

DRAFT – SUBJECT TO CHANGE

East Hanover Township Planning Commission Workshop For the Comprehensive Plan Wednesday, November 25, 2009

Present:

David Craig, Chairman; Mike Webb, Vice Chairman; Glenn Moyer, Member

Absent:

Mike Kovach, Member

The workshop was called to order by Chairman Craig at approximately 7:00 p.m. The meeting minutes were approved by consensus.

TOPICS OF DISCUSSION:

1. Future Land Use Classifications

- Chairman Craig noted there was an e-mail from Nanci Sarcinello on Future Land Use Classifications
- He noted in some instances classification seemed to be defining classification and other times it describes the boundary; shouldn't the map define the boundary and in this classification, it should be defined what; i.e., military lands, state game lands, park lands and making a definition for the classification.
- He asked if it is supposed to be definitions or describing the classifications. Mr. Webb noted it should be definitions according to his understanding.
- There was further discussion regarding definitions and classifications.
- He noted it may be harder to define US military lands because they are self-defining.
- Mr. Webb noted it defines the use of the properties but does not define what the PC wants it to be.
- There was discussion regarding the land use map which will define it as military and the future land use plan which they will note as being preferred to be considered conservation. **There was a consensus from the Planning Commission.**
- There was discussion regarding State game lands. Mr. Webb noted the definition or the future land use classification is not a classification use but a classification of current ownership. **It was noted the change was supported by the Planning Commission.**
- There was discussion regarding Conservation, Open Space. Chairman Craig asked if it should be identified as a sending zone for TDR program. It could be a sending zone as opposed to a receiving zone. He noted the role can be identified and what they are intending it to be.
- There was discussion regarding Park and Recreation. Chairman Craig read a definition provided to him by LTL Consultants. There was discussion

DRAFT – SUBJECT TO CHANGE

- regarding if Tall Cedars should be included as a park and recreation site and if it was geographically suitable the purpose.
- There was discussion regarding the location being on the Manada Creek. Mr. Webb noted it was not listed as a park. The location was to a map they were viewing.
 - It was noted flooding would not be an issue because it is up gradient. They noted they would add it to their “wish list”.
 - Mr. Webb noted one of the items they should be looking at trying to identify parcels on the south end of the Township. If there is all that residential, some park land would be needed.
 - There was discussion regarding identifying some adjacent empty land next to the proposed commercial industrial areas as buffers between them and residential areas.
 - There was discussion regarding the low areas along the creeks making good park areas. Even if they flood, they can be nature-area parks and not necessarily baseball fields.
 - **The Planning Commission noted areas need to be identified on South side for park areas**, specifically closer to the commercial park areas to provide additional buffer.
 - There was discussion regarding a road that is not placed on the map
 - Hershey Trust Property – this property is only shown on the map at this time as a reference. They will convert it to agriculture low density residential on the final draft of the map.
 - Mr. Webb noted he is not sure that is what is should be dumped into. They need discussions with Hershey as to what their future plans are so there are no zoning issues after the comp plan is completed.
 - There discussion regarding streams and obtaining easements.
 - **Chairman Craig made note – need to discuss with Hershey what the long term goal is for the property before assuming will be ag, low density residential.**
 - During discussion, Mr. Webb noted there are not a lot of large parcels left
 - There was discussion regarding some areas being away from the infrastructure
 - There was discussion noting on the Future Land Use map, the existing sewer plant is not identified. – **Leo, please ensure this is marked.**
 - **Commercial Recreation** – it was discussed there would be two properties zoned in this fashion which are interrupted by small scale commercial
 - There was discussion regarding the reason for the interruption. It was noted it provides a location for supporting complimentary businesses that wouldn't fall into the classification of Commercial Recreation.
 - It was noted the definition does not describe what Commercial Recreation is intended to do. It only describes who currently is under it.
 - There was discussion regarding moving the property across the street from Commercial Recreation to Conservation/Open Space.

