

LOWER PAXTON TOWNSHIP  
PLANNING COMMISSION

April 9, 2008

**COMMISSIONERS PRESENT**

Fredrick Lighty  
Roy Newsome  
Dennis Guise  
Ernest Gingrich  
William Neff  
Richard Beverly  
Douglas Grove

**ALSO PRESENT**

Lori Wissler, Planning & Zoning Officer  
Dianne Moran, Planning & Zoning Officer  
Stephen Fleming, HRG, Inc.  
Omar Syed, Dauphin County Planning Commission

**CALL TO ORDER**

Mr. Lighty called the regular meeting of the Lower Paxton Township Planning Commission to order at 7:02 pm, on April 9, 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. Neff made a motion to approve the minutes of the March 12, 2008 regular meeting. Mr. Grove seconded the motion, and the minutes were approved as submitted.

**OLD BUSINESS**

**Conditional Use Application 08-01**  
**Shadebrook**

Ms. Wissler stated that the Township has received a Conditional Use Permit application that would allow an increase in the maximum density provided in Section 314.G.8, if the applicant proves that the architectural standards required by Section 314.D.13 will result in excellence in traditional architecture beyond the minimum requirements of the ordinance, the maximum density may be increased by a maximum of 0.5 additional dwelling units per acre.

Section 314.D.13 requires that the applicant establish legally enforceable provisions controlling the styles of architecture, rooflines, porches, and the general types of exterior materials in such a manner as to incorporate the best features of traditional architecture commonly found in boroughs and villages in Pennsylvania.

John Snyder, Rettew Associates, and Forrest Troutman, Yingst Homes, were present on behalf of the application.

Mr. Snyder stated that Shadebrook had an approved Master Plan and the preliminary plan is under review. He stated that they are applying for a density bonus, and feel that they show architectural standards which will result in excellence beyond the ordinance minimum requirements. By right, they are permitted 283 dwelling units. With the conditional use, they will gain 35 units, totaling 318 units.

Mr. Snyder presented a slideshow to show the architectural excellence as well as to give a feel for the look of the development. The architectural excellence will be beyond the industry standards and the Township's expectations. The architecture is the key to this type of development to bring all aspects into harmony, such as transportation, amenities, and recreation. Nothing comes together without the architecture.

Mr. Snyder stated that under section 116.C, there are several components that must be met.

Compliance with the ordinance: the master plan was submitted and approved, and a preliminary plan is under review. The preliminary plan details all aspects of the project to ensure compliance with all Township ordinances. Conditional use approval does in no way permit the applicant to be in non-compliance with other applicable laws and regulations.

Compliance with other laws: the preliminary plan is under review, and the final plan will be submitted after the preliminary plan is approved. NPDES and erosion and sedimentation control are under review by the Conservation District. Sewer planning approval, phase one, has been submitted and is under consideration by the Township Authority. The joint permit for wetland mitigation is under review by the Army Corps of Engineers.

Traffic, Site Planning, Neighborhood and Safety: The important thing of a TND is that it must be walkable. The commercial core is at the center, and the more densely populated areas have townhouses and twin dwellings and are located around the core to promote walking in the community. The outlying areas are single family dwellings. From that, the traffic layout is generated. In a TND, it is essential to have a network of roads all interconnected. With that comes traffic calming, and it must be walkable, so the traffic has to go slowly. The traffic calming includes narrow streets, parking on the streets, tighter radii, and intersection bump-outs to allow pedestrians the shortest possible distance to cross the street. It is essential that traffic move as slowly as possible for pedestrian safety. Slower traffic doesn't mean congestion. Multiple points of access and multiple routes to get to a house enhance traffic flow, and emergency vehicle access. Thirty-five units mean 4% increase in trips per day. The traffic study is under review as a part of the preliminary plan. With regard to Neighborhood, there is a buffer yard between the development and the existing homes in Spring Knoll, that will have a raised buffer, with berms and landscaping. There will be walkways from the existing development to access the commercial area. Dauphin County Technical School is to the northwest and below that is a single family residential development with the closest structure being 200 feet. There will be very similar residences in that area of Shadebrook to what is existing in the adjacent neighborhood. The eastern property line is an open field, so Shadebrook has included numerous access points so that when/if that area is developed, it can be done in harmony with Shadebrook.

Natural Features: Mr. Snyder stated that there is a joint permit for wetland mitigation. The low quality wetlands are located where the downtown area is. The Army Corps of Engineers has approved

the archaeological work that was done, and is currently doing the technical review, which is expected soon. Other wetlands are located on the southern boundary of the property; the development is staying away from those completely. The riparian buffers to the west are along a stream channel, which will be maintained in its existence. The other riparian buffer is around the pond. The majority of that is scrub vegetation, with a few mature trees. That will be cleaned up and the mature trees in good condition will be kept and the rest of it will be improved. There is a floodplain along the southern boundary. The developer does not intend to infringe whatsoever in the floodplain. There are slopes to be dealt with on the site. They have designed the development moving with the slope so it is tiered down, and they do not cut across it in a manner that would require cuts and fills.

Mr. Snyder stated that section 314.D.13 basically says that there is a unified consistent architectural style while avoiding monotony; the applicant shall establish legally enforceable provisions controlling the styles of architecture. That section talks about front porches, garage doors, roof lines, et cetera. "The Architectural Design Guidelines for Shadebrook" does address all of these and more.

Shadebrook proposes four styles, Colonial Revival, Second Empire Victorian, Georgian, and Craftsman. Most TNDs have 2-3 styles. This is one way in which Shadebrook is exceeding excellence. The Design Guidelines also regulate the elements and the styles, by giving matrices of elements required in the ordinance, but also elements such as columns doors, porches, windows, shutters and so on. This shows how each feature an element can be incorporated into the design and structures.

The Guidelines also address the commercial area on the site. They give examples of what you should see when you walk into the first floor or the store front.

Barry Mehaffie, an Architectural Designer, stated there is potential for outdoor eating, on street parking, diagonal parking to allow for short term parking, there is also parking hidden in the back of the buildings. There are street trees. The fountain is the focal point of the development. The storefronts also have the details of awnings, signage, and spans of glass, to make for a pedestrian environment.

The styles are arranged chronologically, Georgian, Second Empire, Craftsman, and Colonial Revival. Mr. Mehaffie showed depictions and a description of each style. Georgian is from the 1700-1840 time period and has front stoops, shutters, dormers and a simple roof massing. Second Empire has a larger front porch and a change in massing, sometimes an L shape, dormer and different window surround. This is from the 1855-1910, the Grant administration. It also has a steep roof. Colonial Revival has side wings for sunrooms or family rooms, and similar to the Georgian but with more modern window and dormer. The Craftsman is the modern style, from the 1900-1945 period. This has open brackets and gables to the street.

