

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

**February 24, 2009**

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

Also Present:

Norman Ulrich, Township Engineer; David Smith, Township Zoning Officer  
Karen Green, Dauphin County Planning Commission  
Dawn Eppinger, Administrative Assistant to the Planning Commission  
Absent: Scott Wyland, Hawke, McKeon & Sniscak, Township Solicitor

**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 7:01 pm.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

- Chairman Craig, citing his absence at the January 27, 2009 meeting, Chairman Craig noted he would abstain from the voting and motion-making process and asked Vice Chairman Webb to ask for a motion of the meeting minutes from the January Planning Commission meeting. **Mr. Kovach made a motion to recommend approval of the meeting minutes of January 25, 2009. The motion was seconded by Mr. Moyer. Being no further discussion, the motion was approved 3 in favor, 0 opposed; 1 abstention, Chairman Craig, noting his absence at the January meeting.**

**PLANS TO BE DISCUSSED**

1. Reichelderfer (expires 4/19/2009). This is a final subdivision plan at 665 Lauder Milch Road/644 Shady Lane for an annexation. A non-building waiver has been approved by the Township SEO and submitted for approval from the Planning Commission. Mr. James Hartman of D.L. Reiber and Associates was present for the applicant.
- Mr. Hartman acknowledged it is the policy of the Township to accept the plan at the first meeting. He asked to offer comments.

- Chairman Craig answered he would like for Mr. Hartman to orient the Planning Commission to his plan and the justification for what is taking place and noted the professionals may have some cursory review items for the plan as well.
- Mr. Hartman noted the plan falls within the Township ordinance as an annexation. They are moving a lot line of the properties. They would like to bring the property more into conformance with the ordinance. The Reichelderfers own property at the corner of Shady Lane and Route 743 in the Township. It is currently zoned Rural Agricultural. There is going to be a swap of ground between Chad Reichelderfer and Darlene Reichelderfer.
- He noted it has been reviewed by the Zoning Officer and he has spoken with him and received his comments. There will be no earth moving or construction. It is a simple lot line adjustment.
- Chairman Craig asked if there was anything further or anything for the applicant.
- Mr. Hartman answered he had one more comment to offer. This plan does not offer any more dedication of road right-of-way. They have looked through the ordinance and took a look at the annexation and did not see anything specific to additional road right-of-way dedication and he noted it is also felt by the land owner this would be a hardship on the property itself in its current form. They are looking towards the Commission how it might be viewed.
- Chairman Craig noted he will look to the professionals for their comments and added right now he does not know if the Commission is 100% comfortable talking about waivers at this point until it is adequately reviewed internally.
- Mr. Hartman answered he is not quite sure at this point if it is even a waiver. He did not run across the information in the annexation.
- Mr. Ulrich answered it is covered in his comments. He noted there may be some overlap with Mr. Smith's review but he would go through some of the SALDO and zoning issues that were found.
- There was discussion about obtaining a copy of the cursory review. It was noted an escrow account would be established at the Township to cover the review fees as they could obtain a copy of the memorandum.
- Mr. Ulrich noted it was a cursory review and it should be noted additional comments could be generated when a full plan review is completed. It is intended to hit the major zoning and SALDO point.
- Mr. Ulrich reviewed the comments that were covered in his cursory review memorandum of February 19, 2009. There was discussion regarding interpretation of the SALDO for the annexation.
- Mr. Hartman noted his firm will contact Mr. Ulrich regarding the review process for an annexation. He also noted that is one of the reasons some of the issues with Mr. Ulrich's review may have come up, because of how the plan was viewed.
- Mr. Smith noted the only addition he would have from Mr. Ulrich's comments would be that boxes are shown on the Darlene Reichelderfer's property for the septic area. It would be best to show the percs and probes triangles. Additionally the well for Darlene Reichelderfer is not designated.
- Mr. Hartman answered he will get a designation on the well. He asked Mr. Smith as far as showing the percs and probes and noted it was done possibly over

three years ago and he was not sure where those exact locations would be shown.

- Mr. Smith answered they would be shown on the original subdivision plan. Mr. Hartman noted they will take a look at it and review it.
  - Ms. Green asked if a stormwater management plan would be required. Mr. Ulrich answered it would not be required because even to trigger a minor one it would be a minimum of 1,000 square feet of impervious or an acre of land disturbance.
  - Chairman Craig noted for Mr. Hartman to contact the Township for the payment of the escrow so the cursory comments can be released.
2. Costabile (expires 5/4/09) – This is a final subdivision plan at 9377 and 9375 Mountain Road. A non-building waiver has been approved by the Township SEO. Mr. Randy Allen of Dauphin Engineering.
- Mr. Allen noted he prepared the final subdivision and annexation plan for Rocco and Marcia Costabile, Michael Longenecker and Patricia Skinner. The site is located on the southern side of Mountain Road, approximately .9 miles each of the intersection of Mountain Road and Manada Gap Road. The project consists of three (3) existing lots totaling 3.9 acres and zones RA. Mr. Allen gave the following information:
    - Existing Lot #1 and Lot #2 is owned by Rocco and Marcia Costabile. Lot #3 is owned by Michael Longenecker and Patricia Skinner. The purpose of the plan is to re-subdivide the existing tree lots and consolidate them into two new lots, which are referenced Lot #1 and Lot #2 on the plan.
    - Each new lot will contain an existing single family dwelling. In addition, there will be a new driveway which will be constructed to serve Lot #2. The proposed lot annexation plan shall clean up some of the existing encroachments and access that are present with the existing lot configuration. The owners are present and he noted they are available for any questions.
    - Mr. Ulrich reviewed the comments that were covered in his cursory review memorandum of February 19, 2009. He reminded them there could be additional comments when a thorough and complete review is performed.
    - Mr. Smith noted he had two additional comments to Mr. Ulrich's review. Under Section 201.5.4.b, on proposed Lot #2, there is an existing frame shed that encroaches on the property line. He asked for it to be relocated to eliminate the encroachment. Under Section 201.5.2.B, the front yard setback of proposed Lot #1 and Lot #2, actually be shown from the existing right-of-way as opposed to the dedicated.
    - Mr. Allen noted they received the PennDOT permit and believes they can answer the questions that were raised.
    - Chairman Craig asked for questions from the Planning Commission and the public.
    - Mr. Smith gave Mrs. Eppinger the original Highway Occupancy Permit application for her to distribute.

3. Halbleib (expires 5/4/09) – This is a final land development plan located at 8685 Devonshire Heights Road in Hummelstown. Representatives for the plan were Mr. Martsof and Merritt Reitzel of Serratelli, Schiffman, Brown & Calhoon and Craig Raynor and Bill Rudy of Pennoni Associates.
- Mr. Martsof commented the Commission probably all know the property well. He noted his clients spent the better part of a year coming through the process of getting a two-lot subdivision. He noted his client wants to build a home across the street from the existing home and build two pole barns and continue farming. After submitting the land development plan, 80 comments were received from the Township Engineer; 4 zoning and 33 SALDO comments, 42 stormwater comments and 1 general comment. They also received two comments from the Zoning Officer.
  - Mr. Martsof noted at first blush it appears there should not be a lot of comments just to simply build a house across the street from where you currently live with a carport and a couple of pole barns. He also noted the professionals need to do their job.
  - Mr. Martsof noted they will be asking the Commission to do their job and consider this plan to the position of being able to recommend approval or disapproval of this plan to the Board of Supervisors by next month. It is a lot of material to get through, and they have been provided with a copy of the Engineer's comment letter of February 18, and they are prepared to address those comments.
  - Mr. Raynor noted they would be developing on the northern portion of the 47 acres and noted there was a blow-up detail at the meeting. They are proposing to develop the corner of the property with a single family two-story home with a walk out basement with attached garage which measures 30 x 50 and gravel parking area and driveway area that connects to two alcoves which are 60 x 120. Those buildings are for agriculture storage. As far as the subdivision plan, they received approval for the driveway location which is shown on the plan. He outlined on the plan where it was located.
  - Chairman Craig asked Mr. Raynor if he was sure the driveway was approved or that was a proposed driveway which was sketched but was not an approval. There was some discussion away from the microphone which was not picked up.
  - Mr. Ulrich answered the he believed the location of the driveway was approved but not the construction. He added they would need a driveway permit. He realized, he believes, during the subdivision process it was explained there was an existing farm entrance right there, but he actually discussed it with Mr. Longreen, Director of Public Works for the Township. It was noted Mr. Longreen issues the permits for the driveways and he indicated to Mr. Ulrich they are not one in the same. The location is approved but the construction of the driveway is not.
  - Mr. Raynor noted details were shown. He noted what is shown reflects what the subdivision plan illustrated at the time. He noted the plan took careful measures with the stormwater management, even though there will not be that much impervious area to the entire site.

