

**LOWER PAXTON TOWNSHIP
ZONING HEARING BOARD**

Meeting of November 4, 2010

Members in Attendance

Jeffrey Staub, Chairman
Sara Jane Cate, Vice Chairperson
David Dowling
Richard Freeburn
Gregory Sirb

Also in Attendance

Dianne Moran, Planning & Zoning Officer
James Turner, Solicitor

Special Exception # 10-03

Applicant: Amy Hoezee
Address: 6003 Blue Ridge Avenue
Property: 6003 Blue Ridge Avenue
Interpretation: An in-home massage therapy practice is a major home occupation, which requires special exception approval in the R-2, Medium Density Residential District.
Grounds: Article 306.B.1, of the Lower Paxton Township Zoning Ordinance pertains to this application.
Fees Paid: September 30, 2010
Property Posted: October 25, 2010
Advertisement: Appeared in The Paxton Herald on October 20 & 27, 2010
The hearing began at 7:03 pm.

Mr. Staub stated it is customary for the Board to enter as exhibits the application and site plans. The applicants had no objection to its doing so.

The following were sworn in: Amy Hoezee, 6003 Blue Ridge Avenue, applicant; and Dianne Moran, Planning & Zoning Officer.

Ms. Hoezee stated she is currently a nationally certified massage therapist. Pennsylvania does not license massage therapy. She explained she practices out of Capital Chiropractic Center, and has for the last four years. She and her husband bought the property on Blue Ridge Avenue. The home has a finished basement at ground level, so there is a level entrance into that portion of the home, and it would be perfect for a massage studio. A large portion of income is spent on rent, so working in the home will eliminate that, but it will also afford Ms. Hoezee more time to be with her children, and flexibility. She noted that she has references from some of her long-time clients, which show she has not had any problems in the years she has been working.

Ms. Hoezee stated that she spoke to the neighbors. One of them was only concerned about shady characters, which she assured them that she has never had any problems like that with her clients.

Mr. Freeburn asked about a business sign. Ms. Hoezee stated she did not have plans for one, but would only do as the ordinance allows, which is 2 feet by 2 feet maximum. Mr. Freeburn asked if she plans to have any signs there. Ms. Hoezee stated that if she did, it would comply. Mr. Freeburn asked what the purpose of the sign would be. Ms. Hoezee stated it would be for identification, basically to direct them to the correct door. Mr. Freeburn asked if there are plans to illuminate the sign. Ms. Hoezee answered no.

Mr. Sirb asked which entrance should be used. Ms. Hoezee stated it is the entrance through the greenhouse, which clients can access by using the wooden walk way.

Ms. Cate asked how long a typical appointment lasts. Ms. Hoezee answered about one hour, and that she would only see one at a time, with time in between appointments.

Ms. Cate asked how many appointments would be in one night. Ms. Hoezee stated that a good night would be three.

Mr. Staub asked if a massage therapist is the same as a physical therapist. He noted she is affiliated with a chiropractor. Ms. Hoezee stated she rents space from the chiropractor, but is completely separate. She explained that physical therapy and massage therapy are different; physical therapy requires more schooling, and massage therapy has a more specific skill and practice.

Mr. Staub stated that one requirement of a major home occupation is that the occupation takes up no more than 25% of the total floor space. Ms. Hoezee stated that the home was listed at 1,544 square feet, and the room being used is 20 feet by 12 feet. About half of it would be the office, and half would be the studio.

Mr. Dowling asked for an explanation of the off-street parking. Ms. Hoezee stated that there is a driveway that could easily hold up to four cars. There is a significant buffer between her home and the next. He asked if she and her husband both have cars. Ms. Hoezee answered yes. Mr. Dowling asked if there is a garage on the property. She answered no. He stated that if they were both home, and there were two customers there, there would be room for all the vehicles. Ms. Hoezee agreed. Ms. Cate clarified that there should only be one customer at a time according to the testimony. Ms. Hoezee stated her hours are 4:00-8:00 pm. Mr. Sirb asked about weekend hours. Ms. Hoezee stated she does not work on the weekends.

