

LOWER PAXTON TOWNSHIP/  
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Minutes of Board Meeting held June 10, 2008

A workshop meeting of the Board of Supervisors of Lower Paxton Township was called to order at 6:04 p.m. by Chairman William B. Hawk, on the above date in the Lower Paxton Township Municipal Center, 425 Prince Street, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania.

Supervisors present in addition to Mr. Hawk were: William C. Seeds, Sr., William L. Hornung, Gary A. Crissman, and David B. Blain.

Also in attendance were George Wolfe, Township Manager; Steve Stine, Township Solicitor; Terry Harris, McKonly and Asbury; Richard Dumaresq; Al Colone and Robert Weidner, CASA; Lori Wissler, Community Development Manager; Jeff Staub, Dauphin Engineering, Inc., and George Zimmerman.

Pledge of Allegiance

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

Public Comment

No public comment was provided.

Presentation by Terry Harris from McKonly and Asbury regarding affordable housing

Mr. Blain introduced Terry Harris, a managing partner of McKonly and Asbury, which is a public accounting firm located in Camp Hill. He explained that McKonly and Asbury is very well known for its knowledge of real estate and affordable housing projects.

Mr. Blain explained that he shared some of the issues and concerns experienced by the Township with the following projects, the Parmer Project on Locust Lane, the Boyd Mahoney project located at the Sportsmen's Golf Course, and the pending project on Devonshire Road for Mr. Schoffstall. He noted that there is a misconception of what affordable housing is, and suggested that the Board must educate the public on this issue.

Mr. Blain explained that Mr. Harris is very knowledgeable in the industry, working with many local projects and with various companies such as the Housing Development Corporation (HDC), and he thought that it might be appropriate to have Mr. Harris explain what an affordable housing project is, and to break down the stigma related to a "project". He noted that affordable housing is not Section 8 housing, and Mr. Harris would address how local affordable

housing projects have blended in with the community. He suggested that it could be an open discussion with Mr. Harris, as the Board has determined that there is a need for more senior assisted living and those types of projects. He noted that the Township has had great difficulty in getting these types of projects off the ground, and suggested that Mr. Harris may be able to assist the Township with an approach to this issue.

Mr. Harris explained that he has spent a good deal of his time working with developers in affordable housing, and he explained that he would start his presentation with a video made by the HDC, a client from Lancaster County. He explained that HDC develops affordable housing and manages 2,000 plus units in a seven county area to include Dauphin County. He noted that since 1986, the landscape for affordable housing has changed quite a bit because of the tax code. He noted that today's projects are being primarily driven by a low income housing tax credit that came into law in 1986. He noted that it is a very significant industry, and the largest driver of low-income affordable housing in the nation. He noted that the local region has been very active, with some counties being more active than others. He explained that Dauphin County has been active, but Lancaster County has been particularly active due to HDC's presence in that county.

Mr. Harris noted that the six-minute video shows who the faces of affordable housing are. Due to technical difficulties with the video, Mr. Harris had to explain that the first gentleman shown in the video was a disabled resident in Lancaster County. He noted that other faces belong to daycare providers, bank teller, or the stock person at the local grocery store. He noted that the video also showed some of the various properties that HDC has developed.

Mr. Wolfe questioned what the definition of affordable housing is. Mr. Harris explained that it is housing that would serve low-income individuals based on the area's medium income. He noted that Dauphin County's medium income is \$67,500 for a family of four; therefore the program is directed at individuals who are making 60% or less than that average, in the area of \$45,000.

Mr. Wolfe noted that developers must do something, especially if the housing looks similar to surrounding housing, to make it affordable. He questioned how the developers build something that is less expensive than the market rate. Mr. Harris answered that it is not less expensive, but the funding sources are different. Mr. Blain noted that this is a key point, noting that it is the people's perception that affordable housing would result in shoddy housing, but it does not. He noted that the funding sources that fund the building are different, and that allows affordable housing to be solid construction that meshes well into the community.

Mr. Harris explained that affordable housing is an example of a public/private funding partnerships. He noted that banks are big investors in these types of partnerships, and explained that the primary tool used today is the low-income housing tax credit that is a program in the Internal Revenue Code that is administered State by State. He noted that the program is nationwide, and Pennsylvania administers those credits through the Pennsylvania Housing Finance Agency. He noted that they are the primary catalyst for affordable housing projects today.

Mr. Harris noted that the industry used to talk about subsidized housing, and it was changed to low-income housing, then it became affordable housing, and now it is called workforce housing. He noted that it is an evolving system, and some people have the perception that affordable housing would be the projects that build 1000 units and became the center for all kinds of problems and issues. He noted that that is not what affordable housing is today. He noted that most projects do not exceed 100 units as they are smaller projects due to the limited amount of funding available. He explained that a project maxes out on tax credits at \$1.2 million per year. He explained that most projects have multiple sources for funding, either a small or no first mortgage; noting that it is very difficult to make the numbers work because the rents are low. He noted that there are second, third, and fourth mortgages with either a zero interest rate or 1% interest rate, and many times it is deferred, or the principal does not amortize. He noted that the funding source is what makes the housing affordable. He noted, in many cases, that it can be as expensive as regular housing since there is a monitoring agency that is overseeing the construction process.

