Street have been notified that this is being considered. Ms. Moran stated that the applicant had to apply for several variances, so there is a requirement to advertise for the Zoning Hearing Board, as such, the property and surrounding area was posted with hearing notices and an ad ran in the Paxton Herald twice. The Planning Commission meeting was not advertised, however, there was no response from the neighbors for the Zoning meeting.

Mr. Newsome asked if a certain parking ratio is required by ordinance. MS. Moran stated that the Outdoor Recreation Use does have a required parking amount, and this plan does meet the requirement.

Mr. Lighty asked about the reduced hours of the operation as noted by the Zoning Hearing Board action. Ms. Moran stated that the reduced the hours of batting cage operation from a closing time of 10 or 11:00 pm to 9:30 pm.

Ms. Lindsey asked if the property will be open seven days a week. Mr. Gelbaugh, owner of the Meadows Frozen Custard site, stated that the reduced hours of operation only apply to the batting cages. He also noted that the location will be open every day.

Mr. Grove asked about traffic studies, and if they were required for this project. Ms. Moran stated that an ITE trip generation study was done. She also noted that the first submission did not include it, and it was a comment generated with the first review, and when the plan was resubmitted for this meeting tonight, it was included with the plan, however that information was not included with the Commission's packet.

Mr. Dan Wise, Kurowski & Wilson Engineers, was present on behalf of the plan. Mr. Wise stated the existing custard site is on the southern portion along Jonestown Road and the proposed batting cages and miniature golf will be to the north and west, fronting on Care Street. He explained that a variance was granted with some conditions, installation of a fence and limited hours on the batting cages.

There are a few remaining comments to be addressed, but Mr. Wise explained they are minor or technical in nature and he feels they can satisfy them. Mr. Lighty asked if there are any comments the applicant wants to discuss or question. Mr. Wise pointed out that they have reduced the lighting to comply with the ordinance limit of 2.1 foot candles at the residential lot line, and they have added additional landscaping at the stormwater basin. He noted that there is a concern because the site is near residential properties and they are sensitive to that.

Mr. Wise stated that one issue is the width of the access way. He felt that the ordinance reads that the minimum width of 25 feet is measured at the cartway edge of the adjoining street. They have exceeded the 25 feet at that cartway edge of Care Street, so he thinks they comply. The proposed 22 foot width is coordinated with the aisle width of the parking lot.

Mr. Lighty asked if a waiver would be needed for the aisle/access width. Mr. Fleming stated that a waiver would be required if they plan to reduce the width from what is required. HE stated he believes the requirement is 25 feet for the aisle because it is also the access way, it carries vehicles from parking to the public street.

Mr. Wise suggested that this provision is in the Zoning Ordinance, so it may require a variance not a waiver. Ms. Moran agreed that is correct.

Mr. Guise stated the question is the difference between the interpretation of the engineer and the applicant. Mr. Wise asked if the consensus of the Planning Commission is that of the engineer, if so, then they would act based on that interpretation. Mr. Fleming stated that use of the 25 foot width would be consistent with other plans that have been reviewed and approved in the past. Mr. Wise noted that the text of the ordinance reads "measured at the cartway edge". Mr. Fleming asked if you are including the radius in the measurement. Mr. Wise stated that is correct, and it is wider at the cartway with the radiuses included, based on the radiuses provided. Mr. Fleming stated that if you only have to measure it at the cartway edge, you would not have a minimum width for access ways from parking to public streets. Mr. Wise stated he will work with it to comply with the interpretation.

Mr. Wise stated he can address the balance of the comments with staff and the engineer.

Mr. Newsome asked about the timing of the plan. Mr. Wise stated they hope to move this along to get it open.

Mr. Guise asked about the lighting comments. Mr. Wise stated they have adjusted the lighting to reduce it to limit the lighting spill onto the residential properties to 0.1 footcandles or less. The height of the light standards will remain at 20 feet.

Mr. Gingrich asked about the right-of-way measurement. Mr. Wise stated that he took the right-of-way measurement from a deed dated 1911. It showed a split right of way, in a neighborhood plan. If there are more current records, he can base it on those. Mr. Fleming stated they use the liquid fuels roster of streets to inventory street widths and lengths. There is a possibility that rights-of-way vary parcel by parcel in this neighborhood as sites are developed. He asked that the applicant show their documentation so he can verify it.