Mr. Mehaffie showed slides of the proposed development and the mix of housing styles. There is parking on the street, slowing traffic down. There are attached greens in various locations throughout the plan.

Mr. Snyder stated that the Architectural Guidelines address all of the concerns of the ordinance and exceed anybody's expectations.

Mr. Newsome noted that the floor elevation is to be 24 inches above grade, and he asked about handicapped accessibility. He suggested that ramping be added to the matrix. Mr. Snyder stated that access can also be provided in the rear of the lot or at a corner, depending on the grading of the lot. A ramp can be hidden within a porch. Mr. Newsome suggested the Guidelines be appended to include handicapped accessibility.

Mr. Neff asked how long it will take to build the development. Mr. Snyder answered seven years. Mr. Neff asked about the legally enforceable mechanisms that would ensure that another owner would build what is shown. Mr. Snyder stated that the enforceable provisions are the Architectural Guidelines, and the set of deed restrictions. No matter who builds, it has to be in full force with the Architectural Guidelines as approved.

Mr. Lighty felt the residential package was done very well. He was concerned about the main street, and what will actually be built there, and what it will actually look like. He wanted to know how big they would be and how tall they will be. He asked if they will be one story high and look like a strip mall, or if they will really be the two story styles shown in the slides. Mr. Lighty wanted to know what legally enforceable mechanisms will enable the Township to make sure the main street is built as shown. Mr. Forrest Troutman, in-house counsel for the developer, stated that the developer has proposed to present a prospective for each of the buildings, before they are constructed. Before getting a building permit, they will have to be approved that they fit into the development by the Township. The Architectural Guidelines describe the outside parameters. The commercial buildings have to fit into the four architectural styles just as the residential units will. That will always be the case. These buildings will be two stories. There will be some changes made to the store fronts as the uses change over time, and those provisions are in the Architectural Guidelines to address those in the future. The perspectives show what is going to be built. Until the uses are identified, they cannot tell the Township specifically, but with respect to the upper floor. There is no third story on the buildings because there isn't enough parking. Parking is also the reason the residential uses were eliminated from the upper floor. Most of the second floor will be office type uses, with the store front being retail. The idea is to encourage residents to walk here and get their morning coffee or morning paper. The only building that the perspective is drawn to that level yet, is the one on the northeast corner.

Mr. Lighty stated that the residential matrices clearly define what will be built, and that qualifies as exceptional architecture. Mr. Lighty did not see anything that precludes someone from building a one story strip mall instead of a main street. He asked how will the Township know what will actually be built there.

Mr. Troutman stated that there are mechanisms in place. He explained that a declaration of governance and restrictions is going to apply to the entire development. They will create an architectural review committee that will be responsible for policing this. It will not be the Township's responsibility. They will be responsible for reviewing all plans, commercial or residential, and make sure they comply. When it comes time for building permits, the architectural review committee will indicate that it has reviewed that plan and approved it to comply with what is in the architectural guidelines. That will be indicated to the Township in some way.

Mr. Troutman stated that the architectural review committee is responsible for the design stage, but also for during the construction stage. They specifically have the authority to shut down a project if the builder deviates from the plan as approved.

Mr. Troutman stated they did not feel it was necessary to put together a matrix, but they have said that the commercial buildings are bound by the same architectural guidelines and styles created. Since the developer is the one constructing those buildings, they felt it unnecessary to put those choices in.

Mr. Newsome questioned the drawing that shows three stories. Mr. Troutman stated that there are no three story buildings; the upper area is a design element and not another floor.

The Township will rely on the architectural review committee to see to it that the things in the Guidelines are met. The Township will not issue a building permit until everyone agrees that what is being built is what they said was going to be built.

Ms. Wissler stated that the ordinance permits the Township to record the architectural provisions and the Township can also enter into a developer's agreement. Mr. Lighty asked if the developer would commit to the size and styles of the main street buildings in the developers agreement. Mr. Troutman answered yes.

Mr. Neff asked about signage in the main street area. He noted that in other TNDs they do not have signage; people just know where the places are without the signs. Mr. Snyder stated there is a section in the TND ordinance that addresses signage. It calls for awnings which are permitted to have the name of the store. It is not lit. A flat panel sign is permitted to extend from the building, with dimensional requirements. A percentage of store front windows may have signage. Signs will be regulated by the architectural review committee.

Mr. Newsome expressed a concern over when the downtown area will happen. It is critical to the development that the commercial area is built in conjunction with the residential area. Mr. Troutman agreed it could be a condition of approval of the preliminary plan. Ms. Wissler agreed as well.

Mr. Syed asked the percentages of styles to be built. Mr. Snyder did not have percentages. Mr. Syed stated that a whole row of homes could be the same style. Mr. Snyder stated that the Guidelines regulate how many of the same style can be put next to each other, and how many of those have to have different elements. Mr. Syed asked if it would be possible to have very few of some styles. Mr. Snyder agreed it is possible.

Mr. Syed asked about street light design. Mr. Snyder stated that is in the preliminary plan.

Mr. Lighty called for public comment.

Ms. Cassandra Mundell, 6290 Spring Knoll Drive, was impressed by the plan, but concerned about traffic. She noted there are major intersections and it can take up to five minutes to get through

them. Mr. Lighty stated that traffic is a part of the preliminary plan which will be addressed after the conditional use.

Mr. Guise made a motion to recommend to the Board of Supervisors that the developer has demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Planning Commission that the plan shows architectural excellence, and to recommend granting Conditional Use Application 08-01, subject to including handicapped provisions, and that a developers agreement be executed committing to the designs shown. Mr. Newsome seconded the motion and a unanimous vote followed.

**Preliminary Subdivision Plan #07-14**  
**Shadebrook**

Ms. Wissler stated that the Shadebrook plan proposes to develop a 108.828-acre parcel of land into 335 lots consisting of 318 dwelling units and seven (7) commercial lots. This parcel is zoned TND, Traditional Neighborhood Development and will be served by public sewer and public water.

The Traditional Neighborhood Development (TND) has 11 purposes listed within the TND ordinance with the first being to encourage new development to occur in a manner that will be consistent with the traditional patterns and scale of development and mix of uses that occurred in the region before 1946.

The TND also intends to have most business uses and denser housing clustered at one area of the development and the less dense housing towards the perimeter of the TND, particularly adjacent to pre-existing single family detached housing that is outside of the TND.