Mr. Sirb stated if there will be a sign, it may be up to 2 feet by 2 feet, but must be on the door, and it cannot be illuminated. He stated a sign is not necessary to locate the property, but only to identify which door to use. Ms. Hoezee stated that was fine.

Ms. Hoezee stated she has established clientele. Mr. Sirb asked about advertising in the yellow pages or something. She stated she has done advertising in the past, but does not need that now that she has an established clientele.

Mr. Sirb stated that a big part of an in-home business is to keep the home as a home. If he were a neighbor, he shouldn't have to see the business; he chose to move into that neighborhood because it was a neighborhood, not Route 22.

Ms. Hoezee stated she spoke to the neighbors. Mr. Sirb asked if she had anything in writing or if she had them sign anything. Ms. Hoezee stated she did not. Mr. Staub asked what the neighbors said. Ms. Hoezee stated that Becky Miller lives on the corner and she is the one who had no qualms about it, and said that everyone does their own thing, just as long as there are no shady people. The neighbors across the street (Marcy & Curt) said to do her thing and that life is short. The responses she received were very positive.

Mr. Staub asked if she can see Turkey Hill from the back yard. Ms. Hoezee answered yes.

Mr. Dowling asked if there will be employees. Ms. Hoezee stated she had employees in the past and did not like it, therefore she will not have any employees.

There was no comment from the audience.

The Township had no position on the application.

Mr. Freeburn made a motion to grant the application with the following conditions: there be no employees, the hours be limited to 4:00 to 8:00 pm weekdays, no weekends, signage in compliance with the Zoning Ordinance of 2"x2" and to be placed near the house and not at the street, and the signage not be illuminated. Mr. Dowling suggested that at all times there be at least two off street parking spaces in the driveway. Mr. Freeburn agreed to include Mr. Dowling's condition in the motion. Mr. Dowling seconded the motion and a roll call vote followed: Mr. Freeburn-Aye; Mr. Dowling-Aye; Mr. Sirb-Aye; Ms. Cate-Aye; and Mr. Staub-Aye.

The hearing ended at 7:21 pm.

**LOWER PAXTON TOWNSHIP
ZONING HEARING BOARD**

Meeting of November 4, 2010

Members in Attendance

Jeffrey Staub, Chairman
Sara Jane Cate, Vice Chairperson
David Dowling
Richard Freeburn
Gregory Sirb

Also in Attendance

Dianne Moran, Planning & Zoning Officer
James Turner, Solicitor

Docket #1288

Applicant: Calvin Clements, DVM
Address: 4905 Jonestown Road
Property: 4903-4905 Jonestown Road
Interpretation: A minimum 30' buffer yard with plant screening is required.
The applicant proposes to locate existing and proposed parking within the buffer area.

A 30' planting strip is required, with at least 20' outside of the street right-of-way.
The application encroaches into the setback.

Grounds: Sections 803.D.1 and 603.H.2 of the Lower Paxton Township Zoning Ordinance pertains to this application.

Fees Paid: September 23, 2010
Property Posted: October 25, 2010
Advertisement: Appeared in The Paxton Herald on October 20 & 27, 2010

The hearing began at 7:23 pm.

Mr. Staub stated it is customary for the Board to enter as exhibits the application and site plans. The applicant had no objection to its doing so.

Ms. Moran stated that she has begun reviewing the subdivision and land development plan, and discovered they will need a dimensional variance from section 307.A. which requires a minimum lot area of 30,000 square feet. Ms. Moran explained that both lots are substandard, and even after they are consolidated, the parcel will be substandard, with square footage around 22,000.

Mr. Staub asked how that should be handled. Mr. Turner stated the third variance has not been advertised. He suggested the Board hear testimony on all three, and take action on the first two, and he can advertise the third issue for the next meeting, at which time the hearing can be reopened and acted on.