Mr. Gingrich asked Mr. Fleming his position on the remaining comments. Mr. Fleming agreed that most of the comments were technical in nature and the applicant should be able to address them with a resubmission.

Mr. Newsome asked about signage. Mr. Wise stated that they do not propose any freestanding signs. There will be a sign on the clubhouse identifying it, and it will be subject to a building permit and/or sign permit. Mr. Newsome asked if they would modify the sign on Route 22. Mr. Wise did not believe so.

There were no comments offered from the audience.

Mr. Guise made a motion to recommend approval of the plan and approval of the three waiver requests, subject to addressing the comments and subject to compliance with the conditions set forth by the Zoning Hearing Board. Mr. Gingrich seconded the motion, and a unanimous vote followed.

Preliminary/Final Subdivision Plan #12-02
2521 Patton Road

Ms. Moran stated that this plan proposes the subdivision of five single family detached building lots at 2521 Patton Road. The property is zoned R-1, Low Density Residential District and consists of 3.56 acres. All lots will be served by public sewer and public water. The property is located north of Linglestown Road and Carrollton Drive, and east of Patton Road.

The applicant has requested the following waivers: requirement to provide volume controls, requirement that the invert of all stormwater management facilities and underground infiltration/storage facilities be located a minimum of two feet above the seasonal high groundwater table or other soil limiting zone, and waiver of the requirement that the invert of stormwater ponds and underground infiltration/storage facilities be located a minimum of three feet above the seasonal high groundwater table.

Bob Fisher, RJ Fisher & Associates, was present on behalf of the plan.

Mr. Fisher stated he has reviewed the comments generated, and only needed to discuss the swale. Across the back yards there will be drainage from lot to lot, but it is not a formal swale. All of the stormwater from the roof will be directed to the front to an underground facility. Pervious concrete is being used. HE would prefer to not encumber the rear yards.

Mr. Fleming stated that he met with the applicant and discussed the drainage of the lots so that it will be a sheet flow condition than a concentrated direction to the swale. He was concerned that one property owner may build something in that area and trap the water. The swale and associated easement would protect the upstream properties. Mr. Fisher stated he can flatten it out even more. He noted the only water to deal with is from the higher lots, there is no water from offsite drainage. Mr. Gingrich stated it is important to contour the ground so that the water flows away from the structure. Mr. Fisher agreed, and stated they want a sheet flow condition in the rear yard.

Mr. Lighty asked for comments from the audience. Mr. David Berry, 2533 (Check spelling) Patton Road, owner of the adjacent property, noted that there is a sharp curve going from north to south and it is already difficult to pull out onto the street, so the additional five driveways will have a hard time as well. With the additional development to the north end of Patton Road, there will be more and more traffic. Mr. Fleming stated that some of the outstanding comments address the same issue. Mr. Lighty thanked Mr. Berry for his input.

Mr. Newsome made a motion to recommend approval of the plan and waiver requests, subject to compliance with the comments generated by staff, engineer and county. Ms. Lindsey seconded the motion and a unanimous vote followed.

Conditional Use #12-01
Sheetz Convenience Store
Southwest Corner of Union Deposit Road and Briarsdale Road
(#35-075-028 & 35-075-029)

Ms. Moran stated that the Township has received an application for a Conditional Use Permit that would allow the construction of a Sheetz Convenience Store with gasoline pumps at the southwest corner of Union Deposit Road and Briarsdale Road. The property is currently developed as the Your Place Restaurant. The overall property consists of 1.39 acres and is zoned CG, General Commercial District.

The auto service station use is considered a conditional use. The applicant addressed each specific criterion in their narrative for the conditional use as well as the additional criteria specific to auto service stations.

Ron Lucas, Stevens & Lee, and Chris Beauregard, Centerpoint Project Engineer, Mike LeCesa Director of Real Estate for Sheetz, Brian Soyka Permit Manager and In-House Engineer, and Greg Creasy from Grove Miller Engineering, were present on behalf of the conditional use application.

Mr. Newsome asked about the surrounding zoning. Ms. Moran stated it is all commercial general, and is located near the McDonalds on Briarsdale Road.

Ms. Lindsey asked if any neighboring property owners have contacted the Township after being notified of the application. Ms. Moran answered no.

Mr. Guise asked about a traffic study. Ms. Moran stated the executive summary of their traffic study is included in the Commission's packet for the land development plan.