Mr. Harris noted that the other major component is the equity provided by the corporate investor. He noted that many of the banks in the area are investors in these types of properties, because the community reinvestment acts as an incentive for banks to be investing and making loans for lower income individuals. He noted that by investing in these types of projects, the banks can meet their CRA requirements. He noted that a bank would receive, in exchange for a 99% interest in the partnership, federal low income housing credits for a ten-year period, and put up equity as a result of that.

Mr. Harris explained that the rents are determined by the medium area income for the County, and these rates are published annually. He noted that the maximum rent for Dauphin County that would include utilities for a one-bedroom apartment, at 60% medium area income, the most that they would need to charge is \$759.00 per month. He noted that although the rents are lower than the market, they are not substantially lower, suggesting that you could find rents that are lower than what is published in the newsletter. He noted that most of the time, the rents

are not set at the maximum level. He noted, if the person needs to pay utilities, then the rent is decreased accordingly. He noted that the one-person household's rent is based upon the percentage of the medium.

Mr. Harris noted that the rents are typically 80% of the market rates, the occupants must be working families. He noted that typically, there is no rent subsidy at the site, but there are still a few programs that do have rent subsidies. Mr. Wolfe questioned if there are Section 8 certificates. Mr. Harris answered that there may be Section 8 certificates, but they go with the individual. He noted that there are no project-based Section 8 certificates. He noted that they went by the wayside in the early 1980's. Mr. Wolfe noted that when people hear of low-income housing, they think of Section 8 housing. Mr. Blain noted that he was not sure that the Board knew what Section 8 housing is.

Mr. Harris explained that the County has given a certain number of Section 8 housing certificates to individuals who have applied for them if they were qualified. He noted that they could use those certificates to live anywhere they want. He noted that more than 25% of most of the occupants in the projects have Section 8 certificates, but the vast majorities do not. Mr. Blain noted that anyone can apply for Section 8 housing, such as a senior citizen on a fixed income that needs some type of affordable housing, and it could be used to live anywhere they can afford. Mr. Blain noted that there are no longer any Section 8 projects. He noted that the program provides safe, well-constructed, affordable housing. He noted that HDC has three properties in Dauphin County: the Highspire School apartments completed in the early 1990's; Spring Wood Glen in Middletown, roughly seven years old; and Willow Ridge, adjacent to the Hershey Country Club. He noted that you would not know that these were examples of affordable housing. He noted that the Highspire School project is age restricted, 62 plus, with 42 units, and the Willow Ridge development has 60 units. He noted that the word project has its own negative connotation, but that is how it is described. He noted that this is the type of housing that is built today.

Mr. Blain noted that the Willow Ridge development looks similar to the Hidden Lake Development in the Township. He noted that his goal in inviting Mr. Harris to the meeting was to better educate the Board members on what affordable housing is. He noted that a resident made a comment that it would be like Allison Hill, but it is nothing like that, and these types of developments mesh into the community. He noted that the Comprehensive Plan calls for more housing stock for senior living, and this is what Mr. Mahoney is trying to develop in his project for the Sportsmen's Golf Course. He noted that he does not think that the community

understands the concept. He hoped that the Board could work with the developers to better educate the community on what it is.

Mr. Seeds explained that developers often state that they want to build affordable housing, requesting relief for senior citizens or over age 55, but very often the homes start at \$250,000 and range up to \$340,000. He stated that this is not affordable housing, even though the developers try to sell it as affordable housing.

Mr. Hawk noted that there is a difference between assisted living and residential-retirement. Mr. Harris noted that assisted living does not fit into the program. He explained that the Presbyterian Homes is one of his client's, and they have decided to focus on affordable housing for senior 62 plus, and have made that part of their mission. He stated that he is involved in a second project with Presbyterian Homes in the tax credit, Section 42, low-income housing program. He explained that there are restrictions as to how long an owner must keep it affordable. He explained that the owner would have to sign a deed restriction that states that it must remain affordable for 30 years, and list the income limits that must be complied with.

Mr. Blain noted that some residents are concerned that once a project is developed, it would not be maintained, and questioned how the properties are managed. Mr. Harris answered that it comes down to the developer and management team. He noted that programs under PHFA, monitor the units annually, and if funding is available, the units are also inspected. He noted that if there is no funding for inspections, then they must meet the safe affordable process annually, using self certification. He noted that there is oversight from the lender, and in some instances, banks will have their own requirements. He noted that locations are important too. He explained that if the project is built in a bad section of town, it will not be the best project, but when they are developed at a location like the Hershey Country Club, they are fantastic. He noted that for that location, many of the recipients are workers from the Hershey Chocolate Factory or Hershey Park. He explained that there is a real need for this type of housing for those people working in communities like this.

Mr. Harris suggested inviting the Executive Director of HDC to a workshop meeting to further discuss this issue.

Mr. Seeds explained that the Lions Club recently has a guest speaker from the Habitat for Humanity organization, and he explained that the City of Harrisburg provides the property and demolition, and Habitat then builds a new home on the site. He noted that the new home owners have a mortgage and only pay the costs for the materials to build the home since the labor is free. He noted that they are looking to move their operations to the suburbs also.

Mr. Blain questioned if HDC has worked with a private land owner, such as the Union Deposit Corporation to help them with an affordable housing project. Mr. Harris noted that typically, the land is transferred, and they usually don't continue to be involved with the project. He noted, that in many instances, there may be a 50-year land lease. Mr. Blain questioned if many of the projects look like a traditional townhouse project or are they six or seven story buildings. Mr. Harris noted that he has worked with both types of development, noting that it depends on the community and location. He explained that you might find a high rise or taller building in Reading, whereas, in Cumberland County, there is more townhouse construction.

