

LOWER PAXTON TOWNSHIP
PLANNING COMMISSION

December 13, 2006

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT

William Neff
Dennis Guise
Ernest Gingrich
Fredrick Lighty
Roy Newsome
Betsy Sibert
Richard Beverly

ALSO PRESENT

Dianne Moran, Planning & Zoning Officer
Lori Wissler, Planning & Zoning Officer
Chip Millard, Dauphin County Planning Commission
Jim Snyder, HRG

Call to Order

Mr. Lighty called the regular meeting of the Lower Paxton Township Planning Commission to order at 7:00 pm, on December 13, 2006 in Room 171 of the Lower Paxton Township Municipal Center, 425 Prince Street, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania.

Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag

Ms. Sibert led the recitation of the Pledge.

Approval of Minutes

Mr. Newsome made a motion to approve the minutes of the November 8, 2006 meeting. Mr. Beverly seconded the motion and the minutes were unanimously approved.

OLD BUSINESS

Preliminary/Final Land Development Plan #06-21
Shuler All Pro Car Wash, Linglestown Road

Ms. Wissler stated that a time extension was received by the Township from the applicant.

Mr. Gingrich made a motion to table the Preliminary/Final Land Development Plan #06-21 for Shuler All Pro Car Wash, Linglestown Road. Mr. Newsome seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Preliminary/Final Subdivision Plan #06-28
4800 Linglestown Road

Ms. Wissler stated that Kusic Capitol Group is proposing to construct a new two-story office building with 75 parking spaces. The tract, which consists of 4.329 acres, is zoned BC, Business Campus District. The property is currently improved with a three-story office building with 107 parking spaces and will be served by public sewer and water.

The applicant is requesting a waiver of the preliminary plan requirement.

This plan was tabled at the request of the applicant at the October 11, 2006 and November 8, 2006 Planning Commission meetings.

Mr. Ed Lupyak, of Melham Associates, 2247 N. Front Street, was present on behalf of the applicant.

Mr. Lighty asked if Mr. Lupyak received comments from Staff, HRG and Dauphin County. Mr. Lupyak answered that he did receive the comments, does not have any problem with the comments. He is currently in the process of updating the plan to comply with the comments.

Mr. Lupyak stated the site consists of 4.32 acres of land with an existing three-story building and 107 parking spaces. They will add an additional two-story office building of 10,285 of net rentable space, and 75 parking spaces. The addition will disturb about 2.1 acres of the site. There is an existing stormwater management pond on the front of the site which they will drain all the new stormwater to.

Mr. Gingrich asked if a Highway Occupancy Permit will be required. Mr. Lupyak stated that a Highway Occupancy Permit is required, and they are in the process of acquiring that. It is needed to connect to the sewer and water lines, and also for the proposed curb and sidewalk. A note has been added to the cover sheet stating that the client is aware of the regulation, and all permits will be acquired before any construction begins.

Mr. Gingrich asked about the building encroaching into the buffers in the side yard. Mr. Lupyak stated they have shifted and resized the building to make sure they are not encroaching in the buffer.

Mr. Beverly asked how loading and unloading would be accommodated. Mr. Lupyak stated that on drawing 3 of 12, it shows an extra wide parking aisle directly in front of the building which will serve as a turning radius mainly for the fire truck, that will also serve for temporary loading and unloading for trucks such as UPS or FedEx. With a truck there, there will still be enough room for a car to back out. Twenty-two feet is required for the width, and 40 feet is proposed.

Mr. Guise asked if the applicant considered the Township's suggestion for pedestrian routes and outdoor lunch areas. Mr. Lupyak stated that on the revised plan they plan to show a small picnic area to the east side of the building. The back is too steep to put a gravel walkway, and they cannot put a gravel walk through the center because that is the stormwater area.

Mr. Neff asked for a description of the buffering in the area between the rear of the building and the residential homes. Mr. Lupyak stated the buffer will consist mainly of large evergreen trees. Mr. Lupyak stated they will be American Hollies, Siberian Spruce and Blue Spruce with a few interspersed deciduous trees. At maturity, it will be a thick solid screen.

Mr. Neff asked the height of the building. Mr. Lupyak answered it will be two stories, approximately 20 feet. There is some existing vegetation that will not be disturbed.

Mr. Neff asked if it will provide adequate buffer. Mr. Lupyak answered yes, although it will take a few years to grow, but it will then buffer well. The Spruces are fast growing trees with dense cover.

Ms. Wissler noted that Dr. Lacasse of the Shade Tree Commission did review the landscape plan and found the plan to be in order.

