

**LOWER PAXTON TOWNSHIP
PLANNING COMMISSION**

March 9, 2011

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT

Fredrick Lighty
Ernie Gingrich
Dennis Guise
Richard Beverly
Douglas Grove
Robin Lindsey

ALSO PRESENT

Dianne Moran, Planning & Zoning Officer
Tim Smith, Dauphin County Planning Commission

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Lighty called the regular meeting of the Lower Paxton Township Planning Commission to order at 7:03 pm, on March 9, 2011 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. Beverly made a motion to approve the minutes from the February 9, 2011 regular meeting. Mr. Gingrich seconded the motion, and a unanimous vote followed.

NEW BUSINESS

Preliminary/Final Subdivision #11-01
Central Pennsylvania Food Bank

Ms. Moran stated that this plan will subdivide the existing parcel 35-074-053 to consolidate the subdivided parcel with the existing Central Pennsylvania Food Bank parcel, 62-040-055. The purpose of this plan is to increase the lot area of the proposed Lot #1 for future expansion of the Food Bank. No development is proposed for Lot #2 at this time. The property is located west of Briarsdale Road, north of Corey Road and south of Sunnycrest Drive. The total tract area is 1.772 acres located in both Susquehanna and Lower Paxton Townships. The portion of the property in Lower Paxton Township is zoned GI, General Industrial, and is served by public water and public sewer.

The applicant has requested the following waivers:

1. Waiver of the requirement to provide a preliminary plan.
2. Waiver of the requirement to provide survey information of existing features within 100 feet of the subject property.

Ms. Moran stated that Comment #6 in HRG's memo dated March 6, 2011 can be removed, it is not necessary.

Ron Secary, Snyder Secary and Associates was present on behalf of the plan. Mr. Secary stated he has reviewed the comments, and accepts them and offered to answer any other questions.

Mr. Guise asked if Susquehanna Township has reviewed or acted on the plan yet. Mr. Secary stated their planning commission has reviewed it, and their board is waiting on Lower Paxton's action before it acts on the plan.

Mr. Tim Smith, Dauphin County Planning Commission, had no new comments to discuss.

There were no comments from the audience.

Mr. Guise made a motion to recommend approval of the plan, and recommend approval of both waiver requests, subject to satisfaction of the comments generated by Staff, HRG, and Dauphin County. Ms. Lindsey seconded the motion, and a unanimous vote followed.

Special Exception #11-01
Major Home Occupation: Guitar Lessons
Wayne William Clark, 4565 Berkley Street

Ms. Moran stated that Mr. Clark has submitted an application for a Special Exception to allow him to offer guitar lessons, simple repairs and maintenance of the guitars as well as additional services related to the activity of providing guitar lessons from his residence at 4565 Berkley Street. Mr. Clark's residence is located in an R-2, Medium Density Residential District. Guitar lessons in a residence is classified as a major home occupation, which requires Special Exception approval in the R-2 zoning district.

Mr. Clark explained that he is currently employed at Forte Music, as a music teacher. He teaches guitar and bass guitar and is interested in working out of his residence. Mr. Clark stated he has read over the ordinances regarding home occupations, and he feels the home is capable of supporting the activity, without too much nuisance or interruption to the surrounding area. All lessons are given indoors. The driveway is large, 32 feet wide by 22 feet deep so it can accommodate 3 cars at a time, even though there would be only one car coming and going at a time. Mr. Clark noted that he runs a busy schedule at Forte Music, and is an "in-demand" teacher of guitar. He emphasized that he is not going to teach 10-15 people there a week, there will probably be 10-12 people there per day. Every half hour, there will be somebody coming and going from 3:00 pm to about 9:00 pm.

Mr. Clark stated the only other service he would like to offer is the minor repair of his students' instruments. Occasionally he may record a "play-along" CD for his students.

Mr. Lighty asked if the applicant is a permanent resident of the dwelling. Mr. Clark answered yes. Mr. Lighty asked if the applicant is the only one giving lessons. Mr. Clark answered yes. He noted that the ordinance allows for one non-resident employee, and the drum teacher at Forte also lives on Berkley Street and at some point in the future he might consider allowing him to teach at his home as well, but only if it did not violate the rules. Ms. Moran advised that the Zoning Hearing Board will make a decision based strictly on the testimony given, so the applicant should ask for exactly what he needs or desires to do. She also noted that a second teacher at the home will mean more traffic and more parking, and the hearing was advertised as it was presented in the application. Mr. Clark stated that he mentioned a non-resident in his narrative, but kept it vague.