Mr. Blain questioned if HDC had any issues with the community in the Hershey area. Mr. Harris stated that there was opposition, but HDC were very good, over a multi-year period, in educating the community as to what they were building and requesting feedback from the community. He noted that HDC brought managers and residents from some of their other communities and showed pictures of what they would be building. He noted that it is a huge ongoing education process.

Mr. Wolfe noted that he had a video to show on affordable housing from the Center County Region Council of Governments with a presentation made by Andy Haines from S&A Homes. Mr. Wolfe showed the first part of the video to those present.

Mr. Hawk thanked Mr. Harris for attending the meeting and suggested that it would be good to invite someone from HDC to attend a workshop meeting to further discuss this topic.

#### Presentation of a request for the Township to develop a dog park

Mr. Richard Dumaresq explained that he would be the spokesperson for the group and thanked the Board for taking the time to listen to the Dog Park proposal. Mr. Dumaresq explained that he and many of the people present live in the Township. He distributed a sketch copy of the dog park and a time line for implementation to the Board members.

Mr. Dumaresq suggested that the issue of a dog park has been around for four years, and he noted that he wanted to address the benefits of a dog park to the community based on the research his group has done. He noted that a dog park lessens the chance of dog owners letting their dogs off leash in unleashed parks or hiking trails or in neighborhoods. He noted that dog parks become the new community center or village green in many places where people gather who have dogs or enjoy watching dogs play. He noted that dog parks are ideal for the elderly or disabled, to provide a place for them to exercise their dogs, therefore, the dog park would be wheelchair accessible.

Mr. Dumaresq noted that he spoke to some realtors and they were very excited since they felt that dog parks provide a great selling point for people with pets. He noted that the only local dog park is located on the West Shore in Lower Allen Township. He noted that the Terraces at Springford have recently created a dog park, about three quarters of the size of a football field. He noted that some residents chose to live at Springford because of the dog park, and the added sense of community, where people could gather and talk in the evening.

Mr. Dumaresq noted that dog parks promote health and safety since they provide a realistic enforcement of dog control laws. He noted that there would be mandatory registration for park usage that would include a license, and certification that the dog's shots are up-to-date. He noted that a dog park provides a means to socialize and exercise dogs in a very controlled and safe environment.

Mr. Dumaresq noted that he wanted to discuss the other issues that would go with having a dog park. He noted that the group had a concern regarding liability insurance for the Township. He noted that when he talked to the people at Lower Allen Township, he was told that they have had no lawsuits filed, and no additional insurance was needed for the dog park, as it was covered under the Parks and Recreation Insurance umbrella. He noted that the group believes that a dog park is a privilege and not a right; therefore, there would be rules and consequences for violations. He noted that there would be controlled entrances, with registration and volunteer monitoring, at the start, to develop a culture of cleanliness and safe environment. He noted that the group found that the first few months are critical as it would set the tone and culture for the dog park.

Mr. Dumaresq noted that the group is requesting, from the Township, 1½ to 2 acres of land that could be sloped or hilly, but not necessarily flat prime land. He requested the maintenance assistance from the Township in the removal of trash and the mowing of the grass.

Mr. Dumaresq noted that the group estimated that the dog park would cost \$15,000 to \$25,000, depending on the size of the park and the number of amenities provided, such as water, shade trees, and benches. He noted that Representative Ronald Marsico has committed to try to find a grant from the Department of Community and Economic Development (DCED). He noted that the Committee would approach area businesses for donations, and especially businesses that are pet-connected. He noted that he would solicit a minimum of \$10 from the 700 people who signed the petition that was forwarded to the Township, and other people who would be willing to make a donation. He noted that he is looking to seek donations of fencing and lumber, and explained that Paul Owens has volunteered to erect the fencing and build wooden structures,

which would save thousands of dollars in labor costs. He noted that the group would like to charge user fees, especially for non-residents.

Mr. Dumaresq noted that the Committee feels that this is a great investment to increase the quality of life for pet owners in the community, and also for people who just like to watch dogs run and play. He suggested that it would be a great opportunity for the Township and the Dog Park Volunteer Committee.

Mr. Hawk complimented Mr. Dumaresq, and the Committee, for a very good presentation. He noted that the Committee has done their homework well.

Mr. Blain questioned how the Committee would enforce the activities within the park. He noted, if the Township donates the land, it would own the park, and he suggested that it would be difficult for a volunteer group to enforce park rules as compared to a Parks and Recreation employee, or the police. Mr. Dumaresq answered, in talking to the people at Lower Allen Township, he was told that they have an informal enforcement group made up of people who are interested in maintaining the safety and cleanliness of the park, and everyone monitors the park, the dogs, and the area. He noted that volunteers were present in the first few months, reminding users to pick up the waste and to ensure that there are no bully dogs in the park. He noted that people will be asked to leave the premises if they violate the rules. He noted that he believes in the goodness of most canine owners, that they will follow the culture of cleanliness and safety.