Chip Millard, of the Dauphin County Planning Commission, spoke about comment #2. In the new zoning ordinance there are provisions for alternate access for Linglestown Road, mentioning perpendicular or interior streets. Mr. Millard mentioned that this may not be possible or appropriate for this site. Mr. Lupyak noted that the road shown is a private drive and there is no other perpendicular road.

Mr. Millard questioned if the parking is set back 10 feet. Mr. Lupyak stated it is 10 feet from the road, the revised submission shows that.

There was no comment from the audience.

Mr. Gingrich made a motion to recommend approval of Preliminary/Final Land Development Plan #06-28 for 4800 Linglestown Road, Kusic Capitol Group subject to the comments generated, and recommend approval of the waiver of the requirement to submit a preliminary plan. Ms. Sibert seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

Preliminary/Final Land Development Plan #06-36
Schiavoni, LTD

Ms. Wissler stated this plan was tabled at the November 8, 2006 Planning Commission meeting. The purpose of this plan is to obtain Preliminary/Final Land Development approval for a proposed 36 unit town home community. The property is a 5.12 acre tract of R-3 zoned land located on Crums Mill Road west of Beacon Drive. The community will be a condominium development composed of one single lot held in common ownership. The

proposed street and stormwater facilities will be privately owned and maintained by the Schiavoni Ltd. Condominium Association. All units shall be served by public water and public sewer.

The applicant has requested the following waivers:

1. Waiver of the requirement to submit a preliminary plan.
2. Waiver of the requirement that cul-de-sac streets shall furnish access to no more than 20 dwelling units.
3. Waiver of the minimum cartway width requirement of thirty-six feet; thirty feet is proposed.
4. Waiver of the minimum street centerline radius of 250 feet.
5. Waiver of the requirement to construct sidewalks from site entrance to the western property line on Crums Mill Road.

Todd Wilson, Alpha Consulting Engineers, was present on behalf of the plan. Mr. Wilson distributed photos showing how the buildings would appear and be laid out.

At the last meeting, the Commission had some concerns with the overall layout of the units and road. Mr. Wilson submitted plans incorporating those suggestions, noting that the site is a difficult one because of the elevation. The street was straight and all the units were lined up in a row; the new plan shows a curve in the cul-de-sac street, which resulted in the shifting of the units. The units along the western property line have been moved away from the property line. Longer driveways were added and the units were moved back from the street. The driveways are narrower where they tie into the street, but still widened to provide space for two cars in addition to the garage.

Mr. Wilson stated that the Commission had some concerns with the garages being the prominent feature, and because of the grade, they could not change the garages to the rear or side of the units. Mr. Wilson stated one photo shows units with a garage in the front, but it does not stick out and is not a prominent feature.

The units will be stepped up two feet for every two units. There is one building that there is a four foot step because of the change in grade coming into the site.

Mr. Newsome stated that this submission is a vast improvement over the previous plan. Mr. Newsome questioned the placement of the vehicles on the driveways, with regard to the curves. Mr. Wilson stated they can widen the entrances, noting that that was done to alleviate the concern of the entire front yard being paved. The interior units have also been widened to 22 feet. Mr. Newsome stated that the applicant tried to give a single driveway to each unit to gain more greenspace, but suggested that maybe some units combine two single driveways to use for two units.

Mr. Lighty asked if the applicant received the comments from Dauphin County. Mr. Wilson answered that he did receive them and has no issues with any of them.

Mr. Lighty asked how Mr. Wilson plans to address comment #11. Mr. Wilson stated he does not disagree with the comment; however the zoning ordinance requires the open space. Mr. Wilson did not feel the open space would be the greatest use in this type of development, but it is required. Ms. Wissler noted that the applicant is required to provide the open space in addition to the fee-in-lieu. Mr. Wilson was aware of that.

Mr. Neff asked for clarification of the ingress and egress with regard to the pavement on lot 13-18, on sheet 3 of 11. Mr. Wilson stated that is the one building where there is a shared driveway and the condominium association will be maintaining it, as well as the private street. Mr. Neff asked where the entrance of the cul-de-sac would be, and how it would be configured along lot 19. Mr. Wilson stated the one driveway that would come off the southern side is where all the vehicles would come in, then make a right turn to units 19 or 20 or left into units 13-18. Mr. Neff asked if the curb cut will begin at the line between 20 and 21. Mr. Wilson showed on sheet 6 where the curb cut would be.

