

LOWER PAXTON TOWNSHIP  
PLANNING COMMISSION

February 13, 2008

**COMMISSIONERS PRESENT**

Fredrick Lighty  
Roy Newsome  
Dennis Guise  
Ernest Gingrich  
William Neff

**ALSO PRESENT**

Lori Wissler, Planning & Zoning Officer  
Dianne Moran, Planning & Zoning Officer  
Robert Grubic, HRG, Inc.  
Chip Millard, Dauphin County Planning Commission

**CALL TO ORDER**

Mr. Lighty called the regular meeting of the Lower Paxton Township Planning Commission to order at 7:00 pm, on February 13, 2008 in Room 171 of the Lower Paxton Township Municipal Center, 425 Prince Street, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania.

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO THE FLAG**

Mr. Gingrich led the recitation of the Pledge.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Mr. Gingrich made a motion to approve the minutes of the January 9, 2008 regular meeting. Mr. Guise seconded the motion, and the minutes were approved as submitted. Mr. Newsome abstained from voting.

**OLD BUSINESS**

**NEW BUSINESS**

**Rezoning Application for  
Laurel Ridge**

Ms. Wissler stated that the Township has received a proposed amendment to the Township's Zoning Map for a 51.38 acre tract located south of Linglestown Road across from Forest Hills Drive. The applicant proposes to rezone this tract from R-2, Medium Density Residential District to R-3, Medium High Density Residential District. The intent is to develop apartments and/or townhouses.

The existing use of the property is The Village of Laurel Ridge Apartments.

The subject parcels is abutted to the north (across Linglestown Road) by BC, Business Campus District, to the east by CN, Commercial Neighborhood District, R-1, Low Density Residential District

and R-2, Medium Density Residential District, to the west by R-1, Low Density Residential District and BC, Business Campus District and to the south by R-C, Residential Cluster District.

The 2004 Comprehensive Plan's Future Land Use Map shows the majority of the area to be High Density Residential with Business Campus along Linglestown Road, which is consistent with this request.

The 2004 Comprehensive Plan's Land Use Objective for Colonial Park North is to maintain and preserve residential neighborhoods as the predominant land use and to develop residential areas at densities consistent with existing adjacent neighborhoods.

Jim Strupe & John Murphy, Alpha Consulting Engineers; Steve Williams, Attorney; and Richard Hankin, Vice President of Multi-Properties Inc. (MPI), were present on behalf of the application.

Mr. Hankin introduced MPI as the owner of Eagles Crest Apartments and Village of Laurel Ridge. MPI is based in Baltimore and is long term holder. They intend to continue to work with Township staff closely. He felt that the improvements to Laurel Ridge will prove an economical viable and attractive asset to this community. The request before the Commission is in line with what currently exists on the property.

Mr. Strupe, a landscape architect with Alpha Consulting Engineers, stated that the Village of Laurel Ridge dates back to 1975. It includes private streets and recreation facilities. It is a combination of apartments and townhouses. There were a total of 367 units approved in two phases. 187 units have been developed as phase 1. Phase 2 has not been built. This land was always R-2, Medium Density Residential District, but at that time apartments and townhouses were permitted uses in the R-2. The ordinance was amended in July 2006, and apartments were no longer a by-right use. The existing apartments are now a non-conformity. Apartments are permitted in the R-3, Medium High Density Residential District. With the adoption of the new ordinance other apartment sites were zoned to R-3 but this one may have been an oversight. Mr. Strupe felt that the Township doesn't desire to preclude apartments from this property and noted it is an excellent location for apartments, being near commercial uses. The creek provides a natural buffer between this property and the next.

Mr. Strupe explained that MPI wants to complete the plan as designed in 1975, but does not want to create something that is non-conforming. Apartments are still the best use of the land as they will take up less area for any given number of units. There is an economic and environmental benefit. Apartments are now in demand in the marketplace. He presented a graphic of how the apartments could be laid out, and one of how townhouses could be laid out. The end result will most likely be a mix of the two.

Mr. Strupe noted that the purpose of the R-2 zoning designation is to provide a medium density neighborhood with a mix of housing types; the purpose of the R-3 is the same except higher densities. There is little impact to future development other than the use. The unfinished portion of the property is the eastern portion. The property to the east of the subject property is the driving range. He added that it has a private boulevard entrance with a signalized intersection at Linglestown Road.