Mr. Staub asked if the applicant will need to pay a second fee. Mr. Turner answered no.

The following were sworn in: Robert Shaffer, PE, Act One Consultants; and Dianne Moran, Planning & Zoning Officer.

Mr. Shaffer stated that the issue regarding lot area is simply combining two non-conforming lots to one less non-conforming lot.

Mr. Shaffer stated the first variance is about the buffer yards. They propose to add additional parking. As it is now, it is encroaching into the buffer yards. The proposal is to pull it two feet further away from the residential zone. He noted they will still encroach into the buffer zone by 15 feet. Because of the depth of the lot and the parking requirements, there is no option other than to encroach into that buffer area. There is an alley to the rear, and there is proposed a 7-foot wide line of vegetation.

The second variance is regarding the buffer along Byron Avenue. There is currently a 9-foot planting strip between the curb and parking. They wish to maintain the current edge of the parking lot. The request is for 21 feet of relief.

Ms. Cate asked if the applicant also owns the lot beside the veterinarian. Mr. Shaffer answered that they do own the lot the drycleaners is on. She asked if the drycleaners will be torn down. Mr. Shaffer stated the drycleaners is in the basement level, and the first floor will be removed. A roof will be put over the drycleaners.

Ms. Cate asked if the new parking lot will be striped. She commented that the existing lot is not marked, and people park all over. Mr. Shaffer stated that pavement markings are proposed, and there will be 18 spaces. Ms. Cate asked how many are there currently. Mr. Shaffer stated that there are 13 including the one in front of the drycleaners. Ms. Cate questioned the use of the space at the drycleaners. Mr. Shaffer stated that use will need one for each employee and one for every 200 square feet of customer space, so they will require 3-4 spaces.

Mr. Sirb asked how many spaces are required for the veterinarian office. Ms. Moran stated that the ordinance calls for three per veterinarian and one per employee. With two doctors and six employees they will need to have twelve spaces. Ms. Moran stated that the drycleaners will require four spaces.

Mr. Staub stated his experience has been that the parking area was crowded. He asked if Staff was satisfied with the parking shown. Ms. Moran stated they meet the requirements of the ordinance.

Mr. Staub asked if any spaces are required for things such as loading/unloading. Ms. Moran stated she has not completed a full review of the land development plan. Mr. Staub asked the status of the land development plan. Ms. Moran stated that a plan was submitted at the same time as the variance submissions. The plan is in the process of being reviewed.

Mr. Dowling asked if a buffer is required on the west side. Mr. Shaffer stated no buffer is required because it is the same zoning district.

Mr. Dowling asked if the side of the lot along Byron Avenue is where the building is located. Mr. Dowling asked if that side of the building is staying the same. Mr. Shaffer stated that is correct. He explained that the R-2 zoning is very close to Route 22 in this area, which is different than most of Route 22. Because of that, a buffer is required between the commercial and the residential zones.

Mr. Sirb stated that the alley is very active, and he would like any approvals conditioned upon an appropriate buffer. He would like to block the alley off if it would be possible. Mr. Shaffer stated the customers wouldn't have direct access, they would turn right out of the parking lot to Byron Avenue and turn right to the alley. Mr. Sirb would like to recommend to the Planning Commission that they highly consider requiring a fence.

Mr. Staub asked about the building coverage on the lot, and if it meets the ordinance requirements. Mr. Shaffer stated that the maximum impervious cover is 75% and the existing is 55%, and 64% is proposed. Mr. Shaffer stated they are proposing 33% building cover.

Ms. Moran stated the off-street loading area requirements are left to the zoning officer's judgment at the time of plan review.

There was no comment from the audience.

The Township had no position on the application.

Mr. Sirb made a motion to grant the variance requests, with the condition that a privacy fence be installed for the length of the alley frontage, a minimum of four feet in height.