- Mr. Raynor continued, they are proposing three infiltration basins. One is actually a detention basin that serves as an infiltration basin. The water collected from the larger building will come down into five foot gravel strips on either side. That runs over land into the infiltration basins. They have the vegetative filter strip and the infiltration working for them. The majority of the building area comes down into another infiltration basin which eventually dumps into a larger detention basin. Everything is sized according to the ordinance. The one issue they did have was with the driveway. When it was constructed, there was an 8" pipe installed underneath so they are designing what they had at the time and some of the comments through the review letter, they will ask for waivers from because that portion of the project has been constructed.
- Chairman Craig asked what the alternative would be if a waiver does not come recommended from the PC, not knowing what the Board of Supervisors will do.
- Mr. Martsof answered they are still working on that and do not know what the alternative is.
- Mr. Raynor continued they would like to go through each comment and get clarification or some type of an indication to the receptiveness for a waiver and they want to identify items that they can address.
- Chairman Craig noted that typically speaking, waivers are not acted upon until the fact that the applicant has done their best to meet the ordinance, and once it is explained why it would be a hardship. If it is done the other way around, it will come in piecemeal and wonder how they arrived at that point. The Commission would like the applicant to come to the Commission and say, "Hey, this is the best that I can do. I've worked with your Engineer, I've worked with your Zoning Officer to cure these problems or issues." Come to the Planning Commission that way as opposed to saying, "Let's see what we don't have to do and then we'll move on from there".
- Chairman Craig added they like to put the onus back on the applicant, reminding them the Commission are volunteers. The representatives for the applicants are the professionals who are getting paid to do this, so the Commission expects the professionals to do the bulk of the work and then come to the Commission.
- Mr. Raynor added the plan is rather simple and not complicated. There will be a relocation of the barn. Another point would be the existing barn will be demolished and all that impervious area will go away. The stormwater basin is basically what they did was to create an embankment with the driveway and that is standing up from the water.
- Mr. Raynor continued there are approximately 12 acres of stream and just farmland. Further down is a little stream spring and one point he noted was on the subdivision plan it is identified as wetlands and/or the hundred year flood plains. This area, according to the wetlands report, is just a stream.
- Chairman Craig asked if the applicant was specifically referring to the downhill side of the driveway. Mr. Raynor pointed to an area on his board and noted it started at the point he was referring to. The plan is sensitive to the environment and provides the owner with a nice site to the home, overlooking the Manada Creek. Mr. Raynor asked if there were any comments.

- Chairman Craig answered Mr. Raynor had indicated he wanted to address the Engineer's comments.
- Mr. Raynor went on to discuss the comments from Mr. Ulrich's letter of February 18, 2009.
- Comment #1, Zoning Section 201.5.1.E.a – He noted this is in regards to the setback line. The question is, when the subdivision plan was done, they provided a 50 foot right-of-way along the property. He noted the question asked by the Township Engineer was whether or not the dedication has been accepted and if not should they show the property and the set back lines from the existing right-of-way line the ordinance requires. He would need some clarification.
- Mr. Ulrich answered the reason it is a comment is because he was unsure whether the additional right-of-way proposed in the subdivision was accepted or not or what the Township's position is. It is really a graphing issue, and they can find out from the Township. If the right-of-way has not been accepted, it would be fine on the plans.
- Mr. Smith noted to save some time so Mr. Raynor will not have to go over his comments, that is an item that was in his review letter as well.
- Comment #2, Section 309.4 – Slope allowable, the driveway cannot slope greater than 10% without approval from the Zoning Officer. They are showing a driveway with a 13%. That is in the area where they are turning back to the house. The Zoning Officer does have a comment that it is related to that with regard to the entryway. The entryway is 8% and they will comply with that. He asked if the Zoning Officer accepted the 13%.
- Mr. Smith answered he did not see that specific requirement in Section 309.4 of the Zoning Ordinance. He read the section from the ordinance. He also noted there is an amendment, 2005-1 that he will look into and contact Mr. Raynor.
- Comment #3, Section 327.3 – Mr. Raynor read the comment out loud in regarding the buffer plantings. This comment did not come up from the Zoning Officer on the subdivision plan. This was a recent comment of the Township Engineer's. Is it really applicable to this site where the development is just taking place on a small portion of the property and the rest will remain agricultural land. If they have to provide a study, what would the definition of expert evidence be.
- Mr. Ulrich answered he believes there is a definition for an expert in regards to the Township. The definitions can be checked in the zoning ordinance. If there are questions regarding that, they can contact the Township. There is no type of real hard type of factual background, someone who that is their background.
- Mr. Raynor asked if it would apply to this plan because there are existing farm fields and the development is in such an isolated area. They are encroaching on an area of the riparian buffer where the driveway is installed, but a very small amount of encroachment.
- Chairman Craig asked if that was the reason why maybe this process should have happened before the driveway was put in. He asked where the driveway was barely encroaching.
- Mr. Raynor came up to Chairman Craig's seat and showed him the area he was referring to.

- Mr. Ulrich noted the way the driveway was installed, as you are going up the driveway to the left-hand side, which is the downstream side, there is a one-to-one slope and it looks as though the toe of that one-to-one slope is essentially right on the edge of the wetlands. He added it would need to be verified that what is showing on the plans is accurate as compared to what is in the field. That is why it could possibly be wetlands. He does not know that for sure.
- Chairman Craig noted it is not wetlands, but it is floodplain. There was further discussion regarding the floodplains outside the realm of the microphone which was not picked up.
- Chairman Craig asked if they would like to amend and update the information. Mr. Ulrich noted he would look into it just to be on the safe side as far as calling it a stream versus a wetland. He added Mr. Raynor may still have issues with the Zone 1, 2 and 3 buffer for the stream, if they are calling it a stream; but, if they are not calling it wetlands and they are calling it a stream, there would still be stream buffers 1, 2 and 3. and it would only clip that one corner.
- Mr. Raynor answered the way he interpreted it was you are allowed to encroach on the buffers.
- Chairman Craig answered that is why the professionals get to make the call if it is substantial and not actually the applicant. Mr. Raynor added he just wanted to make the point it is not wetlands.
- Chairman Craig asked as far as Comment #3, for Mr. Raynor to get the plan he was showing over to the Township professionals and what is impacted.
- Comment #4, Section 327.4 - Mr. Raynor commented the amount of encroachment is minimal and really does not affect the overall intent of the ordinance.
- Mr. Raynor started on the SALDO comments from Mr. Ulrich:
- Comment #1, Section 303.1 – He noted they are asking for a waiver because they submitted a final plan noting it is a fairly simple plan and they have scheduling constraints. He believes that was also done with the subdivision also.
- Comment #2, Section 304.7 – He noted he is not sure if anything needs to be done. He did not receive a letter from DCPC. The plans have been submitted for review to the DC Conservation District. The sewer planning module is part of the subdivision plan.
- There was discussion from Mr. Webb who commented a copy of a letter from DC Conservation District noted it was administratively incomplete. Mr. Raynor answered that has been taken care of.
- Mr. Raynor continued: The NPDES is under review, the Township Zoning Officer, the letter was received; Township Fire Department and Emergency Management Coordinator – he asked if these were necessary.
- Chairman Craig answered they like to consider all aspects and it was discussed at the last Supervisor's meeting that essentially Emergency Management and the Fire Department would be looking at it as well.
- There was discussion as to the distribution of the plans to the Fire Department and Emergency Management. There was verification Mr. Raynor would need to deliver more plans in order for the Fire Department the Emergency Management to perform a review. Mrs. Eppinger will contact them.

