

**PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES
EAST HANOVER TOWNSHIP
DAUPHIN COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA
8848 JONESTOWN ROAD, GRANTVILLE, PA 17028**

June 24, 2008

Present: David Craig, Chairman; Michael Kovach, Member
Mike Webb, Member, Glenn Moyer, Member
Absent:: Donna Lebo, Vice Chairman

Also Present: Jaromir Kovarik, Consulting Attorney to the Planning Commission
Norm Ulrich, Township Engineer, LTL Consultants
Dawn Eppinger, Administrative Assistant to the Planning Commission
Karen Green, Dauphin County Planning Commission
Absent: David Smith, Light-Heigel Associates, Township Zoning Officer

This meeting was audio taped. The tapes are strictly for the use of the Administrative Assistant for clarification during preparation of the minutes.

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Craig at 7:05 pm.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- **Mr. Kovach made a motion to recommend approval of the meeting minutes of May 27, 2008. The motion was seconded by Mr. Webb. Being no further discussion, the motion was approved 4 in favor, 0 opposed.**

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

1. Jody Royer – (expires 07/19/08). This is a preliminary-final two lot minor subdivision plan located at the corner of Stirrup and Red Fox Lanes in Grantville.
 - Chairman Craig noted due to the nature of the time-frame, there will be action required by the Planning Commission.
 - Representatives present were: John Madden of Madden Engineering
 - Mr. Madden spoke regarding the comments from LTL's letter dated June 17, 2008. They are as follows:
 - Section 316.1 – the replacement area. They are willing to add a note to the plan about the protection of the area.
 - Mr. Ulrich's noted his concern with the replacement area, things can "get lost in the shuffle". There may not be flags in the area. If the note is added to the plan, it will protect the township or they can have it recorded with the deed.
 - Mr. Webb added for a practical point of view, what would happen when they sell the home. Mr. Ulrich added unless the homeowner is doing that they do not need a permit for, the line of defense for the township would be if they

come in and want to put something in, they would have to go to the Zoning Officer, who would look at the old plans and see the replacement area. A note on the plan is reasonable and is normally handled this way.

- Mr. Madden continued that half of the replacement system is in the wetland buffer boundary. Mr. Madden spoke with Mr. Smith over the telephone regarding this. He didn't want to speak for Mr. Smith but noted it would be a temporary disturbance to construct the septic system once it is installed, gets seeded and becomes lawn, there would be no long-term impact. He noted Mr. Smith told the applicants where to build the fill site to create a future septic location and performed the testing.
- Mr. Ulrich noted if Mr. Smith reiterates the information, the comment would be addressed. Chairman Craig noted they would like to get information from Mr. Smith echoing what Mr. Madden has shared.
- Mr. Madden addressed the comments under "Conformance with Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance" in the following:
 - Section 303.6 (comment #1) – Dauphin County comments have been addressed. The module was submitted to DEP.
 - Sections 403.1 & 402.1.1 (comment #2) addresses the scale of the plan. There was a brief discussion on this.
 - Sections 403.2 & 402.2.11 (comment #3) – they are waiting to hear about action on the waivers they requested and listing the ones they receive approval on.
 - Sections 403.3 and 402.3.1 (comment #4) – they are asking for a waiver on this section.
 - Sections 403.3 & 402.3.4 (comment #5) – existing features along Manada Creek. They would be willing to add a line to the plan noting whether or not the boundary is to the center line or the top of the bank. This was a clarification.
 - Sections 403.3 & 402.3.4 (comment #6) – has to do with the waiver requirement to do topo 200 feet beyond the property lines. They did have the surveyor look at the area across the road on Red Fox Lane and pretty much everything (driveways, poles, location of septic system) there are just trees along a bank on a big lot. Mr. Ulrich was out there previously and does not see an issue with this.
 - Sections 403.5, 403.6.3 & 402.5.2 (comment #7) – has to do with the planning module again. They had signatures and it was forwarded to DEP.
 - Sections 403.3 and 402.3.5 (comment #8) has to do with stormwater management. They have added a note on the plan about obtaining a minor land disturbance plan. They are requesting a waiver.
 - Mr. Webb asked if they are requesting a waiver from doing a stormwater planning. Mr. Maddon answered for them not to do it now but to do it at the actual time they apply for the building permit and minor land disturbance plan. Mr. Ulrich clarified it is not a waiver from doing the stormwater, it is just a waiver from doing it at this point.
 - Chairman Craig noted on Section 403.6.9 (comment #9), they are looking for a waiver which is no longer required and is redundant.