The TND shall be developed following a single Master Plan. The Master Plan for Shadebrook was reviewed by the Planning Commission and approved by the Board of Supervisors on January 1, 2007.

Ms. Wissler noted that the number of waivers requested is due to the fact that the current SALDO does not address the design for a TND. She stated that the following waivers have been requested:

1. A waiver is requested to allow property lines to intersect the right-of-way at acute angles.
2. A waiver is requested to allow roadway centerline radii less than those required by ordinance.
3. A waiver is requested to allow a maximum grade of 12% instead of 10%.
4. A waiver is requested from the requirements that blocks shall have a maximum length of 1600 ft. and, so far as practicable, a minimum length of 400 ft. measured from the centerline of the intersecting streets.
5. A waiver is requested to allow alleys to change alignment without horizontal curves [1117.12.e]. (Correct the reference to.
6. A waiver is requested to allow for dead-end alleys.
7. A waiver is requested to allow a decrease in the size of clear sight triangles.

8. A waiver is requested from the requirement that pipes shall be designed so as to provide a minimum velocity of 2.5 ft per second when conveying the design discharge.
9. A waiver of the requirement to provide sidewalks along Union Deposit Road and along Fairmont Drive for the 200 ft. from the intersection with Union Deposit Road to proposed Road I.
10. Waiver of the requirement that intersections shall be approached on all sides by a straight leveling area, the grade of which shall not exceed 4% within 60 ft. of the intersection.
11. Waiver of the right-of-way width and cartway width for all streets.
12. Waiver of the requirement that driveways shall be located not less than 40 ft. from an intersection.
13. Waiver of the requirement that driveways shall be located not less than 10 ft. from a catch basin, drain inlet, or fire hydrant.
14. Waiver of the requirement to provide curbing along Union Deposit Road and along Fairmont Drive for the 200 ft. from the intersection with Union Deposit Road to proposed Road I.

Mr. Lighty stated that Site Specific Comment #2 was resolved at the Supervisors workshop meeting. He noted that #12 is no longer necessary. Ms. Wissler agreed.

Mr. Snyder stated he has no problem with Staff's comments. Mr. Snyder did review the original comments from the County, but did not see any secondary comments. Mr. Syed stated there were no additional comments.

Mr. Lighty asked if a draft of the homeowner's agreement will be filed and when. Mr. Snyder stated that is being prepared and will be submitted prior to the plan going to the Supervisors meeting.

Craig Mellott, TPD, stated that he prepared the traffic impact study for this project. He worked with staff to decide which intersections to focus on. The study recommended several improvements at intersections. Even though many of those are in need of signalization and turning lanes today, that is not directly attributable to this development. Because of the number of intersections operating at levels below accepted standards, he, while working with staff and the engineer, had to prioritize, based on proximity to the development and safety issues. The study focused on Locust Lane at Fairmont Drive. It meets minimal PennDOT signal warrants as it is today, and the study recommends that the intersection be signalized, as well as widening it and striping it for turning lanes.

Mr. Lighty stated that Fairmont Drive at Locust Lane is very dangerous, and is already failing, and definitely needs improved. Mr. Lighty asked if the developer is willing to help the Township or work with the Township and signalize that intersection.

Mr. Troutman stated that, on behalf of the developer, they are willing to work with the Township and are committed to improving that intersection. The details of that can be worked out with the Township.

Mr. Neff asked if it would be possible to revisit the traffic issue at each phase of the development. Mr. Mellott stated the study examines the initial situation, and then 10 years out at build-out. While the commercial uses have not been selected, the study is based on conservative assumptions from a traffic perspective. Mr. Snyder stated that since the study goes 10 years out, looking at it in two years would not make a difference.

Mr. Guise asked what other improvements the developer will support or install. He asked if the study identified other intersections with problems that will get worse with the development. Mr. Mellott stated that the developer hasn't indicated they were going to work on, but the study does identify other intersections for the Township to consider. Mr. Mellott noted that there are several intersections in this area that meet warrants for signalization now, and it may not be feasible for the developer to fix every one of them. It is better to prioritize based on safety concerns or concentration of traffic to the development. From discussions with staff and the engineer, they have agreed to focus on the intersection at Locust Lane and Fairmont Drive. That intersection has a crash history that meets signal warrants now, so that could be the Township's responsibility at some point. They have agreed to install the signal, as well as turning lanes on both Locust Lane and Fairmont Drive. That will improve the capacity, i.e. the length of time you wait, as well as the safety.

Mr. Mellott stated that Locust Lane, Union Deposit Road and Nyes Road are State-owned roads. Cider Press Road and Fairmont Drive are Township roads.

Mr. Fleming stated that his comments are in the memo dated March 31, 2008, which includes concerns for the intersections of Locust Lane at Nyes Road, and Locust Lane at Fairmont Drive.

Mr. Guise asked about bullet #1 under comment #27, and if it has been addressed or if a waiver is required. Mr. Snyder stated that a waiver has been requested. Mr. Fleming recommended approving the waiver because of the environmental constraints in this area that would prevent realignment of the intersection, and the traffic calming measures should help disburse the traffic.

Mr. Lighty called for public comment.

Ms. Mussoline, 6219 Spring Knoll Road, asked if the Township or the citizens pursues the State to get improvements done to Locust Lane at Nyes Road. She has already sat for 12 minutes with 18 cars in front of her, and 12 behind her. The students at DCTS pull out into traffic squealing their tires. She has seen accidents personally, and is very concerned with the traffic and the 600 additional cars. Her second concern is that the school busses use Fairmont Drive to get from the bus garage to DCTS. It is impossible to get out of Spring Knoll when the busses are lined up. She asked about the sharp turn in the commercial area being used to control speed when they cannot control the speed there now. She asked how it will be slowed down.

Mr. Lighty stated the Township has been aware that Locust Lane at Nyes Road is a major problem. The Township has pushed PennDOT every chance it gets, to get them to fix that intersection, but unfortunately, the Township doesn't have the ability to fix it because it is State owned. Mr. Newsome encouraged the residents to contact PennDOT and the legislators. Mr. Lighty stated that the

intersection at Fairmont Drive and Locust Lane is also dangerous, and that is an improvement that the Township can realistically get out of the developer.

Mr. Snyder stated that Cider Press Road and Fairmont Drive will be very different in this development than they are now. They will be bumped out at the intersection, narrow cartway, and other methods to slow the traffic. The roads there now are scary, but that is not what a TND is, and not going to be possible. With regard to school busses, Mr. Snyder stated that all intersections, even though they are necked out, have been designed to accommodate the school busses and emergency vehicles. They can pass through the road, but it will have to be a slower speed than what they do now.