- Comment #3, Section 402.1.2 – This section defines the property boundary requirements. He noted he will clarify that and also clarify it once there is a determination of what right-of-way line they are going with.
- Comment #4, Section 402.2.11 – This requires any existing waivers, variances, special exceptions, conditional uses and existing non-conforming structures or uses to be shown on the plan. He will make notes on the plan. He asked if they are asking for the waivers for them to be put on the plan
- Chairman Craig answered there is a form that needs to be filled out and Mr. Raynor did fill these out for some of the waivers and there were some that were lumped together. He asked for them to be done individually.
- Mr. Raynor answered they will show the waivers that were requested on the plan and if they are not granted, they will be removed.
- Comment #5, Section 403.3.2 – identification of adjacent property owners. There is one property owner on the far corner which will be identified and put on the plan.
- Comment #6, Section 402.3.3 – boundary marks shown and described on the plan. This was previously approved on the subdivision plan. He asked if it needs to be re-applied for it.
- Mr. Ulrich answered if it was approved under a previous subdivision, it needs to be shown on the plan.
- Comment #7, Section 402.3.4 – information to be shown on the plan when present or within 200' of the site. Mr. Raynor commented there is an existing easement and it will be shown. He is working on a plan submitted after this that will show a lot line swap. Pointing to the map, he noted if the road line does not make much sense, it will become part of the Zeigler property.
- Comment #8, Section 402.4.6 – easements to be shown on the plan. Mr. Martsolf noted when he looked at this particular provision, he did not see the public improvements on this property. This is one property, one detention pond, and he didn't see why the municipality would want easements or blank easements to come in under any circumstances because it is private.
- Chairman Craig asked if there are stormwater management facilities on the property. Mr. Martsolf answered for one house and one barn.
- Chairman Craig added there is stormwater being collected at this site and it needs to function properly. If it is not functioning properly, then that water can either be inundating people downstream or having an adverse effect. It is in keeping with the health, welfare and safety of the general public.
- Chairman Craig continued, if it is deemed, "it's only one house", everybody can say it's one house, one house, one house, but compounded together, that is a lot of development. The other option would be talking to the Supervisors for a waiver or if the applicant can come to some sort of agreement with the Solicitor. It is open to discussion.
- Mr. Martsolf noted he appreciates that and for the Commission to understand their position is the impact for this 47 acre farm to be farmed. There will be a house and two pole barns, with sheet flowing into the Manada Creek. He noted he doesn't believe they are going to severely or substantially impact anybody else. That is the position they will be taking with the Solicitor and/or the Board.

- Comment #9, Section 402.4.13 – requested waivers to appear on the plan. Mr. Raynor noted they will be shown on the plan.
- Comment #10, Section 402.5.9.1 – topographic map showing steep slopes, all existing and proposed site alterations. Mr. Raynor noted a plan will be provided and with the steep slopes, the areas are very minor. The areas of steep slope are the basin and the driveway. He proposed to ask for a waiver from the requirement of the steep slope report. It has gone through the Conservation District, who will comment on bank stabilization and best management practices, post construction management plan.
- Mr. Ulrich commented as a point of note, in the past LTL has taken the position with regards to the steep slope report, some of those issues that are called out to be in the report can be addressed on the plan. Some of the items that may be required by a steep slope report could be handled on the plan. If they are on the plans or in note form and are going to be recorded, that would satisfy it and there would be no need for a report. Specifically, there is a requirement that a geotechnical report be provided if there is any type of structural issues that are proposed on slopes of 20% or greater. That would actually need a report.
- Comment #11, Section 402.5.9.2.3 – requires detailed information to assure structural safety and minimize harm to the environment during construction. Mr. Raynor asked for clarification if the Engineer was looking for a geotechnical report on the existing driveway embankment. Mr. Ulrich answered he believes a geotechnical person would also qualify as a professional, and would be more appropriate than anyone else.
- Mr. Raynor asked if it was necessary for a private driveway to have a structural engineer certify that the embankment is adequate to support minimal traffic. Chairman Craig asked if he was referring to farm equipment; i.e., tractors and hay bailers.
- Mr. Ulrich noted his feeling on it is the concern he would have from an engineering standpoint, and not having a geotechnical background, but more of a civil nature, because you have an impoundment upstream from the applicant and a stormwater management basin, and because of the way the outfall pipe was installed, and there is no way of knowing whether there were any seat collars installed. Because of that being the case, very likely there will be a situation where there will be water following the outfall pipe and it will take sediment and deposit it into the creek during heavy flows and overtime.
- Mr. Ulrich added this is something that may not happen within the first six, nine months or possibly even a year. Over time that will happen if the measures that are outlined in the stormwater ordinance are not followed. If the applicant has someone to say from a stability standpoint it is fine, then it will satisfy the structural concerns because there is a basin upstream from it.
- Mr. Ulrich also noted during the installation of the driveway, there was no one there to verify any type of compaction. There are a number of other issues in regards to the basin. That is the reason for that, and taking a look at it, it looks like a one-to-one slope and because of that being the case, that is definitely a concern because he believes the requirements for the ordinance says nothing greater than three-to-one.

- Comment #12, Section 402.5.9.2.6 – requires adequate foundations for building and/or structures be provided as they relate to slope stability concerns. Mr. Raynor noted he was looking for clarification on what the Engineer is specifically looking for. Mr. Ulrich answered his guess from looking at that comment is there is probably a foundation basin lull or the possibly the pole building that might be constructed in something deemed a steep slope. Mr. Webb noted from the plans it would be the corner of the house.
- Mr. Ulrich explained that would be what he would typically see. If the applicant is going to have the normal construction, less than 15% not being a steep slope, one can assume normal construction techniques would be fine and sufficient. If there are slopes in excess of this, then there are different soil pressures happening with loading a potentially unstable slope. Once again, if a geotechnical professional notes there are no issues with the slope stability or the foundation would need to be tied in, that is the information he is looking for.
- Comment #13, Section 403.4.1 – requires complete description of centerline and right-of-way line for all new and existing streets. Mr. Raynor commented he believes this was discussed when they did the subdivision plan that hidden expense would have made the plan more cluttered when the right-of-way was done so it was not shown on the subdivision plan. It can be shown.
- Mr. Ulrich answered reading over the letter, he was surprised it was not raised in the subdivision plan. He apologized if it was missed. Mr. Raynor answered that it was. Mr. Ulrich answered he would like to discuss it again. He is not quite sure why and the only thing he can think of is there are so many tangents there and there is so much curve that it would be difficult to describe the center line.
- Mr. Ulrich added the monuments are in place, they have already been verified and if the property is going to be described to this, it may not be an issue.
- Comment #14, Section 403.6.4 – requires notarized statement on the plan signed by the landowner. Mr. Raynor answered they provided two signatures for both Jill and Kevin Halbleib to sign it. He asked if Mr. Ulrich was looking for two separate certifications.
- Mr. Ulrich answered there may have been some confusion on his end with the individual who helped with the review. They may not have been aware the transfer of the deed had officially taken place. If this was the case, the comment would not apply.
- Comment #15, Section 403.6.10 – requires the submission of an improvements guarantee with the final plan. Mr. Raynor noted they are looking for a relief from the improvements guarantee, the developer's agreement and the bulk of the improvements on the site are all private. He noted the engineer makes the argument the stormwater management facility is a public improvement. They are looking to get relief from the whole aspect.
- Mr. Ulrich noted it is up to the Planning Commission. At a minimum he would suggest anything that is inside the public right-of-way.
- Comment #16 403.6.11 – statement on the plan all public improvements will comply with Township's construction specifications. Mr. Ulrich added all he is saying is that a note be added to the plan and as they move forward with approval for the plan any appropriate details needed for construction are shown

within construction standards. The general note also goes a long way to cover the Township because if something missing from a detail standpoint, there is a note on there that it needs to be built that way.

- Comment #17, Section 403.6.13 – requires an executed Developer’s Agreement for submission. Mr. Raynor noted the applicant will be asking for a waiver from this.
- Comment #18, Section 502.1 – requires submittal of financial security for required improvements that have not been installed. Mr. Raynor noted they will be asking for a waiver because this is a private residence.
- Comment #19, Section 506 – requires inspection be performed for public improvements before, during and after construction. Mr. Raynor commented it ties into, what are public improvements. They will be requesting a waiver from this section. He noted the last part of the paragraph notes a detail for the driveway tie-in to Devonshire Heights Road should be provided. He answered this would be no problem, they will take care of it.
- Comment #20, Section 507 – requires as-built plans be provided. Mr. Raynor noted they will request a waiver from this section.
- Comment #21, Section 602.12.5 – requires rounded cartway edges according to PennDOT requirements. Mr. Raynor noted it was previously approved but they will put the same details on the plan.
- Comment #22, Section 602.12.7 – requires adequate site distance provided for all intersections. Mr. Raynor noted he believes it was approved as part of the subdivision, the location of it, and the site triangle was done. Mr. Ulrich answered the information just needs to be put on the plan.
- Comment #23, Section 605 – requires design criteria for access driveways which provide vehicular movement between a street and a tract of land containing any use other than one-single-family or a farm. Mr. Raynor does not believe this section applies because that is what the applicant is proposing.
- Mr. Ulrich answered it may have been unclear as to whether or not there would be different uses for the facility; i.e., small business. What could satisfy it would be a note on the plan stating this is intended for a farm and no other uses will be performed out of this property.
- Comment #24, Section 613 – requires easement be established for certain facilities. Mr. Raynor noted this goes back to the easements, and they will determine whether or not they will go for a blanket easement or ask for a waiver.
- Comment #25, Section 617.6 – requires activities within wetlands and wetlands margins will not degrade water quality, wetland vegetation or have an adverse hydrological impact on the wetlands. Mr. Raynor noted this relates to the wetlands, but the area in question is actually a stream.
- Comment #26, Section 617.2 - defines limits of wetlands and wetland buffers. Mr. Raynor noted this is associated with the wetland comment.
- Comment #27, Section 618.1 – requires the means of natural resource protection during construction be demonstrated. Mr. Raynor noted the driveway is in and has stabilized rock, bolder, side slopes. He asked for clarification and noted there is a plan in with the Conservation District for E&S approval. He asked what the Township is looking for.

