

**LOWER PAXTON TOWNSHIP
PLANNING COMMISSION**

May 12, 2010

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT

Fredrick Lighty
Ernest Gingrich
Dennis Guise
Richard Beverly
Robin Lindsey

ALSO PRESENT

Dianne Moran, Planning & Zoning Officer
Steve Fleming, HRG, Township Engineer
Drew Ames, 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 May 12, 2010 in Room 171 of the Lower Paxton Township Municipal Center, 425 Prince Street, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO THE FLAG

Ms. Lindsey led the recitation of the Pledge.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Gingrich made a motion to approve the minutes of the April 19, 2010 workshop meeting and the March 15, 2010 workshop meeting. Ms. Lindsey seconded the motion, and a unanimous vote followed.

NEW BUSINESS

**Preliminary/Final Land Development Plan #10-03
Pleasant Meadows**

Ms. Moran stated that the purpose of this plan is to provide an independent living development containing approximately ninety (90) single family residential units and sixty (60) apartment-style units. This property contains 36.09 acres and is zoned Residential-Cluster. The property is located north of Locust Lane and west of the intersection of Locust Lane and Fairmont Drive. The property will be served by public sewer and public water.

The Zoning Hearing Board granted a variance via docket #1254 allowing the development of the parcel with a total of 150 units, of which no less than 90 be single family detached dwellings with the condition that the development proceed as an age-restricted community.

The applicant has requested the following waivers:

1. Waiver of the requirement to provide curb and sidewalk on Locust Lane west of proposed Primrose Place and sidewalk along a small portion along Fairmont Drive. [905]. Also a waiver is requested of the requirement to provide sidewalks along the private streets within the development.
2. Waiver of the requirement to provide curbing and widening of adjacent streets (451 feet along Fairmont Drive) [1117.03(m)].
3. Waiver of the cul-de-sac diameter and construction [1117.04(b)]
4. Waiver of the 30' width street requirement for private streets within the development. [1117.05(a)]
5. Waiver of the 275' minimum street centerline radii requirement. The applicant is proposing a street centerline radius of 150 feet. [1117.06(a)]
6. Waiver of the 400' minimum separation distance requirement between minor or private street intersections. [1117.08(c)]
7. Waiver of the requirement to provide vertical curbing. [1117.14]
8. Waiver of the requirement to provide a preliminary plan. [1119.01(b)]
9. Waiver of the plan sheet size requirement. [1121.02]

Mr. John Kerschner, representing the Parmer Family Foundation, and Mr. James Snyder of Snyder Secary & Associates, were present on behalf of the plan.

Mr. Kerschner stated they have been working on a use for this tract for some time to implement one of the goals of the Foundation, which is an affordable housing option for the elders of the community. It is an independent living situation. The original plan made it all the way to the Board of Supervisors, where passionate public hearing swayed the Board to vote against the application. Taking the positive aspects of the application and working through the negative, they have come up with the plan before the Commission tonight. It includes 90 single level detached cottages, and up to 60 units in a three-story building Mr. Kerschner stated the Parmer Foundation is a not-for-profit enterprise, hoping to provide affordable independent living for the elderly in the community. It is designed for individuals that do not need a large home anymore, or for a widow/widower who can no longer maintain their own home. This will not compete with other independent living facilities which provide assistance, this will only be for independent individuals. The ownership will be condominium style. This will provide the individual the opportunity to purchase the unit or lease it. When the person no longer needs the home, the Foundation will buy it back, rehabilitate the home and put it back on the market. When the home goes back on the market, it will be at a price similar to the original selling price, and it will become more and more affordable as time goes on. The difference between other existing facilities such as Bethany Village or The Masonic Home is this facility will be much smaller and will not provide assistance, and the units will be affordable.

Mr. Kerschner explained that the density of this neighborhood is very similar to the surrounding neighborhoods between the Central Dauphin Middle School and the subject parcel. When they made the presentation to the Zoning Hearing Board, they pointed out that the "brick yard" neighborhood is similar to this in density and size and style of home. The proposed homes will be more energy efficient and easier to maintain. The age of the proposed residents will have less of a traffic demand than a typical residential development. The traffic patterns will also vary from the peak hours for those going to work or school.

Mr. Kerschner stated that the Zoning Hearing Board reviewed and granted the variances requested.