Mr. Neff questioned the adequacy of overflow parking. Mr. Wilson stated each unit has space for one car in the garage, two in the driveway and parking is available on one side of the street and he felt that was adequate. Mr. Newsome was unsure how cars would park in between all the curb cuts on the street. Mr. Neff agreed. Mr. Wilson agreed that they could not do that on the whole length of the street.

Mr. Newsome asked if the applicant still considers this plan to be more affordable housing. Mr. Wilson answered the homes will go for \$175,000 to \$200,000.

Mr. Chip Millard noted with regard to Dauphin County comment #10, the flood plain is now shown on the map, but unfortunately the flood plain does appear to go across the entire frontage of the property. The concern is that the only access to this neighborhood is in the flood plain area. Mr. Millard questioned if, when there is a significant flood event, this is an area that does get flooded. Mr. Lighty did not recall this area ever actually flooding. Mr. Snyder did not recall specifically, but the area is mapped as an approximate flood plain in the FEMA study, but did not think it was essentially a problem.

There was no comment from the audience.

Mr. Beverly did not feel he could give full approval on this plan because they have not satisfied the comments generated.

Mr. Newsome made a motion to recommend approval of the plan, and approval of the five waivers requested; approval shall be subject to resolution of the comments generated by staff and County. Mr. Guise seconded the motion.

Mr. Gingrich asked if the Commission should discuss the waiver for the sidewalk going to the western property line. Mr. Wilson explained that the applicant does not object to installing sidewalks on that section, but it is impractical because it goes under the underpass and immediately outside the shoulder is a guide rail then immediately beside the guide rail are

the columns for the underpass. Mr. Gingrich asked for the engineer's comments. Mr. Snyder asked if the waiver is only for the area from the driveway to the end of the property. Mr. Wilson answered yes. Mr. Snyder stated that waiver for sidewalks does make sense, but asked that they curb and widen that section. Mr. Wilson stated they will show on the revised plan the curb and widening.

With the comments given, the Commission voted unanimously in favor of the plan.

Preliminary/Final Land Development Plan #06-37
St. Thomas Roasters

Ms. Wissler stated that the applicant has asked to be tabled because they applied for a variance and were denied. Mr. Guise made a motion to table the plan. Mr. Beverly seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously.

NEW BUSINESS

Preliminary/Final Subdivision & Land Development Plan #06-38
Sheetz Convenience Store

Ms. Wissler stated that the purpose of the plan is to subdivide the current tract into two lots and to permit the construction of a 4,997 square foot Sheetz Convenience Store with fueling facilities and an automated carwash (Lot #1). Lot #2 will remain undeveloped at this time.

The property is located at 6290 Allentown Boulevard and is zoned C-1, General Commercial District. The tract possesses 5.45 acres and is served by public water and sewer.

A Conditional Use Permit was granted by the Board of Supervisors on September 19, 2006.

The applicant has requested the following waivers:

1. Waiver of the requirement to submit a preliminary plan.
2. Waiver of the sidewalk requirement along the frontage of Lot 2.
3. Waiver if the requirement that datum to which contour elevations refer shall be US and Geodetic Survey Datum.
4. Waiver if the requirement that storm inlet tops have a 10 inch curb reveal.

Aaron Navarro, of J. Michael Brill & Associates, and Michael LaCesa, Sheetz Real Estate, were present on behalf of the plan.

Mr. Neff asked what zone this is in. Ms. Wissler answered C-1. Mr. Neff asked the minimum lot size required for the CN zone, with regard to Lot 2. Ms. Wissler stated that this plan's conditional use was granted under the old zoning ordinance, but under the new Commercial Neighborhood District, it would have a minimum lot size of 30,000 square feet. Mr. Neff noted that Lot 2 would be conforming.

Mr. Navarro stated he has received the comments from staff, HRG and County, and has no issues except for the ones that were generated because the review was done under the new regulations.

Mr. Newsome asked why there is no weather protection between the gas pumps and the building. Mr. LaCesa explained that Sheetz does not want the canopy to be the dominant architectural feature on the site; they want the people to see the building and associate Sheetz with food as well as inexpensive gasoline. Mr. Guise added that most people pay at the pump now. Mr. LaCesa added that food can be ordered at the pump as well.

Mr. Guise asked about HRG comment #16 regarding the viable driveway for Lot 2. Mr. LaCesa assumed that the access to Lot 2 will be directly across from the existing street. They will look at the comment that addresses the location of the endwall and the pipe location, and consider relocation so an access can be created for Lot 2.