- Mr. Webb answered he would say they are talking about a professional determining whether or not the impact of putting the driveway there without having approval, and the construction activities having caused any impact. Basically, this could have been avoided by just waiting until approval was obtained before it was put in.
- Comment #28, Section 618.2 – requires plans to show existing trees and construction impacts proposed. Mr. Raynor asked for clarification of the ordinance because it notes 25% needed replacement. If 25% are removed, do they have to be replaced. Mr. Ulrich answered he will take a look and get back to Mr. Raynor. Mr. Raynor answered they may be asking for a waiver from this.
- Chairman Craig asked Mr. Raynor if he understood that criteria when he asks for each waiver in that section. Mr. Webb added there are criteria that needs to be met to justify why they are asking for the waiver.
- Comment #29, Section 618.3 – defines requirement for street trees. Mr. Raynor noted this will be another one they will be asking for a waiver from.
- Comment #30, Section 618.6 – defines the type of allowable landscape material. Mr. Raynor answered he believes these are two landscape areas that were planted with pine trees. Mr. Ulrich asked if these were previous plantings. Mr. Raynor confirmed they were planted. Mr. Webb asked when they were planted. It was confirmed it was in the fall.
- Mr. Raynor commented it is his understanding that all plantings have to be native species, or it is just the ones covered under the Zoning and SALDO. Mr. Ulrich answered there is a list they can pick from. There was discussion regarding foundation plantings. Mr. Webb added they should be careful about introducing other species. Mr. Ulrich noted it would be street trees, anything inside the riparian buffer. The landscape strip around the house would not be included.
- Chairman Craig noted they are not shown as doing street trees, but it is required. When the street trees are shown they can be identified.
- Comment #31, Section 619 – requires conservation standards for construction that is proposed within areas which contain slopes of 15% or greater. Mr. Raynor noted this was discussed earlier and ties into the notes on the plan for the steep slope conservation. There was discussion regarding the computerized contour plan.
- Mr. Ulrich asked if he was saying the existing contour plan would generate them on requirements less than what the ordinance requires. Mr. Raynor answered it would be more strict. Mr. Ulrich suggested going into those areas, blowing them up and modifying them as needed
- Comment #32, Section 620.4 – requires sanitary sewer system be designed and permitted. DEP has approved the Exemption from Planning. Mr. Raynor noted the information was provided as part of the subdivision plan.
- Comment #33, Section 623.2 – requires dedication of park and/or open space when one or more new dwelling units is created. Mr. Raynor noted they will be asking for a relief from this fee because it is a single family resident.

- Mr. Ulrich answered he believes the way it was addressed at the subdivision time was it was a deferment until the land development plan came in; however, this can be discussed with the Planning Commission.
- Chairman Craig noted it appears there are a lot more waivers and not just the few that were outlined. Mr. Raynor acknowledged there were. Chairman Craig asked because there are more waivers coming in if they are going to be submitted together all at once as a packet.
- Mr. Raynor answered his plan is to address the comments and provide the waiver requests in time for the March 24<sup>th</sup> meeting, with the previous waivers being redone and resubmitted.
- Mr. Ulrich noted he believes the waivers previously granted under the Halbleib subdivision do not have to be reapplied for. The waivers just need to be shown on the plan as a previously granted waiver.
- Mr. Raynor introduced Bill Rudy of Pennoni Associates and noted he would address the stormwater comments provided by LTL.
- Comment #1, Section 304.B.1 – soil testing to be conducted for proposed infiltration facilities. He noted no action needs to be taken.
- Comment #2, Section 304.J.4 – requires protection during construction for all infiltration systems. He noted this will be taken care of.
- Comment #3, Section 305.A – requires runoff control to reduce post-construction peak rates of stormwater flow. He noted when the following two comments (#4 and #5) are revised, Comment #3 will be taken care of.
- Comment #4, Section 306D – requires utilizing a predetermined value for the sheet flow distance AND
- Comment #5, Section 306.E – outlines CN value to be used. He asked if the extra .25 acres if that was in regards to the bare compacted soil. The gravel and all the impervious areas for the house and the pole barns, that was all accounted for in the .65. The only thing he could figure was maybe the extra quarter acre was a compacted bare soil which he was not sure exactly what area was being looked at.
- Mr. Rudy asked Mr. Ulrich if under Comment #4 he was looking for the time of concentration calculation for the 150 for both pre and post construction. Mr. Ulrich answered yes, the pre and post sheet flow condition needs to spell out a length of 150 feet.
- Mr. Ulrich answered it can be discussed at a later date. He is sure there is mark ups on the stormwater report. He does not know off the top of his head.
- Comment # 6, Section 307.B – requires an overflow system to be provided when structures become blocked. Mr. Rudy asked if it is referring to the basin or the conveyance system. If it is referring to the basin, they would want to request a waiver from that. The driveway and existing berm is has an 8” pipe.
- Mr. Ulrich answered his understanding is that it would apply to the basin as well as some of the inlets.
- Comment #7, Section 307.E. – requires a minimum grade and diameter for all storm pipe size of 15” in diameter. Mr. Rudy noted a waiver will be requested because an 8” pipe is already installed.

- Comment #8, Section 307.F – requires all storm sewers to be Class II reinforced concrete pipe. Mr. Rudy noted they will be requesting a waiver because the pipe for the basin was installed. They are proposing HDPE pipe for the conveyance system.
- Mr. Moyer asked Mr. Ulrich if the 8” pipe was adequate. Mr. Ulrich answered he does not believe so. The reason he would say no is that another requirement as well is up to and including a hundred year storm cannot pass through the principal spillway for the outlet structure and even the two year if it passes through that. The capacity on an 8” pipe is probably in the neighborhood of 4 or 5 CFS. Mr. Rudy added it would be working under pressure flow. Mr. Ulrich continued the ordinance requirement is the 15” concrete pipe. The 8”, as far that goes with passing the storm, there are other issues there. Combining all of the issues, his guess is it will be an issue.
- Mr. Ulrich asked Mr. Rudy if his 8” pipe was the primary orifice. Mr. Rudy answered is because this is an infiltration area, what the water does is building up and flowing into the top of the inlet and then out the 8” pipe. The only control structure is the type-end inlet.
- Mr. Ulrich answered the other issue is he is not so sure the outfall pipe can be a control. Mr. Rudy answered he is not sure and would have to check.
- Chairman Craig asked if Mr. Moyer’s question was answered and added this is a little more technical and instead of taking up time, that can be discussed on the side.
- Mr. Rudy answered the biggest thing regarding the stormwater is whether or not the waiver for the 8” pipe will be supported as it is being used through the stormwater. He noted obviously they will have to ask for other waivers based on that. He thinks they have shown through the stormwater report, unless using the 8” pipe as the control, they have met all the flow criteria, all the peak rate criteria for the basin design.
- Mr. Ulrich asked if they have. Mr. Rudy answered he thinks with Comment #3, the only question would be the .9 acres and if they feel it is not correct then the applicant may not meet the peak flows.
- Mr. Ulrich added generally speaking based on what Chairman Craig and Mr. Webb had said, other than general issues, he has more of a concern with regards to the placement of the now existing driveway than he does even with the outfall pipe. With the driveway being constructed as it is, there is no clay core trench, there are no anti-seep collars and no emergency spillway per say, certainly not a stabilized surface emergency spillway, there are a number of concerns. As you look through the rest of the comments they are pointed out section by section, the trench, the fact that compaction cannot be verified. He is sure they would agree when it comes to an embankment and putting it where it is not on an existing slope, that is vital. Over time, it is definitely a concern.
- Mr. Rudy answered what they will do is work through which waivers will be supported.
- Chairman Craig noted they can keep going through the items if there are any questions. If Mr. Rudy wants to keep hitting the other items if clarification is needed or if there are questions, that can be done.