Mr. Neff asked for the reason for the request, other than the non-conformity issue. Mr. Strupe stated that the applicant desires to build the additional apartments in addition to townhouses.

Mr. Neff questioned the number of units approved in 1975. Mr. Strupe stated that 367 units were shown on the plan. Mr. Neff asked if it broke down the types of units. Mr. Strupe answered that the plan shows 119 townhouses, and 248 apartments. Mr. Strupe stated there are 187 units on the site now, but did not know the current mix of apartments to townhouses.

Mr. Lighty asked about how many units could be built if the property were maximized. Mr. Strupe stated that it would be between 75 and 110.

Mr. Millard, Dauphin County Planning Commission (DCPC), stated that the Township's Comprehensive Plan identifies the future land use for the entire development as being high density residential. The plan is more consistent with the requested zoning than the existing zoning.

The Dauphin County Comprehensive Plan identifies the future land use for the tract as being residential. The County Plan does not distinguish between low/medium and high density residential uses. Both the existing and proposed zoning would be consistent with the Dauphin County Plan.

Most of the surrounding lands are zoned for and/or have uses that are commercial retail, business office, or lower density residential uses. Higher density residential development can be compatible with smaller scale commercial retail and business uses if travel between the uses is walkable. On the other hand, higher density and lower density residential uses sometimes are not as compatible with one another due to different levels of development intensity.

Most of the uses permitted in the R-3, Medium High Density Residential District are also allowed in the R-2 District. Uses that are allowed in the R-3 but not the R-2 include duplexes (two unit up and down housing), apartments, mobile homes, and nursing homes/assisted living facilities.

The existing development has only one roadway access to the surrounding roadway network, via Pheasant Ridge Drive to Linglestown Road. The intersection between these two roads is signalized. Also, based on the existing development of other access points to the surrounding roadway network may be limited. Mr. Millard noted that, because of the creek, it will be very difficult to have another form of connection.

The northern portion of Lower Paxton Township, north of Interstate 81 currently lacks R-3 zoning areas. Permitting R-3 zoning areas in the northern half of the Township would permit greater housing opportunities for people attracted to that portion of the Township. However, the R-3 zoning district would also allow uses with higher development intensities, which in turn increases traffic volumes relative to lower intensity zoning districts, at least in cases where nearby commercial or business uses were not accessible via non-motorized transportation or public transportation.

After reviewing the proposed revisions, Mr. Millard stated that the Dauphin County Planning Commission recommends the proposed zoning change from R-2, Medium Density Residential District to R-3, Medium High Density Residential District not be approved. Though Township's

Comprehensive Plan recommends the Laurel Ridge development area become a high density residential area, and though there are some commercial retail and business office uses within walking distance of the development, the DCPC has significant concerns about allowing higher density residential development in an area with limited access to the surrounding roadway network. Increasing the permitted development intensity on this tract could create additional traffic volumes on Linglestown Road, an already congested roadway. Also, the DCPC is unsure if high density residential development would be compatible with adjacent low density residential development in this location. Finally, most of the uses permitted in the R-3 District are also permitted in the R-2 District. Rezoning the tract from R-2 to R-3 would not provide dramatically greater development flexibility for the developer.

Mr. Neff asked about the differences between apartments and townhouses with regard to traffic trip generations. Mr. Strupe stated that a single family residence creates the highest amount, and apartments and townhouses generate less. This is because single family dwellings have more residents per unit, than an apartment or townhouse.

Mr. Grubic stated that a single family dwelling generates 10 trips per day and a multi family home generates about 7 trips.

Mr. Neff noted that there are a substantial number of apartments near Route 22 and I-83, and the traffic reports he was familiar with indicated that apartments generate a higher number of trips, because of people going out to dinner and other services. Mr. Millard speculated that apartments would generate less because they typically have fewer people in each unit.

Mr. Neff suggested that the higher number of units would offset the lower number of trips per unit.

Mr. Gingrich asked about isolating the R-2 land to the east if this land should be changed. Mr. Millard stated that the R-2 portion is part of the driving range, so at this point wouldn't be an issue, but future development potential may be an issue. He agreed that was important to consider.

Mr. Murphy, a civil engineer from Alpha Consulting Engineers, stated that the difference between trip generation ends up to be a wash between townhouses and apartments. He added that any traffic impact would be mitigated as part of the eventual land development plan. He also noted that the mix of townhouses and apartments will not really affect the traffic impact.