Mr. Hawk noted that many communities at the shore have very well maintained dog parks. He noted that the group would already have \$7,500 from the donations of those who signed the petition. Mr. Dumaresq noted that the DCED grant request would be for \$5,000, and he estimated taking in \$4,000 from businesses, and \$6,000 from the \$10-donations, and \$3,000 for fencing and lumber. He estimated that the group could save \$8,000 to \$10,000 in labor costs with the donated labor. He noted that the Committee could put together a park that would have some nice amenities, and that people would be proud of.

Mr. Crissman provided a newspaper article on dog parks that included a section on people paying an annual fee using a swipe card system. He noted that the negative side to that is that people who live in the area would feel that they were being taxed twice. Mr. Dumaresq noted that the Committee has discussed this issue, but has not had closure on it yet. He noted that there should be a fee for non-residents and they are still struggling with what to do for the residents.

Mr. Seeds noted that Mr. Dumaresq provided a very good presentation. He noted that Mr. Luetchford, the Parks and Recreation Director, was in the audience, and he questioned if it would

be a problem to locate a dog park in a public park. He questioned if fees could be charged in a public park. Mr. Luetchford answered that the Koons Park Pool charges fees and it is located in a public park. Mr. Seeds questioned if there would be a problem with charging a fee or using a card. Mr. Luetchford answered that there are options for doing that, but he questioned how they would enforce the rules, and bar people who have not paid the fees. Mr. Wolfe noted that the Township charges fees for just about everything its does in the parks that has any organized value. He noted that the Brightbill basketball leagues charge resident and non-resident fees. He suggested that the two critical issues are that he did not think that the dog park could be for Township residents only, and he noted that it would cost money to collect money. He noted that posting staff to collect money could become a financial liability. It was suggested that it could be done via the Internet by credit card.

Mr. Blain noted that once the Committee receives the initial funding to build the park, outside of the Township maintaining the grass and taking the trash away, what the ongoing maintenance costs would be. Mr. Dumaresq answered that the Committee is still discussing these issues, and it may decide to request donations or conduct fundraisers as the user fees may be too onerous to collect. He noted that the Committee has a year, based on its plan, to make a decision.

Mr. Seeds noted that he wanted to clarify something that was in the memo to the Board members from the Dog Park Committee. He stated that the Koons Park Pool Committee has asked for funds for this year, but they have not received any. Mr. Hawk noted that the non-resident fees seem to be a viable approach. Mr. Dumaresq noted that fees could be collected through the Internet or mail without manning someone on-site to collect fees. Mr. Hawk noted that he likes the concept.

Mr. Crissman noted that, although it is in the letter, Mr. Dumaresq did not specifically ask for water service to the dog park. Mr. Dumaresq explained that water service is something the Committee would like, but now they are looking to get the park up and running. He noted that once that is accomplished, then they could go to the next step, seeking additional donations. A member of the Committee noted that water needs to be considered upfront because if it is a very hot day, the dogs will become thirsty along with the dog owners. Mr. Crissman noted that many dog owners carry their own water, but he noted that water should be taken into consideration when planning for a site for the park.

Mr. Seeds noted that he lives near Koons Park where many people walk their dogs in the park, but he noted that over 90% of the owners clean up their dogs, and most of the time they are on leashes. He noted that he likes that there are a lot of people involved with this Committee, as

the same was true for Possibility Place. He noted that people getting involved in projects, is much better than just having government do it for them. He suggested that Mr. Dumaresq and his Committee should work with Mr. Luetchford and the Parks and Recreation Board to make it happen. Mr. Dumaresq noted that he would like to work with a group to make the site selection within the next two months.

Mr. Crissman questioned if the attached timeline was created by the Committee for the park. Mr. Dumaresq answered that this is what the Committee has worked out at this time, noting that it would like to have a site selection by the end of July in order to go to people to start the fundraising. Mr. Crissman noted that the Committee is looking for a commitment from the Board that it would donate a piece of property for the purpose of a dog park. Mr. Hawk noted that the Board does not vote at the workshop meeting, but he suggested that the impression is favorable. Mr. Wolfe suggested that it would be appropriate for the Board to have the Committee meet with the Parks and Recreation Board for consideration and discussion of a potential site.

Mr. Hornung noted that the Committee is planning to open the dog park on Memorial Day 2009, but what if they miss the date, would they want to start it up in September. He questioned what they would do with the dog parks in the winter time. Mr. Dumaresq answered that there is no maintenance for the winter time other than the collection of trash and the removal of snow from the area around the gates.

Mr. Hornung noted that a dog park was suggested for the landfill area but a large public outcry resulted in regards to the issue of barking dogs. He suggested that the Committee should be prepared for that. He noted that issues addressed were barking, cleanup, noise and parking. Mr. Dumaresq noted that the ideal location would be inside a park that could provide a buffer. Mr. Hornung suggested that it would be better to locate the park in a higher density area as opposed to a lower density area where people already have the ability to let their dogs loose without many issues. A committee member noted that that was excellent input and requested any other input that would be useful to the Committee.

#### CASA fundraising discussion with the Association's consultant, Al Colone

Mr. Blain noted that Mr. Weidner, the President of the Capital Area Soccer Association (CASA), requested him to allow Mr. Al Colone, Colone Associates, to make a presentation to the Board in regards to CASA fundraising. He explained that Mr. Colone would be helping CASA in its fundraising efforts, and in the development of a soccer complex. He noted that the goal is to ascertain if the community can finance a soccer complex.