Mr. Lucas stated that the criteria in the ordinance mainly deal with repair work but since this is primarily vehicle fuel retail, they have no problem complying with those items. The only outside activities are fuel pumps and air pumps. All setbacks and storage regulations are met. The convenience store use has certain requirements, and those are also all met. The fuel tanks and canopy are met as well.

Regarding traffic, Mr. Lucas stated they met with PennDOT a week ago, and as a result they feel they can meet all the requirements for a traffic impact study. The existing driveway is on Union Deposit Road and is a right-in right-out driveway. There is a connection with Metro Bank that will remain, and an existing easement from when the property was a Mr. Steak years ago. The driveway on Briarsdale will be moved further away from the intersection of Briarsdale and Union Deposit Roads, locating it immediately opposite the McDonalds driveway. Your Place and the Fairfield Inn are owned by different entities, both of which are controlled by the Dommel family. There will be an easement for the relocated driveway. Additional turning lane will be added on Briarsdale Road.

Mr. Guise asked if Sheetz will be open 24 hours a day. Mr. Lucas answered yes.

Mr. Lighty asked how the size of this location compares to the store on Allentown Blvd or Paxton Street. Mr. Mike LaCesa stated it is similar to the store on Allentown Blvd, with additional seating, but not as big as the one at TecPort. The restrooms will be larger and a vestibule will be added. Mr. LaCesa stated that there will be 5 fuel islands, serving ten vehicles, with diesel on each end strictly for pickup trucks and suv's; large trucks are not invited on the lot. There are 7 pumps at Allentown Blvd and TecPort.

Mr. Lighty asked about stacking of vehicles since there will only be 5 pump islands. Mr. LaCesa stated he doesn't think there will be a problem with that because that area is unique. The morning and evening hours are busy with the industrial park, but gasoline is usually an evening purchase, and based on their time studies, the stacking should not be an issue.

Ms. Lindsey stated that adding jobs at this location will be good for the area. Mr. LaCesa stated there will be 30 to 50 employees depending on the mix of full and part timers.

Mr. Guise made a motion to recommend approval of the conditional use application and Mr. Grove seconded the motion. Hearing no discussion on the motion, a unanimous vote followed.

Preliminary/Final Subdivision and Land Development Plan #12-05
Sheetz, Union Deposit Road and Briarsdale Road

Ms. Moran stated that the plan for Sheetz on Union Deposit Road proposes consolidation of lots and development of a Sheetz Convenience Store at the existing Your Place Restaurant location. The property is located at the southwest corner of the intersection of Briarsdale and Union Deposit

Roads. The property is zoned CG, Commercial General District, consists of 1.39 acres and is served by public water and public sewer.

The applicant has requested waivers for the requirement to submit a preliminary plan and the requirement that a registered landscape architect sign and seal the landscape plan.

Ron Lucas, Stevens & Lee, and Chris Beauregard, Centerpoint Project Engineer, Mike LeCesa Director of Real Estate for Sheetz, Brian Soyka Permit Manager and In-House Engineer, and Greg Creasy from Grove Miller Engineering, were present on behalf of the land development plan.

Mr. Lucas stated they would like to withdraw the request for a waiver from the requirement to have a landscape engineer sign and seal the landscape plan. He also noted that after reviewing the comments, he feels they can work through them. HRG comment #5 and 6 will have to be discussed and see if they can meet the requirements or if waivers are needed.

The lighting plan will be included in the second submission. Mr. Lucas stated he can comply with staff's comments, and noted that the access easement for the other Dommel property will be completed and there is already an easement for the other driveway. He noted they will comply with all the comments from the traffic safety unit of the police department.

Mr. Lucas explained that there will be three lanes going northbound, a left, right and straight lane. The right turns are the movement that gets backed up, so this should help that greatly.

Greg Creasy stated that an additional lane will be provided, and everything is being moved to the west leaving the McDonalds curb as it is. The alignment with the straight lane and the turning movements were considered and it will actually be better. Mr. Lighty stated that he has seen vehicles drive north and across the intersection and drive over the concrete median because they do not adjust for the realignment. Mr. Creasy stated that happens now, but when the additional lane is installed, that straight lane will be 12-13 feet further west making it easier to go across.