Mr. Lighty asked if the community could still be completed without the rezoning. Mr. Murphy stated it can, but it may not be to its most appropriate completion. It will be developed wither way, but Mr. Murphy felt it was in the best interest of the community and the Township to eliminate the non-conformity and complete the development as originally intended.

Mr. Hankin noted that from a management perspective, they desire a mix of tenants and product types. He also noted that this project has a density of about 4-5 units per acre, whereas most have 10-12 units per acre.

Mr. Lighty called for comments from the audience.

Mr. Eric Epstein, chairman of SWAN, noted that the Colonial Crest neighborhood will be surrounded by the following in the near future: 164 units to the north (Kessler), a number of units to the east (Molinari), 449 units on the Stray Winds Farm, and Quail Hollow to the north. Each development is considered on its own with regard to its own traffic impact, but as neighbors, they feel the impact of them collectively. He would like to look at a traffic study. He emphasized that this property abuts the Paxton Creek, which is a vital and sensitive watershed.

Mr. Epstein questioned where the information regarding the demand for apartments came from. Mr. Murphy stated it was not from the Township Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Epstein asked about the percentages of open space. Mr. Strupe was not sure until the proper studies have been done. Mr. Epstein noted that 40% has been an average percentage where there starts to be developer incentives.

Mr. Murphy stated "contract zoning" is not legal in the state of Pennsylvania and that is the reason he can not give precise numbers in answers to the questions asked. Mr. Epstein understood and agreed that the developer is moving in the right direction.

Mr. Epstein noted that electric rates will go up 32% in the next year.

Mr. Epstein asked how many residents in Laurel Ridge are Section 8. Mr. Hankin stated they do not have any; the only exception would be someone that had not been Section 8 when moving in, but later met that criteria.

Mr. Epstein asked that the Commission keep Quail Hollow in the back of their minds when acting on such requests.

Mr. Newsome commented that the Township did not miss anything when this parcel was rezoned to R-2, it was very intentional and done very carefully. The Township made adjustments where it felt it necessary. Mr. Murphy apologized for his misunderstanding.

Mr. Guise asked the total number of units permitted if the entire parcel were zoned R-3 and was maxxed out with apartment units. Mr. Strupe stated that there are 14 undeveloped acres, and in the R-2, the density is based on 8,000 square feet per unit, allowing 5.5 units per acre, or about 90 units. In the R-3, the permitted density is 5000 square feet, which would allow 8.7 units per acre, or about 130 units. He noted that reality will be less than that, at about 75-110 units with a mix of apartments and townhouses.

Mr. Lighty asked if the developer could fill some units in between the exiting units because of the spacing there. Mr. Hankin answered that they do not want to and do not intend to, but technically they could.

Mr. Neff asked if MPI owns the property. Mr. Hankin answered yes, they do already own it.

Mr. Guise asked staff if this property was intentionally zoned R-2. Ms. Wissler stated that the Township did specifically go over all the apartment complexes. Mr. Strupe asked if it was fair to say that the Township did not intend to create non-conforming uses. Mr. Lighty stated that it would not be fair to say that.

Mr. Guise made a motion to recommend to the Board of Supervisors that they not approve the rezoning request for Laurel Ridge from R-2 to R-3 for the reasons discussed tonight, specifically that the higher density and additional development would be detrimental to traffic and other concerns. Mr. Newsome seconded the motion. Mr. Lighty called for discussion on the motion. Mr. Lighty stated that the Township, as a whole, has more than its share of apartments, and is not lacking in them. Apartments are a cost to the Township as opposed to other forms of housing. Giving the number of units already in the Township, he felt that apartments are not something the Township needs. A unanimous vote followed.

**Preliminary/Final Subdivision Plan #08-02**  
**Brown Farm**

Ms. Wissler stated that the purpose of this plan is to separate an existing dwelling and undeveloped land (Lot #2) from residual Lot #1. The tract consists of 48.3 acres, is located at 6370 Lyters Lane, is zoned R-1, Low Density Residential District and will be served by private water and public sewer.

The applicant has requested the following waivers: waiver of the requirement to submit a preliminary plan; waiver of the minimum cartway width requirement of 36 feet; waiver of the requirement to provide sidewalk and curbing along Lyters Lane; and waiver of the requirement to provide a stormwater management plan.