Mr. Guise asked about the waiver for the width of the inlets, to eight inches. HRG's comments suggest keeping it at 10 inches, but they could have any size. Mr. Snyder explained that the 10-inch hood requirement is within the roadway rights-of-way, if it is private, a waiver would not be necessary.

Mr. Millard noted that under the new zoning ordinance, comments 3-5 do not apply.

Mr. Millard asked about County comment #1, with regard to lot area values. Mr. Navarro stated that if the numbers are added, it totals the acreage for the lot area to the legal right-of-way area, not to the deed right-of-way area.

There was no comment from the audience.

Mr. Guise made a motion to recommend approval of Subdivision & Land Development Plan #06-38 for Sheetz Convenience Store, and recommend approval of waiver #1-3, and waiver #4 to the extent that a waiver is necessary, and the recommendation for approval is subject to compliance with the comments as discussed. Ms. Sibert seconded motion and the motion passed unanimously.

Preliminary/Final Re-Subdivision Plan #06-39
Gifford Bell

Mr. Lighty stated that this plan has been withdrawn. No action is needed.

Preliminary/Final Land Development Plan # 06-40
Dauphin County Technical School
Additions and Renovations

Mr. Lighty stated a letter has been received asking that the plan be tabled.

Mr. Gingrich made a motion to table the plan. Mr. Beverly seconded the motion, and the motion passed unanimously.

Master Plan #06-41
Shadebrook

Ms. Moran stated the Township has received a Master Plan for Shadebrook. The purpose of the Master Plan is to conceptually plan the Traditional Neighborhood Development. The property is located north and south of Union Deposit Road, east and west of Fairmont Drive, and consists of 86.879 acres. The plan proposes 354 units and 5 commercial lots. The property will be served by public water and public sewer. The property is surrounded by the following: to the north is Heatherfield apartments which are zoned R-3, to the east and south the tracts are zoned R-1 and to the west is the Dauphin County Technical School which is zoned Institutional District.

The Master Plan is not required to include the same level of engineering detail as a preliminary subdivision plan. Stormwater calculations, construction details, erosion and sedimentation control plans, profiles and similar engineering details are not required at the Master Plan level. The Master Plan includes existing conditions and the proposed layout of the homes, non-residential uses, lots, open space, and streets. Therefore, Staff has done a conceptual review and not a detailed review. Details will be provided during the preliminary plan review process.

Mr. Richard Yingst and Mr. Paul Hepler, from Yingst Homes, Mr. Kevin Brown from E.G. Stoltzfus, Mr. Barry Mehafie, Architect and Project Manager/Land Planner at Rettew Associates, Mr. Doug Parkins, Registered Landscape Architect and Principal of Rettew, and Mr. John Snyder, project managers from Rettew Associates were present on behalf of the plan.

Mr. Lighty stated the staff review was done looking at things that staff wants to see when the preliminary subdivision plan comes to the Township. The standard of review for a Master Plan is section 314(c).

Mr. John Snyder stated this plan has been developed according to the new TND ordinance. Mr. John Snyder felt this ordinance encourages smart growth within the Township. Mr. John Snyder asked the Commission for input on all aspects of the plan, and a

recommendation on the plan. They would also like to gain input on preliminary waivers, because there are instances where the subdivision ordinance does not promote the same type of design as the TND ordinance. The Master Plan is similar to a sketch plan, but it contains more detail.

Mr. Doug Parkins commended the Planning Commission for its vision and bold outlook for this type of project. These projects are well received in other areas.

Mr. Parkins presented a power point presentation showing pages from the Master Plan, and also pictures of existing TND developments from the surrounding area. The presentation is as follows:

The first slide is of the entire TND plan, showing Fairmont Drive coming into the site from the west, and intersects with Cider Press Road. Union Deposit Road borders the site to the south. There is an existing spring-fed pond on the site, which drains to the south to a tributary which runs along Union Deposit Road. The project conforms to a transect, or a more urban and dense area in the middle and feathers out towards the edges to a less urban condition. The darker colors represent more dense area. The plan proposes a commercial main street type area along existing Fairmont Drive. Most units are accessed by alleys so there are no driveways along the fronts. The exception is the perimeter lots, where the garages are front loading, most of these situations have the garages recessed to the back. The parking areas for the commercial units are behind the buildings hidden from the view of those using Fairmont Drive. The open space is the neighborhood park, which is located at the terminus of Fairmont Drive where it is surrounded by Cider Press Road and housing units. There are also some "pocket parks" or "attached greens". These are areas where the front yard of a unit is immediately adjacent to the park, with no street between. This is a unique feature of a TND.