- The following comments were made by Mr. Rudy.
- Comment #10, Section 307.J –they will revise.
- Comment #11, Section 307.K –they will look for a waiver.
- Comment #12 Section 307.L–they will revise.
- Comment #13, Section 307.M. –they will look for a waiver.
- Comment #14, Section 307.N – they will revise.
- Comment #15, Section 307.0 1&4 and Comment #16, Section 307.P.1 – they will revise
- Comment #17, Section 307.P.3 and Comment #18, Section 307.P.4 – they will revise
- Comment #19, Section 307.P.6 – they will add a note.
- Comment #20, Section 308.A.3 – Mr. Raynor touched on this earlier in the meeting regarding the setback.
- Comment #21, Section 308.B, Comment # 22, Section 308.C – they will request a waiver. Mr. Raynor asked Mr. Ulrich for clarification regarding orifice size.
- Mr. Ulrich answered the reason it is in there is because there is also a requirement that no flow can enter the principal spillway. The basin is designed for even the two-year storm passing the principal spillway. The reason it is on is to try to shortcut if the plans are submitted again and the minimum orifice size is 3”.
- Mr. Ulrich noted if a waiver is being requested for the section requiring no flow to pass through the principal spillway for the two year and hundred year storm and the PC were inclined to grant the waiver, Comment #22 would not apply.
- Mr. Rudy continued:
- Comment #23, Section 308.D – information can be provided. They are already using the driveway as an emergency spillway. Mr. Ulrich noted his big concern would be if they are going to have a very wide emergency spillway, his guess is the driveway would probably be stone. If that spillway were ever used, that stone would be gone. What he would suggest if the driveway is going to be used as an emergency spillway, at least that area that would be an emergency spillway be paved, use concrete checker blocks, etc.
- Comment #24, Section 308E and Comment # 25, Section 308.F – they are going to request a waiver for both of these.
- Comment #26, Section 308.I – they will revise.
- Comment #27 through #32, Sections 308.J.2; 308.J.5; 308.L; 308.M; 308.N; 308.Q.4 – they are going to request waivers for all of these.
- Comment #33 through #34, Sections 308.Q.6 and 309.B.1 – they will provide the information.
- Comment #34 through #39, Sections 310.A; 310.B; 310.C; 310.E.1; 310.F.5 – these all have to do with the E&S. He asked Mr. Ulrich if he was looking for them to submit the E&S plan.
- Mr. Ulrich answered he believes to some degree the applicant will need E&S approval; so they are looking for a plan that complies with the Conservation District requirements.
- Comment #40, Section 312 – the easements were already discussed.

- Comment #41, Section 401 – Mr. Rudy noted there was just a statement regarding the land disturbance that is taking place.
- Comment #42, Section 702 – Mr. Rudy noted Mr. Raynor mentioned earlier there is no roof lateral for the pole barns. There will be stone placed at the edge of the pole barns and water will run off into the stone. All the other areas there are directed to vegetative areas so that will be cleared up in a future submission.
- Mr. Ulrich brought up Comment #42 would be a concern for him. He noted he did take a look at it a little and while the proposed way of handling the runoff certainly seems more green and more environmentally friendly, his concern is with a structure that size and the amount of volume of runoff you will get, where is that going to go after it surcharges the voids created by the installation of a five by foot or two bed. Because the property is a farm, he is guessing there will be muddy areas because of the activity. His concern is he is not so sure the monies that would be spent for excavating and putting in the stone trench might be better spent if they were to run a roof along the back of the building and discharge it directly to an area that will not be disturbed and will be maintained as a stabilized surface.
- He continued and noted even if the smaller basin in the middle area if that is left go and not mowed, all the better because that is really what that is all about. Or if it is less costly, there are two inlets proposed to get around that. It is shorter to pop them into the inlet low grade and save the cost of excavating and putting the stone in there.
- Mr. Webb made a comment about the stone with the heavy equipment and noted after a number of years, it will fill in on those type of stones and you will no longer have infiltration.
- Mr. Ulrich asked about the infiltration capabilities of that soil in that area yield. If there is no infiltration data to support, over time it will fill the voids with sediment but also may not infiltrate in the first place.
- Mr. Rudy answered the areas adjacent to the building were not used in the calculations for the infiltration. They only looked at the two infiltration berms and an additional area (discussion at this point was not picked up because there was additional talking). He added they can talk to the area about the concerns.
- Mr. Ulrich answered from a cost standpoint, it would be very similar. He thinks in that particular case because there is a high concentration of impervious in that area, if it can be captured into a roof gutter and through a facility that can handle it and it will continue to be a stabilized area, he just thinks it would be better for the property owner and it would function better.
- Mr. Raynor thanked the Commission and the professionals for their time and consideration and if there are any other additional comments or questions to let him know.
- Mr. Webb asked how soon they will be delivering the revision to the Township Engineer. Mr. Raynor answered two weeks before the meeting date. Mr. Webb suggested if it could be done faster than that if you would like to see things move promptly.
- Mr. Ulrich pointed out the ordinance does say 14 days; however, the ordinance also spells under that normal submission process unlike this condition tonight,

the Board granted the applicant the favor of getting it forwarded in a shorter term. He thinks what Mr. Webb was getting at is if it is gotten here in the 14 days, what that typically allows is for at the subsequent Planning Commission meeting, they would accept it as opposed to a review being provided. If the PC wishes to allow that shorter process to continue, they can do that. Normally a full review is not provided in 14 days. Normally, it is submitted and accepted at that meeting with a full review at the subsequent meeting. In order to save the applicant a month, he would be willing to do it.

- Mr. Raynor answered he would like to address the comments and have a meeting with the Township Engineer as soon as he can to go through the more technical aspects.
- Chairman Craig answered it is an open dialogue with our technical professionals. He noted one of Mr. Smith's comments were addressed but did not know whether or not the other one was discussed. Mr. Smith answered it was.
- Ms. Green noted she just confirmed they still want to receive a copy of the County's review.
- Chairman Craig asked if the Planning Commission or public had any questions for the applicant. There being none, they moved on to the next agenda item.

## **OTHER BUSINESS**

By consensus of the Board, it was agreed upon to have LTL present the Park and Recreation plan first.

1. Park and Recreation Master Plan - The Board of Supervisors has asked for the Planning Commission to review and comment.
  - Mr. Ulrich noted the Board of Supervisors has asked the Planning Commission to do a review and asked for their comments. The following is a presentation by Mr. Ulrich:
    - He noted, what the Commission has in front of them in an effort to save some time for the Township, LTL did perform a complete review on the plan.
    - They outlined possible waivers for the plan they may need because of site conditions.
    - What they intend to do is explain what the section of the ordinance requires, the shortcomings of the plan, why and what plan modifications would be necessary if the Planning Commission felt a waiver would not be appropriate. There were reasons why they felt the waiver might serve the Township better than actually complying with the ordinance.
    - Mr. Ulrich introduced Mr. Steve Espenshade, Chairman of the Park and Recreation Board. He came up and identified himself and spoke about the plan.
    - He noted there is an existing baseball field and two fields used for soccer. East Hanover Township provides no fields for the baseball or for the football associations that are in our Township. That has been one of the things that was promised to EHBSA by the Park and Recreation Board before, that there would be baseball fields or athletic fields in this Township to use. Presently, all the Associations pay for their own fields, pay to mow the grass, pass for everything.