Ms. Wissler noted that this plan has been before the Township already, but the developer failed to respond to its conditional approval letter, resulting in a deemed denial.

Mr. John Murphy, Alpha Consulting Engineers, was present on behalf of the plan. Mr. Murphy stated that the purpose of this plan is to separate the house and barn from the rest of the property.

Mr. Lighty asked if the applicant has received comments from staff, county and HRG. Mr. Murphy answered yes. Mr. Lighty asked if he had any objections to the comments. Mr. Murphy answered no.

Mr. Gingrich asked if this plan is the exact same plan as before. Mr. Murphy answered yes.

Mr. Neff asked if the waiver regarding cartway was meant to be about right-of-way. Mr. Grubic stated that Lyters Lane is a collector roadway, and they support the request because it will come up again when the residual lot is developed. Mr. Neff asked if this would be a good time to get the right-of-way dedication. Mr. Grubic stated that the right-of-way has been dedicated, but cartway is not needed at this time.

Mr. Millard had no comments to discuss.

There was no comment from the audience.

Mr. Neff made a motion to recommend approval of the plan, including the four waivers. Mr. Gingrich seconded the motion and a unanimous vote followed.

**Preliminary/Final Subdivision & Land Development Plan #07-15**  
**Harrisburg Foot & Ankle**

Ms. Moran stated that the Harrisburg Foot and Ankle plan has been resubmitted with several changes. The access onto Linglestown Road has been removed from the plan and Linda Miller's property to the east is no longer part of the project. The proposed curbing along Linglestown Road has also been removed. However, sidewalk along Linglestown Road is still being proposed as well as the improvements to Crums Mill Road. A waiver request has been submitted for the curbing requirement along Linglestown Road. The property owner has also decided not to disturb the wetland area of the property decreasing some of the parking spaces.

This plan proposes a 13,730 square foot medical office building. A second building with 13,276 square feet is proposed for future expansion. The property is located at the southwest corner of the intersection of Crums Mill Road, contains approximately 7 acres, is zoned BC, Business Campus District and will be served by public sewer and public water.

This plan was approved by the Board of Supervisors at its October 16, 2007 meeting with the following waivers: waiver of the preliminary plan requirement; and waiver of the requirement to provide sidewalk along Crums Mill Road and Linglestown Road.

The applicant has additionally requested a waiver of the requirement to provide curbing along Linglestown Road, which Staff supports.

Mr. Judd Dayton, Evans Engineering, was present on behalf of the plan.

Mr. Neff stated that the Commission recommended a meandering sidewalk, and asked if the easement shown on the plan includes the sidewalk. Ms. Moran stated that the Board of Supervisors approved the waiver of the requirement to provide sidewalk along Linglestown Road as long as the walkway is moved as far north as possible, required sidewalk along Crums Mill Road noting that the cross path to be installed be moved as far north as possible.

Mr. Dayton stated that they have made minor modifications to the plan. This was due to difficulties getting permits with regard to the wetlands on the site. A portion of the parking area and driveway to Linglestown Road encroached on wetlands, and they could not successfully get permits for that. They have now modified the parking layout so that it does not encroach. That eliminated some parking spaces and the driveway to Linglestown Road and the widening associated with that.

They did take the commission's suggestion and connected a walking path between Linglestown Road and Crums Mill Road. The Supervisors additionally requested that the sidewalk be extended to Linglestown Road. The waiver of sidewalk applies to the small portion of Linglestown Road frontage between the creek and the intersection.

Mr. Dayton stated that they have received the comments and have no problem addressing them.

Mr. Neff questioned the size of the wetlands. Mr. Dayton stated it was less than the criteria for a general permit for impacting, which is 2,000 feet. The shape of the wetland is such that DEP thought that they violated another section of the regulations.

Mr. Millard had no additional comments.

There was no comment from the audience.

Mr. Guise made a motion to recommend approval of the plan, reaffirming the waivers previously granted, and approval of the additional waiver subject to compliance with the comments. Mr. Newsome seconded the motion and a unanimous vote followed.

### **Greenway Plan**

Mr. Luetchford stated that the Township is going through a review and approval process for the Greenway Plan, including the Planning Commission, the Parks and Recreation Board and the Board of Supervisors. The Plan has also been posted on the website for additional public review and comment.

Mr. Luetchford stated that the development of the Greenway Plan was funded by a \$5,000 grant from the Department of Conservation and Natural Resources. Simone Collins was the consultant hired, and the Township formed a Greenway Committee.