Mr. Lighty asked if the area to be used for lessons is 25% or less of the total floor area of the house. Mr. Clark answered yes, that it is basically the smallest bedroom in the house.

Mr. Lighty asked if there is one off-street parking space. Mr. Clark stated he lives on a corner lot, and the driveway is 32'x22'.

Mr. Lighty asked about tractor trailer deliveries. Mr. Clark stated he does not receive any deliveries.

Mr. Lighty asked about noise. Mr. Clark stated it will absolutely not create any noise or vibration. Mr. Lighty asked if that meant that the lessons are acoustic or without amps. Mr. Clark stated it is a practice amp. Mr. Lighty cautioned that the activity can only be perceptible to neighbors until 9:00 pm. Mr. Lighty asked about a sign on the house. Mr. Clark stated he does not need one, he does not want "walk-ins". Mr. Guise asked if there would be more than 3 students at a time. Mr. Clark stated the lessons are individual lessons. He noted however that every once in a while a student that is in a band may ask him to record the band as a demo. This is something that the kids really get a lot out of, and there is no happier kid than one with a CD of his own band. He noted that if he could do that approximately three times a year, that would be great. It is something he does to give back to the students as a thank you to the students. Even with this, there will be no perceptible noise to the outside. Ms. Lindsey asked if students will use the front or side door. Mr. Clark stated that everyone that visits his home now uses the side door by the driveway, so that will probably continue.

Ms. Lindsey asked if the applicant has been in touch with his neighbors about the application. Mr. Clark stated he hasn't really had a chance yet, except the immediate neighbor Laura and she is really the only one close. Ms. Lindsey asked if the lessons will be Monday-Friday, or 12 cars each day. Mr. Clark stated Monday through Friday, and maybe a few on Saturdays, however, this would be about three years down the road when he has developed a full schedule. He does not have plans to leave Forte, but would like to work on adding home students in case Forte closes or is sold.

Mr. Guise made a motion to recommend to the Zoning Hearing Board that the Planning Commission has reviewed the special exception application and have no objections to it. Mr. Grove seconded the motion, and a unanimous vote followed.

Text Amendment
Density Bonus Construction, Triple Crown Corporation

Ms. Moran stated that the Township has received a proposed text amendment to the Zoning Ordinance regarding Section 306.B.1 Allowed Uses in Primarily Residential Zoning Districts, R-1, Low Density Residential District. The request is to allow density bonus construction. The applicant also proposes to amend Section 202 of Articles 2, Definitions, in the Zoning Ordinance, to include a definition for density bonus construction.

Mark DiSanto introduced John DiSanto, Mark Coakley, the Acquisition Manager for Triple Crown Corporation (TCC); and Rick Martzolf, Counsel for TCC, on behalf of the application.

Mark DiSanto stated they have come to the meeting to present the concept of a density bonus to address some concerns they have encountered while planning in the R-1, Low Density Residential District. There are other restrictions in the ordinance further limiting the underlying zone allowance of two units to the acre, when you take into account steep slopes, wetlands, stormwater, and buffers. These things make it difficult to achieve that density.

Mark DiSanto explained that the proposal is for properties which are 240 acres or larger, 45% of the property must be maintained as open space; 10 acres of the open space would have to be developed as a public park to Township specifications; 15% of those homes would have to be age-restricted. All of this should allow them to get back to the underlying density.

Mark DiSanto explained that after reviewing the Comprehensive Plan, he thinks it ties in with Dauphin County's comment that the proposal complies with the planned growth areas and the updated regional growth management plan for this development. The Township Comprehensive Plan says that open space is valued and that sprawling development is undesirable. This text amendment supports that by requiring 45% open space.

He also noted that the Township Comprehensive Plan states that they should encourage innovative open space and conservation oriented development. This amendment supports that concept. The Comprehensive Plan also calls for residential areas with density consistent with the existing adjacent neighborhoods. The property is zoned R-1, with two units to the acre, the surrounding areas are on half-acre lots, the true net density on older developments is 2 to the acre and that is all that this proposal would allow.