Jim Snyder offered to go through the comments, and noted that none of the comments will materially change the plan. He would like to answer the technical questions for the Commission.

Mr. Lighty asked about Staff's Site Specific comment regarding the recreation fee. Mr. Snyder stated this development is unique, and does not have the typical recreational demand. They will provide internal recreation, as well as walking paths, open areas, and community gardening. There will be an area in the building for social gatherings or events. This is not a standard residential development.

Mr. Lighty asked about the community garden. Mr. Snyder indicated on the plan where there is a larger open space where they would like to see those types of activities take place. He indicated where the walking path is located, surrounding the development. He noted that they did not think this type of development lends itself to the payment in lieu of recreation dedication at \$2,300 per unit. Mr. Snyder stated he would like to discuss with the Board of Supervisors if this comment is applicable, or if a waiver may be appropriate. Mr. Lighty asked Staff's position on the recreation fee. Ms. Moran stated the Township does expect a fee in lieu of recreation development. Mr. Snyder stated that issue will move on with the plan but shouldn't affect the design of the plan.

Mr. Snyder stated that the staff memo says "no less than 90 units be single family..." and he asked if it should say "no more than ..." Ms. Moran stated she will check the Zoning Hearing Board Decision. Mr. Snyder stated that the plan shows 90 cottages/60 condos, and noted that the end result may be some other variation. Each unit on the plan is shown at the maximum area of 1,200 square feet, and he noted that they may be smaller depending on the needs of the buyer. Mr. Guise asked if there are fewer cottages if there would be more condos, for example, 88 cottages and 62 condos. Mr. Snyder answered no, the maximum number of condominium units is 60.

Mr. Guise asked about maintenance of the units. Mr. Kerschner stated that all exterior maintenance will be provided for the residents, including the streets, yards, landscaping and exterior of the structures. There will technically be an association, but it will essentially be the Foundation. A condominium ownership provides the flexibility for the occupants to purchase or lease the units.

Mr. Gingrich asked if the cottages will be one story with a basement. Mr. Kerschner stated they will be one story on a slab, unless the grade provides an opportunity for full exposure for an exposed basement, in that case they will have a basement. About 20% of the cottages will have exposed basements.

Ms. Lindsey asked the age of the residents. Mr. Kerschner stated the facility will be structured for 55+, but the Foundation will really target ages more like 70-80. He noted that at the hearing there were several comments from neighbors who were over 55, who commented that they were not ready for a facility like this. Ms. Lindsey questioned the proposal to not install sidewalks within the development, but have a walking path which may not be as sturdy as a sidewalk. She commented that some 70 year olds may be fine with that, and some may have difficulty. Mr. Guise asked if the walking path would be paved. Mr. Kerschner stated it would be an all-weather surface, not wood chips or rubber.

Ms. Lindsey questioned the smaller width of the streets. She noted that the Fire Department and Police Department did not support that request because there will be parking on both sides of the street, and she asked for the reasons behind such a proposal. Mr. Snyder stated that they are trying to create a street system that is more intimate: smaller streets and slower traffic. Each unit will have two parking spaces off-street, via a garage or carport and the driveway. Due to the age demographics of this development, there will be less of a parking demand. While there is the ability to park on the street, it will be sporadic. Twenty-eight feet is wide enough for two cars to travel even with a car parked. Mr. Snyder pointed out that the other age restricted communities in the Township have smaller streets, such as Meadowview Village with 20-foot wide paved area including a 4-foot striped walkway in the cartway. He agreed that that is too small, but felt that 28 feet was small enough to slow traffic, and wide enough to travel comfortably.

Ms. Lindsey stated that the Fire Department provided a drawing with their comments showing their vehicles cannot maneuver the proposed streets. Mr. Snyder stated that the Fire Company said they need 16 feet of clearance. That is enough room even if a car is parked on the street. Mr. Lighty stated it is not enough if there are two cars parked across from each other. Mr. Snyder commented that that is a worst case scenario. He further stated that there are many driveway cuts creating natural breaks in the parking, so he did not think it was a concern. He added that the likelihood of having that much parking on this street was very unlikely. Mr. Kerschner stated that this will be a private development with a condominium association, so they can limit the number of vehicles a person can keep at the property. Family gatherings or events will most likely take place at the social hall rather than the person's home. Visitors may still come and park on the street. One of the last pieces of freedom a person is willing to give up is a vehicle; however, it is still reasonable to place restrictions on how many vehicles they may keep here.