The next slide shows an architectural rendering of the elevation of the buildings. There is a linear open space along the Union Deposit Road stream corridor.

The next slide shows the commercial main street along Fairmont Drive. At the end of the neighborhood park you can see the housing on the other side. This shows the parking behind the commercial buildings. There are breaks in the buildings to get pedestrians from the parking areas to the front of the commercial buildings. There is "teaser parking" along Fairmont Drive, where there is street parking in front of the shops.

The next slide shows a closer view of the main street, showing the angled parking along the road. The landscape pattern is somewhat formal. There is an extra wide sidewalk to accommodate outdoor dining. There is a service aisle behind the parking for the commercial buildings.

The next slide shows the architectural perspective of the terminal vista. The view is framed with the residential homes on the other side of the park. The architectural renderings are not exact, but they are the character of what is anticipated in this development.

The next three pictures are actual pictures of TNDs showing the main street area. There may be some two-story, some three-story buildings with retail on the first floor.

Mr. Guise asked if there will be apartments on the second floors. Mr. John Snyder stated the uses on the second floors will be offices, and up to 43 apartments.

Street furniture is an important amenity in this type of area, including benches, trash cans, and lighting.

Porches and stoops are another important aspect of the TND. The focus is on pedestrian access versus a large front yard.

The next slide shows how the northwest corner may look in a typical street within this project, and how fencing and shrubbery and sidewalks and other details may look.

The next slide shows the alley-loaded garages, another keystone of the TND. The garages that load from the front are set back to deemphasize the garage door and emphasize the pedestrian access in the front. The result is an uninterrupted pedestrian experience along the fronts.

The next slide shows photographs of typical alleys. The alleys are kept clean and are landscaped as part of the rear yards. This is a good location for utility boxes, so they are not along the street and are out of site. They would still be very accessible for maintenance just out of sight.

The project includes pocket parks and attached greens as shown on the next slide. The open space represents over 30% of the gross area, including the neighborhood park, the linear park, and some attached greens in the neighborhoods. There is also a substantial wooded area that has been retained to the west and a sizable attached green at the entrance to the west.

The layout of trails within the neighborhood park is shown on the following slide. A series of trails will interconnect the streets through the park and to each other. The location of these may change with the engineering part of the plan development. A pavilion will be in the park, as well as an expansive lawn.

The units with frontage on a pocket park will have higher value than those with street frontage. This also creates a safer condition, with eyes on the parks.

Another architectural perspective is shown of the inside of the park. This shows the homes fronting the park and some park activities.

The next slide shows coming into the development from the north, where the buildings pare back creating the landscaped open space. This also provides a view to the front doors of the units with green frontage. The other side of the street has buildings that are recessed to provide an additional attached green.

Where the streets angle at an intersection, this provides another area for an attached green, adding value and interest.

The entrance area along Fairmont Drive from the west provides great opportunity to move the buildings back and provide detailed entrance plantings.

There is a condition to the north where they have pulled the garages away from the property line, where a bermed landscape screen can be installed between this and the next development. This also provides a pedestrian link between the developments so they can access the main street of Shadebrook.

The next few slides show the types of housing: villas, cottages, townhomes, twins, and manors.

Mr. John Snyder stated they provided a compliance packet to be used in the review process. The developer felt they have addressed all the issues in the new TND ordinance or will address them with the preliminary plan submission.

Mr. John Snyder brought to the attention of the Commission that the developer has applied for two density bonuses. One requires 30% open space and the plan shows 30.4%. The other requires higher architectural standards. Architectural plans are not required until the preliminary plan, so it will be provided at that time.

Some other aspects of the plan that are not shown yet and will be detailed in the preliminary plan include: stormwater management, utilizing the existing pond and underground with no large visible basins reducing flooding events; shared parking; these are in accordance with the ordinance. Mr. John Snyder asked for staff's review of that aspect now instead of with the preliminary plan.

Mr. John Snyder stated there are seven waivers being sought. These are because the TND is unique and varies from the subdivision ordinances.

Article 1117.11.e: Lot lines shall be radial or perpendicular to rights-of-way. These occur with the townhomes. They cannot be radial when there is curvature on the street. This is a common waiver with TNDs and townhome developments.