Mr. Weidner explained that Mr. Colone is from upstate New York, and has a lot of expertise in doing this kind of work. He noted that he would be completing the feasibility assessment for the soccer complex. He explained that he would be interviewing many contacts within the Township over the next seven days, and then come back to follow through on the interviews.

Mr. Weidner stated that the Central Dauphin Girls High School Soccer Team won the State Championship, noting that 11 of the girls on the starting lineup are Lower Paxton Township residents, and most of the girls came through the CASA program. He noted that six of the girls will be playing college soccer, so the Township has benefited by having some very talented girls. He noted that the purpose of the soccer complex is to provide more opportunity for exposure for kids in order to provide for better college opportunities.

Mr. Weidner noted that he would like to pursue the issue of providing sod for George Park, and based on the response from the Board members, he was asked to secure more cost numbers to ascertain if CASA could follow through on this request. He noted that there is still an ongoing appraisal for the Wolfersberger Tract. He noted that CASA is trying to find out what type of financial support it could receive from the community for the complex, and that is the reason for hiring a consultant.

Mr. Colone thanked the Board members for the opportunity to explain what he is trying to do for CASA. He explained that his company was formed ten years ago, and prior to that he founded and was the executive director of the National Soccer Hall of Fame in New York. He noted that he took that project and turned it into a multi-million dollar venture. He explained that he consulted for a small soccer association in a County of 50,000 people located in upstate New York, helped them to raise support to include a \$255,000 grant from the State of New York. He explained, after leaving the National Soccer Hall of Fame, he went into the tournament business, and found it very difficult to run an event with 193 soccer teams coming from a multi-state area with a one-man operation. He noted, as a result of that experience, he chose to redirect his energy and work more directly with groups such as CASA.

Mr. Colone noted that he met Mr. Weidner five or six years ago, when he was setting up a tournament in the Harrisburg area. He explained that he had 75 teams signed up for the tournament, and found that there were insufficient fields to accommodate it; therefore, he had to scrub the event. He noted that through this process, CASA explained their need to develop more fields. He suggested, at that time, to conduct a feasibility assessment. He explained that it is

wonderful to have ideas, but you get to the point where you can determine that you can support those ideas with capital construction funds, and the sustaining funds.

Mr. Colone noted that he knows that CASA has approximately 2,000 members, of which 600 are serious players, while the others are recreational players. He noted that the serious players have identified that there is a need for up to 20 additional soccer fields of various sizes, such as regulation fields, or small training fields. He noted that a good soccer field constructed of natural turf, would cost anywhere from \$175,000 to \$225,000 per regulation field. He noted that CASA had indicated an interest in two synthetic turf fields, which would cost \$750,000 a piece. He noted that the complex could cost as much as \$7 million.

Mr. Colone noted that CASA could not come up with this funding by themselves. He noted that they would need to reach out to leadership beyond the confines of CASA. He noted that the feasibility study would show if there is leadership sufficient in the Township who believes in the concept, think that the dollars can be raised, are willing to cut some checks, and are willing to provide some guidance and advice to help move the project forward over a reasonable amount of time.

Mr. Colone reported that he has scheduled nine appointments with key leaders in the area over the next two days. He suggested that he would have to reach 35 to 40 people when all is said and done, and he is on a listening mission looking for the advice and guidance of key people in the area.

Mr. Colone noted that he would welcome the advice that the Board members could provide, to include thoughts on the physical layout for the facility site, Wolfersberger Park, noting that CASA has designed a site plan for eight fields at that location. He noted that he is approaching this from a clean slate.

Mr. Colone distributed his business card to the Board members and requested them to contact him if they have specific ideas or concerns. He explained that the interviews that he would be conducting are fully confidential, and would be expressed in general terms as part of the final report.

Mr. Hawk questioned if the \$7 million cost included the Wolfersberger Tract or the 20 fields. Mr. Colone answered that that would be for the 20 individual fields at a total cost of \$7 million. Mr. Hawk questioned if the 20 fields would be located in multiple Townships. Mr. Colone answered that it could be multiple sites. Mr. Seeds questioned if this included the purchase of land. Mr. Colone answered yes.

Mr. Colone explained for his project in upstate New York, during the second leadership meeting, he met with a very successful business man who asked where the facility would be built, and he was told that it was an unknown at this time. He explained that the gentleman stated that he would be willing to donate 21 acres of land, and noted that he would not know what opportunities are available until he starts knocking on doors.

Mr. Blain noted that Mr. Colone stated that he has nine interviews planned with leadership persons, he questioned if it included government officials or members of the private sectors. Mr. Colone noted that it involved both, as well as the media, educators, business people, philanthropists, and foundations.

Mr. Hawk questioned if Mr. Colone had a timeline for the project. Mr. Colone answered that the feasibility assessment would take three to five months, depending on how the responses come back. He noted that the assessment could result in the creation of a development committee of private leaders allied with the CASA Board with the express purpose of raising the funds needed to build the facilities.

Mr. Seeds noted that it would be a big challenge.

Mr. Blain questioned if Mr. Colone would be putting together a report. Mr. Colone answered yes, and he noted that the Township would receive a copy. He noted that he would include a roster of who was interviewed.

Presentation by Glen and Barbara Cassel of a sketch plan for  
133 acres along Union Deposit Road

Ms. Wissler explained that Mr. Staub has prepared a sketch plan to present to the Board members concerning 133 acres along Union Deposit Road that belong to Glen and Barbara Cassel.