Mr. Lighty asked if the Briarsdale driveway is across from the McDonalds entrance or the street. Mr. Creasy stated it is across from the McDonalds driveway, and Pieffers Lane is next to it. There is also a comment to squeeze in a center left turn lane for McDonalds/Sheetz/Pieffers Lane. The plan will be modified somewhat to show that. Mr. Lighty stated that a vehicle turning left into McDonalds waiting on northbound traffic can back traffic all the way to Union Deposit Road. Mr. Creasy stated that is one of the reasons to install the center turn lane and the additional lane at the intersection. He also noted that a left turn arrow will be added for those coming onto Briarsdale Road. The models show that with the changes, the ques will not be backed up to the driveways. It was suggested to make a right arrow for when the Union Deposit lefts are turning, the vehicles turning right off of Briarsdale can keep moving. This will be especially good for trucks, which will not have to slow down stop and start back up.

Mr. Lucas stated that the driveway onto Briarsdale Road has the correct angle at the intersection, but may not have the depth to meet the ordinance. The hotel is already going to lose four

parking spaces and they will not want to give up any more. The hotel will still be in compliance with the parking ordinance. A waiver will probably be needed. He noted that the primary entrance to the hotel is further south, not at this immediate area.

Mr. Lucas stated they would be happy to come back next month, if they can meet a submission deadline. He and Ms. Moran agreed the resubmission will not be due until March 21st.

Mr. Grove asked about the lighting on the site. Mr. LaCesa stated that all lighting will be inward and downward. The majority of the lighting will be under the canopy, and all lighting is LED, so it is softer. Lights are flush mounted under the canopy so there will be nothing hanging down. The canopy is no longer attached to the building. LED does not glow as other types of lighting do. Mr. Grove stated the concern with lighting is the use of full cut off fixtures. Mr. Lucas stated that there are basically holes in the canopy for the lights and the parking lot lighting are painted so the light is directed downward. Mr. LaCesa stated they are considered full cut off fixtures. The newest store on Derry Street has these types of lights. The canopy area is well lit, but as you get away from the canopy, the light cuts off drastically. There are bollards that are lighted on the sidewalks and at the entrance.

Mr. Gingrich asked about the portion of the property that is located within Susquehanna Township. Mr. Lucas stated that they communicated with Susquehanna Township's zoning officer, engineer and manager, all of whom agree that lots that are mostly in Lower Paxton, can be handled by Lower Paxton and Susquehanna will sign off on the plan. Mr. Gingrich asked about the water flow that ends up in Susquehanna. Mr. Lucas stated that is where it goes now, but in a sheet flow condition.

Mr. Gingrich made a motion to table action on the plan. Mr. Newsome seconded the motion and a unanimous vote followed.

Ordinance 12-02
Dedication of Recreation Land and Fee Requirements

Ms. Moran read over some of the proposed changes to the existing Recreation Fee ordinance. Mr. Newsome asked who generated the changes to the ordinance. Ms. Moran stated that the Director of Parks & Recreation, Brian Luetchford, and George Wolfe worked together on this as they worked on the new Recreation and Parks Plan.

Ms. Moran stated that Dauphin County has reviewed the ordinance and found it to be consistent with the Pennsylvania MPC and found no adverse conditions for approval of the proposed amendment.

Mr. Newsome made a motion to advise the Board of Supervisors that the Planning Commission concurs with the ordinance change. Mr. Grove seconded the motion. Mr. Lighty called for discussion on the motion. Mr. Lighty asked what impact this will have on developers' costs. Ms. Moran stated she did not yet know. A unanimous vote followed.

Ordinance 12-03
Amending the Zoning Ordinance and Zoning Map
Deleting the Floodplain District

Ms. Moran stated that Dauphin County and SWAN have reviewed this ordinance and did not have any issues with it. She explained that FEMA is preparing new flood maps, which are scheduled to be adopted on August 2, 2012. Part of the process of accepting the changes is to first delete the old district. The floodplain ordinance will stand alone rather than being put back into the Zoning Ordinance.

Mr. Newsome stated that SWAN had several good comments on this ordinance, particularly in how it may help people to understand the floodplain and the options relating to flood insurance. He suggested that an article be put in the Township Newsletter about flooding. He noted that lending institutions only require appropriate flood insurance at the time of the sale of a property. They do not follow up after the sale is complete. The issue only comes to a head when there is a disaster. FEMA is supposed to oversee this, but falls short. Mr. Newsome commented that anything the Township can do to bring attention to the matter will benefit its residents. Ms. Moran stated she has met with FEMA several times over the last few months and they have indicated they will provide information to be distributed to residents about who is eligible for flood insurance. She also noted that when homeowners refinance their mortgages the lenders are requiring flood insurance where applicable. Mr. Newsome noted that he was involved in a municipality where they painted the flood mark on each light standard in the town to draw attention to the matter, and it did increase flood insurance coverage by about 20%.