Article 1117.06.b: Minimum centerline radius for minor street is required to be 275 feet, but this is in direct conflict with the intent of the TND. The TND sets up narrow streets within neighborhoods and a pedestrian-friendly environment. The horizontal curvatures are designed in accordance with the Institute of Traffic Engineers and ASHTO Guidelines for Neighborhood Residential Streets being 89 feet. This is the standard for TNDs. Turning templates for emergency vehicles were done on these streets to ensure that the largest fire truck will be able to transverse these streets.

Article 1117.07.b: Maximum street grade of 10%. The developer is asking for 14% because of the existing slopes of the site. Fairmont Drive, an existing road, is between 12% and 13.5% in some areas. Most of the site is in excess of 10%. The intersections will be designed for safe stopping, and in accordance with the ordinances and PennDOT regulations. Vertical variations are common in TNDs, and accentuate the uniqueness.

Article 1117.10.b: Block length maximum of 1,600 feet, and minimum of 500 feet. This waiver is requested because the ordinance does not say which street should be measured and is unclear. All the blocks meet the minimum. This requirement is contrary to the TND intentions of smaller blocks.

Article 1117.12.e: Alleys shall not have sharp changes in alignment. The development meets the intent of this. The right-of-way is angular, so that the lots are uniform in width and length. The garages are aligned in the back as well. The cartways are rounded to allow better turning movements for the vehicles.

Article 1117.12.d: Dead-end alleys shall be avoided. This issue is in direct conflict with the TND concept. The number of units with access to alleys with dead-ends has been limited to 4 or 5, and the length has been shortened to less than 50 feet.

Article 1117.08.c: 75 foot clear sight triangles. Contemporary developments need this, however, in a TND the houses are closer to the street to create the neighborhood community, pedestrian friendly environment, and to slow traffic. Having a large, clear sight triangle would require all the buildings to be moved back away from the intersections. That conflicts with the TND.

Mr. Guise asked staff about when it would be appropriate to act on waivers. Ms. Wissler stated the Commission would officially act on them at the preliminary plan submission, but the developer is asking for the Commission's opinion at this time.

Mr. Guise asked who maintains the green areas, pocket parks, open space, attached greens. Mr. John Snyder answered that the homeowners association typically maintains those areas.

Mr. Newsome asked if there will be one homeowners association for the entire development. Mr. John Snyder speculated there may be a couple associations, such as one for

the commercial area, and another one for some of the neighborhoods. Those details have not been worked out.

Mr. Newsome asked about the residential uses above the commercial uses. Mr. John Snyder stated the maximum number of units above the commercial buildings will be 43.

Mr. Newsome asked about phasing. Mr. John Snyder stated the phasing will typically follow the utilities. Most utilities are on Union Deposit Road, so the lower portion will probably be the first phase. The sewer issues in Lower Paxton Township will also impact the phasing.

Mr. Newsome asked if the developers have had any contact with neighboring property owners. Mr. John Snyder answered no. Mr. Guise asked about the link between the existing apartments and Shadebrook. Mr. John Snyder stated that information came from Mr. Lighty and the Commission early in the development of the Master Plan.

Mr. Newsome stated there are some significant vacant tracts surrounding this development. Mr. Lighty clarified only to the east. Mr. John Snyder stated that tract runs along Cider Press Road, and two future extensions are provided in that area for that lower parcel. They will be green, but with a dedicated right-of-way.

Mr. Neff suggested the applicant come back to discuss phasing before the preliminary plan submission because it is very important. The Fairmont Drive commercial corridor is key to the development, but could not be developed first for a lack of consumers at that time. There will be an appropriate time for Fairmont Drive to be completed. Mr. Neff was concerned that the commercial area not be left last in case it does not get built for some reason. The phasing is important because of the utilities, the commercial area, and the mix of housing types.

Mr. Neff asked if the parking on Fairmont Drive is diagonal. Mr. John Snyder answered yes. Mr. Neff noted that the depictions of commercial activity showed parallel. Mr. Lighty noted that the diagonal parking was brought up and requested by the TND sub-committee.

Mr. Neff asked about the pond, and if it were being left alone and what the depth was. A pond that is less than four feet deep will have a high propensity for vegetation. Mr. Neff asked how the pond will be treated. Mr. John Snyder stated that will be detailed in the preliminary plan, but speculated it will be a park concept, with some earthwork required at the edges of the pond including clean-up of the scrub vegetation around the pond. Mr. Neff asked if the developer anticipates a pond of four feet in depth or greater, and how the vegetation issue will be handled. Mr. John Snyder stated that a lot can be done to negate algae growth. He was unsure if a nutrient management plan was allowed by the Conservation District. Those options have not been explored yet. Mr. Lighty noted a fountain is required which will aerate the pond keeping the water from being stagnant.