- Mr. Madden continued:
- Sections 403.6.10 & 403.6.13 (comment #10) – it has to do with monuments, markers and street trees. He verified Mr. Robinson indicated the monuments and markers have been set and they are asking for a waiver on street trees. Mr. Webb asked when the rest of the development was developed. It was developed in the 1960's.
- Section 617.6 (comment #11) – this goes back to the replacement area within the wetland buffer. This is a SALDO requirement. This is a replacement area that may be or not be used in 20, 25 years if the primary site fails. It would be a temporary disturbance to construct it and will be seeded. There was further discussion.
- Section 618.3 (comment #12) – this concerns street trees and they are asking for a waiver. The property is wooded. In order to put the street trees in, they would have to disturb existing trees. The rest of the development does not have them. They added a note saying if the trees along the front are disturbed, they would have to comply with the ordinance. There was further discussion. Mr. Ulrich noted street trees are within the public right-of-way.
- Mr. Lou Robinson, who performed the surveying, noted there is extensive vegetation on both lots in this area. Additional trees would get lost in the existing vegetation. There was further discussion regarding maintaining existing trees.
- Mr. Madden added there was a note put on the plan, General Note #18. There was further discussion on maintenance of trees. Mr. Ulrich added if the homeowner would need to disturb a certain area to put in the home or driveway or reasonable lawn, it is reasonable. If they buy a wooded lot, they may not be interested in clearing it. He added something could be put either on the plan or the deed noting no cutting of trees other than what is necessary to put in driveway, lawn or house.
- Mr. Ulrich asked if there would be an issue with adding the language to the deed and the plan. Mr. Madden answered he would talk to the client and he would provide a copy of the deed restrictions. There was further discussion from Mr. Kovarik regarding maintaining the character of the area.
- There was further discussion regarding the trees in the right-of-way. Mr. Ulrich noted it does not appear that any trees would need to be taken down to put in the trees or the house that are within the public right-of-way.
- Mr. Madden continued with the letter:
- Section 618.3.3 & 618.3.4 (comment #13) – this is regarding the specs for the street trees.
- Section 623.2 (comment #14) – this has to do with dedication of park. He indicated the fee would be paid in lieu of land.
- Waiver Requests were voted upon:
- **Mr. Kovach made a motion for recommendation to the Board of Supervisors for approval of waiver Section 403.1. Mr. Webb seconded the motion.** Mr. Webb asked for verification regarding the waiver received on May 13. Mr. Ulrich verified the date of the waiver. **Being no further discussion, the motion was approved 4 in favor, 0 opposed.**

- Chairman Craig asked for a motion on Section 403.6.9, Recorder of the Deeds box which is no longer required by the County.
- **Mr. Webb made a motion for recommendation to the Board of Supervisors for approval of waiver Section 403.6.9. Mr. Moyer seconded the motion. Being no further discussion, the motion was approved 4 in favor, 0 opposed.**
- Chairman Craig asked for a motion on Section 403.3 and 402.3.4, Topographic Features 200 feet beyond the site.
- **Mr. Kovach made a motion for recommendation to the Board of Supervisors for approval of waiver Sections 403.3 and 402.3.4. Mr. Webb seconded the motion. Being no further discussion, the motion was approved 4 in favor, 0 opposed.**
- Chairman Craig asked for a motion on 618.3, Street Trees, Sections 618.3.3 and 618.3.4. Mr. Webb noted he doesn't believe the waiver as it is currently written deals with the proposed remedy or alternative that was discussed this evening. It does not include mention of adding language to the title. There was further discussion. There was further discussion regarding the waiver sections.
- **Mr. Kovach made a motion for recommendation to the Board of Supervisors for approval of waiver Sections 618.3, 618.3.3 and 618.3.4. Mr. Moyer seconded the motion.** Chairman Craig noted there is an issue with property rights issue and the guidelines that are written. There was further discussion. **Being no further discussion, the motion was approved 4 in favor, 0 opposed.**
- Chairman Craig asked for a motion on Section 402.5.3, Stormwater Management Plan. He noted that a note was added to the plan stating the land disturbance plan will be done at the time a building permit is applied for. He asked the motion add wording about a note being added. There was clarification and discussion regarding stormwater and having it not be done concurrent with the plan and have it done when a building permit would be pulled for the property. Mr. Kovarik added they are asking not for the stormwater to be waived, but just for it to be deferred. Chairman Craig noted it is a waiver from our process.
- Chairman Craig read the wording on the waiver request, "Note #16 – The owner of Lot 2 may be required to submit a minor land disturbance plan prior to issuance of a zoning/building permit". He questioned if the word "shall" should be substituted for the word "may" after the words Lot 2. Mr. Ulrich clarified if the building is small enough, it may not trigger a land disturbance plan. Mr. Kovarik added they might want to add that the applicant shall be required to comply with 402.5.3 at the time of construction.
- **Mr. Kovach made a motion for recommendation to the Board of Supervisors for approval of waiver Section 402.5.3. Mr. Moyer seconded the motion.** Mr. Moyer asked if it should state somewhere that it will be applied to when they build. There was further discussion. **Being no further discussion, the motion was approved 4 in favor, 0 opposed.**