The Greenway Committee has identified a variety of benefits, including economic, social, recreational and transportation. It inventoried the natural and manmade resources in the Township. It also analyzed data of future Greenways throughout the Township and developed an action plan to consider specific greenway locations then plan and construct them individually as the opportunities arise.

Mr. Gingrich noted the following typographical errors. Under Table of Contents, the natural resources is on page 14 not 15. The portion of Jonestown Road south of Allentown Boulevard is not "Old Jonestown Road" and the proper name is simply Jonestown Road. That will affect all the maps. Paxtonia is labeled on the maps as east of Nyes Road, when it is actually west of South Mountain Road. Allentown Boulevard is identified as Jonestown Road on Map "Linglestown #2".

Mr. Newsome requested Mr. Luetchford to explain the implementation and timetable of the Plan. Mr. Luetchford stated that some opportunities have already come up such as the McNaughton plan along Patton Road, where they have agreed to a 5-foot-wide bike path on both sides of the road. McNaughton

has also agreed to extend their walkway and nature trail from Patton Road/Continental Drive up to the power line. The Township will discuss with the developer of Autumn Oaks Estates about going from the power line up to the top of the mountain. The Township will also be talking with PennDOT about their reconstruction of Nyes Road. In the mean time, the Parks and Recreation Board has been talking with the owner of the land east of Hocker Park and working with the Central PA Conservancy establishing walkways legally from Hocker Park to the Boyd's Big Tree Conservation Area. The Township is working on small pieces of the plan as opportunities arise. He noted that the Township is also seeking grant money from the safe ways to school program, and other grants. The plan will be implemented in a piece-meal fashion. Mr. Luetchford noted, for example, the Brown Farm plan that was just discussed has a trail through it on the Greenway Plan, so they intend to discuss that with the developer of the residual tract there.

Mr. Luetchford stated that the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (SALDO) will include provisions for implementation as well.

After the Plan is approved, the Greenway Committee will be reestablished to implement the Plan.

Mr. Newsome suggested a Planning Commissioner should be included on the Greenway Plan. He felt this Plan will help the Commission tremendously when reviewing subdivision or land development plans, and in having an impact on the implementation of the Plan.

Mr. Newsome asked if there are portions or trails or bikeways that are a priority. Mr. Luetchford stated that the Nyes Road portion is a priority. Other priorities will be set by the Greenway Committee and also by the funds that become available. Mr. Newsome noted that this Plan is an exciting addition to the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Lighty called for public comment.

Mr. Epstein, SWAN, noted that they have a negotiated agreement with Triple Crown with regard to Stray Winds Farm, and although they support the Greenway, they do not support an easement through that development. Part of that settlement is that none of the neighbors want an easement going through there. Triple Crown will not grant such an easement. Mr. Epstein noted that the area through Stray Winds is already technically a greenway, and there is a total of 108 acres that will remain undisturbed. SWAN does appreciate the need for walkways. Triple Crown has also agreed to keep the 10-acre passive recreational asset. SWAN was greatly concerned with eminent domain.

Mr. Lighty explained that nothing about the Greenway Plan or the Greenway itself will be by eminent domain. The Greenway Plan will be incorporated into the Comprehensive Plan. It is not an ordinance, it is something totally different. In areas where the Plan proposes trails where there is already something in place, the two can be conformed.

Mr. Gingrich noted that in the development of this plan, it will probably never be developed as it is shown, and asked for Mr. Luetchford's comments. Mr. Luetchford recognized that fact, and agreed

that it will not be 100% completed as shown. The idea is that it is an idea, a plan. It is flexible and will follow what the local land owners want to happen.

Mr. Lighty hoped that after the adoption of the Plan, developers of future developments will recognize this as a part of the desires of the Township and will do their best to accommodate this in the design phases of their projects. Retrofitting is always a problem.

Shelly Kunkle, owner of a property on Paxton Church Road, stated she grew up in Lower Paxton Township, and questioned the manner of acquisition of land for these trails. She noted that the map identifies easements as Township-owned, she corrected that to say that it is privately owned land subject to a right-of-way for Lower Paxton Township. For her family's property, such an agreement was executed in 1971 for the narrow explicit premise of constructing, maintaining and repairing the public sewer, it did not include by-ways, highways, bike trails or walking trails. The Kunkle land and her neighbors have about 3,000 feet of frontage on Paxton Creek that are currently earmarked for this plan. That causes them alarm. She did, however, applaud the extraction of land from a developer during the development process, but is strongly concerned as a private land owner as to how it will impact her and her family. Ms. Kunkle also questioned police enforcement along such trails because her family has experienced problems with that in the past on her family's 110 acres.