Mr. John Snyder asked if the Commission wants them to bring a phasing plan with the preliminary plan. Mr. Lighty and Mr. Newsome agreed that would be appropriate. Mr. Guise suggested the developer work up a phasing plan for review and comment by the Planning Commission. Mr. Guise noted the preliminary plan includes a phasing plan. Mr. John Snyder agreed.

Mr. Lighty suggested that a cross section of the berm and planting proposed in the northeast corner be included in the preliminary plan. The actual height of the fountain should also be indicated, both from the elevation of the water, and the elevation of the main street, to make sure it is visible from the main street.

Mr. Guise noted that the Township and the developer should work together to determine if the waivers are actually necessary and appropriate. Mr. John Snyder noted that the TND ordinance states that if there are any conflicting ordinances, the TND should take precedence. These issues were not addressed in the TND ordinance. Mr. John Snyder noted the only one that may apply is the one about the block length, and that could be handled with a determination of the zoning officer. The ordinance does not specify how the block length is measured, and added it might not matter.

Mr. Lighty suggested the applicant bring pictures of the plantings within the parking areas with the next submission.

Ms. Sibert felt the plan was well done and appreciated the work put into it.

Mr. Newsome asked if Lower Paxton Township's TND ordinance was on par with other communities, or if there were problems to be worked on. Mr. Parkins felt it was good as far as they have dealt with it. In the central Pennsylvania area there are a few municipalities that have created an ordinance for TND, and none are perfect but the unique aspect of a TND is each site can be done differently and each design is different, waivers will be needed because an ordinance will not be able to be created with a balance between flexibility and detail in the ordinance.

Mr. Newsome encouraged the applicant to continue to seek the Township's involvement with working on this project. The Township is excited about and very interested in this type of development. It will be beneficial for this community, but also may possibly become an example of what can be done for other communities in this region.

Mr. Gingrich asked if there are any completed TNDs in central Pennsylvania. Mr. Parkins stated there are some in Lancaster and elsewhere, noting this plan is far better than the ones he's seen in Central Pennsylvania. Mr. Lighty noted that Millcreek in Lancaster is called a TND but is nothing like Shadebrook. Mr. Parkins agreed, and he felt it was more of a hybrid between conventional and TND. Other TNDs are Veranda, and Florent Hill. There are three TNDs being submitted in one Lancaster County municipality, totaling about 800 acres. One of those will be along the rail system.

Mr. Gingrich asked if the pictures in the presentation were from the local TNDs. Mr. Parkins answered that the photographs are from Maryland, they were not from the more local ones because those depicted are at maturity and the Lancaster ones are not yet.

Mr. Gingrich asked if the pictures are recent. Mr. Parkins answered that they are less than one year old.

Mr. John Snyder added that the TNDs around this area are not true TNDs; they are hybrids with some components of TNDs but are basically traditional subdivisions. This proposal is a true TND and will be unique.

Ms. Wissler asked about a community center within a TND. Mr. Parkins answered that it varies, depending on how urban the site is and the market.

Ms. Sibert stated she is familiar with the Thatcher Hills TND in South Carolina, and Shadebrook is very similar to that project. Thatcher Hills has a YMCA and a daycare and an elementary school, and is very impressive.

Mr. Newsome requested a copy of the Power Point presentation, and asked that the County Planning Commission view the presentation as well.

Mr. Chip Millard, Dauphin County, felt very impressed by the proposal, and offered some comments as follows. Mr. Millard questioned the width of the streets with regard to how narrow they are near the creek crossing, and how they are much wider in front of the units. The wider street in front of the units may encourage the residents to park there as opposed to in the garages. The variation could also reduce traffic speeds.

Mr. Millard asked about the parking for the units above the commercial buildings, as well as the parking for the commercial buildings themselves. Mr. Millard was concerned about the residents not having parking available to them because the spaces are in use by customers. Mr. Parkins stated that some spaces will be designated for residents, and added that there will be on street parking available as well. Mr. Lighty felt there will have to be some determinations made regarding the parking including signage and possibly time limits along Fairmont to push the residents and employees to use the back lots.

Mr. Millard asked about bicycle parking.

Mr. Millard asked how wide the alleys will be. Mr. John Snyder answered 16 feet with a 20 foot right-of-way in accordance with the ordinance.

Mr. Millard suggested the curbing at the intersections be mountable curbing to accommodate the larger emergency vehicles. Mr. John Snyder stated the intersections have been designed for the largest fire trucks. The intersections have been designed to be narrower to slow traffic, create a pedestrian friendly environment, and stormwater control.