Mr. Robert Coburn, 5818 Hillsborough Court, stated that he worked for the Transportation Department for the School District for 30 years, and with the location of the high schools now, there is no longer a need for the busses to use that road, they should be going up Rutherford Road to Locust Lane to East High. Mr. Coburn asked if the houses on Hillsborough Court will be required to hook up to public water since the service is being run to the development. Mr. Lighty answered no. Mr. Coburn asked if the construction will impact the wells in his neighborhood. Mr. Lighty stated the stormwater management plan should prevent that. Mr. Fleming stated that the stormwater management plan is designed so as to not change ground water levels. They may even be improved. The wells can be monitored and protected.

Mr. Joseph Manotti, 6251 Cider Press Road, asked about the traffic increasing on Cider Press Road as a result of the development, and if a study was done for that area. Mr. Mellott stated that Cider Press Road was analyzed where it intersects Union Deposit Road. Because of the signal at Union Deposit Road and Nyes Road, there is a smaller distribution going out Cider Press Road to Union Deposit Road. The projection showed that, with the current configuration of a stop control at Union Deposit Road, it has acceptable levels of service. Mr. Manotti repeated that the traffic will increase some, but not enough to put a traffic light there. Mr. Mellott agreed.

Ms. Bernice Arthun, 5812 Barnsley Drive, thanked staff for the notification about the plan. She asked what recommendations were made for the intersection for Fairmont Drive at Union Deposit Road. She understands that they are both State roads, but felt it would still be the responsible thing for the developer to consider both major points of entry into the development. Ms. Arthun asked if someone would install a mirror opposite Stoneybrook Drive, because that is a "suicide-left-turn".

Mr. Mellott stated that the intersection of Fairmont Drive at Union Deposit Road was studied, and they also did a traffic survey. The volume of traffic is much less than Fairmont at Locust Lane, and Locust Lane at Nyes Road. There are not a significant number of left turns off of Fairmont Drive onto Union Deposit Road. The levels of service at that intersection are much better than the other two intersections. That intersection does not meet signal warrants now based on current volumes, nor does it meet signal warrants with the first phase of the development. Potentially, 10 years from now, it should be monitored by the Township. Typically, an intersection with a heavy right turn volume does not get a signal because that movement can be done easily.

Ms. Arthun asked about the sidewalks to and along Union Deposit Road. Mr. Lighty stated that sidewalks will not be installed on Union Deposit Road, or on the first 200 feet of Fairmont Drive off of

Union Deposit Road. After that first street, there will be sidewalks everywhere, and they will be wider than the typical sidewalks.

Mr. Robert Davis, 6016 Willow Spring Road, asked how the stormwater will infiltrate more than it does now. He asked how that is determined and how that will be protected for the future. Mr. Fleming stated that DEP has a requirement that they must infiltrate the difference between the stormwater runoff before and after the development. The developer's engineer has identified areas where he proposes stormwater infiltration, and designs structures that will allow stormwater to run into these areas and be captured and infiltrate into the ground. It is a passive system. Testing is done to make sure the areas are suitable for the structures. Structures mean piping system underground that stormwater can run into and be elevated. It is a perpetual system and there is maintenance in the form of inspection throughout the life of the system (the responsibility of the homeowners association). Mr. Davis stated that the homeowners association will have city water, so they won't care if stormwater goes into the ground or not. Mr. Fleming stated they are required to maintain it. Mr. Davis asked if the Township oversees it. Mr. Fleming stated the Township is involved to the extent that they will make sure the homeowners association is maintaining it. The Township does identify areas that are in need of maintenance to the homeowners associations. If the homeowners association fails to do that, the Township has the right to do the work and pass the cost back to the associations.

Mr. Davis stated that the Locust Grove development has to make the left turn from Fairmont Drive to Union Deposit Road to get to Grove Road because of the angle of Grove Road. A left turn from Union Deposit Road onto Grove Road is nearly impossible. To get around that, people go down Fairmont Drive to Union Deposit Road. He felt that needs to be addressed as well, because the people of Locust Grove depend on it.

Mr. Booker Fulmore, 6123 Spring Knoll Drive, asked about phasing. Mr. Snyder stated that the area north and west of Fairmont Drive by DCTS is first, the southwest area is second, the northeast area is third and the southeast corner is last.

Mr. Fulmore noted that the houses in Hearthside seem to be having trouble being sold, and asked if the developer is concerned that they may have a similar situation. Mr. Snyder did not think that would be a problem. A TND is a completely different lifestyle, different than anything around. Mr. Fulmore asked how long it will take to build the development. Mr. Snyder answered 6 years, but noted it is market driven. Mr. Fulmore asked how Cider Press Road and Fairmont Drive could get any narrower than they are now. Mr. Snyder stated that they will be narrower than the typical subdivision streets, which are 36 feet wide with no parking on the streets, which equates to a racetrack. This will be 20-24 feet wide and have two travel lanes, and parking on the street. The intersections will be bulbed out. It has been found that people drive slower on streets that are narrow with cars parked on it.

Mr. Fulmore asked where the stopping points will be. Mr. Snyder stated that one might be at Fairmont Drive and Cider Press Road; there will be one at the first bend of Fairmont Drive, as well as the second bend of Fairmont Drive.

Mr. Fulmore asked about the waiver for sidewalks. Mr. Lighty stated that 5-foot wide sidewalks are being required in this development on both sides of the streets. The waiver is only for 200 feet of Fairmont Drive closest to Union Deposit Road, and along the frontage of Union Deposit Road.

Mr. Gingrich asked about the time frame for phase 1 and if that includes the commercial area. Mr. Snyder stated the site work for the commercial area will be done in phase 1. The commercial buildings have not been linked to a specific phase yet. Mr. Lighty asked if the entire main street and the fountain will be constructed in phase 1, and if so, how does the township enforce that it is. Mr. Snyder stated the site work, which includes mass grading and curbing, will be in phase 1. Mr. Lighty asked when the main street will be built. Mr. Snyder stated that the street of the main street will be built in phase 1. Mr. Lighty asked about the buildings. Mr. Snyder stated it would not make financial sense to build all of main street with no residents there to use it. Mr. Lighty stated that the Township cannot permit all four phases to be built, and never get around to the main street. The main street is the heart of the community, and the main reason this Township wrote a TND ordinance. There has to be an agreement of how much of the main street will be built in what phase. Mr. Snyder agreed that should be worked on between the developer and the Township. Mr. Lighty felt that should happen at this time. Mr. Snyder thought that should go in the developer's agreement. Mr. Lighty asked if the developer would commit to a particular percentage of main street being completed in each phase, such as 33% in phase 1, 2 and 3.