- Chairman Craig read the waiver for Section 402, Preliminary Plan, Minor Subdivision.
 - **Mr. Kovach made a motion for recommendation to the Board of Supervisors of waiver Section 402.1, Minor Land Disturbance. Mr. Moyer seconded the motion. Being no further discussion, the motion was approved 4 in favor, 0 opposed.**
 - There was discussion regarding what waivers were acted upon. Chairman Craig noted Mr. Madden has direction with some of the notes that will go on the plan. Action still needs to be taken in regards to the plan for the Board of Supervisors due to the expiration date of 07/21/2008. He asked if a motion would be entertained or for discussion from the representative of the applicant.
 - Mr. Ulrich asked Mr. Madden is an extension of time has been requested. Mr. Madden answered no. They have a note regarding the replacement area, a note regarding replacing the center line with Manada Creek. They are the two outstanding comments and he has agreed to making the notes to the plan. There was discussion, and Mr. Madden asked if it could be a condition of approval or does he have to grant the extension, make the revisions and come back next month. Chairman Craig answered the Commission will have to do decide and make the decision.
 - Mr. Ulrich added as far as the note changes, he does not have an issue with it, his concern is they have not heard back as far as the planning module goes. His recommendation would be the Township not consider a conditional final approval until the planning module is received back.
 - There was discussion when the planning module was submitted. Mr. Madden indicated he would get a grant for extension of time. There was further discussion regarding conditional approval.
 - **Mr. Kovach made a recommendation to reject the plan unless an extension of time is granted to the Board of Supervisors by the applicant due to the planning module not being received. Mr. Webb seconded the motion. Being no further discussion, the motion was approved 4 in favor, 0 opposed.**
 - There was further discussion on the notes that will be changed on the plan.
2. Steve Gingrich, Kimberly Gingrich and Robert & Stacey Jones (9/19/08). This is a preliminary-final one-lot addition.
 - There were no representatives for the plan.
 - Chairman Craig asked if there were any questions from anyone present or if the Commission would like to table the plan until representatives were present.
 - Mr. Kovach recommended tabling the plan until the July meeting. There was a consensus of the Commission.
 3. Hilton Garden – (expires 7/21/08) This is a preliminary land development plan with proposed construction of a 159 room Hilton Garden Inn at the intersection of Station and Ridge Roads.

- There were no representatives present at the meeting.
- Chairman Craig noted because of the expiration date of the plan, action will be required in the form of a recommendation to the Supervisors.
- Chairman Craig asked for discussion from the Commission. Mr. Webb noted it is his understanding they have not replied to any comments from the engineer. This was confirmed by Mr. Ulrich.
- **Mr. Kovach made a motion to recommend to reject the plan unless an extension of time is granted to the Board of Supervisors by the applicant.** Mr. Webb added “due to their failure to respond to the Engineer and Zoning Officer’s comments.” There was further discussion. Chairman Craig asked if Mr. Kovach wanted to withdraw his motion. Mr. Kovach answered yes. **Mr. Webb made a motion to reject the plan unless there is a grant of extension of time by the applicant based on a failure of the applicant to respond to the May 21, 2008 comments provided by LTL Consultants, Township Engineer. Mr. Kovach seconded the motion. Being no further discussion, the motion was approved 4 in favor, 0 opposed.**

