

Lower Paxton Township

Planning Commission

Meeting Minutes

March 2, 2022

Commissioners Present

Fredrick Lighty
Doug Grove
Jeff Kline
Everette Hamilton
Sandra Bloom
Kurt Meckes
Courtney Powell (alternate)

Also Present

Nick Gehret, Lower Paxton Codes Officer
Jason Hinz, HRG. Inc.
Andrew Bomberger, D.C.P.C.

Call to Order

Mr. Lighty called to order the Lower Paxton Township Planning Commission meeting at 7:00pm on the above date in room 171 of the Lower Paxton Township Municipal Building at 425 Prince Street, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania.

Pledge of Allegiance

Mr. Kline led the recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance.

Meeting Minutes

Mr. Lighty asked if there were any questions or changes to the February 2, 2022, Lower Paxton Township Planning Commission Meeting minutes. Mr. Grove made a motion to approve the February 2, 2022, Lower Paxton Township Planning Commission Meeting minutes. Mr. Hamilton seconded the motion and a unanimous vote followed.

New Business

a. Review of the Existing Features Plan and Yield Plan for Parkway Farms

Mr. Gehret stated that the Lower Paxton Township Planning Commission has received the following information on the Review of the existing Features Plan and Yield Plan for Parkway Farms. Which under the Open Space Development Overlay District, the applicant is required to provide an existing features plan and yield plan for review as part of the application for an open space development. The density, open space and lot standards and maximum number of dwelling units on the tract shall be determined based upon an existing features map and a yield plan.

The Parkway Farms tract encompasses two parcels 35-004-694, and 35-004-030 with a total area of 31.6 acres. A total of 44 single-family dwelling units are possible under the current R-1 zoning district if the open space development provisions would not be used. The maximum number of dwelling units allowed on the tract through open space development shall be 10% greater than the number of dwelling units that is determined upon review of the yield plan.

It is the applicant's belief that a total of 49 dwelling units is possible when utilizing the Open Space Development Overlay.

Mr. Lighty asked Mr. Gehret regarding the yield plan and Lot # 3 does the developed set back apply, and the different points of access to Lot # 43 to be developed as well, Mr. Gehret stated that the wetland setbacks do apply.

Lauren McDaniels, McNaughton Company was present to represent the review. Mr. Joel McNaughton, McNaughton Company, was present to represent the review. Ms. McDaniels stated that the Farm and Yield Farm are east of Autumn Oaks and were on plan 21-05 in 2021 with the site Open Space on the Open Plan. The wet plains are on the property with no woodlands. The Yield Plan has several lots that are zoning land. There are 44 dwelling lots that are R-1 low density criteria and looking to have the cul de sac waivable.

Mr. Meckes stated that adding five lots into the plan, 49 lots and they are proposing 48 lots of 20,000 sq. feet instead of 10,000 sq. feet. The wetlands are on lots 1,2,3 and 43. Mr. Lighty stated that the yards would be under water in a storm. The Township than would hear about the water issues. Mr. Grove stated that looking at the lots does the D.E.P. see that it is fit to develop on those areas. If the yard gets water the Township hears the flack. The house may not get water, but the yard will. The homeowners need to understand this. Option to adjust to 44 lots. Mr. Bomberger stated that the Open Space Development Overlay is environmental concern with the Yield Plan and to give the density number. 44 lots, open space areas are all protected. Mr. Bomberger stated that there is nothing of the Yield Plan to be on the plan? The 44-unit layout could go to 49 in a concentrated area where the backyards were not wet. The expectation is 1, 2, 3, 42 and 43 to develop wetlands. Smaller lots proposing 4 up to 5 with proposing 48 lots. Mr. Lighty stated without open space or overlay, to cluster 44 to 48.

Mr. Meckes stated that more in less area of wetlands a lot more lots on layout. It is entirely different if used as open space (20) and the cul de sac. There is a 250 ft. concern if the cul de sac is waived.

Mr. Grove stated that looking at the five lots at least 1/3 to 1/2 of the ground is in the wetlands, determine that there is a way to be developed more than what the sketch plan really determines. Five lots with wetland coverage are developable even if they will not be developed. Ms. McDaniels stated that while situating a dwelling on lot 43 with a different access to the back portion of the lot. Mr. Gehret stated that a shared driveway permitting to get thru the lot. The wetland ordinance is 50 % total available lot with 20,000 sq. feet. The lot 43 access to lot 44 permit over the wetland is the benefit of the yield plan. Mr. Grove stated that the open space conservation on all wetlands. The wetlands are not developable and are not sectional off. Mr. Lighty stated that smaller lots should not make someone else's backyard smaller.