Mr. Troutman stated that there needs to be a balance between residential and commercial construction. It is the intent of the developer to have that first building, shown in the slides, to be built as part of phase 1. There are a lot of factors to consider, such as residential uses and when they will be developed, commercial uses that have not been identified yet, the offices that have not been identified yet, and until they know what those are, it is difficult to give a percentage. Mr. Troutman stated that, while he understands the abstract of what the Township is asking for, it is difficult to realistically give a number. The infrastructure and the road system also have to be installed and have to be considered simultaneously with the other aspects of the development. Mr. Troutman stated they could commit to work with the Township to get it worked out.

Mr. Newsome stated that the developer has implied a certain percentage of commercial space in phase 1, so they obviously have considered some percentage. Mr. Troutman agreed they have considered it, and they have considered a number of ways to go about it. Different types of housing demands different types of commercial uses.

Mr. Newsome asked if the developer could, in phase 1, install the curbing or some other thing to show and tie down what it will look like. He noted that other TNDs have extensive roadway work done in phase 1. He asked how much improvements can be installed to support the downtown area.

Mr. Troutman understood the comments, and stated that the road and the curbing will be installed in phase 1 so that the area can be used. Mr. Troutman stated they commit to the concept, but cannot commit to a number right now.

Mr. Neff stated the commercial can't be built with nobody to shop there, and the houses can't be built with no main street. Rather than base the numbers on phases, Mr. Neff suggested that certain

things occur based on the number or percentage of building permits pulled, not occupancy permits. That seems to be fair to the merchants and the residents. Mr. Newsome agreed, noting it is critical to the endeavor that potential residents can get a feel for the commercial area.

Mr. Newsome noted that this is the first time Lower Paxton Township has done a TND, and is the most significant development in central Pennsylvania. The township is learning as they go, and it has already been a long and involved process. This issue is only one of the many the Township and developer have worked on.

Mr. Troutman agreed an agreement should be made, but did not agree that an arbitrary number should be placed on it right now. Mr. Lighty asked when the Township gets it, if not now. Mr. Troutman stated it would be in place before going before the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Gingrich suggested requiring one of the seven commercial buildings at set intervals. Mr. Troutman stated the design is that the second floor will go across a breezeway, so the first floor will be separated by that walk way while the second floor will have the potential to be bigger than the lower part. There are not necessarily seven buildings, but those breaks shown on the plan are the walkways connecting the parking in the rear to the storefronts.

After some discussion, Mr. Troutman stated that the developer is willing to commit to 25% of the first floor commercial space by the time 25% of the residential building permits are issued. Mr. Lighty questioned "first floor". Mr. Troutman stated it means the first floor of the commercial space, to include the building up to the roof, but the square footage shall be based on the first floor.

Mr. Troutman suggested the following ratios: 25% residential to 25% commercial first floor space, then 50/50, then 75/75, and finally 90% residential/100% commercial. Mr. Guise asked about the statement that the first commercial building will be started right away, and didn't want the developer to wait until 25% of the residential building permits were issued before starting the commercial buildings. Mr. Lighty stated the agreement is to set a floor, and if they want to build the entire commercial strip right away that would be fine. Mr. Guise agreed to "not less than".

Mr. Lighty asked if that language will be in the developer's agreement. Mr. Troutman stated that is correct.

Mr. Lighty asked if the fountain pond can be done up front as well. Mr. Troutman stated it is their intention to install that in the beginning. Mr. Lighty asked if they would commit to at least the fountain part of it by the end of Phase 1. Mr. Troutman and Mr. Snyder answered yes.

Mr. Lighty asked if the fountain is lit. Mr. Troutman wasn't sure what the plan showed. Mr. Snyder stated the specifications for the fountain do have the capability to be lit.

Mr. Newsome emphasized that the fountain is the focal point of the development and it is very important that this fountain has plenty of pressure to be impressive. Mr. Lighty stated the fountain is shown at 17 feet about the street level. He asked if that is sufficient to meet the ordinance requirement that it be the actual focal point. Mr. Troutman stated that this focal point was specifically discussed

from the very beginning and it doesn't do any good to have a fountain that doesn't get seen. They will make sure that does get seen, but they couldn't say what the spray will look like at this time. He noted that you will view the fountain from coming up the main street, and that the fountain will be elevated in relation to your position so it will appear larger than 17 feet. Mr. Lighty emphasized that it has to be substantial enough that you can see it clearly from anywhere on the main street.

Mr. Lighty asked if the fountain will be seasonal or year round. Mr. Troutman will get the information from the pump manufacturer and then be able to answer that specific question. Their intent is to always have that be the focal point.

Ms. Mussoline, 6219 Spring Knoll Road, stated that the houses in Hearthiside have been vacant for years, and asked if the single family homes do not sell, would the builder skip them and build more townhouses. She asked if there has to be a buyer to build a home. She asked if the market calls for townhomes, and they run out of townhomes in phase 1, will they move to phase two without building the single homes in order to get more townhomes. Mr. Troutman answered yes. Ms. Mussoline stated that building more homes regardless of style gets more of the main street built.

Mr. Rob Davis, 6016 Willow Spring Road, asked how the neighborhood is going to be lit. He noted that some neighborhoods do not have street lights, and he prefers that, but some neighborhoods look like day light 24/7. He asked if there is a way to light this neighborhood and keep the lighting on the ground. Mr. Fleming stated that there is a street tree and lighting plan that shows street lights intermixed with street trees. The spread of the light is also shown on the plan. The lights are designed to light the sidewalks and into the street area, but not up light the neighborhood. Mr. Davis wanted the light shown down and not 360 degrees. Mr. Lighty stated that these are not parking lot lamps like in Paxton Towne Centre, they are pedestrian scale.

Ms. Angie Orcini, 6172 Spring Knoll Drive, agreed a traffic signal is needed at Locust Lane and Fairmont Drive, but Spring Knoll development has only one way in or out. The entrance to her development is about five car-lengths to the intersection. She asked how the traffic light backing up will impact her development. She noted that stop signs in the other direction may back up traffic the other way. Mr. Mellott stated that currently going north on Fairmont Drive approaching Locust Lane there is one lane with a channelized right turn, and it will be widened to have a left turn lane, a through lane and maintain the right turn channel. There will be more room to stack cars. Mr. Lighty stated that cars stack waiting and waiting to get onto Locust Lane, but when the traffic on Locust Lane is stopped to let the cars on Fairmont Drive out once in a while, the wait should be less. Mr. Mellott agreed. Ms. Orcini asked about the widening and how close that would be to the Spring Knoll houses. Mr. Lighty stated that the design isn't done, and there is sufficient right-of-way to widen.