Mr. Staub explained that the land is zoned Agricultural Residential, (AR), and is located in the southeast corner of the Township on Union Deposit Road. He noted that the property is split by Union Deposit Road, and Mr. Cassel has chosen the sketch plan presented tonight as a means to develop the land. He noted that it shows two cul-de-sac streets, one of which is longer than the ordinance permits. He noted that the other lots are carved off of Willoughby and Union Deposit Roads. He noted that the plan would not require any variances; however, he was requesting input from the Board members in regards to waivers. He noted that the waivers would concern right-of-way improvements with Union Deposit Road, and to a lesser extent Willoughby Road. He noted that Beaver Creek crosses the tract.

Mr. Stine questioned if this land has a junkyard located on it. Mr. Staub answered that it does. He noted that part of the property extends over Beaver Creek into West Hanover Township.

Mr. Staub questioned what required improvements would be necessary for Union Deposit Road. He noted that it would require some widening and curb, and he had a question regarding the cul-de-sac streets.

Mr. Seeds questioned how many acres make up the tract. Mr. Zimmerman answered that it is 133 acres. Mr. Staub noted that the lots would have on-site sewage and wells. He noted that, given the limited number of lots, the cost for improvements would make or break the project. Mr. Hornung noted that it is a tough site to develop.

Mr. Hornung questioned if the homes would be fairly expensive. Mr. Zimmerman suggested that some of them will be. He noted that the homes that were just built on Willoughby cost almost \$1 million.

Mr. Hornung questioned if the existing housing would remain in the area of the junkyard. Mr. Zimmerman noted that it would be cleaned up. He noted that the house, garage and barn would probably remain as a separate tract, and the cars would be disposed of. Mr. Hornung suggested that the garage is not in good shape. Mr. Zimmerman noted that it could be fixed up.

Mr. Crissman questioned if both cul-de-sacs would have plenty of space for emergency vehicles and school buses. Mr. Staub answered that it would be a standard cul-de-sac, meeting the Township's requirements.

Mr. Staub noted that since Union Deposit Road is a State Road, PENNDOT would have some input on the improvements. Mr. Hawk suggested that it may be hard to envision what would be required as a result of what PENNDOT would be doing in that area. Mr. Zimmerman noted that PENNDOT just redid Union Deposit Road in that area. Mr. Seeds noted that he likes the plan because it would remain AR.

Mr. Hornung questioned if the road would be widened in the area of the entrances. Mr. Staub answered that he would have to do a traffic assessment and that study would determine if turn lanes would be needed. He noted that the study would be provided to PENNDOT for their review. Mr. Hornung noted that he would like to see slow down lanes installed. Mr. Stine suggested that the area is hilly, and someone could come up on another vehicle very quickly.

Ms. Wissler questioned Mr. Staub if he considered designing an open space development. Mr. Staub answered that Mr. Cassel did not want to do that.

Mr. Crissman questioned what problems Mr. Staub anticipated encountering with PENNDOT. Mr. Staub answered that he had a preliminary discussion with PENNDOT and they stated that they would like to see combined driveways. Mr. Crissman questioned if that creates a problem for property owners who would share a driveway. Mr. Stine explained that the deed would have declarations in it that would require everyone to participate in the maintenance of the common parts. Mr. Staub noted that PENNDOT stated that they would not issue driveway permits for each individual lot, and the combined driveways would have to meet the sight distance requirements.

Mr. Wolfe questioned what the average lot size was for the north side of Union Deposit Road. Mr. Staub suggested that two lots are 15 acres to 20 acres. Mr. Zimmerman noted that some of the other lots are five acres to six acres. Mr. Wolfe questioned why Mr. Staub did not move everything onto the north side and reserve the south side to decrease the development costs. He suggested if he extended the cul-de-sac and designed two-acre lots, he could put everyone on the north side, and not worry about the south side. Mr. Zimmerman explained that there is a power line that comes through the property, and there are plans to widen the power line. Mr. Staub noted that the premium lots would be located at the top of the bluff.

Mr. Hawk noted that the plan calls for roughly 23 homes. Mr. Seeds questioned if Mr. Zimmerman would be developing the land for Mr. Cassel. Mr. Zimmerman noted that that could change, and Mr. Cassel may sell the land and have someone else develop. He noted that Mr. Cassel does not want to spend the money to develop it.

Mr. Staub questioned if there would be a chance for waivers for Union Deposit Road for widening. Mr. Hawk requested Mr. Staub to list the waivers for their review. Mr. Seeds suggested that Mr. Staub would have to work with PENNDOT for the request for Union Deposit Road.

Discussion regarding the Residential Retirement Overlay  
zoning district in the Institutional zoning district

Mr. Wolfe explained that Mr. Hornung requested to have a discussion regarding the residential-retirement overlay with Board members. He noted that the Township experienced a protracted discussion with the Union Deposit Corporation regarding the Sportsmen's Golf course, and the Board authorized staff to continue working with Union Deposit Corporation to find something that would work for the Township and the community.

Mr. Wolfe noted that developers who wished to develop a residential-retirement or age-restricted housing much prefer the Institutional Zoning (IN) as opposed to the age-restricted

zoning that is permitted in all the zoning districts, but only provides a 15% bonus in density, and mandates that the underlying zoning types remain in effect.