Mr. Guise made a motion to recommend approval of the ordinance. Mr. Gingrich seconded the motion and Mr. Lighty called for discussion on the motion. Hearing none, a unanimous voice vote followed.

OLD BUSINESS

SALDO Text Amendments

Mr. Fleming stated that the Planning Commission raised some issues at previous meetings, and asked him to gather some information and suggestions. He has done that, and offers the following.

Greenway consideration: Mr. Fleming recommended adding a statement to the plan submission checklist that the applicant has to review the Greenway and Comprehensive Plans and the proposed development is consistent with the recommendations contained in each.

Aisle widths in parking lots: Mr. Fleming recommended increasing the minimum required aisle spacing of 24 feet as it is consistent with other municipal requirements and the Pennsylvania Design Standards. He would also recommend maintaining the current requirement for access ways or driveways leading to parking spaces, with the addition of a definition of accessways and driveways as

“any on site vehicular path that conveys vehicles from the public road to a parking area or any aisle within a parking area that connects multiple parking aisles”.

Defining driveway cuts: Mr. Fleming recommended adding a requirement that the minimum curb radius within a parking area that joins an accessway or driveway with another accessway or driveway or aisle be 10 feet and any other curb radius within a parking lot be a minimum of 2 feet. Mr. Fleming also recommended adding a statement in the parking requirements that a driveway connection for any other use than residential would be a minor street intersecting with the appropriate classification for the abutting street for the purpose of determining the entrance minimum curb radius requirements. This should reference the chart in 503.K.3.

Showing the entire campus, such as CGOH or Holy Name: Mr. Fleming recommends that a statement similar to the following statement “Where a project utilizes other parcels for access, parking, stormwater or may in other ways be considered a campus development (multiple buildings utilizing separate tracts of ground in a way that may be considered interdependent); the existing features all properties within the campus shall also be shown on an overall plan with a minimum scale of 1”=200’. Mr. Newsome stated that he had difficulty locating the closest intersection on the Sheetz plan this evening, and asked if street intersections would be required to be shown with that wording; it seems to only call out natural features. Mr. Fleming stated that street connections are not outlined in that. Mr. Newsome stated he thinks they should be. Mr. Fleming stated that those are covered in the traffic study. Mr. Newsome suggested they would be helpful if shown on the development plan to ensure the Commission has a full picture of the affected area.

How can the Township require an improvement to an existing driveway or other improvements: Mr. Fleming suggested changing the traffic impact study requirement to give the Township more latitude to require a traffic impact study for developments. HE recommended the following: “In all cases, a traffic impact study will be conducted when in the opinion of the Planning Commission/Township, the site development is expected to have a significant impact on the safety and or traffic flow of the affected roadways.” Mr. Newsome did not want that determination to fall on the Commission, rather it should be up to staff before the plan gets to the Planning Commission. Mr. Fleming stated he put both the Commission as well as staff to give the Commission the ability to make such recommendations in the case where staff does not ask for it or if additional information comes to light after staff’s review.

Mr. Newsome thanked Mr. Fleming for the information and a job well done. Mr. Fleming will revise the amendments and forward them on to Ms. Moran and Steven Stine. At this time, no action is needed.

COMMISSIONERS’ COMMENTS

Mr. Lighty announced that the TND development “Shadebrook” has been canceled. After several years of working on a unique project, the developers will be bringing in a different plan for the site located on either side of Fairmont Drive. Economy had an impact, but the major issue was the changes to the stormwater requirements of the State DEP. Mr. Fleming added that if they were to

comply, they would have lost over 40 residential units and 25% of its commercial section, as well as the park and fountain and other unique features.

Ms. Lindsey asked for a status of the BID. Mr. Lighty stated that Mr. Wolfe advised him that the Board will contact the Commission about the Business Improvement District, until that time there is nothing to report.

ADJOURNMENT

The next regular Planning Commission meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, April 11, 2012, at 7:00 pm at the Lower Paxton Township Municipal Center, Room 171.

Being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 8:45 pm with a unanimous vote.

Respectfully Submitted,



Michelle Hiner
Recording Secretary