

Lower Paxton Township  
**PLANNING COMMISSION**

MEETING MINUTES

July 03,2013

**COMMISSIONERS PRESENT**

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

**ALSO PRESENT**

Dianne Moran, Planning & Zoning Officer  
Stephen Fleming, Township Engineer, HRG Inc.

**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 TO THE FLAG**

Mr. Guise led the recitation of the Pledge.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Mr. Lighty asked about the May 1, 2013 minutes. Mr. Lighty said he would not approve minutes.

**OLD BUSINESS Revised Preliminary Subdivision & Land Development Plan for Shadebrook # 13-09**

Ms. Moran states that The Fishing Creek Valley Associates has submitted a revised plan for the development of Shadebrook Traditional Neighborhood Development. The property is located at the intersection of Fairmont Drive and Cider Press Road. The original project site was known as the Kocevar Farm and consist of approximately 108.828 acres. The property is zoned R-1, Low Density Residential District with the (TND) Traditional Neighborhood Development Overlay.

The area to be developed is 84.373 acres and will consist of two hundred sixty one (261) residential building lots, two (2) commercial lots, ten (10) open space lots and one (1) Residual lot that is located on the South side of Union Deposit Road. The site will be served by public sewer and public water. One Hundred ninety-seven (197) single family residential units and sixty four (64) twin dwellings are proposed.

This plan was tabbed at the June 4, 2013 Planning Commission Meeting in order for the applicant to address staff, township engineer and county comment.

Waiver request # 6 Waiver of the requirement that dead end street (alleys) are prohibited unless designed as a cul-de-sac streets, waiver of maximum length of a dead end street and number of units to be served by same. [180-503.F.1, 2, 3] **Staff Supports with the exception of the termination of Road C near lots 82 and 83.**

Mr. Staub with Dauphin Engineering states that they have taken the opportunity to make revisions to the plan between the meeting last month and today. We did revise the plan with several exceptions almost all the exceptions had to do with the comments of HRG correction letter from last month. I think the only thing I would like to talk about regarding the waiver request is there was one waiver request # 6 they supported the waiver request with the exception of Road C combination and property line. We revised the plan to show a temporary cul-de-sac there so I think that would address that particular concern on that waiver request, hopefully you the Township staff now with HRG will support that waiver request.

Mr. Lighty asks Mr. Staub if he would come up and show on the drawing where all of this is occurring. Mr. Staub agrees. Mr. Staub states that Sheet 22 reads, the land and movement plan, at the end of road C we will place a temporary cul-de-sac and it will remain in place until a future time and rest of the adjoining property is developed, so lot 82 will not be constructed until the street is constructed. If that was addressed hopefully that concern with the Township staff and HRG development agree. That was one major issue. The second major issue had to do with the proposing of the retaining wall along the north side Cider Press Rd. The original drawing had shown the retaining wall which was on the lines here, in front of the building set back line in compliance to the ordinance. So we revised the plan to pull that wall back behind this front lawn set back. Regardless it has taken place in this area to the spillover required is 3 feet instead of 4-5 feet.

Mr. Grove asked about safety issues. He questions the code of 30 inches of fence railing installed.

Mr. Staub did not answer to that.

Mr. Guise question the issues on sidewalks?

Mr. Staub said because we have a sidewalk along side of Cider Press road and next to the sidewalk there's a walkway that goes back to the first floor being higher than the street and a higher wall. I think there are some houses in Penbrook that have the stone walls and the steps going up, it would be similar to that.

Mr. Newsome asked would that create a shared sidewalk from the walkway to the main walkway?

Mr. Staub said yes there would be a railing in the center.

Mr. Fleming Engineer said you may want to consider going back to previous point knowing that's the next best option for the waiver that the walls would be more pleasing after they submitted that the shared stairways and walk outs to the street they are problematic instead of shared walkways.

Mr. Staub said well were open and we can go either way on this.

Mr. Grove said I think architecturally landscape wise this could be handled and look quite attractive either way.

Mr. Newsome said if you do put a railing in that defines property line the owners know what to take care of.

The third comment that we tried to address is from the original correction had to do with a recommendation of the shared driveways and our correction is the justification why we felt that.

Mr. Lighty said opposed to shared driveways.

Mr. Staub ???

Mr. Newsome said the number of streets in Camphill??

Mr. Staub said getting back to the two new comments we need to make sure that.

1. The Master Plan is up-dated that meets the requirements of the ordinance.
2. On the interims revised that all architected guidelines be submitted for HRG review.

Mr. Staub said the Architectural Guidelines???

Mr. Newsome said that's not the issue. How do we take action if we don't have it?