Mr. Wolfe questioned if the zoning ordinance provides enough flexibility for the development of residential-retirement or age-restricted housing. He explained that he attached copies of the age-restricted and residential-retirement zoning requirements, and noted that the residential-retirement density was amended by the Board from 12-units per acre to ten-units per acre. He questioned if the Board was happy with that high a density. He noted that this was one of the reasons that the Board determined that the rezoning for the Union Deposit Corporation was not appropriate.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the residential-retirement is only permitted in the IN zone, which contains other permitted uses. He noted that in some cases, those other uses are impractical, but it does not negate the communities concerns that it permits a prison or drug rehabilitation facility. He suggested that developers don't buy land to build prisons.

Mr. Hornung explained that Mr. Schoffstall is developing a seven-acre tract on Devonshire Road, and he volunteered to help him with this in order to learn the planning/developing process. He noted that Mr. Schoffstall's situation has similar concerns as the Union Deposit Corporation in the development of the Sportsmen's Golf Course. He suggested that the Township gets to the end product (residential-retirement) in a very convoluted way. He noted that he has a concern regarding the residential-retirement development concept and what it will end up being 30 years from now when the baby boomers have died and there is a surplus of residential-retirement homes. He suggested that there will be pressure to change them to a younger housing market. He noted, at some point in time, the high density would not be a good thing because families with children could be moving into these homes. He noted that there would be pressure for future Board members to do something since the homes will be vacant.

Mr. Hawk noted that Mr. Schoffstall only has seven acres in his plan. He noted that with the permitted uses allowed in the IN zone, a person could not developed it. Mr. Hornung noted that the problem is that it is an emotional issue for the residents who don't understand it. He noted that the emotional issues with the Union Deposit Corporation concerned the possibility of building six-story buildings. He noted if a developer wants to build a nice residential-retirement development, he would never build ten-units per acre. He suggested that four or five units per acre would be more appropriate. He noted that it does not make sense to allow for ten units per

acre. He noted that 30 years from now, the homes would be a good inexpensive starter home for young families.

Mr. Hornung noted that a builder could develop age-restricted housing in R-1 with a density of three units per acre; however, he suggested that it would be more appropriate to provide for five units per acre. Mr. Staub noted that Meadowview Village is 5.2 units per acre. He noted that it has 110 units on 22 acres. Mr. Hawk noted that the Board has had more requests for IN rezoning, that permits 10 units per acre as it is a financial windfall for the developer since he could make much more money with that amount of development. Mr. Hawk noted that when the baby boomers pass on, there won't be the same need as there is now. Mr. Hornung noted that the density of ten units per acre is too high for families with small children, therefore, it is his recommendation that the Board come up with a zoning that does not require the use of the IN zoning to get five units per acre to get the residential-retirement overlay. He noted that it is not like the two are tied together. He noted that there will be a growing demand for residential-retirement, and an area that the Board members should focus on because there are many developers requesting that zoning. He noted that Mr. Schoffstall is adamant in that he wants to build a club house in his development to provide a place for the people to go to play cards and socialize. He noted that the Township needs to take a look at the zoning for residential-retirement development that provides sidewalks, and other amenities, but does not require that it be built only in the IN zoning.

Mr. Staub explained that he would be taking Mr. Schoffstall's plan to the Planning Commission to request a rezoning for the land from R-1 to IN. He noted that he has heard that it is going to be an ugly meeting, since many of the residents are very upset with the IN rezoning. Mr. Hawk noted that Mr. Staub would receive a fair amount of opposition to the plan. Mr. Hornung noted that he is not requesting this discussion because of the opposition, but because he does not like the ten units per acre maximum, and noted that the residents have a legitimate complaint. He noted that once the land is rezoned, the developer could sell the land, and the IN zoning would allow Mr. Davis to build a work release center. He noted that there is a risk factor for the Township to rezoning land to IN, and there is a need for a trust level with the developer that need not be there if the Township created a zoning district for residential-retirement development. Mr. Staub noted that, if he was a neighbor to Mr. Schoffstall's property, he would not be pleased with the rezoning request, simply because there are no guarantees as to what would be developed.

Mr. Hawk explained that when he thinks of a residential-retirement development he immediately thinks of a Messiah Village-type development or the Presbyterian homes where they have walking trails and amenities to play cards. He noted that some developers are requesting the IN zoning simply because it provides a bonus so it is more profitable for them to build the units. He noted that the Amesbury development only has two units sold, and he questioned what senior citizens are looking for. He questioned if they really want that type of development. He questioned if he sold his home for \$200,000, he would not want to take on, at age 65, a \$300,000 mortgage. Mr. Seeds noted that Amesbury has sold four homes, and the model home costs \$324,000. Mr. Hawk noted that that is not senior housing to him. Mr. Hornung noted that economics always controls the project, but if you don't allow at least five units per acre, the economics pushes the houses up into the \$300,000 level. He noted that a developer should be able to build homes for \$250,000 at five units per acre.

Mr. Blain noted that Mr. Schoffstall is planning to build a townhome complex. Mr. Hornung noted that he is planning to build duplexes, similar to the kind found at Messiah Village where two homes are located next to each other. He suggested that you could buy those homes in the range of \$250,000, providing a nice home and garage. He noted that the residential-retirement development works nicely at five units per acre, but for the Township, the IN zoning permits ten units per acre.