NEW BUSINESS

1. Application Review Process

- Chairman Craig noted Mr. Webb disseminated information which was generated from the workshop. There is concern with regards to the direction they are headed and suggested a joint workshop with the Supervisors to make to ensure their time is spent judiciously and how they are putting the language in there.
- He asked if they could put a hold on it until they get feedback from the Supervisors or a legal opinion. If they are using the 21-day period at the first Planning Commission meeting, if by the professional’s review, they deem it inadequate or deficient, the Planning Commission may not necessarily have the power to reject the plan. That power may be reserved for the Board of Supervisors, but there is nothing to preventing the PC from taking action before the 90 days and making a recommendation to the Supervisors and letting them make the call.
- There was discussion because it was deficient or not meeting the standards, the PC is not filing the application. Mr. Webb noted currently the township has the ability to do that in seven (7) days. Mr. Kovarik noted Mr. Wyland has expressed that when a plan is rejected that the reason it is defensible in court.
- Mr. Webb noted the intent of what they were trying to do was provide adequate time for a professional to review the submission for completeness, we would be on a better ground of being able to make that decision and the applicant would be better off by knowing he had a deficient application and being able to correct it before he submits it. This should make the whole

process move quicker and reduce the number of times he has to grant an extension of time. That was the intent.

- Mr. Kovarik answered he understands and debated with Mr. Wyland from the PC position. His position is that it is fine and that is a situation when we are dealing with an applicant who has the best intentions to go forward. Mr. Kovarik indicated Mr. Wyland believes we also have to take into consideration there might not be some applicants coming in with a good faith effort but they want to set up the township because they might have a grudge from the past. If this happens, Mr. Wyland wants to ensure all the potential loop holes have been covered. There may applicants who want to do it at a minimum cost.
- Mr. Kovarik continued it was suggested to have it properly investigated and once a decision and in fact the PC would be in a position to reject the applications then there should be directive or resolution from the Board of Supervisors authorizing the Planning Commission to do it. It is not clear from the MPC whether this authority can be vested in the Planning Commission without actually having the Board of Supervisors authorizing the PC to do it.
- Mr. Webb answered at this point the applicant has a recourse in terms of being able to appeal the decision directly to the Board of Supervisors. They are not being taken out of the loop, they are just not being handed more work to do. Mr. Kovarik agreed.
- Chairman Craig answered he can see both sides. However we can put our legal team in the strongest footing and if it is a matter of changing some verbiage or rerouting paperwork, that could be done. Mr. Webb indicated he has no problems with a joint workshop. He honestly believes the Township Supervisors may have jumped the gun in terms of being concerned about this considering they are the ones who are going to have to review what the suggestions are from the PC. The PC cannot arbitrarily do any of this.
- Chairman Craig indicated if a joint workshop cannot be put together in a timely fashion, maybe Mr. Kovarik and Mr. Wyland can discuss it and put something together they are both comfortable with. Mr. Kovarik answered he is comfortable with the exception of he feels they might need directly resolution from the Township giving the PC direction to take action in the case they are not directly authorized to do something according to the MPC.
- Mr. Kovarik further indicated he would like to speak with Mr. Wyland and see if there is something the PC is missing. If the PC takes all 90 days, there is not much time for the Supervisors, if they would like to get more deeply involved with the plan to do their own additional review. He indicated Mr. Wyland noted EHT's Planning Commission is more involved than other townships.
- Mr. Kovarik indicated he sent an e-mail regarding a second issue that himself and Mr. Webb are working on with the updating of the SALDO and has not heard any response which is trying to get information about contamination or pollution of the ground water. There was further discussion. He suggested if there is a joint workshop on the issue of changing the SALDO in terms of the review process, this issue should also be resolved.

- Mr. Kovach noted according to the Planning Commission charter, they are an advisory board and make recommendations. He would like to work with the Board of Supervisors with changing language as needed, but as far as vesting the Planning Commission with powers, he is not comfortable with this. It does not meet the PC's charter, and they are the elected officials. It should be their decision to make.
- Chairman Craig answered he agreed with Mr. Kovach and the PC needs to stay within their realm. Most importantly, the PC has to listen to the Township Solicitor when he says he doesn't feel comfortable with particular language, it might get us in trouble. He noted we have a responsibility to the community. Mr. Webb noted the language needs to be changed, because the provision is in the SALDO.