Steve Fleming stated that this density would call for a street width of 36 feet. Regarding the traffic calming claim, Mr. Fleming stated there are other effective measures. If the waiver request were less, it may not be so objectionable. The wider street will accommodate maintenance and emergency vehicles. Mr. Fleming recommended that a wider street width be proposed to accommodate the on-street parking.

Mr. Lighty asked for a clarification on the ordinance requirement, 30 or 36 feet. Mr. Fleming stated that the application references 30 feet, however the SALDO and the Zoning Ordinance requires 36 feet for a development with lot widths of less than 100 feet. Even though this is not a fee-simple development, based on the spacing of the homes, the wider street width is supported. Mr. Lighty asked if that means 30 or 36 feet. Mr. Fleming answered 36 feet. Mr. Lighty asked Ms. Moran for Staff's opinion. Ms. Moran agreed with the engineer's interpretation. Mr. Fleming added that the applicant obtained a variance for density for this development.

Mr. Snyder stated that a 36-foot wide street is enormous. It is almost the size of a collector street (38), and that is not the type of street they are trying to develop. He understood the logic Mr. Fleming used, but noted there are no fee-simple lots to base the calculation on. Regardless if the requirement is 36 or 30 feet, Mr. Snyder stated they are still seeking the waiver. Mr. Snyder pointed out that the Township wants the roads wider, but also wants traffic calming devices; he suggested the opportunity to use narrower streets would be a good measure.

Mr. Lighty questioned if speed is an issue where the targeted residents are 70-80 years old. Mr. Snyder stated the same rationale could be applied to on-street parking.

Mr. Snyder stated that the goal is to create a small community with small homes close to the street.

Mr. Guise asked if the applicant felt the required street width is 30 feet. Mr. Snyder answered yes. Mr. Guise asked if the engineer disagrees with that. Mr. Fleming stated he does disagree. Mr. Snyder stated that there is a provision within the density section that says if there is parking on one side plus two travel lanes the requirement is 30 feet. Based on that, they thought that was probably the standard, so they ask for a waiver from 30 to 28 feet. Mr. Guise suggested it is quite probable that there will be cars on both sides. Mr. Snyder agreed, but felt that would not be the norm. Even if it did occur, there will be plenty of space. With narrow streets, people share the roadway: one lays back to allow the other car to pass. Mr. Guise did not disagree, but felt there could be trouble if there were an emergency.

Mr. Guise stated that when the Fire Company and the Police are against the waiver, it is difficult to disagree with what is needed to get emergency equipment into a neighborhood.

Ms. Lindsey stated there will be 60 units in the building, and there are 64 parking spaces for that building. That building is intended to host the social events as well. If every unit has a husband and wife, each with a car, there would be 120 vehicles in 64 spaces, and she asked what would happen when there is a party or event. The cars will be parked up the street. Mr. Snyder stated the ordinance does contemplate that. It calls for two spaces for each unit for residential development; if the development is age-restricted for 62+, the requirement is 1 space per unit; if the age is 70+ the requirement is ½ space per unit. They have based their proposal on the one space per unit for the building. Ms. Lindsey stated the ordinance may say that, but people aren't old anymore till they are 90. Mr. Lighty stated the everyday occurrences do not seem to be a problem, but when there is any event, the parking will overflow to the neighborhood streets. Mr. Lighty did not think speeding would be a major issue within this community. It is more likely that ambulances and medical transports will frequent the neighborhood and should be accommodated. Mr. Snyder stated there is more than enough room for them. Ms. Lindsey stated the emergency responders disagreed. Mr. Snyder did not know what the police based their comments on. The Fire department said they need 16 feet of clearance to put outriggers down and fight a fire. If there was a 28 foot street, parking on both sides, and a fire, there would be room for it all. The width of a car is about 6 feet.

Mr. Kerschner stated that they would be willing to bring a revised plan back to the Planning Commission next month. That would give Commission the chance to be more comfortable with the decision. It would also give the two absent members an opportunity to address any questions they may have.