Ms. Cate questioned the maximum height allowed for a fence. Ms. Moran stated that if it is a public road the most the fence can be is four feet, but if it is not, it could be six feet in height.

Mr. Dowling seconded the motion, and a roll call vote followed. Mr. Freeburn-Aye; Mr. Dowling-Aye; Mr. Sirb-Aye; Ms. Cate-Aye; and Mr. Staub-Aye.

The hearing ended at 7:45 pm.

**LOWER PAXTON TOWNSHIP
ZONING HEARING BOARD**

Meeting of November 4, 2010

Members in Attendance

Jeffrey Staub, Chairman
Sara Jane Cate, Vice Chairperson
David Dowling
Richard Freeburn
Gregory Sirb

Also in Attendance

Dianne Moran, Planning & Zoning Officer
James Turner, Solicitor

Docket #1289

Applicant: PinnacleHealth Systems
Address: PO Box 8700, Harrisburg, PA 17101
Property: 4300 Londonderry Road
Grounds: Section 714 of the Lower Paxton Township Zoning Ordinance
pertains to this application.
Fees Paid: September 30, 2010
Property Posted: October 25, 2010
Advertisement: Appeared in The Paxton Herald on October 20 & 27, 2010

The hearing began at 7:47 pm.

The Board members discussed how to handle a request for so many signs. Mr. Freeburn suggested this docket should have had its own meeting. Mr. Dowling stated he does not want to hear about every sign, he wants to hear an overview of how the applicant decided what signs were needed and where, and what standards were used in the decisions. Mr. Dowling stated that someone who knew what he was doing surely spent a lot of time to determine where to put these signs. Mr. Dowling also noted that the signs are internal to the site.

Mr. Freeburn had a concern about giving a carte blanc if there may be signs that interfere with traffic at an intersection or something like that.

Mr. Staub stated it is customary for the Board to enter as exhibits the application and site plans. The applicant had no objection to its doing so.

Mr. Sirb asked what the maximum allowed signage is for the site. Ms. Moran asked Mr. Sirb which group of signs he was asking about. Mr. Shugart offered the information on his chart, as it shows what is allowed and what is permitted for each sign type. Mr. Turner stated the exhibit referred to is in the original application.

The following were sworn in: Greg Shugart, Deforest Sign Company; William Wilkison, PinnacleHealth.

Mr. Wilkison stated that PinnacleHealth has been before the Board of Supervisors numerous times over the past ten years for various improvements to the Community General Osteopathic Hospital (CGOH) Campus which have really improved the ability to provide services to the community. With this growth, the campus has grown in complexity and visitors are having difficulty navigating the campus. There have been a number of complaints both directly from patients/visitors, and also from the doctors that have received the complaints from their patients. There will be another building opening soon: the Medical Sciences Pavilion, which is mostly an outpatient facility and will have a high volume of traffic. This will add to the existing problems. These are the reasons for the proposed improvements to the signage.

Mr. Shugart stated there have been major renovations to the Campus. There are people coming to the hospital for doctor appointments, procedures, to visit relatives and for emergencies. There is a real need to move around the campus safely, and without creating additional stress on those coming to the campus.

Mr. Shugart presented photographs of the main entrance to the facility off Londonderry Road, the entrance to the Bloom Building, and the entrance off of Arlington Avenue. There are two types of signs being added or replaced, instructional signs and directional. The instructional signs are permitted and are limited to four feet in height and eight square feet in area, and four per parcel. Mr. Shugart directed the Board to the section of his chart regarding instructional signs.

Mr. Sirb asked if 25 instructional signs are permitted, and 4 are allowed. Mr. Shugart answered that is correct.

Mr. Sirb stated the ordinance allows a sign to be four feet in height, and they are requesting eight feet in height. The request is based upon United States Department Highway Transportation, regarding height of signs and visibility over cars and things of that nature. Most of the requested signs are eight feet, but there are three that are at 15 feet. The reason for that is they are shuttle bus signs on top of shelters. The signs will not be illuminated. There are some PinnacleHealth regulation signs with messages like no smoking or no skateboarding.