Mr. Millard asked about the pocket parks and if there would be a sidewalk in front of the units that face the park. Mr. Parkins answered yes and it will be along the property line.

Mr. Millard asked about the blue designations on the plan. Mr. John Snyder stated that is for when the ordinance allows for a second residential unit above the garages, such as in-laws quarters.

Mr. Millard asked about the tiny red areas located in the walkway and some pocket parks. Mr. John Snyder stated that is for play areas within the parks. The landscaping and trails and details will be submitted with the preliminary plan.

Mr. Jim Snyder, HRG, asked how many accessory dwelling units there will be. Mr. John Snyder answered nine.

Mr. Jim Snyder asked if a pattern book will be filed with the preliminary plan. Mr. John Snyder answered yes.

Mr. Jim Snyder asked if there will be a homeowners association. Mr. John Snyder answered there will be an entity such as a commercial entity or a renters association.

Mr. Jim Snyder noted that Fairmont Drive is a collector street with a fair amount of traffic between Union Deposit Road and Locust Lane. He asked if a traffic analysis has been done for the proposed street through the proposed commercial area. Mr. John Snyder answered no, adding that they have submitted a scoping letter of traffic intersections to be studied. That road was not on the letter when it was received back. It does include the Cider Press Road and Fairmont Drive intersection. Mr. Lighty noted that having traffic linger somewhat is not a bad thing on a main street.

Mr. Jim Snyder asked if the alleys are private. Mr. John Snyder answered yes.

Mr. Jim Snyder asked the percentage of open space that will be offered for dedication to the Township. Mr. John Snyder did not yet know.

Mr. Jim Snyder asked if the applicant has considered use of materials other than bituminous paving, such as brick pavers or special curbs. Mr. John Snyder stated that those details will be contained in the architectural package along with street lights, benches, et cetera.

Mr. Lighty noted that the ordinance calls for the main street to be a brick or brick-looking material for the sidewalks.

Mr. Lighty called for comments from the audience with regard to the Shadebrook Master Plan.

Fred Lynn, 6102 Spring Knoll Drive, really liked the idea that Spring Knoll and Shadebrook will be connected so they can walk to the shops. Mr. Lynn felt the plan was

fabulous. Mr. Lynn commented that school busses may have a problem because of how heavily it is traveled by the two Central Dauphin high schools, Dauphin County Technical School and the church school at the corner of Fairmont Drive and Locust Lane. A shopper on the main street may have difficulties at 3:00 in the afternoon.

The Manager of Heatherfield Community Association commented that he was happy to see the break between the properties. She felt that most of her homeowners are receptive and believe this will increase their property value.

Mr. Neff asked how far down Union Deposit Road the high school is located. Mr. Lighty stated Central Dauphin East High School is a mile and a half. Mr. Neff commented that they cannot get around the bussing.

Mr. Neff asked Mr. Millard about CAT bus service. Mr. Millard answered there definitely should be some bus service to the commercial development, and even more so to the dense number of people. This would be extremely convenient for people that live there, as well as those that work there.

Mr. Guise made a motion to recommend to the Board of Supervisors approval of the Master Plan for Shadebrook, taking into account the comments, noting it is the sense of the Planning Commission that the requested waivers appear unobjectionable, subject to further review of the details. Mr. Newsome seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Lighty asked about the scheduling for this plan from this point. Ms. Wissler stated the soonest it could go to the Board of Supervisors is January 16, 2007. Mr. Lighty asked when the preliminary plan could be expected. Mr. John Snyder answered about two to three months.

Public Comment

There was no public comment at this time.

Commissioner Comment

Mr. Newsome asked if Villa Theresa is zoned Institutional. Ms. Wissler answered yes.

Mr. Newsome was disappointed about the newspaper review of the Linglestown Plan meeting. Mr. Newsome felt this was an ongoing issue and the Planning Commission should be involved as an observer, at minimum, at these types of meetings. The Planning Commission should be notified as to the date and time of such meetings and some, if not all of the commissioners, should be in attendance.

Adjournment

Planning Commission

December 13, 2006

Page 18 of 18

The Planning Commission will meet to discuss the Linglestown Road rezoning issue on Wednesday, December 20, 2006, at 7:00 pm.

The next regular Planning Commission meeting is scheduled for January 10, 2006 at 7:00pm at the Lower Paxton Township Municipal Center, Room 171.

Being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 9:00 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Michelle Hiner
Recording Secretary