Mr. Lighty asked about curb and sidewalk requirements. Mr. Snyder stated there is a fair amount of frontage on Fairmont Drive. That road is a narrow 22 feet wide and there are steep grades. Mr. Lighty asked about proposed improvements for the bridge. He thought the Township had acquired the right-of-way to do it, but did not know where the improvements stood. Mr. Snyder stated there was additional right-of-way given when the Waggoner tract was subdivided. He and Mr. Fleming did not know of plans to actually improve the bridge. Mr. Fleming noted there are bridges slated to be worked on, but this is not

one of them. That piece of frontage is where they are asking for a waiver of curb, sidewalk and widening. There is existing sidewalk at the church which stops at the property line. They propose to extend that sidewalk down to the proposed intersection and into the development, including widening and curbing. The applicant is asking for a waiver for the other section of frontage along Locust Lane because they will be tapering the roadway back in, and there is significant grading in that area with a culvert and guiderail. Those factors make sidewalk installation impractical in that location. If they did install sidewalk, it would have to be outside the right-of-way. Mr. Gingrich stated there is sidewalk on the school side of Locust Lane in that area. Mr. Snyder stated there is sidewalk on the south side in front of Dauphin County Technical School (DCTS), the water tower lot and the Township Public Works facilities. On the north side, there is one little piece near Haney Drive, but it is a mile or more until there is more sidewalks.

Mr. Lighty stated there is curbing in front of DCTS, and asked if there is curbing on the north side. Mr. Snyder stated there is no existing curb, and they will install curb on the eastern end, but do not want to on the western end of the Locust Lane frontage because of the existing conditions since that is the area where the widening will taper back to the existing street width.

Mr. Gingrich stated that the detention pond is shown on the plan in that area. Mr. Snyder stated that is correct. Locust Lane will be widened, and the corners will be curbed and the widened area will be tapered back in the area of the culvert.

Mr. Snyder stated they are asking for a waiver of the requirement to provide sidewalks internally. They propose a walkway around the development. Mr. Lighty stated he loves the walking path, but questioned how a resident is supposed to get to it without walking in the narrow streets parked with cars. Mr. Snyder stated people do not use sidewalks, and tend to walk in the street even if there are sidewalks. Mr. Lighty stated there will be traffic weaving in and out of parked cars, so a logical trade would be installation of sidewalks, at least on one side of the street, to keep people away from the traffic calming narrowness. He noted there should be sidewalks integrated to get people to the walking paths. Mr. Snyder stated that in neighborhoods where there are sidewalks, people rarely use them. Mr. Lighty stated there was a study that said the main reason people do not use them is that two people cannot walk side-by-side. Mr. Snyder stated the ordinance requires a four-foot wide sidewalk. Mr. Snyder stated that this is not a typical development.

Mr. Guise asked if there will be a restriction on pets. Mr. Snyder did not think so.

Mr. Guise suggested a better sidewalk system, even if it is not on both sides. The walkway is good, but there needs to be a sufficient walking area internally.

Mr. Snyder stated the walkway was intended to be instead of internal sidewalks, and did not know if the developer would want to do both. He did want to pursue the waiver request. He understood that without sidewalks, people will have to walk on the streets, but he stated that people will walk on the street anyway.

Mr. Lighty stated there should be access to the walkway so people are not walking in backyards where there is more potential to fall; it is important to control where the people will walk.

Mr. Guise noted that the issues raised are genuine and are not meant to be argumentative.

Mr. Lighty asked about the waiver of the cul-de-sac diameter. Mr. Snyder stated that the ordinance calls for a 100-foot diameter cul-de-sac. They would like to have a landscaped interior island. Mr. Lighty stated that the Planning Commission does favor landscaped islands within cul-de-sacs, but he questioned the waiver of the diameter. He asked if a fire truck can get around the cul-de-sac. Mr. Snyder stated the comment asks for a graphic or turning template that shows the truck will fit, then it seems they will be okay with it. Mr. Lighty asked if it will fit even with parking, or if it will be signed for no parking. Mr. Snyder did not know, but stated the cartway is 20 feet wide and is one way. He will look at it both ways: with cars parked around it and without. Mr. Lighty stated if the applicant can show that the trucks can get around the cul-de-sac, he would be okay with it. Mr. Guise added that if it satisfies the Fire Department's comment, he is also satisfied.

With regard to centerline radii, Mr. Snyder stated that the proposal is to match the proposed ordinance at 150 feet.