The other part of this request is about directional signs. There is no limit in the number of signs, but there is a limit of 16 square foot of sign area and a maximum height of six feet tall. Directional signage is very important to a campus with several entrances and several buildings with multiple functions in each.

Mr. Shugart explained that the directional signs will all be designed in the same manner. The only part of the copy area that will be lit will be the area of the wording, not the entire sign.

Mr. Dowling stated the ordinance has an allowable height of six feet, and most of the proposed signs are taller, and asked for an explanation. Mr. Shugart explained that they have to start three feet off grade for visibility around cars.

Mr. Dowling stated the signs seem to have a lot of information on each sign. Mr. Shugart stated those are the services offered on the site. It is important that someone coming in from any entrance can get to any of the services offered, safely and expeditiously.

Mr. Freeburn asked the height of the tallest directional sign. Mr. Shugart stated the tallest is 9.5 feet high; six feet of copy.

Mr. Sirb asked if there are more than one parcel associated with the site. Even if there is only one, it is a huge parcel. Mr. Turner asked how many buildings are on the site. Mr. Wilkison stated there are four distinct patient care buildings.

Mr. Dowling stated that the sign height is requested based on visibility. He stated that the area of the signs is justified by the volume of content on them. He asked about the process used to determine where the signs should go and how high and how big. Mr. Shugart stated that H. Edward Black did an extensive survey of the site. There is also information from the US Department of Transportation Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices about what can safely be read. In an urban area that publication calls for signs seven feet in height before the copy is seen.

Mr. Dowling asked how much traffic the site experiences. Mr. Wilkinson stated there is a detailed traffic study. On any given day at any given time, he estimated there are 40-50 empty parking spaces and everything else is full. There is constant traffic of patients, visitors et cetera and the parking spaces turn over frequently.

Mr. Dowling questioned the geographic draw for this campus. Mr. Wilkison stated they draw from Dauphin, Cumberland and Perry Counties, as well as Northern York, Southwestern Schuylkill County, Lebanon County. Because of the specificity of the services offered, people do come from all of those locales. The rehab hospital has 55 beds and the average daily census is 37-40 patients, from any of the mentioned counties, and beyond. CGOH is not what it used to be when it served this and the immediate surrounding municipalities. In 1997, the average daily census of the hospital was 40, and there are now 185 beds. The newer buildings are mainly to treat outpatients. The newest building is the Cancer Center, and it is the only cancer treatment facility in the PinnacleHealth system, and is associated with Fox Chase.

Mr. Shugart stated that all the signs being discussed are internal. Mr. Dowling stated his main concern was that there was some group of people who spent enough time deciding what was needed and where. He stated he does not want to hear about every sign.

Mr. Wilkison stated this signage has been worked on for over a year. The ultimate goal is to get people who are already stressed out being a patient who does or might have something wrong or they may be a visitor of such a person, and most do not know where they are going. The goal is that that person can get to wherever they need to be from which ever entrance they used by simply following the color coded signs. The amount of copy, the color of the copy, and the amount of signs are all based on that goal.

Mr. Turner asked about illumination. The signs will be internally illuminated, there will be no flood lights, no lights shining into the air or off site. Mr. Shugart stated the only part of the sign that will be lit will be the part with words on it.

Mr. Dowling and Mr. Freeburn stated their concerns have been addressed. Mr. Freeburn stated the older he gets, the more direction he needs to find where he needs to go. Ms. Cate stated she shares those concerns.

Mr. Sirb stated he thinks that less is more and the amount of reading on one sign is a lot, but with the multiple functions taking place, there is some leeway that needs to be given. He suggested the amount of signs could be worked on.