Mark DiSanto stated that the Comprehensive Plan calls for housing for seniors, and this amendment does that by requiring a percentage of the homes to be age-restricted transfers. It also calls for protecting stream corridors with riparian buffers, which is achieved with 45% open space. This gets the property back to the net density contemplated by the ordinances, and complies with the

Comprehensive Plan. It keeps development within existing infrastructure, and requires that the developer do something for the Township by supporting the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Guise asked if TCC has done an analysis to show what other areas of the Township may qualify for these criteria other than Stray Winds Farm. Mark DiSanto stated that he did not have such a list. He noted however, it was not designed to apply to smaller tracts. If it works with this property, it may be a good planning tool, and if they wanted to reduce the acreage requirement in the future that could be done.

Mr. Guise stated that the amendment says that if it meets the criteria, it is a by right permitted use. He asked if alternatives have been considered, such as special exceptions or conditional uses. Mark DiSanto stated they did contemplate those concepts but this one seems to be the most appropriate with the park and open space requirements. It also gives the Township the control to offset the benefits.

Mr. Smith, Dauphin County Planning Commission, stated that additional density does comply with the County's Comprehensive Plan. It also has access to facilities and utilities. He cautioned that it will apply to all R-1 areas, and recommended the Township consider that in making its decision. Some R-1 areas may or may not be in areas where the planned growth should be.

Mr. Smith asked if the additional traffic was considered. He also asked if other services such as sewer were considered, for both this location and others that may qualify for the bonus.

Mr. Lighty called for comments from the audience.

Helen Gemmill, McNeese Wallace and Nurick, explained that she represents two residents in close proximity to Stray Winds Farm. The residents are Andrew Snyder from Paxton Church Road and Harry Ulsh. Ms. Gemmill noted she is a resident of Lower Paxton Township.

Ms. Gemmill reviewed some of the background of the Stray Winds Farm development to date. The Zoning Hearing Board granted variances to build 449 units; one was granted and one was deemed granted. Those variances require TCC to make a \$1.8 million contribution to the Township to pay for offsite improvements. Those offsite improvements were the hardship cited in the variance hearings. Mr. Snyder and Mr. Ulsh litigated the validity of the variance, and the Commonwealth and the Court of Common Pleas of Dauphin County have ruled that that variance was not proper. With that, TCC is permitted to build 374 houses. The variances have been struck down, even though they are still winding their way through the courts. She explained that TCC is now trying a different attack, if you can't get a variance from the law-try to change the law.

Ms. Gemmill noted that the role of the Planning Commission is to make recommendations based on sound planning for this Township. She stated this is not sound planning; this is intended to benefit one developer. That was demonstrated when Mr. Guise asked about other possible properties, and there were none. Ms. Gemmill stated she did not know of any either, so this is intended to benefit one developer for one property: Stray Winds Farm. It is crafted specifically to match the size characteristics of the Stray Winds Farm property.

Ms. Gemmill stated that the Pennsylvania Constitution prohibits special legislation; spot zoning is a form of special legislation. She stated they think that is what this is. It is basically a defacto rezoning for this property. There is no legal right to get this amendment. There is no substantive invalidity in the ordinances requiring an amendment; it is just because TCC wants to build more than 374 homes. She noted that she recognizes that if they are allowed to build what they want they will contribute to fix some offsite problems. She noted that many municipalities are facing tough economic times, but the Municipalities Planning Code (MPC) has a section with a mechanism to deal with issues where offsite improvements need to be made. That is the procedure that should be followed, not adopting an ordinance that benefits one property owner. It is not right to bypass that procedure for the financial benefit of one property owner. Ms. Gemmill suggested calling a spade a spade; the Township is allowing one person to buy a law that works for them. For example, a property on Jonestown Road that sits back a little bit, wants a bigger sign so they get more customers. That person could make a donation of \$30,000 to the Friendship Center, and the Township could allow big signs when it only allowed little signs before because it was near some residential properties. That person could draft an ordinance so that it only fits to that property. She noted that is not good government, and it is not how Lower Paxton operates. She noted she realizes that there is an economic benefit to the Township, but you cannot buy a new zoning ordinance.

Ms. Gemmill noted there may be some fear on what TCC could build if they were not allowed to build the extra homes. The answer is simple, it is what is allowed under the Zoning Ordinance. Any rational developer is not going to build a shoddy development, because that will not sell their homes.

With regard to age restriction, Ms. Gemmill stated that calls for age restricted transfers. That term is not defined in the Zoning Ordinance. What is included, is "age restricted development". There are specific requirements in that section of the Zoning Ordinance that are not in the proposed amendment. The proposed amendment does not say that a woman over 55 with four children under 18 could not live there. The Zoning Ordinance requires that it be permanently restricted, which is done by deed restriction, lease restriction, or a note recorded on the plan. TCC is proposing that they will certify that the first 15% of people that they sell to have at least one person 55 or over. When that person sells it, they can sell it to anyone. This does not fit with existing regulations in the Zoning Ordinance. The ordinance has a mechanism that will monitor it through an association. Under the proposal, you have to rely on TCC to take care of it.