Mr. Snyder stated that there is a waiver request to reduce the separation between intersections from 400 feet to a minimum of 150 feet.

Mr. Snyder stated they would like to install slant curb instead of vertical curb, and noted it is very driveway-friendly. He noted they would install vertical curb along Locust Lane and the entrance.

With regard to paper size, the proposal is 30"x42", which will accommodate the whole plan on one sheet, at a large enough scale to see the detail. Mr. Guise asked if the size causes a problem with recording. Mr. Fleming stated that it has been allowed for larger developments.

Mr. Snyder stated the HRG comments about traffic should be discussed. He stated that his traffic study did not recommend any improvements other than what is shown on the plan. The comment says that there are a lot of vehicles turning right and turning left into DCTS in the morning. The comment suggested an eastbound and a westbound turning lane. Mr. Snyder felt that was DCTS's issue, not Pleasant Meadows, which will add 17 cars. He noted that Pleasant Meadows' peak is not the same time of morning as DCTS's peak, and even if it were, it is only 17 cars, and it is not their problem to fix.

Mr. Snyder stated that they are not proposing any improvements to the intersection at Fairmont and Locust Lane. Shadebrook is proposing to signalize that intersection. Mr. Lighty stated that the traffic study says there will be no problem because the intersection will be signalized by Shadebrook. The piece of the puzzle that is missing is Shadebrook. Given the economic climate, it is unsure if and when that development will come to be a reality. If they don't, or if they can't for some time, there is no signal there. Mr. Lighty stated that everyone agrees it is a dangerous intersection. Mr. Snyder stated it is common practice to factor in other approved plans when doing a traffic study, so theirs includes Shadebrook's traffic as well as their improvements. If you take out their signal, you also have to take out their traffic volume. Mr. Lighty stated you would still be left with a failing intersection. Mr. Snyder stated that is an off-site improvement. He also pointed out that 17 trips does not warrant the installation of a traffic signal. Mr. Lighty stated that the bridge at the low point on Fairmont is not off-site.

Mr. Snyder asked if Shadebrook has filed a final plan yet. Ms. Moran stated they have not completed their developer's agreement. Mr. Snyder stated the preliminary plan was approved subject to the traffic signal contribution. Mr. Fleming stated they are moving forward with meeting the conditions of their plan, however, he has not seen any traffic or highway occupancy permit (HOP) plans yet.

Mr. Ames stated the County recommends a physical connection to Shope Place. The Zoning Ordinance and the SALDO recommend connections to existing developments when possible. If there was an accident or incident at the intersection there would still be a way in and out. Mr. Snyder understood the concern, but noted that when this project had a variance hearing, there was substantial objection to a physical connection between the development. As a trade-off, it was proposed to have a stabilized area that could support emergency vehicles. It would not appear to be a street, and would not allow or invite cut-through traffic; it would only be an emergency access-way. He noted they are trying to respect the existing neighbors' concerns. Ms. Lindsey asked if it would be marked for emergency vehicles only. Mr. Snyder stated it would not be marked, but emergency personnel would have it on their GIS system. Mr. Fleming stated it has been discussed with emergency personnel in the past when working on hotels that did not have dual access and their GIS is equipped to inform them of the additional access point and directions on how to use it. Mr. Snyder stated it could be paved and signed, but as soon as it is paved, it will be used. Mr. Snyder noted that the entrance is a boulevard entrance so the real probability of both sides being blocked are slight, but the access is still there. Ms. Lindsey asked how that access is maintained in the winter. Mr. Snyder stated it would be a requirement of the condominium association to keep it clear and accessible. Mr. Guise stated that no parking signs will have to be installed internally. Mr. Ames agreed with the proposal especially given the wishes of the neighborhood. He noted a waiver is required from Section 1117.3.E. Mr. Snyder asked if it is mandatory. Mr. Ames stated it says "shall", which is mandatory.

Mr. Ames stated that street lighting is not required, but he suggested it be considered, based on the age of the proposed residents. Mr. Snyder stated they do not propose street lighting. They will have light from the homes, which will be close to the street. Other than the obvious added safety, Mr. Lighty added that street lighting would beautify the neighborhood. Mr. Snyder stated that the ordinance doesn't require it, and they will have building lighting. Mr. Lighty suggested the applicant consider street lighting, even if it is not a specific requirement.