Mr. Dowling stated he felt it was too complex to second guess. Mr. Sirb agreed to a degree, but he felt it was important to show the rationale behind granting such a variance, and he felt it was accomplished with the testimony given.

Mr. Freeburn stated a hospital is not the same as a gas station where the signage is advertising.

Ms. Cate stated she has a reputation for being “anti-sign” on the Zoning Hearing Board, but she stated she can recognize the needs of the Hospital and she noted it was handled very well and she is satisfied with the explanation.

Mr. Staub stated that he agrees with the comments noting that what is proposed will solve a lot of problems that exist on the site. He has visited the Campus twice in the last year, both times in the dark and under duress and it is very difficult to find your way.

Mr. Staub questioned the table that lists signs to remain and new signs. Mr. Shugart explained that the signs listed as remain will actually be removed and replaced with what is shown. Mr. Wilkison explained that there are quite a few signs such as “Emergency Parking Only” which are placed at every parking space associated with the emergency room.

There was no comment from the audience.

The Township did not have a position on the application. Ms. Moran noted that when she met with H. Edward Black, they went over everything very thoroughly and she noted her appreciation for the work that was put into this project.

Mr. Freeburn made a motion to grant the request as submitted. Ms. Cate seconded the motion, and a roll call vote followed: Mr. Freeburn-Aye; Mr. Dowling-Aye; Mr. Sirb-Aye; Ms. Cate-Aye; and Mr. Staub-Aye.

The hearing ended at 8:28 pm.

**LOWER PAXTON TOWNSHIP
ZONING HEARING BOARD**

Meeting of November 4, 2010

Members in Attendance

Jeffrey Staub, Chairman
Sara Jane Cate, Vice Chairperson
David Dowling
Richard Freeburn
Gregory Sirb

Also in Attendance

Dianne Moran, Planning & Zoning Officer
James Turner, Solicitor

**Docket #1290
Special Exception # 10-04**

Applicant: South Central Emergency Medical Services
Address: 5531 Poplar Street
Property: 5531 Poplar Street
Grounds: Section 805.C.3, 803.D.1, 307.A of the Lower Paxton Township Zoning Ordinance pertains to this application.
Fees Paid: September 30, 2010
Property Posted: October 25, 2010
Advertisement: Appeared in The Paxton Herald on October 20 & 27, 2010

The hearing began at 8:29 pm.

Mr. Staub stated it is customary for the Board to enter as exhibits the application and site plans. The applicant had no objection to its doing so.

Ms. Moran explained that the Planning Commission reviewed the application and had no objections.

The following were sworn in: Frank Grottola, Act One Consultants; and Dianne Moran, Planning & Zoning Officer.

Mr. Grottola stated that the first sheet of drawings shows the gray shaded area representing the buffer that would lie to the east and south along the residential area. There is a totally wooded area to the east. No construction is proposed in that direction. The expansion of the building, which has been there since 1975, is proposed to house the equipment used by the South Central Emergency Medical Services (SCEMS). There is a proposed 12 foot expansion to the west, towards Paxtonia Fire Company.

He explained the site is paved, that is why no stormwater is proposed. There will be no grading work done, only raising the building by putting a freestanding steel building with garage doors that are big enough to get ambulances into without folding the mirrors in. There

will also be security improvements made and a second story added. This is the maximum that can be done with the lot, and the minimum needed for the association to function. This site is a central point in Dauphin County.

Mr. Grottola stated that three ambulances can fit inside and there will be an access drive of over 20 feet. Diagonal parking is proposed to meet the criteria. He noted that they may drive to the west towards Paxtonia Fire Company.

Ms. Cate questioned the number of employees in an evening or a shift. Mr. Grottola answered two per shift.

Barry Calhoun, CEO and Executive Director of SCEMS was sworn in. Mr. Calhoun stated there is one ambulance with two personnel aboard. Shifts run from 7 pm to 7 am, and 7 am to 7 pm. There can be times with two ambulances, based on status management. Previously there were three bays with three trucks, but there will normally only be one, sometimes two trucks. A supervisor may stop in, but is not stationed there. There may be a drive-through bay, depending on money.