- One of his goals has been to come up with the plan. The acreage is there to do something with it. Baseball fields are a necessity because everything is leased by the Baseball Association. They have a 25-year lease on two fields. They worked on this quite hard, there was a lot of discussion. They would love to get more out there field-wise, but it cannot be done because of the lay of the land being very hilly and there are some wetlands.
- Mr. Kovach asked if the VFW still leases the land behind the school. Mr. Espenshade answered yes, and it is a 25-year lease. He is not sure where they are at in the lease. There may be 20 years left, and they pay \$1.00 per year. That could change at any time if they want to sell that land.
- Mr. Kovach asked if the plan goes forward to completion, will the lease be surrendered back to the VFW. Mr. Espenshade answered no, because they need the extra fields. There are 200 kids on 3 or 4 fields.
- Mr. Webb asked regarding the two additional baseball fields and if they are going to be regulation size. Chairman Craig noted the one up front is probably for American Legion ball and the other ones are probably for PeeWee, Midget league. But given the fact there are so many kids matriculating through here, will they end up needing larger or for the American Legion size baseball fields because there are two small fields and more kids are coming. The Township will need to expand further. He asked about longer range growth plans.
- Mr. Espenshade answered presently, anyone who leaves the Midget program which runs through 12 years old, they go to Lower Dauphin Teener Association which combines all the five elementary townships in Lower Dauphin. None of those games are played in East Hanover. They have their own fields for the program, and will not be asking for field usage from East Hanover. There are sufficient fields over there for that. Baseball is not as popular as it once was.
- Mr. Webb added his second comment was considering the increase in interest in soccer, will there be enough fields to handle new soccer in the Township.
- Mr. Espenshade answered no, but for that area, they would like to look at some of the other land the Township owns out here for that in the future. It is not enough for the Soccer Association. They presently do use some of the small fields for games and they have 8 fields at Keller field which Lower Dauphin uses as their home field. There are not enough soccer fields in the Township, but they are looking in the future to do that.
- He noted this is just a plan for this area, but that does not mean the Park and Recreation Board will stop there. This area will also be used for the girls softball program, where there is also a need for girls fields. Both fields will be little league specification, 210 foot fences. That will also be in the ASA (American Softball Association) for the girls size. It will be able to be used for both male and female.
- Mr. Kovach commented he noticed the land is already fenced in and asked if that was done as part of this plan or was that done to keep the teenagers out of the park after dark.
- Mr. Espenshade answered that was for the people who like to take their four wheel drives out in the fields and tear them up. This was not really part of this plan. This was separate. They wanted to secure the area before they got in and

started making changes to the fields and planting new grass. They didn't want to have it torn up once monies were invested in the landscaping because it is very expensive.

- Chairman Craig asked if that part of the field will be available once they start work on the field or will they lose use of that field for this project.
- Mr. Espenshade answered the expansion of the one soccer field but until it starts, they will not lose any of their existing fields until that project starts and they fill in a little and expand the one field. That is the only thing they will lose.
- Mr. Webb commented considering all of the use that the improvements will be involved with, and under the traffic impact report the justification is it will not have that much of an impact.
- Mr. Ulrich answered the reason for that is the traffic impact studies generally see an impact when trips are generated during normal business hours. This type of activity will be on evenings or weekends. The reason to request the waiver is even with all the fields and with the number of kids even if all the fields are used at the same time, there would be sufficient parking spaces.
- Mr. Ulrich added keeping in mind it will be used nights and weekends, it will not be during business hours and will not be during a.m. or p.m. peak hours where there will be an impact. This is not a business, this is something for pleasure.
- Mr. Kovach asked Mr. Ulrich in his professional opinion is there is ample site distance for people traveling north on Manada Gap Road and people who are unfamiliar with the Township, will they be able to turn left without getting hit by someone traveling southbound.
- Mr. Ulrich answered that was a good point. He pointed out it was not looked at because there was an existing driveway. He would like to take a site and check to make sure that will not be an issue. Mr. Kovach commented for the residents who live in the Township, they know it is there and can anticipate it.
- Mr. Ulrich answered they probably should take a trip out and measure the sight distance and make sure for the 35 or 40 mile speed limit there is ample sight distance.
- Chairman Craig asked if they do not anticipate these being at peak travel hours and asked if that what was said as far as the traffic study is concerned.
- Mr. Ulrich answered that was correct. Typically with fields like this, it will be after work after going home or coming home. Typically, it will not happen during the peak hours; certainly not the a.m.
- Chairman Craig asked about the p.m. hours. Mr. Ulrich answered it is generally considered up to 5:30 – 6:00 p.m.
- Chairman Craig noted as opposed to waiving this totally, wouldn't it be better to propose a modified traffic study. Mr. Ulrich answered that could be looked at. He further added he does not feel it will change the plan but will verify the information. Chairman Craig commented if the Township is asking everyone else, we can do it as well.
- Chairman Craig asked Mr. Ulrich to walk the Commission through everything.
- Mr. Ulrich, while indicating the plan which was on display, he noted the existing entrance, the alignment in the one area is a modified parking area to increase parking in that area. Right now it is kind of a make-shift gravel area and not very

well defined. The plan is showing something that will comply with the ordinance. He explained there will be parking next to the soccer fields, and next to the ball fields. The idea was to make it a one-way loop so there are less decisions to be made from a possible accident standpoint.

- There are existing baseball fields, existing football/soccer fields. Mr. Ulrich further explained on the display plans where the different fields would be located. There are also walking trails and paths throughout, so individuals do not have to cut across the fields.
- He also pointed out the stormwater facility and showed where the swale and infiltration area will be, noting there will be four to five different stormwater facilities within the site. The existing fields with the basins are incorporated into this design. He pointed out where the stormwater basins. There is a regional basin and some smaller basins.
- Mr. Kovach asked if the basin towards the back had a fence wall. Mr. Ulrich answered that is one of the waiver requests. They could go either way. The ordinance says the requirements of the ordinance can be satisfied with buffers with a fire thorn type of shrub. It is not a physical fence. It is a deterrent for going through.
- Mr. Kovach answered that is his concern. There will be a lot of kids in the area, they wander off. He doesn't want to see any of them drown in that. Mr. Ulrich showed the landscaping plan and pointed out where the buffer was to keep children away and there is a buffer that goes along the outfield to try and keep kids away from the basin.
- Mr. Ulrich noted it has been his experience over the years, that even a four to five foot chain link fence would not be adequate. The children will go right over, and it will not be very aesthetically pleasing. He added if they decide on a post and rail fence, they would not stop anyone. Some of the recommendations such as the fire thorn were taken right out of the ordinance. They tried to provide something that would be deterrent. There was further discussion regarding the buffer.
- Mr. Kovach asked how big the deepest basin was. Mr. Webb also asked how much water theoretically it would collect. Mr. Ulrich answered about four feet and added it is not very deep.
- Chairman Craig noted there will be a lot of people coming to the fields and along with that, they will bring garbage and there will be a need for either sewer or outhouses.
- Mr. Ulrich there will be port-a-potties and garbage bins placed at the direction of the Park and Recreation Board.
- Chairman Craig noted he did not see them on the plan and wondered where they would be placed. Mr. Ulrich pointed out the locations on the plan.
- Chairman Craig asked if a dumpster would be placed out there for trash or would it be treated the same as the park with the trash cans and they will drive around and pick them up. There was discussion regarding 55 gallon drums where someone will come around and empty them periodically. He didn't necessarily feel the locations needed to be shown on the plan.

- After discussion with Mr. Espenshade, it was confirmed 55 gallon drums will be placed throughout the area and dumped periodically.
- Mr. Kovach asked if there was any plan for lighting. Mr. Ulrich answered at this point, there was not. They do not have anything shown as far as foot candles, but there is a location where they can bring electric to the site.
- Ms. Green asked about recycling and she was told there is no Township recycling program currently. She suggested the Township consider implementing one.
- Chairman Craig asked if the discussion regarding lighting was more about security lighting. Mr. Espenshade answered security light because at dark, the park is closed.
- There was discussion about the location of the electric being for field lighting. Candle lighting is not shown but they can be added. Mr. Ulrich noted they can be added and noted he believed it was not their intention and confirmed with Mr. Espenshade to not necessarily go to the effort to show candle patterns, but just show if they wanted to, it could be done. Mr. Espenshade acknowledge this. Mr. Ulrich added the important part of that is if the Park and Recreation Board thinks they want to head in that direction longer term, a transfer can be installed along the driveway. He continued to show where the electric comes in along the driveway it is already on the one side of the road.
- Mr. Espenshade added there is already electric run back at the fields. It is 7,000 volts. There is electric there in the event they decide to do some lighting. The ditch has been dug, but MetEd has not hooked it up yet or energized them. He showed on the plan how far it goes back and noted they are planning ahead but they are not planning to do any lighting at this time. He also noted it probably will never happen. It is too expensive.
- Chairman Craig asked if they did do something eventually, they would build a small shed or something to accommodate the electric.
- Mr. Espenshade answered MetEd will set two transformers. There will be a temporary service put in and it will be energized this Spring. If they ever do lighting, they will set a panel out somewhere. It will not go into a building. It will be controlled from an area.
- Chairman Craig noted the concession stands will have some electricity. Mr. Espenshade answered yes, that will be done as soon as possible. As far as lighting, that will be a future thing. The voltage is there.
- Mr. Webb asked if there will be bleachers on the fields. Mr. Ulrich answered there are some shown. What they also tried to do was to grade the slopes in such a way that individuals could easily set up lawn chairs. There are some sloping sides and grading had to take place.
- Mr. Webb answered it depends on the amount of use, but it will be predominantly only weekend games, so he is presuming the grass will get thick, especially since it is on a slope. Mr. Ulrich answered yes, and it depends on the type of grass seed utilized. There was discussion regarding the specs for the grass and a seeding schedule.
- Mr. Webb asked what type of stair material will be used. Mr. Ulrich answered concrete. Mr. Webb asked if they considered using that would be a little less

impervious. Mr. Ulrich answered as far as the trail goes that would be fine, but as far as the steps, he recommended concrete; otherwise, there is too much of a chance of shifting and the step themselves do not take up that much room.