Mr. Guise made a motion to recommend approval of the plan, including approval of the 14 requested waivers. The approval shall be subject to compliance with the comments submitted, and the approval shall be conditioned upon the execution of a developers agreement stating that a minimum of 25% of the commercial area shall be built at the time of 25% of the residential building permits are issued, a minimum of 50% of the commercial area shall be built at the time of 50% of the residential building permits are issued, a minimum of 75% of the commercial area shall be built at the time of 75% of the residential building permits are issued, and that 100% of the commercial shall be completed at the

time of 90% of the residential building permits are issued; and that the fountain, which is the focal point of the development, shall be designed and constructed so as to remain the focal point of the development and be appropriately lit; and the approval shall also be conditioned upon the developer agreeing to and following through on the traffic improvements to Locust Lane at Fairmont Drive subject to PennDOT approval and the availability of right-of-way as described in the traffic plan. Mr. Beverly seconded the motion and a unanimous vote followed.

## **NEW BUSINESS**

### **Conditional Use 08-02** **Giant Food Stores, LLC**

Ms. Moran stated that the Township has received a Conditional Use Permit Application that would allow a gasoline station with three double-sided fuel dispensers and an attendant's kiosk to monitor fueling operations and assist customers. The attendant's kiosk is not accessible to the public; however, some convenience items are sold from the kiosk. The site will also contain a two-bay automatic carwash along Union Deposit Road.

The site is the former Denny's restaurant and the Point Shopping Center. The property is zoned CG, Commercial General District, which allows the carwash as a permitted use. The auto service station (gas station) is a conditional use.

Ms. Moran stated that written notification has been sent to all surrounding property owners within the neighborhood.

Mr. Doug Gossik was present on behalf of the plan.

Mr. Neff asked how the permitted signage compares to the ordinance. Mr. Gossik stated the standard sign package should be in compliance or close, and what has been presented in the pamphlet is not formally proposed and he understands that there is a separate process for signage.

Mr. Kerry Eck, Real Estate Representative for Giant, stated that a typical gas station has a 50 foot tall sign you can see from the highway, and that is not what is proposed here. They would like a small freestanding monument or a digital price sign on the existing pylon sign that serves the shopping center now.

Mr. Lighty questioned the entrance on Union Deposit Road, and noted there are a lot of accidents there now. He asked if it would be wise to have another entrance onto Union Deposit Road. Mr. Gossik stated that they will be maintaining the existing entrance for Denny's. The primary benefit of that entrance is to get the fuel truck to the fuel island. The movement of the truck is in through that entrance, through the site, then exiting through the shopping center, to the signal at East Park Drive to get back to Union Deposit Road. The radius will have to be improved to accommodate that truck, and that will require PennDOT HOP approval.

Mr. Syed asked about stacking of cars and if they would block the entrance. Mr. Gossik stated that the carwash stacking will be segregated from the fuel island area. There is 30 feet on the west side of the fuel island that provides stacking spaces at each pump and 24 feet behind the kiosk, so there is a generous area for stacking. Mr. Syed asked about the number of vehicles stacked. Mr. Gossik stated that they can have one at the pump with 2 stacked behind it.

Mr. Neff asked about the vacuums. He was concerned about the pull-in and back-out movements, because the backing out would be into the traffic for the carwash or into the gas pump circulation. He suggested parallel parking instead. Mr. Gossik stated that he can consult Keystone Petroleum with regard to the question.

Mr. Lighty called for public comment.

A resident from Acri Drive stated that there are two big ponds in his neighborhood that had a problem with run-off from the parking lot or from a broken sewer pipe. It limited the usage of the pond for four years. He asked about spillage preventive measures. He stated that even though people don't use the pond for anything, they still go down there, and the sewer pipe break impacted that. Other than those concerns, the resident was happy to get a gas station there. Mr. Gossik stated that this will be a state of the art fuel facility, above industry standards from a safety standpoint, with double walled fiberglass tanks and the space between the walls of the tank is monitored for any fluids not just gasoline. There is seamless double walled piping from the tanks to the pumps. The pumps have breakaway handles and hoses. There is a 24-hour monitoring service at the fuel island. If the operation of the fuel island is discontinued, Giant will remove the fuel island in its entirety, including the subsurface tanks and restoring the area to its original condition. Mr. Gossik stated that any stormwater inlets will have filters installed, and will be maintained continually.

Mr. Booker Fulmore, 6123 Spring Knoll Drive, stated that he was concerned that the lot was very small for a gas station. His other concern is the carwashes, and the traffic it will generate. Mr. Fulmore was not in favor of something going on that site with a carwash.

A resident from 1030 Scenery Drive, stated she is not in favor of the carwash because of all of the traffic on Union Deposit Road as well as the traffic in the parking lot. She is also concerned about lighting, and asked for some consideration for residential neighbors. Mr. Lighty stated the older businesses were under a different ordinance, but this will have to comply with a strict lighting ordinance.

Mr. Beverly made a motion to recommend approval of the conditional use, subject to compliance with the comments generated by staff, county, and engineer, and asked that the Board of Supervisors take into consideration the comments made by the public. Mr. Guise seconded the motion. Mr. Lighty called for discussion on the motion. Mr. Guise stated that the carwash is a permitted use, so the gas station is the only thing under the conditional use, and no action is being taken on the carwash at this time. Mr. Lighty stated that this use will probably draw a lot less traffic than many other permitted uses, such as a fast food restaurant. He also noted that it is only gas pumps, no convenience store associated with the pumps. Mr. Gossik stated that a gas station is pass-by traffic, and doesn't generate new trips. A unanimous vote followed.

**Special Exception 08-01**  
**Advantage Medical Transport, Inc.**  
**d/b/a Advantage Ambulance**

Ms. Wissler stated this application is for the old firehouse property on Firehouse Lane, off of Union Deposit Road. Most recently, the property was used as a karate studio. An emergency service station is a special exception in the IN, Institutional District.

Mr. Serge Sivchuk was present on behalf of the application.

Mr. Guise asked if the current uses will remain in the building. Mr. Serge stated that it was designed for emergency vehicles, and will go back to that.

Mr. Newsome asked if it was a service station. Mr. Serge stated that they are non-emergency, and are not part of the 911 system. The building will house the company employees and its vehicles. Inside the building will house maintenance and storage of the vehicles and office space.