OTHER BUSINESS

1. Ordinance 2008-03 – A public hearing is scheduled for Tuesday, August 5, 2008, for the proposed zoning change by RVG Management on Route 22.
 - Mr. Kovach noted this is an example of how the applicants have recourse regardless of what the Planning Commission recommends. At the previous meeting, the PC voted not to recommend a zoning change based on the fact they wanted to see a more comprehensive township-wide zoning, so they went directly to the Board of Supervisors and got a hearing scheduled.
 - Mr. Webb noted that is the way the process works. Under the current situation, even if something was rejected within seven (7) days, they have recourse to go back to the township. At most they get a 14 day delay before presenting the case to the Board of Supervisors.
 - Representatives for RVG who were present were: Dennis Schmidt, Principal; Edric Fetter of RVG and Bob Fisher of RG Fisher & Associates, Project Engineer.
 - Mr. Fisher noted this plan was presented at the May PC meeting. The main change since the last meeting is it has gone before the Dauphin County Planning Commission. He verified the PC had copies of the report. He noted the DCPC supported the zoning changes; however, they had some qualifications on the memorandum.
 - Mr. Fisher asked if the PC would like a review. Mr. Kovach indicated he would. He showed a rendering of the current and proposed zoning and identified the land owners. He also pointed out the township line.
 - Mr. Fisher pointed out 40.9 acres are in EHT included in the zoning request. The overall conceptual plan is develop tract into several commercial uses. With the plan, they have a number of traffic improvements. There is numerous improvements to the intersection of 39 and 22. There is a traffic signal proposed on 39 coming out in the WHT portion of the site and a traffic signal planned down at Bretz Drive and another signal proposed coming out opposite to the driveway coming out of the Ollie's Outlet property.
 - He noted there are substantial improvements proposed to the current intersection. He showed the signal lane improvements. There is a

- substantial investment to the traffic lane improvements. Part of the reason they would like to move forward at this time is they would like to account for all of the possible uses and all the possible impacts there might be. They don't want to improve a major intersection only to find out a year later that they should have added more lanes, better timings or done things differently because now they are going to include EHT.
- They would like to make this investment as it moves forward and include EHT in the overall traffic planning to get the proper signalization, proper turning lanes, stacking lanes all in the initial construction change.
 - Chairman Craig asked if they already received the zoning change in WHT. Mr. Fisher answered they have not. The hearing for WHT is scheduled for August 4 and EHT August 5. Chairman Craig noted they will only be moving forward based upon what is said by WHT, as well as EHT BOS.
 - Mr. Fisher noted some of the lands in WHT are already zoned commercial in WHT. There are some changes that they are proposing to the zoning in WHT to allow for some uses and they are accounting for those.
 - Ms. Green asked where PennDOT is on some of the improvements they are proposing. Mr. Fisher answered there are applications into PennDOT for all the traffic signal improvements. Mr. Schmidt indicated they are moving forward.
 - Chairman Craig asked if there is a distance between stop lights that PennDOT requires. The distance from Bretz to Ollies is not very large. Mr. Fisher answered it is 1200 feet. Ms. Green indicated access is a big focus and has been with PennDOT all along. Chairman Craig asked how the proposed stop lights go against what they have on the wall with the Blue Ribbon Study.
 - Mr. Fisher noted all of their improvements have been coordinated with PennDOT. Chairman Craig noted as far as he remembers, they were looking to reduce the number of crossovers on 22. Mr. Fisher answered what they are proposing is only one additional traffic signal. The signal shown at Bretz Drive is already planned and funded by the development that happened in the commerce park opposite Bretz Drive. They have been collecting fees for that. The traffic signal on 39 was already planned as part of the development. He pointed out additional development. He noted it is part of a traffic impact study approved by PennDOT. The only new signal being proposed is the one at Ollie's Outlet.
 - Mr. Kovach asked if there were any plans for a left-turn lane at the light towards eastbound 22. Mr. Fisher answered yes. Mr. Webb inquired about a left turn lane westbound going into Ollie's. Mr. Fisher answered that level of detail in planning is part of what they want to get into. If the rezoning does not happen, it will not take place. Mr. Webb asked if there is a break at Ollies. It was confirmed there is.
 - There was discussion regarding traffic stacking on Route 39 approaching 22. Mr. Fisher noted south on 39 towards 22, there will be a left-hand turn lane, a through lane and a right turn lane all proposed. Chairman Craig inquired as to whether the site distance be improved. On the south side it is worse.

There will also be a left-hand turn lane, a right-hand turn lane and a through lane. This is an existing problem.