Mr. Blain questioned if Mr. Schoffstall was going to build mid-income housing. Mr. Hornung noted that he is looking to build homes in the \$225,000 range, which he feels is affordable for someone who would be downsizing and selling their home. He noted that he could structure the buildings to end up with a Messiah Village-type development, and he suggested that Messiah Village is a very nice place to live. Mr. Seeds questioned if a residential-retirement overlay could be built in R-2 and R-3. Mr. Wolfe answered that the residential-retirement overlay is only permitted in the IN zone. He noted that a developer could build age-restricted in the other zones, but it only provides for a 15% density bonus. Mr. Seeds questioned what was wrong with building an age-restricted development. Mr. Wolfe answered that it would only provide a 15% bonus, and the current housing must be maintained, therefore, in the R-1 district it would have to be single-family housing, and would only permit 2.3 units per acre.

Mr. Hawk questioned what would be the benefit of living in a residential-retirement development that he would not have in a townhouse development like Whisper Woods other than age-restricted. He noted that Whisper Woods has a higher density than five units per acre. Ms Wissler noted that it is zoned R-2 and only allows five units per acre. Mr. Hornung noted that

there are benefits with the age-restricted development as it would provide a tax base with very little demand to the police, schools, or sewer system. He noted that usually there are two or less persons living in the home, using fewer infrastructures. Ms. Wissler noted that her development was not set up as age-restricted, but she explained that she is probably the youngest resident in the neighborhood. She noted that many of the other residents are retired.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the underlying argument is, should the Township provide some type of development density bonus, by using a minimum of 15% that would provide the age-restricted, or the maximum of up to ten units per acre that is provided for in the residential-retirement IN zone. He questioned, if the Township should be providing a bonus for that type of housing, what it should be. Mr. Hornung noted that ten units per acre is too much, and 15% is not enough. He noted that the ideal would be five units per acre, but there is nothing in the ordinances that permit this. He noted that this is what would set up the Messiah Village-type development. Mr. Wolfe suggested that the Township could change the zoning ordinance to allow the residential-retirement zoning in all residential districts at five units per acre. Mr. Hawk suggested that it would be the easy way to do it. Mr. Hornung noted that there would be no risk factor for rezoning to IN. He noted that if he was a neighbor to Mr. Schoffstall's property he would not want the tract to be rezoned to IN, and this was also the objection for the Sportsman's Golf Course development. Mr. Hawk noted that the Union Deposit Corporation is a much larger tract of land, and he voted against the plan because he did not want 300 more homes built in that area. He noted at ten units per acre, it is impossible to say what Mr. Mahoney would develop.

Mr. Wolfe noted that Mr. Harris suggested inviting a representative from the HDC to address the Board members about workforce housing. He noted that this is all interrelated to retirement housing and affordable housing. He suggested that a discussion could be scheduled for the next workshop meeting to cover both issues.

Mr. Staub noted that the Schoffstall tract is a perfect location for retirement-residential living since it is an infill, the utilities are readily available, it would add very little traffic, and it is located next to the Paxton Towne Centre and the Friendship Center. Mr. Blain noted that it is the public's perception that the developer would build whatever he wants to in the IN zone, similar to the same perception of Section 8 housing looking like the slums of Philadelphia. He noted that that was his reason for the discussion held earlier on affordable housing. Mr. Hawk noted that the Board use to discuss cluster housing, but now it is discussing open space housing that carries a different connotation.

Mr. Hawk noted that he likes Mr. Hornung's thoughts on the problem.

Mr. Seeds questioned when further discussions would be held regarding the Union Deposit Corporations' land. Mr. Blain noted that the Board committed to them that they would look at rezoning that land to R-1. Mr. Seeds noted that he did not remember the Board agreeing to this. Mr. Hornung noted that the Board agreed to bring it back to discuss it, but it did not vote on it. Mr. Seeds suggested that the top 11 acres should not be R-1, but remain Conservation (CO). Mr. Hawk suggested that Mr. Zwally wanted it to remain CO too.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the Board could continue these discussions at the July workshop meeting. He requested Mr. Blain to provide him with a name for someone from the HDC to invite them to attend that meeting.

Mr. Wolfe noted that Mr. Schoffstall has an approved single-family plan for his site on Devonshire Road. Mr. Blain noted that a few years ago, Mr. Schoffstall requested Business Campus zoning, and the Board refused his request. Mr. Hornung explained that single-family lots are not selling, and, there is also a lot of trash that blows onto that property from the shopping area. He noted that a person who buys a \$450,000 home would not want to contend with a trash issue. He suggested that a lot of buffering could be done in the area, if the residential-retirement development was permitted, and it would look pretty.

#### "Otta Know" Video Presentation: Workforce Housing

Due to the late hour, it was decided to table the 30 minute presentation to another meeting.

#### Improvement Guarantees, Development Agreements, Plan Reaffirmations

##### Patton Place

A release in a letter of credit with Integrity Bank in the amount of \$3,480.00.

Mr. Crissman made a motion to approve the one improvement guarantee as presented. Mr. Blain seconded the motion, and a unanimous vote followed.

## **Adjournment**

There being no further business, Mr. Blain made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Crissman seconded the motion, and the meeting adjourned at 8:12 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Maureen Heberle  
Recording Secretary

Approved by,

Gary A. Crissman  
Township Secretary