Mr. Newsome asked if the company has 24-hour service. Mr. Serge stated that the company is non-emergency, so it does scheduled transports, during the day.

Mr. Guise made a motion to advise the Zoning Hearing Board that the Planning Commission has no objection to Special Exception 08-01. Mr. Newsome seconded the motion and a unanimous vote followed.

**Preliminary/Final Subdivision Plan #08-05**  
**Olympic Realty**

Ms. Wissler stated that the purpose of this plan is to subdivide the Wendy's site from the parent Home Depot parcel. The property is located at 5101 Jonestown Road and is zoned CG, General Commercial District. The tract possesses 11.8882 acres and is served by public sewer and water.

On February 28, 2008, the Zoning Hearing Board granted the following variances for the Home Depot lot (New Lot 1): Minimum lot width of 200 feet at building setback along an arterial street; Impervious surface coverage of 75%; Number of parking spaces required is 551 spaces; and Number of street trees required is fifteen. They also granted the following variances for the Wendy's lot (New Lot 2): A minimum lot width of 200 feet at building setback along an arterial street; Impervious surface coverage of 75; Number of parking spaces required is 54 spaces; and Minimum of ten feet parking setback from building.

The following waivers have been requested:

1. Waiver of the requirement to submit a Preliminary Plan.
2. Waiver of the requirement to submit a Stormwater Management Plan.
3. Waiver of the requirement to submit an Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan.
4. Waiver of the requirement to provide elevation contours.

Mr. Lighty asked if the separate lots would comply on its own. Ms. Wissler stated that they needed the variances, and there is some parking that is off-site, but there is an easement for the parking. Mr. Lighty asked if there is anything besides the variances that will be non-conforming. Ms. Wissler answered no.

Mr. Jeffrey Staub, Dauphin Engineering Co., stated he has received comments from staff, engineer and county, and does not have a problem with any of them.

Mr. Guise asked if Arby's is already a separate lot. Mr. Staub answered yes.

Mr. Neff asked about stormwater. Mr. Staub stated the property was originally the coal yard whose stormwater ran down to the Sheesley tract, which is now Paxton Towne Centre. When Paxton Towne Centre was built, they routed the stormwater through the site to a large detention basin behind Target. That is stormwater from Arby's, Wendy's, Home Depot, Fulton Bank, K-Mart, and is before the stormwater ordinance. The water is collected and runs to a natural drainage way. There are cross-easements between Wendy's and Home Depot. Mr. Fleming stated he has asked Mr. Staub to show that and make sure they are contained.

Mr. Staub stated that he is going to ask for a waiver for the HRG comment about showing storm sewer and inlets. The plan is fairly small, and adding that information will clutter the plan. He will have the waiver request in writing to the Township as soon as possible. The information is available elsewhere, on the Builders Square plan, the Home Depot plan, the Arby's plan, and the Wendy's plan. He stated he can put it on the drawing, but felt it was unnecessary. Mr. Fleming stated he would support the waiver if Mr. Staub would show the pipes. Mr. Lighty asked that a note be put on the plan to indicate where the information is available at.

Mr. Syed noted the 43 parking spaces are unclear. Mr. Staub offered to shade them.

Mr. Guise made a motion to recommend approval of the plan, approval of the 4 waivers, and the partial waiver of showing the storm sewer lines, subject to showing the lines only; subject to compliance with the comments and to outline/shade the 43 parking spaces prior to action by the Board of Supervisors. Mr. Neff seconded the motion and a unanimous vote followed.

**Preliminary/Final Land Development #08-06**  
**Hoffman Ford Sales**

Ms. Wissler stated that the purpose of this plan is to construct a 7,000 square foot building addition to the Hoffman Ford facility located at 5200 Jonestown Road. The tract, which consists of 7.13 acres, is zoned CG, Commercial General District and will be served by public sewer and public and private water.

The applicant has requested a waiver of the requirement to submit a Stormwater Management Plan and a waiver of the requirement to submit a preliminary plan.

Christopher Pecora, Hartman & Associates, was present on behalf of the plan. The addition will serve additional service bays and additional body shop area. The building will be on existing impervious surface. He noted they are asking for a waiver of the stormwater management plan because they are not increasing the impervious coverage.

M. Pecora stated he has received the comments from staff, County and HRG. He asked about HRG #8, and stated that the size of the parking spaces vary, some are for display area, customer and employee parking. Mr. Lighty suggested a note on the plan to say there are no spaces less than a certain width so as not to have to dimension every parking space on a car lot. Mr. Fleming agreed that was fine, but noted the comment refers to the relocated spaces only. Mr. Pecora agreed to dimension the relocated spaces.

With regard to #11, that area is already used regularly, and will continue the same low dust or no dust conditions. Mr. Fleming stated that if he can meet the ratio without those spaces, he should not show them on the plan.

Mr. Pecora asked about staff comment #10. Ms. Wissler stated that is a standard comment and needs to be stated on the plan.

Mr. Pecora asked about #12. Ms. Wissler stated that is also a standard note and refers to stop signs and other traffic signs on the property.

With regard to #18, Mr. Pecora stated that there is macadam to the curb, so it is walkable already without sidewalks. Jaycee Avenue has a very steep slope and prohibits sidewalks there. Ms. Wissler stated that a waiver request should be put in writing for Jaycee Avenue, Carolyn Street and Jonestown Road, but cautioned the applicant that he should be prepared for the Supervisors to want sidewalks along Jonestown Road.

Mr. Pecora questioned comment #19 about buffering. He stated that the area to the west is the marina and some residential uses. There is some natural buffer there with the slopes and trees.

Ms. Wissler noted that comment #20 is no longer applicable.

Mr. Pecora asked about general comment #3. He stated that other than the sidewalk on Jonestown Road, there are no public improvements. Mr. Gingrich asked about the possibility of sidewalks on Jaycee Avenue. Mr. Pecora stated the slopes would require some significant earth-moving. Mr. Newsome asked if there are curbs already in place. Mr. Pecora answered yes. After looking at the existing conditions page of the plan, Mr. Gingrich agreed that waiving the sidewalks on Jaycee and Carolyn would be appropriate.

Mr. Neff asked if the stormwater goes to the lake. Mr. Pecora stated that the runoff is collected by a series of inlets then goes into the lake as it always has. There will be no new runoff by the work proposed for this development. Mr. Neff asked about contaminants in the runoff and how they are controlled. Mr. Fleming stated that there is an oil receptor that catches oil and other debris that may come from a parking lot. That does require maintenance every few months. Mr. Neff asked about filter

bags. Mr. Fleming explained that those are temporary devices for sediment control. Mr. Pecora stated there is an infiltration bed in the area where the work is proposed. There is some control and maintenance there, as well as a vegetative strip between the parking lot and the infiltration bed. Vegetative buffers are a Best Management Practice. Mr. Fleming noted that the measures in place do meet the ordinance requirements.