HRG Comments

Mr. Hinz stated that his concerns are the length of the cul de sac, the number of lots based on the waiver. There is no waiver to the yield plan. The zoning ordinance, the maximum under the current township ordinance, decrease length to 600 feet and how many lots adjusted or how many lots lost without seeing the plan. Ms. McDaniel stated that the zoning is to be used. Mr. Hinz stated that the Land Development Plan waiver for Open Space and the Yield Plan has the R-1 criteria. This is the toughest yield plan. Mr. Joel McNaughton stated that Open Space Overlay Plan was much more live able. Provide the depiction of R-1 sketch plan. The lots of 1, 2 and 3 would love to have the wildlife, depiction of the R-1 plan. Mr. McNaughton stated we could have drawn the shared driveways with the lot sizes 600 feet. Mr. Hinz stated that judging by reasonableness.

Mr. Meckes stated that 10% more open space you cannot mess up. Ms. Powell stated that put a house on lot 43 under R-1 and share a driveway with lot 44 would be reasonable or go thru a soggy environmental with cross wetland into a small place.

Mr. Grove made a motion to recommend the approval of the review of the Existing Features Plan and Yield Plan for Parkway Farms to allow Open Space Development Overlay to increase the dwelling units on 2 parcels with the approval of the comments from Staff, County and HRG. Mr. Kline seconded the motion and a unanimous vote followed.

b. Review of the Master Plan for Cider Press Development

Mr. Gehret stated that the Lower Paxton Township Planning Commission has received the following information on the Review of the Master Plan for Cider Press Development. If an applicant is proposing a development within the Traditional Neighborhood Development Overlay District, the applicant is required to provide a master plan. The Master Plan is required to show the proposed streets and cartway widths, alleys, approximate lot lines and dimensions, common open spaces, recreation areas, major pedestrian and bicycle pathways, parking areas, major detention basins and proposed types of housing.

The Cider Press Master Plan proposes 76 new single-family lots and has a total area of 27.78 acres situated on parcel 35-066-002 which is bisected by Cider Press Road. Due to the existing Shadebrook development which is adjacent to the proposed TND extension. The proposed development is permitted to have a minimum lot size of 20 acres, provided that the second TND is designed to be consistent with the first TND. Including compatible architectural standards with the first TND and a logical extension of streets. Additionally, the proposed TND extension is not required to include commercial uses since the adjacent TND "Shadebrook" has an existing commercial area.

Jared Sawyer, John Fox, Joe Burget, Burget & Associates, and Stan Stakowsky were present to represent the plan. A discussion on the TND. Mr. Sawyer state that it is R-1 with the 89 potential units, 76 single family no muti family nor duplexes. 48% open space, with a walking trail behind Union Station to a park, sidewalk to Cider Press Road that loops along Nyes Road. Mr. Lighty stated that this is right and wrong. The building of architectural greatness and streetscapes. The increase of density and a trail downhill to Nyes Run. Propose a park to the top left of the property or to the bottom right of the property. Possibly

4 or 5 parking spaces to the walking trail with the street scape with the higher density. The park at the left would only serve 4 houses. The connection to Spring Knoll should be explored. Mr. Bomberger stated that with TND walkability and interconnections should be noted From Shadebrook to Weston Drive.

Mr. Gehret stated looking at the plan, is a walking trail with ability for residents to get to Nyes Run and walk the trail. The maintenance of the trail will be on whom. Mr. Sawyer stated that trail should be paved, and the HOA will have to maintain the trail. It is a 100-year-old flood plain. If it is considered Open Space, would it be for everyone to enjoy. Ms. Powell stated if you switch parks with the stormwater facility and expand the walking trail from the top to the bottom of both parks.

Mr. Bomberger stated that public transit and Open Space should be considered and looked at. The Regional bike/pedestrian connection is 400 feet of Union Deposit Road crossing and expanding the trail. Nyes Road is not walkable. Mr. Lighty stated that a nature trail is to be 5 feet to 10 foot wide.

Mr. Gehret stated to come back to the Planning Commission with a master plan.

Next Regular Meeting: April 6, 2022

The next regular Lower Paxton Township Planning Commission Meeting is scheduled for April 6, 2022.

Adjournment

Mr. Hamilton made a motion to adjourn the March 2, 2022, Planning Commission Meeting. Mr. Grove seconded the motion and a unanimous voted followed. The meeting adjourned at 8:20 pm.

Sincerely submitted,

Michele Kwasnoski
Recording Secretary