The three bays will be on the north side of the building. The drive-through bay will enter on the south side and exit on the north side of the building, and it is located on the west side of the building.

Mr. Staub stated he was concerned about the off-street parking. When he scales the parking spaces on the plan, they do not meet the Township standard of 18 feet. He also questioned the ability to enter from the south side of the building if the angled parking is located there. Mr. Grottola stated they scaled that to work with the required access way. He noted they propose seven spaces and are only required to provide five. He and Scott Buchle looked at this and believe they can do it. Mr. Staub asked if the aisle width needs to be amended to meet the requirements, will they have to resubmit their drawings for the variance.

Mr. Staub asked where the employees park currently and if they park at the firehouse, since there is no parking area marked. Mr. Grottola stated they park on the south side of the lot near Louise Avenue. Mr. Staub stated Louise Avenue is paved and he did remember seeing vehicles in that area. Mr. Grottola did not think Louise Avenue was paved, rather it is all grass, and off-site.

Mr. Staub stated the drawing shows Louise Avenue as paved. Mr. Grottola stated that is because the fire company has everything paved except for the little chunk of grass.

Ms. Cate questioned the ownership of the building. Mr. Calhoun stated SCEMS owns it. She asked if LP Firemen's Association owns the land, as indicated on the plan. Mr. Calhoun stated they are the neighboring property, and they do not own the SCEMS property. Mr. Grottola noted he did notice that on the plan, and it is a housekeeping issue.

Mr. Sirb asked if there are sleeping quarters on-site. Mr. Calhoun answered yes, as well as a minimal kitchen facility. Ms. Cate asked if that will be relocated on the second floor. Mr. Grottola stated it would be, but right now everything occurs on one level.

Mr. Sirb asked if SCEMS is a for-profit agency. Mr. Calhoun stated it is a 501(c)3 charitable organization.

Mr. Staub asked if SCEMS receives funding from the Township. Mr. Calhoun answered yes.

Mr. Calhoun stated there are facilities for bunks, but it is rare that they are used. The staff may rest in a recliner type of chair.

Mr. Sirb asked if there is another EMS service in the area as competition. Mr. Calhoun stated the competition is in the transportation business, which is different. He explained that ambulances are assigned based on municipalities, and SCEMS is responsible for 911 calls in Lower Paxton, West Hanover, East Hanover and portions of South Hanover Townships.

Mr. Freeburn asked about fee-based services such as transporting a patient between hospitals. Mr. Calhoun stated SCEMS does provide emergency and non-emergency services. If a person is at CGOH and needs a heart cathertization right away, SCEMS is called to emergency-transport the patient to Harrisburg Hospital. Non-emergency transportation does not go through 911, but is performed from this facility. Mr. Freeburn asked if the vehicles are assigned. Mr. Calhoun stated the ambulance is for 911 emergencies. There are five vans for non emergency transports, and they are not located at this facility.

Ms. Cate asked if the applicants spoke to the residential neighbors about the hearing. Mr. Calhoun stated they have only spoken to the fire company so far. If SCEMS gets approval, Mr. Calhoun will talk to Barney Gross. He added that that property is in a trust, and SCEMS has not been able to contact that owner for at least 17 years, even through hiring counsel to contact him.

Mr. Staub asked about parking setbacks from the building. Ms. Moran stated that is a pre-existing non-conforming part of this plan.

There was no comment from the audience.

The Township had no position on the application.

Mr. Sirb made a motion to grant the variance and special exception. Mr. Freeburn seconded the motion, and a roll call vote followed: Mr. Freeburn-Aye; Mr. Dowling-Aye; Mr. Sirb-Aye; Ms. Cate-Aye; and Mr. Staub-Aye.

The hearing ended at 8:54 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Michelle Hiner
Recording Secretary