With regard to traffic, the previous proposal included more age restricted homes and at that time there was 3,181 trips with 53% of 449 units being age-restricted. Under the new proposal, it comes out to 4,041 trips. This is not a compromise, it is more traffic than what they would have had if the variance had been lawful.

Ms. Gemmill stated the proposal is awkward in nature, because they are creating a definition of "density bonus construction" and calling it a use. It is not a use. It is density. It makes for a very confusing ordinance.

Ms. Gemmill suggested this proposal is not even going to do what they want it to do, since the property is not zoned R-1 anymore, it is RC. Under the RC zoning, in order to calculate permitted density, you go back to the R-1 since it is the previous zoning designation, this shows very clearly how poorly planned out this was.

Ms. Gemmill stated that the bottom line is that TCC is trying to use the legislative process to get something that the courts have told them they may not have under the current Zoning Ordinance. There is no reason to give this special benefit to TCC.

Ms. Gemmill stated that there was a vote within SWAN, 30-22 in favor of supporting this. That is a close vote, and it is not representative of what the community thinks. With regard to neighborhood opinion, she presented a petition with 90 signatures, in opposition to having more than 374 homes on the Stray Winds Farm. She noted that two people that voted as part of the 30 in favor of it, were confused about what they had voted for. Ms. Gemmill noted that she also has a comment from Representative Ron Marsico via email in opposition to the proposal. The bottom line is that TCC is not entitled to this, it is not a sound planning decision, and she urged the Planning Commission to refuse to recommend approval to the Board of Supervisors.

Eric Epstein questioned if Ms. Gemmill was present on behalf of a client or for herself. She answered she is compensated to be here tonight but if she was not...Mr. Epstein asked if she was compensated for her night. Ms. Gemmill stated she is, but she speaks as a resident also.

Mr. Epstein stated that SWAN has been together for six years and he has never seen Ms. Gemmill at a meeting. There are 350 members, and they negotiated a settlement for eight months and what was heard tonight was half of what occurred. His concern is that he has heard Ms. Gemmill's name before as well as Frank Wright, but he never knew if they existed. He stated they are non-profit so they cannot lobby, so all they can do is tell the Planning Commission what has occurred.

Mr. Epstein stated that the economic benefit as Ms. Gemmill discussed is not only for TCC. While he is not happy with the text amendment, after eight months of hard work he thinks it is close to what the Township and the abutting community wants. It is not a difficult decision to say no, because you think it's about economic benefit. Mr. Epstein does not believe that to be the case. There has been give and take, and if you consider the things negotiated from TCC, you will realize there is a significant difference between their work and others.

Mr. Epstein stated that in the negotiation process, the most contentious part was the age restricted housing. When TCC started they had no age restricted housing. Now they are at 15%. The level of age restricted housing is higher than normal, because you do not normally have to be 55+ to purchase the house. He recognizes that after that occurs, somebody younger could move in. He believes that the economic price points will drive values up for people who live next to the neighborhood. He noted SWAN was willing to trade density for things that they thought were beneficial to the community. Among those, an 8,400-foot bike path, 45% open space, a corridor that goes back to Laurel Ridge and almost to Linglestown Road. The wildlife and the tree stands are being preserved, and a recreational park will be created where there is no park around.

Mr. Epstein noted that \$1.8 million will be used to correct two very unsafe conditions. They are significant issues. The reality is there will be a minimum of 374 homes generating more traffic, with or without those improvements. He is trying to find a compromise solution that may not make everybody happy, but it will improve the overall quality of life for folks. This is more than an economic benefit for TCC, it is for the benefit for SWAN as well, who has been around for many years. He noted that the 30-22 vote is equivalent to Ronald Reagan. He stated they did not lobby for members or petition for votes, they stood back and let the people come to them.

Mr. Epstein noted he would have preferred 53% age restricted, but he also would have preferred the farm never be developed at all and that he could have played centerfield for the Phillies. His preference is not reality. Reality is with 449 homes we can get a development, albeit not perfect, it will be something we can all enjoy. He noted that 449 homes may not necessarily mean more trips generated, lower price homes do equal more traffic. Traffic will always be an issue there. At least there will be some sort of solution to ameliorate that concern.