- Mr. Webb asked about ramps for ADA requirements. Mr. Ulrich answered either that or handicapped parking, need to get to the pavilion. He noted that was a good question and asked for ADA access to be added to his list.
- Mr. Webb added he was just thinking of the timeline and what may need to occur, if it is not done now and is required in the future, it might make it a very expensive revision.
- Mr. Ulrich answered Mr. Wenrich, who also worked on the plan is an ADA requirement specialist.
- Chairman Craig asked in regards to Section 617.6, grading within the wetland, buffer area. If there is encroachment in the one wetland area with the grading, would it be possible to add to another wetland for the area that was encroached upon so it is a give and take.
- Mr. Ulrich answered there are no wetlands being disturbed. Chairman Craig noted it is the transitional area. Mr. Ulrich noted there is a requirement to stay 75 feet away from the wetland. What they are saying in this particular case, it can be a benefit to the wetland if we would be closer in this condition. He noted they are a minimum of 25 feet away from the wetlands, but the ordinance requirement is 75 feet. The main reason for setbacks from the wetlands is you want to make sure to keep any type of contaminates out. When the basin is graded in the way it is shown on the plan, it will intercept any flow contaminate-wise that might get to the wetlands.
- He continued, water coming out of a basin is considered an impoundment for a wetland. Water cannot be discharged from a basin into a wetland. In this particular case, the reason he is suggesting it might be a good thing is if the basin is low in elevation in the wetlands, there is an issue. What you can create there is if the basin is dry, it can take water from the wetlands. In this particular case, the bottom of the basin is above the wetland. If there is any situation going on there at all, you might have a situation where you are actually going to supply that wetland with filtered water. In this particular case, it is being filtered because it has to go through the basin and bank obstruction to get to the wetland. This is something that cannot be modified for the ordinance. He suggested in this particular case, it might be a good thing because the wetlands could be provided with additional water.
- He added he does not think from an ordinance stance it is important, he thought it might be useful to point out that the person who went out to delineate the wetlands came back he basically said he believes the wetlands were formed over a number of years of farming the area. The reason he said that is because he believes when plowing took place over a number of years, there was a berm that was created. It is not true wetlands, but they are delineated wetlands and we must comply with requirements of the ordinance.
- Chairman Craig notes Mr. Ulrich goes so far on his item of his note to say this plan meets the existing ordinance and actually is shown as something in compliance with the proposed landscaping requirements that are in the SALDO

changes. He asked about the rest of the proposed changes, but this is not actually a submission. This is just an introduction or a sketch submission of where the Park and Recreation Board is headed. He asked if these other changes happen and occur, will they have to comply with them as well.

- Mr. Ulrich answered the plan was reviewed under the existing SALDO. It was not reviewed again with the proposed changes and because they do not know how the Planning Commission will agree with the new ones. The reason this was brought up was because the Park and Recreation Board and LTL wanted to show that they were putting more landscaping on the plan than was required by the ordinance. There were two minor areas that the plans did not comply with the new ordinance but did comply with the existing one. If this will have to be an approved plan, this will be the same as any other plan that was submitted. What is applicable at the time. It was not a matter of trying to get in under the wire, it was they needed to have a set of rules to follow, and right now the Township has adopted a SALDO and that is what they went by. There could be possibly changes to the SALDO. He believes one of the changes has to do with the setback of the access road from the property line. It complies with the existing SALDO. He thinks with the new SALDO changes, there is more of a setback requirement.
- He added the existing ordinance does not require street trees along the access drive. The other one if the buffer that is all along the property line would be required by the new SALDO to show that.
- Chairman Craig asked how soon this would move from this stage to an actual submission. Mr. Ulrich answered his understanding with the Board was this was going to be if the feedback they received from the Planning Commission. He wants to verify with the Board, but there not actually be a formal submission. LTL did not fill out the waiver requests. If that is what they are looking for, he answered they can go through the whole formal submission process. The plans prepared comply with the ordinance. The reason for that is the Township project has to comply with the ordinance. He shared with the Commission what does not comply and what waivers would be requested.
- Mr. Ulrich added if the Commission is saying they are inclined to move forward with a particular waiver request, then that is fine. The plans can be modified to comply. The only that would be the most impact, he believes there is some steep slopes in the one area that he pointed out for the Commission that would severely impact the parking. He recalled for the Commission on the Royer plan how the slopes were manmade and not natural and the Commission agreed. He added that is the situation in the parking area.
- Mr. Ulrich added in addition to that the other thing that the Commission needs to be concerned about as far as steep slopes is, is there anything structural such as a retaining wall or foundation wall that might be negatively impacted. In this particular instance, it will be graded and will be a parking area.
- Chairman Craig noted he thought this presentation was more like a “show us what you’re doing” sketch plan and not really looking for any action from the Planning Commission because it showed up seven days ago. He did not know what the Board was asking or what their direction is. He was under the

assumption that eventually there would be a full submission and go through the same process everyone else does. He does not what the Board of Supervisors are directing him to do.

- Upon a question from an individual (which could not be heard because it was not into the microphone), Mr. Ulrich answered yes, there are E&S plans prepared. They have not been submitted to the Conservation District and the reason for that is with the Park and Recreation Board there is inevitably going to be phased construction. They do not know what the phases are going to be. Once they do know that, they will prepare an E&S plan that outlines what they want to do.
- Mr. Webb noted going back to the basins and deterrent plans, he asked why they proposed the shrubbery because normally a basin would be fenced 360.
- Mr. Ulrich answered he was right and they can do it. The reason for it is in the back (he pointed to the area on the plan) there is a stream, there is a wooded area and the topo goes right up to the wooded area. There can be a visual deterrent or whatever the Planning Commission's recommendation with a six foot chain-link fence with some type of wire on the top of it. Anything can be done. They thought the brush made the most amount of sense considering there are mature trees along the back of it. They took it to where the trees were and on the other side to where the edge of the woods are as well. He pointed out a small break in the buffer and explained the reason for that is there is a natural graded swale.
- Chairman Craig asked if there is any maintenance involved in these basins. Mr. Ulrich answered the basins would be the same as any other basin. Maybe once a year, it will require maintenance.
- Chairman Craig noted they would still need to gain access to it one way or another. Mr. Ulrich answered if the Planning Commission's recommendation and ultimately to fence it in, there would be an access gate installed that would allow for a backhoe or something to get through.
- Chairman Craig asked for any other questions or discussion. He asked for any thoughts of making any recommendations to the Board of Supervisors or would they rather wait.
- Mr. Webb answered there is a list of items that LTL needs to look into that may have an impact on the plan (seeding schedule, traffic report, ADA requirements).
- Mr. Ulrich answered that information could be put together. He noted the Supervisors would probably be more interested in some type of recommendation, more with regards to the plan revisions. Any feedback for LTL to act upon.
- Mr. Webb commented the Township requires everybody to go through the submission process and it would be hypocritical of us to say that applies to everyone else in the Township but it does not apply to the Township.
- Mr. Kovach responded he kind of feels the same way. He added the Township cannot hold the residents to a standard if they don't hold themselves to it.
- Mr. Webb added the Township should be in a position of setting the standard for the ordinances and where you can or feel it is not appropriate. That is one of the things he did like about what Mr. Ulrich had on there. He has some justification that really laid out as to why either it couldn't be done or why what was being

done met the intent of the ordinance. That is something so rarely seen on requests for waivers. He really feels it should go the normal path.