Dr. Olsen stated his property is surrounded by the Kunkle property. He thought the Plan was a good idea, but had concerns about safety. He asked who would be liable if someone falls into the mill pond along the Creek. There are problems with graffiti in the underpasses of Crums Mill Road, as well as trash and alcohol bottles. He questioned if ATVs and motorbikes and animals would be permitted on these trails. He was also concerned that no one has contacted him about this and there are plans for something directly across the creek from him. He suggested the Township contact property owners that will be affected by or abutting the trails. Dr. Olsen explained they bought a large piece of wooded land to intentionally be away from others, and cherish their privacy and the isolation of their home.

Mr. Lighty explained that this is a plan where greenways could be. It does not say that the Township is bringing in equipment to build what is shown.

Mr. Neff noted the plan says the Township ordinances provide an average level of guidance, and asked if the Greenway Committee will come up with ordinance changes. Mr. Luetchford confirmed that this is a task for the Greenway Committee.

Mr. Neff asked if the Zoning Hearing Board has been briefed or consulted about this plan since their decisions can override ordinances. Mr. Lighty stated that this is not part of the zoning ordinance.

Mr. Neff asked about wetlands and stream corridors. Mr. Luetchford stated the Committee will also look at them. He also reminded the Commission that a greenway does not necessarily include a trail at all, it can simply be passive.

Mr. Neff asked about PPL high power transmission easements and if they would consider leases. Mr. Luetchford stated he will be discussing such matters with MetEd in the next month.

Ms. Kunkle's main concern was the exploitation of existing rights-of-way. Mr. Lighty stated that he will raise that issue with the Greenway Committee, and make sure that the legal status of easements and rights-of-way be determined.

Mr. Guise made a motion to recommend to the Board of Supervisors that they incorporate the Greenway Plan into the Township's Comprehensive Plan, with the understanding that the implementation is a long term effort and will involve a lot of public-private partnerships and should not involve any taking of private property for public use. Mr. Gingrich seconded the motion. Mr. Guise noted that by "taking" he means without the consent of the property owner, such as eminent domain. He further noted that the Plan gives no indication that they were considering taking of land, but felt it was an important concern and should be voiced to the Board of Supervisors. Mr. Guise's motion is not intended to in any way limit the Township's authority to negotiate with developers to include greenway corridors within proposed new developments. A unanimous vote followed.

### **Public Comment**

There was no further public comment.

### **Commissioner & Staff Comment**

Ms. Wissler explained that the Township may consider a possible rezoning of 100 Holbrook Street. The property is currently zoned R-1, Low Density Residential District but had previously been zoned C-1, General Commercial District.

The property and the adjacent property to the west were part of the Seig Coal Yard.

Mr. Newsome asked the current use of the property. Mr. Timothy Mosher stated he operates a plumbing business on this property, as well as his home.

Mr. Newsome asked about the property behind it. Mr. Mosher stated there is a large church there. Mr. Guise asked about the property to the north of the church. Mr. Mosher stated that TRC Interactive owns it and uses it for parking.

Mr. Mosher explained that he went to Melham Associates to have them draw up plans for development of the commercial property. Melham brought it to his attention that the property is no longer commercial. He then went to the Township with his concerns. There is a house and two garages on the one-acre lot.

Mr. Lighty asked about the property to the west. Ms. Wissler suggested that they both be considered for rezoning to commercial. Mr. Lighty asked if the recommendation is for CG or CN. Ms. Wissler stated that the C-1 district used to include all of Fritchey Street. Ms. Wissler recommended CG to be consistent with what is there.

Mr. Lighty suggested coordinating efforts with the owner of the other property as well.

**Adjournment**

The next regular Planning Commission meeting is scheduled for March 12, 2008, at 7:00 pm at the Lower Paxton Township Municipal Center, Room 171.

Being no further business, Mr. Newsome made a motion to adjourn. Mr. Guise seconded the motion, and the meeting adjourned at 8:53 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Michelle Hiner  
Recording Secretary