Mr. Epstein stated he has not seen an email from Representative Marsico, even though he has availed himself to him. SWAN has had 60 meetings, and it has not been easy, but this is the best we can do. He noted he is not an attorney, and he is not paid to do this, but he wants the Commission to know what has been done trying to come up with a compromise for the community. It is not perfect, but it is for the best of the community.

William Gannon, stated he and his wife oppose the amendment. About five years ago they bought a home in Colonial Crest fully understanding that Stray Winds Farm would be developed, with the same hope that it not be developed, but understanding that it will be. He thought it would be developed under the current zoning regulations and they were comfortable with the number of homes and the traffic proposed. What is being proposed is to increase it, and to do it with a plan that will funnel all of that traffic onto McIntosh Road. He noted that Eric may think that is a good idea, but he thinks is a horrendous idea. That is a light community road that cannot handle the additional volume. The original ideas of access are being restricted to a single access. Mr. Gannon stated that from the beginning, when he was recognized and allowed to speak, that he was not there as a member of SWAN, he spoke as a member of the Colonial Crest community. At the last meeting, when the vote was taken on the amendment, he was greeted at the door and told that he needed to sign a paper stating that they were joining SWAN to be allowed to vote. Even though there are 350 members in SWAN, and this is the official SWAN position he has presented, that is an eschewed number because he would not have signed the petition if he had been allowed to be heard without it.

Andrew Snyder, 3975 Paxton Church Road, one of the individuals that challenged the variance decision, stated he sees the issue as a three fold process. He feels the text amendment is nothing more than an attempt to overturn the ruling of the Commonwealth Court. He stated that this is special legislation. When other qualifying tracts were questioned, there are none. That is proof that the amendment is specifically designed for this site and to benefit a single developer. Mr. Snyder stated he also challenges the validity of the membership numbers of SWAN. The number of 350 is nothing more than a collection of email addresses. He would like to know what determines membership in SWAN and if there are signed documents saying they are indeed members. He held up a document that they were required to sign the night of the vote. If that constitutes membership, then they have

about 60 members. Thirty members voted for the text amendment, and he present 90 signatures against it, 3:1 opposition in black and white on paper.

Steve Brindle, has been a resident of Colonial and McIntosh Road for 35 years. He stated that those that live on McIntosh have a significantly different perspective than Eric does living on Hillsdale. The area cannot handle 75 more homes. Additional school busses and young children will be a detriment to the area. He does not think that it is Colonial Crest's responsibility to make it economically feasible for TCC when they purchased a property for a price too high to make it work for 374 units. They should not have to bite the bullet just because TCC overpaid for the property.

Robert Klotz, stated he has lived in Colonial Crest for over 40 years in the same house, two homes from the intersection. He has seen many changes over the years. He noted he is also a registered professional and civil engineer. Taking into consideration the comments he has heard, he opposes the amendment.

A. C. Ulsh, stated he lives on McIntosh Road, two houses in from Colonial Road. He is very concerned about traffic that is all going to dump onto McIntosh Road. They are besieged by traffic now, and there hasn't been one house built on the Farm yet, but it seems like every single day there is more and more traffic. McIntosh Road is a country bumpkin road, and he has been there for over 34 years. The road is just not equipped to take that traffic. There have been concessions made to keep all the other roads closed off, leaving McIntosh as the only road in. those roads, including Hillsdale and Valley View should have been kept open. He knew the family that developed Colonial Crest, and they envisioned that farm becoming part of or an extension of Colonial Crest, one big neighborhood. There are too many dead-ends in this township and he thinks the roads should be opened up to take some of the heat off of McIntosh Road. He is not against this farm being developed, and he is not against 374 units which is what is allowed. But he is not for anymore than that.

Mike Valenti, McIntosh Road, stated that he bought two 1-acre lots at the same auction as TCC. He made a decision at that time to purchase, based on what would surround him, based on the regulations in place. He built his home on one, and has one for sale. TCC's land surrounds him on three sides and across the street. This amendment will hurt him and the sale of the other lot. People ask him what will be built, and he doesn't know what to tell them. He hopes they follow the law like he did.