Mr. Ames asked that the clear sight triangles be shown on the plan. He noted it looks as though it meets the requirement, but it needs to be shown on the plan.

Mr. Ames stated that the traffic impact study and the HOP are required prior to issuance of building permits. Mr. Snyder stated he did submit a traffic study and they are working on the HOP.

Mr. Snyder stated the only question they have from the comments generated by the Fire Company is the access to the rear of the building. The slopes are significant. There is a level area in the back which they anticipate to be outdoor recreation space for the residents. The slope on one side could be flattened out to bring the trucks to the back, but the slopes are an issue. Mr. Fleming stated that the rear access is a standard concern for apartment buildings or hotels. Mr. Snyder stated he will work on that.

In the Police Department comments, speed humps are suggested. Mr. Snyder stated that they are not sure they want to do that, but will look at it.

With respect to the entrance and the recommendation for turning lanes, Mr. Fleming explained that the traffic at the intersection is at a failing level of service. The development is proposing a small number of additional trips, which may not make the situation worse, but it may make it more complicated. The Police Department are already required to direct traffic in the morning and afternoon. Further to the west, there is an existing stormwater culvert where the guide rail is located. There is a state-owned and maintained stormwater detention facility. The developer intends to outlet the detention basin into that facility. It is the State's point of view that when it carries stormwater from a development, it will become the responsibility of the Township to own and maintain. Mr. Fleming suggested the Township look at it before that happens to make sure there is no liability, noting that he and Matt Miller will look at it together.

Regarding the frontage along Fairmont at the bridge, Mr. Fleming did not think curbing, sidewalk, and widening would be a benefit to the Township or the development, however, the existing topography, street width, drainage and pavement condition are a concern. The Township does treat the surface to increase skid-resistance to reduce the number of winter traffic accidents. Full improvements are probably not warranted, however something should be considered. He suggested a portion of the roadway should be widened and the surface should be improved. It could be done on the developer's side of the road or it could be coupled with the Township's improvements of the roadway. Mr. Snyder stated there was not much room to widen the road because of the slopes. He also noted that the Township maintains the road, not the developer. Mr. Lighty agreed, but disagreed with the thought that the improvements are not the developers responsibility. Mr. Snyder stated the Township can ask for widening and improvements along the frontage if those improvements are necessary for access to the project. Mr. Fleming stated that the residents of this development will use the roadway. Mr. Snyder stated it is not being used for direct access. Mr. Lighty did not necessarily agree.

Regarding the school intersection, Mr. Snyder stated the turning lanes would only benefit the school. The eastbound right and westbound left are the only movements that fail, the overall intersection is not failing. If you add an eastbound left turning lane and a center turning lane, there are two more conflict points and this seems to be excessive. Mr. Fleming stated that even though the development is not a big player in this intersection it is still a player. By adding a movement, you are not improving the existing conditions. He requested the developer consider the intersection, noting that the developer has to submit an HOP anyway. The widening of the road is the right opportunity to consider additional lanes. Mr. Snyder pointed out that the school recently went through a substantial land development plan and was not required to make any improvements to their driveways. Mr. Lighty stated they argued that they were not adding any additional trips. Mr. Snyder argued that if there was an opportunity, that was it.

Mr. Snyder stated that the backed-up left turns stop the through traffic, but when this widening takes place, there will be a shoulder to allow vehicles to get around the left-turns informally. Another option is that a lane could be striped to address that situation. This developer may not want to be tied down to that.

There were no questions or comments from the audience.

Mr. Guise made a motion to table consideration of the plan, to allow the applicant the opportunity to address and give full consideration to the issues, suggestions and comments generated by Planning Commission, Staff, and Engineer. Mr. Beverly seconded the motion and a unanimous vote followed.

Business Improvement District

Mr. Lighty reminded the Commission there is no meeting in May because of primary elections, and the next BID meeting will be June 21, 2010.

Wind Energy Subcommittee

Mr. Lighty stated that the subcommittee needs to set a date for a meeting.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no additional public comment.

COMMISSIONER COMMENT

There was no additional Commissioner comment offered.

ADJOURNMENT

The next regular Planning Commission meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, June 9, 2010, at 7:00 pm at the Lower Paxton Township Municipal Center, Room 171.

Being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 8:40 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Michelle Hiner
Recording Secretary