Mr. Newsome made a motion to recommend approval of the plan, and approval of the waivers for a stormwater management plan and the requirement to submit a preliminary plan, and also approval of a waiver of the requirement to install sidewalks along Jaycee Avenue and Carolyn Street, and recommend disapproval of the waiver request for sidewalks along Jonestown Road. Approval shall be subject to addressing the comments. The sidewalk waiver must be submitted in writing to the Township. Mr. Beverly seconded the motion and a unanimous vote followed.

**Preliminary/Final Subdivision Plan #08-07**  
**Wenrich Heights**

Ms. Moran stated that the Township has received a plan to subdivide 1120 Wenrich Street into 18 multi-family, fee-simple building lots. The property consists of 4.1539 acres and is zoned R-2, Medium Density Residential District. The property is located west off Wenrich Street and south of Linglestown Road. The property will be served by public sewer and public water.

The applicant has requested the following waivers: waiver of the preliminary plan requirement; waiver of the requirement that driveways shall not be located within 10 feet from a catch basin, drain inlet or fire hydrant (staff supports as long as the inlet tops are appropriately blended into the driveway openings); waiver of the minor street right-of-way width; and waiver of the minor street width.

Mr. Jeffrey Staub was present on behalf of the plan. Mr. Staub stated he has received the comments from staff, county and engineer. He met with Ms. Moran and Mr. Fleming to discuss the HRG comments, and can address the comments.

With regard to HRG comment #12, Mr. Staub stated that four recent plans have gotten waivers from the street width requirement, specifically, Montrail and Tuscan Villas were reduced from 36 to 30 feet, and Rosewood and Victoria Abbey were reduced from 36 to 32 feet.

Mr. Fleming stated that his concern is with on-street parking. Each home meets the parking requirements with the driveway and garage, but will use the street for guests. Mr. Fleming stated that he received an exhibit showing 13 vehicles parked on the street. He will support the request as long as the other side of the street has a parking restriction.

Mr. Lighty asked about the purpose of reducing the cartway. Mr. Staub stated it will cost less. If a 60 foot right-of-way is provided, the plan will have to be redesigned with smaller footprints. A reduced width of 32 feet as opposed to 30 feet does not gain more parking spaces. Mr. Staub stated that this plan is consistent with the Rosewood plan. Mr. Lighty stated that there were reasons for Rosewood to reduce the cartway, and none for this plan. Mr. Lighty stated that visitors to the north side of the road will park on the other side of the street. Mr. Staub stated that the only way to have parking on both sides

is to pave 34 feet. Mr. Fleming noted that the plan shows single car garages for each unit, and there is a probability that at least some of the units will end up with two-car garages.

Mr. Guise asked if the street will be a public street. Mr. Staub answered yes.

Mr. Guise asked if the plan could accommodate two-car garages. Mr. Staub stated that Mr. Loew instructed him to use the footprint from Hillside Villas in Susquehanna Township. He speculated that given today's market, some people may want a two-car garage. He also noted that the footprint shown is not exact, and the dimensions and shape may vary, while staying inside the setbacks.

Mr. Lighty stated that narrow streets are good for traffic calming; otherwise they should be user friendly.

Mr. Newsome stated that if the cartway is 36 feet, you get six more parking spaces.

Mr. Fleming stated that the street width requirement is based on the density of the development and he felt that the plan shown is adequate.

Mr. Grove noted his street is not wide enough for two vehicles to pass when there are cars on both sides, and he prefers a wide street for ease of travel.

Mr. Gingrich would like to see less impervious coverage, from an environmental standpoint.

Mr. Newsome was not convinced that the developer couldn't do a wider street and still meet the setback requirements. Mr. Staub stated he can, but the apron for the driveway will be steeper like those in Whisper Wood.

Mr. Beverly preferred a wider street for emergency vehicles to get by parked cars.

With regard to HRG #35, Mr. Staub stated that there will be no homeowners association since Mr. Loew will own and maintain the lot with the detention facility. Mr. Fleming agreed that was discussed in their meeting, and noted that Mr. Loew will maintain the lot, and when he sells that home, he will make the buyer aware of the responsibility.

Mr. Syed, Dauphin County, asked if a fire hydrant will be installed. Mr. Staub stated that there is an exiting water line in Whisper Wood Lane, so they can run public water into the site, so there will be at least one new fire hydrant.

Mr. Neff asked if the applicant considered an island in the cul-de-sac. Mr. Staub stated he did not. He can talk to Mr. Loew about an island. Mr. Staub personally prefers them, but they do require a waiver. Mr. Lighty stated that the commission does recommend that an island be installed.

With regard to street width, Mr. Staub asked the Commission's preference. Mr. Newsome stated the Commission wants 36 feet. Mr. Staub stated he will withdraw the waiver.

Mr. Guise made a motion to recommend approval of the plan, and approval of the waiver of the preliminary plan requirement; waiver of the requirement that driveways shall not be located within 10 feet from a catch basin, drain inlet or fire hydrant, waiver of the minor street right-of-way width (from 60 to 50); and recommend disapproval of the waiver of the minor street cartway width of 36 feet, the Commission prefers the street width to be 36 feet. The approval shall be subject to addressing the comments. Mr. Guise further stated that the Commission recommends that an island be installed if the developer is so inclined, and that if a waiver is necessary for that, that it be granted. Mr. Newsome seconded the motion and a unanimous vote followed.

### **Public Comment**

There was no further public comment.

### **Commissioner & Staff Comment**

Ms. Wissler stated that staff has encountered another correction that needs to be made to the zoning map for two parcels on Doehne Road. They are shown as both BC, and R-1, and they should be only R-1. Commissioners agreed.

Mr. Lighty stated that there is a meeting Monday, April 21<sup>st</sup> at 5:30 pm regarding improvement districts.

Mr. Syed stated that the County has a model SALDO that is available to municipalities.

### **Adjournment**

The next regular Planning Commission meeting is scheduled for May 14, 2008, at 7:00 pm at the Lower Paxton Township Municipal Center, Room 171.

Being no further business, Mr. Grove made a motion to adjourn. Mr. Beverly seconded the motion, and the meeting adjourned at 10:55 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Michelle Hiner  
Recording Secretary