Eric Epstein, stated that there is nothing nefarious going on about having someone sign to get in. He was concerned that there were people at the meeting for the vote that had never come to a meeting before. There are 350 members, and most are via email. There is no hardship posed on anybody for coming to the meeting. Some people were removed from the mailing list because they were suing SWAN, and most of those people do not come to regular meetings when other issues were discussed. At 60 meetings, and 350 members, are they there all the time-no, that is the way it is. You can speak at any meeting and every meeting. You cannot vote unless you say you agree with the cause. As an organization, they have a right to ask their people to commit to the goals of the group. There is nothing nefarious. Everything you could want from SWAN is on the website. Mr. Epstein stated that nobody has ever been denied the right to speak at a SWAN meeting, nobody.

Kathleen Gannon, stated she takes issue with what Eric said about not being denied a vote or a right to speak during his SWAN meetings. One time she disagreed with them, and sent a letter to the Township regarding traffic flow the way she viewed it, I received an email or a conversation from Eric, you are with or you're against us. Mr. Epstein stated that is not true. At that time, she was removed from the mailing list for SWAN.

Greg Judd, residing at Colonial and McIntosh Roads for about ten years, stated that his reasons for moving there are the proximity to the church across the street, and the street was quiet, not a lot of houses. He stated he is definitely against adding any more than they are allowed. With regards to SWAN, he has been going for years, and he noted that many people get confused when the votes are taken. It is very hard to understand. He does not remember a vote saying are you for or against adding more homes, but he may be wrong. Mr. Epstein stated he is wrong. Mr. Judd stated he must not have been at that meeting, because he would have opposed it.

Betty Miller, a resident of Hillsdale Road for 27 years, stated she is opposed to only 374 homes, she wants to go the opposite direction and voted for the text amendment because with it there will be open land, buffers, road improvements. With the 374 homes, there will be none of that, only a cookie cutter development, with no amenities or anything. She stated that she has been to probably all of the 60 meetings, and has never seen Mr. Judd.

Mark DiSanto, TCC, explained that this text amendment is not specific to a development, it will be applicable to any property that meet the conditions. All of the complaints against the text amendment are site-specific, and do not address the text amendment. The traffic concerns are valid, and they will supplement the previous traffic impact study. Regarding the issue of spot zoning, he noted this is not spot zoning, and they do not believe in special legislation. He suggested that TCC take those comments under advisement and supplement some of the information and answer some of the questions raised. He requested that the action on the text amendment be tabled until the next regular Planning Commission meeting.

Mr. Lighty asked if anyone else would like to speak or ask questions. Hearing none, Mr. Guise agreed there are many issues and tabling the plan is a good idea, since there is a question whether this is good planning and if it is sound.

Mr. Guise made a motion to table the plan. Mr. Gingrich seconded the motion, and a unanimous vote followed.

Business Improvement District

Preliminary Plan

Mr. Guise suggested the statutory powers be incorporated by reference instead of listing them out. Mr. Grove agreed that is a good idea, since the other items are taken from the statute. The other members agreed the work was well done.

Mr. Lighty will incorporate Mr. Guise's work and finish the Plan so it can go to the Board of Supervisors workshop meeting.

Wind Energy Subcommittee
(Alternative Energy Subcommittee)

Mr. Epstein suggested enlarging the scope of the committee, wind energy may be wrapping up in another year. Wind is pretty established, and solar is struggling somewhat. His industry has found that one of the emerging energy sources is biodigestors. That has become a money maker. Because of the issues the Chesapeake Bay is having, you can get credits for basically burning manure. You can also accept manure. One issue that arises is traffic bringing waste to a farm. He suggested broadening the scope. He noted that he doesn't see the micro-wind happening like was thought it might. There are complaints about aesthetics and about the hookups with the grid. One way biodigestors make money is taking waste from restaurants. The alternative energy world is constantly changing.

Mr. Lighty stated that the wind energy got the attention because people were putting them on house-tops and on the side of utility poles. While it didn't happen here, there weren't regulations to control it either. There was also a concern that people weren't doing it correctly. Mr. Epstein noted that solar raised some issues when people didn't realize they had to have a sturdy roof. People are always looking for ways to reduce their energy consumption and spending. On the residential level, there is no money to be made, rather it is all about energy efficiency and changing your generator.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no additional public comment offered.

COMMISSIONER COMMENT

Mr. Lighty stated he will email a draft of the Preliminary Draft to the Commissioners and work on hard-copies as well.

ADJOURNMENT

The next regular Planning Commission meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, April 13, 2011, at 7:00 pm at the Lower Paxton Township Municipal Center, Room 171.

Being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 8:30 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Michelle Hiner
Recording Secretary