Mr. Fleming said the Architectural as far as an ordinance criteria we didn't look at them very closely. I think the last time we talked there were not many changes.

Mr. Lighty said I think when we approve this were also approving that. How do we stand this on?

Mr. Staub said you can make that condition of plan approval that if would want to see that in another meeting.

Mr. Lighty said tonight we could make it condition that of any of us here has comments what happens?

Mr. Staub said they could come back at a future design???

Mr. Newsome said let us look at it. I know you understand this is a new process to us and it's very critical architectural reviews.

Mr. Staub said my point about the Architectural Guidelines that's being reviewed. We didn't add anything to it essentially what we did is we edited it to take out the townhouses and review the comments and it's very minor changes.

Mr. Staub states there is 318 units and the plan proposes 283. Mr. Newsome asks if its approved is that all built with one particular phase? Mr. Staub answers that the client wants to move on the plan,untorqued. They cannot add one more unit. It would have to be condos on top of a commercial building. Mr. Lighty states that is a plus the condo on top of a commercial unit.

Mr. Guise asks what is the architect name? Design Guidelines of Shadebrook. Mr. Lighty says that the guideline book has not been seen recently. There should be a photocopy of the book for the staff.

Mr. Staub states that C.A.T. has been contacted and central plan is being proposed in writing for services to this area. The School District was contacted thru email, they won't circulate buses thru this area until

its completed. The students would have to walk out onto the main road, Fairmont and Cider Press, for pickup. Waste Management and they are in the process of how they are going to service the dead-end alley, possibly smaller trucks.

Mr. Newsome questions what kind of Postal Service Delivery? Would there be mailboxes? Mr. Staub answers that it depends on the street names if there are mailboxes, kiosk or individual mailboxes.

Mr. Fleming reviews the traffic common plan. The plans, signage and locations. Mr. Straub requests no parking signs, less is better. Mr. Lighty agrees with the less signage the better. He states the comparison of Linglestown Square and the signage.

Mr. Lighty discusses the issue of trees in the vicinity of Dauphin County Vo-Tech. He says that Dr. Lacasse with the Tree Commission knows trees and suggests that they do what Dr. Lacasse suggests.

Mr. Staub asks any questions? None

Mr. Lighty asks any questions? None

Mr. Fleming addresses comments last meeting and withdrew the zoning 3 and amended the waiver of zoning 6 and 7.

Public Comments- None

Mr. Guise states to approve waiver # 17 and #6 amended to not necessary but can be a temporary cul de sac. Approval conditioned 1. Submit and review architectural guideline

2. Density explained state bonus up to 318 P.C. residential above community.

Mr. Newsome seconds the motion. Asks for Master Plan Sheet 10 the hard copy.

### New Business

- a. Final Subdivision Plan for Resubdivision of Lots 93-96 of Quail Hollow, phase V #13 -10

Dianne Moran says that the Township has received a plan for the subdivision of Lots 93 through 96 of Quail Hollow, Phase V. The intent of the plan is to resubdivide and consolidate Lots 93 through 96 from the original subdivision plan. Lots 93 and 94 will become lots 93A and Lots 95 and 96 will become 95A. Lot 93A will contain .56 acres and Lot 95A will contain .56 acres. The property is zoned R-1, Low Density Residential District, contains 1.123 acres and is located east of Crums Mill Road. The lots are served by public sewer.

#### **Waiver Requests:**

Bob Fisher represents the plan for Quail Hollow. The original proposed plan was to have a 18 ft retaining wall but it was too expensive. HRG suggests keep the small wall and eliminate the larger wall. The flood plaining boundary is above flood plain. If the retaining wall is larger it would require less fill.

Mr. Fisher asked Mr. Fleming's comments regarding GEO Tech and the ordinance pertaining to new home construction and flood plaining boundries.

Mr. Lighty asked any questions for Mr. Fleming- none.

Commissioners questions- none.

Mr. Grove motions the approval of subdivision 93-96 PhaseV.

Mrs. Lindsey seconds the motion. All in favor vote I.

### **Public Comment**

### **Commissioner Comment**

Mr. Guise spoke about the master plan changes for Koons Park to include 1 dog park and nice amenities. It would be 10-12 year that would be worth while.

### **County Comments**

Harrisburg transportation / PennDot are doing a bike/pedestrian study. Planning is through Fleming Consultants. A 5 minute survey online for public comment. Mr. Lighty asked about the cost a bike per car. Mr. Fleming commented from Hummelstown to East Park 1 to 70 people.

### **Adjournment**

Mr. Guise adjourned the meeting at 8pm.

Michele Kwasnoski

Recording Secretary