- Mr. Ulrich answered if that is the wishes of the Planning Commission to please give some kind of direction in the minutes that is the directive to take back to the Board.
- Chairman Craig asked Mr. Moyer what his thoughts were. Mr. Moyer indicated the Township should follow the process everyone else has to follow.
- Chairman Craig noted because there was a consensus, a motion would not be needed. He asked for any other questions from the public.
- Mr. David Marshall spoke from the public. He indicated he was the one who made the motion on the Board of Supervisors to send the plan to the Planning Commission and his intent was for it to follow the standard procedures.
- Mr. Marshall discussed the detention ponds and the fences with the prickly briars with Mr. Ulrich. He knows there will be some maintenance on the ponds and brought up the road crew having to go through the bushes.
- Mr. Webb asked Mr. Marshall if he would be suggesting to include a location where there was a gate entry.
- Mr. Marshall answered if the prickly briars or some sort of a hedge is used, there should be an access point to get in and out. He noted if whatever method is used, it should be surrounded by all four sides, and from an insurance standpoint, that would be best
- Mr. Webb added that was his point of view, because if anyone gets hurt if anyone gets hurt, the Township is still liable.
- Mr. Marshall added there needs to be a deterrent that individuals will not go in there. He is reserved about the prickly briars, but if the rest of the Board is satisfied with it being enough of a deterrent, he is fine with it. His personal opinion is he would like to see a positive fence. Maintenance needs to be kept in mind as to an access way. There could be problems with the orifices getting clogged that would need to be maintained. Also, the bottoms of the beds will need to be mowed from time to time. To maintain it, there will be an expense, and that should be kept in mind.
- Chairman Craig asked if there were any more comments or questions.
- Mr. Ulrich asked if the Commission wanted him to go over the rest of the waivers or wait until a submission is made. Some feedback right now as to how the Commission is feeling about this would help LTL get closer to a final plan that he is sure from a cost standpoint, it would help them get as close as they can to where it needs to be for their first submission.
- Mr. Ulrich noted the third waiver, Section 607.9, Marking of Parking Space. The ordinance requires curb to delineate parking areas and aisles on lots with more than 30 spaces. Curbing has not been provided because obviously there would be a cost there. If curbing went in, there would need to be quite a few more inlets added. Or at that point, buffer blocks would be needed. He asked the Planning Commission for input.
- Chairman Craig asked if it was all going to be gravel or macadam. Mr. Ulrich answered right now it is showing as paved, but when it is paved without curbs, there is no flow restriction. There can be a grade so they stay off but when you

curb it, anything that would fall on a parking area would no longer run off. He spoke about the piping being run underground and sent to the basin. He pointed out on the map the areas it would require. It would not require the access drives be curbed but would require the parking areas to be curbed.

- Chairman Craig asked about the one up front. Mr. Ulrich answered that would need to be curbed as well. Chairman Craig answered the justification of cost savings is not necessarily a justification for the criteria for the waiver. He added if Mr. Ulrich can show that without the curbing the intent of the ordinance can be met as far as handling the stormwater runoff and guiding it. In that fashion, LTL would be showing they are meeting the intent of the ordinance.
- Mr. Ulrich answered if he understood Chairman Craig's question correctly, the way the plan is proposed now without curbing with the concrete bumper blocks, stormwater would still be controlled. It is not a matter of controlling it. It does state in Section 607.9 that parking lots of 30 or more spaces need to be curbed.
- Chairman Craig asked if the purpose of the curbing is to guide the stormwater to the inlets, etc. and that sort of thing. Curbing at certain heights in front of buildings are so the cars don't hop over them.
- Mr. Ulrich answered if it is looked at it because it will control stormwater, then he would say the plan as proposed satisfies the stormwater. The only other issue he could think of is like Chairman Craig mentioned was you would not want a car to go down over the edge and down an embankment. The concrete bumper blocks would serve the purpose as the curb.
- Ms. Green brought up ADA requirements and noted there are some fairly onerous curb-cutting requirements coming up for ADA. She spoke of the requirements for flat sections for wheelchairs and particular difficulty with compliance in the city of Harrisburg.
- Mr. Ulrich added he would not let that change the decision of the Planning Commission because where the paths access the parking areas, that can be shown with the depressed curb, an apron, the proper wheelchair requirements.
- Chairman Craig noted as long as the intent of the ordinance is met, he does not look at cost or cost savings. If Mr. Ulrich can stick to intent and revise, it, that would better.
- Mr. Ulrich answered from a safety standpoint, there are buffer blocks and from a stormwater standpoint, the site will still comply with the criteria.
- Mr. Ulrich touched on the Section 402.5.9.3, steep slope and geotechnical reports. The requirements for a steel slope report are provided within the plans and details for the submission. These are manmade slopes. He pointed out on the plan the areas he was referring to.
- Mr. Webb answered the major issues with looking at a geotechnical report to make sure there are not going to be landslides. Particularly where there would be structures and the structures would move. The alternate the type of soil and the type of coverage would prevent the underlying fill material not to get saturated and be able to move. He asked what is the height of the steep slopes are. What is the vertical height.

- Mr. Ulrich answered it will be difficult to say because there are three different slope modifications. The geotechnical report is required for slopes graded at 20%.
- Mr. Webb asked what would be the highest slope. Mr. Ulrich answered there are different patterns that goes between 15 to 20 and 20 to 25. Mr. Ulrich answered probably about 15 to 17 feet vertical. He pointed the area out on the plan.
- Chairman Craig asked if it was going down into the creek bed. Mr. Ulrich answered it goes close to the creek. The wetlands are shown there are well. It would be within 25 feet or so.
- Mr. Webb asked if it is currently vegetated. Mr. Ulrich answered yes. Mr. Webb asked if there was any indication of erosion. Mr. Ulrich answered not when they did the field walk. He verified it is currently mowed up to the tree line. Mr. Espenshade indicated it was done once or twice a year.
- Mr. Webb pointed out the issue he is concerned about there is a high enough slope under very high hydride conditions and it is not stable and you can just see the whole thing fly, particularly the filler. If there is adequate vegetation, generally this will not be an issue. He asked if the fields have been there for quite some time.
- Mr. Espenshade answered the existing baseball fields have been there for 13 years at least. Mr. Webb answered if it did not go in 1996, it is not going to go.
- Mr. Ulrich added typically there will be talk about something structural when you are talking about a load and there really is no load when there is a path being put on it and they are driving on it. It is not the same type of conditions.
- Mr. Ulrich noted as far as the traffic report, he know where the Commission stands with that, like a mini report.
- Mr. Webb added he does not know how everybody else feels, but if they are going to have practices earlier in the day over the summer particularly in the middle of week when there is no school scheduled to conflict with. There is not a lot of housing back that road.
- Mr. Ulrich answered Mr. Webb seems to be more concerned about the p.m. rush house than the a.m.
- Mr. Webb answered he didn't think a.m. would be an issue. He noted there may be a bigger impact on Manada Bottom and the Jonestown Road intersection than what is going on back there, along with whatever happens to be going on in the other half of the park on weekends.
- Chairman Craig asked to get back to the steep slopes and asked what was actually said. He noted Mr. Ulrich answered they are complying with the ordinance within the plans it is just the waiver request is for the soils engineering report strictly. He noted it was just discussed that ultimately the Township would be on the hook if something were to happen. The ultimate thing is, if the Township Engineer says it is not needed and the final decision rests with the Board of Supervisors.
- Mr. Ulrich answered as with the Royer subdivision, it is not a naturally occurring steep slope that would trigger this part of the ordinance. He brought it up anyway for completeness sake.

- Chairman Craig asked how this would differ from the Halbleib property. Mr. Webb noted his understanding on that was that they had construction that occurred on where they basically put in a structure.
  - There was also discussion regarding the County obtaining a copy of the plans for their review.
2. Proposed Ordinance to the SALDO – Discuss the proposed changes to the SALDO and make a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors.
    - After a brief discussion, it was decided by consensus that the changes would be voted on at the March Planning Commission meeting.
  3. Paul Keeler – He is a representative for Ray Funck
    - Mr. Keeler noted they were not aware the Hilton Garden Inn would not be at the Planning Commission meeting.
    - He expressed that Mr. Funck and the owner's for Mamma's Pizza had concerns regarding the proposed traffic study for the Hilton Garden Inn.
    - Mr. Ulrich noted to Mr. Keeler and Mr. Funck that his concerns may be put in writing and given to the Board of Supervisors

## **ADJOURNMENT**

**Mr. Kovach made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 10:59 p.m. Mr. Moyer seconded the motion. Being no further business, the meeting was adjourned, 3 in favor, 0 opposed.**

Respectfully submitted,

Transcribed by Dawn E. Eppinger

<p>Cc: Board of Supervisors          Marie Beaudet          Keith Espenshade          Dave Marshall          Tom Shutt          John Nelligan          Norman Ulrich, Township Engineer          David Smith, Township Zoning Officer          Deborah Casey, Secretary-Treasurer          Karen Green, Dauphin County Planning Commission          Zoning Hearing Board</p>	<p>Planning Commission          David Craig          Donna Lebo          Mike Kovach          Mike Webb          Glenn Moyer</p>
--	--