- Ms. Green noted regarding I-81, the discussion that took place at the Dauphin County Planning Commission was there is a PA 39 widening project at the intersection of 81. They are trying to get funding for it. It is border-line right now. It was mentioned by the Commissioners if that project could be taken into account when they are speaking with PennDOT about future improvements.
- Chairman Craig asked if the allocation of funds towards improvement should extend beyond this immediate area. Ms. Green answered there is no extra money anywhere for anything right now. There is a number of things that could be considered. The applicants could look at counts and studies that could be reviewed. It was a general recommendation at the Commission meeting.
- Mr. Fisher planned on coordinating with PennDOT, but there is a limit as to what the private funds can do. This is an existing problem, but they are doing their part of fix the existing problems but would look to coordinate. The intersections at the church, Bretz Drive, Ollie's and 39/22 are all being paid for by private funds.
- Chairman Craig asked Ms. Green if she had any further comments. Ms. Green answered they are seeing instances of "spot zoning" in different municipalities. They are cautioning municipalities to keep in mind their comprehensive plan and their planning process. The fact that EHT is planning on revisiting zoning is good and it is being taken very seriously by EHT. Historically, their reviews have fallen back on County documents and allowed the municipality to focus on its own documents and that is generalizing but they also review the municipality's documents and it was some of the goals and objectives in the multi-municipal comprehensive plan that EHT is part of that made them look at the other side.
- Ms. Green also noted the County just received the request from West Hanover to do their review. It has not been completed yet but will be by the time they have their hearing. The review for EHT will be taken into account when the other staff person looks at the review. The fact that WHT is not under the same comprehensive plan, there is no guarantee what was recommended here will be recommended in WHT.
- Chairman Craig noted it seemed the recommendation could be taken in either direction. There is a fair amount of latitude. Ms. Green answered they are obliged to either recommend or not recommend. Historically, their reviews tend to be pretty one way or another. This was a tough decision. Ultimately the recommendation was that the pros outweighed the cons.
- Mr. Kovach added his concern is if this is approved, the word is out that EHT is about to begin a comprehensive rezoning plan, there may be a mad rush for everyone who is zoned RA along the corridor and everything would become exactly what EHT is trying to avoid.
- Mr. Kovarik asked Ms. Green if it is possible once there is a review for WHT and since it is all one project, to go back and revisit what was recommended

for EHT. Mr. Fisher answered that is part of why the request was submitted concurrently. They have been before the WHT Planning Commission and they recommended in favor of it. Chairman Craig asked to allow Ms. Green to finish with her comments.

- Ms. Green answered the staff person, who is not her, will be obliged because the EHT portion has already been reviewed, to consider this. That does not mean he is going to be obliged to come up with the same recommendation, particularly because WHT is under a different comprehensive plan. There was further discussion from Mr. Fisher. Mr. Fisher added on the planning side, when they are doing the traffic improvements they are accounting for all possible scenarios.
- There was discussion regarding a recommendation and the time frame it needs to take place. Chairman Craig noted RVG came to the Planning Commission as a courtesy before going to the Board of Supervisors.
- Mr. Kovarik asked if we received a formal request from the Board. He noted Mr. Lucas and Mr. Wyland were working with each other on legal description.
- Ms. Green noted in the previous minutes it was Mr. Wyland noted the Planning Commission must make a recommendation within 45 days. Mr. Kovarik noted the 45 days starts when the request is received from the Board of Supervisors. Chairman Craig noted there was no official request received.
- The next Planning Commission meeting will be held on Tuesday, July 22, 2008, with the workshop following on Tuesday, July 29, 2008.
- Mr. Kovarik asked if the Planning Commission would like him to verify if this was a formal submission from the Board of Supervisors.
- Mr. Fisher added the legal description was prepared and submitted with the zoning request to the Township. Mr. Kovarik noted he was present at the last Supervisor's meeting and as far as he can recall, they didn't request the Planning Commission to act on it.
- Mr. Webb noted the ordinance was sent to the PC on 6/12 by Mrs. Casey. Mr. Fisher added it was on the agenda, so they showed up in the event they were needed. There was further discussion regarding the recommendation.
- Mr. Kovach noted he would like clarification as to whether or not we are officially notified and if they are under any time constraints.
- Chairman Craig noted they are welcome to come back next month. Mr. Kovach added they would be notified.
- Chairman Craig asked Ms. Green if she would be able to send a copy of their recommendations with regards to West Hanover Township and if it would be available before the next meeting. Ms. Green indicated that would be done.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Kovach made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 9:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Transcribed by Dawn E. Eppinger

Cc: Board of Supervisors
Marie Beaudet
Keith Espenshade
Dave Marshall
Larry Spitzer
Tom Shutt
Norman Ulrich, Township Engineer
David Smith, Township Zoning Officer
Deborah Casey, Secretary-Treasurer
Karen Green, Dauphin County Planning Commission
Zoning Hearing Board

Planning Commission
David Craig
Donna Lebo
Mike Kovach
Ed Twaddell
Mike Webb