DRAFT – SUBJECT TO CHANGE

- Mr. Webb noted as long as a mechanism is provided for those properties to be a sending zone for development credits, that way the properties maintain value.
- **Small Scale** - Chairman Craig read the description. Mr. Webb noted this is a description of the boundaries but not a definition.
- There was discussion regarding trying to identify fairly significant tracks to have enough room to have circulation roads. During the discussion, they used a map to point out the areas.
- There was discussion regarding TDR's in some areas. Chairman Craig suggested looking at the 537 plan and the topography as well to see if it lends itself to it.
- There was discussion to allow the area (22 and Sand Beach) to grow to have enough property potential. There was discussion regarding a portion of 743.
- There was discussion regarding mixed use. **A note was made to have this revisited.**
- Mr. Webb noted they should identify the right-of-ways that exist in the township where development cannot occur such as the electrical transmission corridor where there can be no development
- Chairman Craig read information on Highway Commercial and changing some areas to RA. There was discussion regarding changing the properties to RA
- There was discussion regarding conservation to help with runoff of salting and provides a buffer between them and medium density housing
- There was discussion regarding the TDR program and management of water
- There was a discussion regarding certain areas not going residential and becoming conservation.
- There was discussion regarding “green islands” on Route 22 and helping to maintain property values
- There was discussion regarding possibility of restriction of driveway access to Route 22.
- It was noted it is a state road and the Township would have no control over it.
- There was discussion regarding zoning for ultra low density on portions of Route 22.
- There was discussion regarding the properties that would be affected and zoning near the 22 and 743 corridor and medium density areas
- There was discussion of the location of the sewer lines
- There was discussion regarding listings for Industrial Zone, Village Zone
- Mr. Webb noted the way Medium Density is currently defined, it is nothing more than RA.
- Chairman Craig noted they need to touch base with the 537 plan and see how they are integrating with the long and short-term opportunities
- Alternatives to Rural Agriculture. Mr. Moyer suggested Commercial Recreation. There was discussion and Conservation or Commercial Recreation was suggested.

DRAFT – SUBJECT TO CHANGE

- Large Scale Uses and appropriateness – There was discussion regarding changing definitions in comp plan will help drive where zoning changes have to get made in order to make them consistent
- There was discussion regarding defining small scale commercial as a function of number of trips or amount of activity or based on the number of employees.
- Mr. Webb suggested defining the amount of traffic or another functional measure
- There was discussion regarding the number of hotels/motels in the area.
- There was discussion regarding if Hershey Park and Penn National expands, there may be a need for more.
- There was discussion regarding if Large Scale Commercial provides enough area for the hotels/motels associated uses
- There was discussion regarding amenities in the area for residents
- There was discussion regarding infrastructure and being able to maintain them
- There was discussion regarding Commercial Industrial helping the tax base.
- There was discussion regarding Interchange Commercial and those properties that can go five stories
- There was discussion regarding the difference between large and small scale commercial uses
- **PC asked for definition of small scale versus large scale in terms of stores or can it be defined in terms of the total square footage they are allowed to occupy.**
- There was discussion regarding classification of large scale commercial at the interchange and office parks
- There was discussion regarding limitation of driveway accesses and sight distances
- There was discussion regarding the topography along the creek (referred to an area on the map)
- There was discussion regarding the zoning along intersection of 81 would have been large scale commercial
- There was discussion regarding Spring Road, access to a parcel of land a buffer and the topography
- There was discussion regarding Bow Creek zoning and a commercial establishment on one side of Bow Creek and developing it and the concern with degrading Bow Creek
- There was discussion regarding the concern with Bow Creek being too small to accept large runoff
- There was discussion regarding the other portion of Bow Creek potentially a mixed use zone
- There was discussion regarding mixed use zones and the benefits
- There was discussion regarding mixed use and commercial use noting it would be beneficial to have conveniences closer and within walking distance

DRAFT – SUBJECT TO CHANGE

- There was discussion regarding making the east side of Bow Creek going to a mixed use; the west side for mixed
- Mr. Webb suggested for the mixed use area that could be cut in half and make it large scale commercial
- Chairman Craig noted he would marked it as supporting commercial establishments, meaning they cannot be primary as far as coverage
- Light Industrial – Chairman Craig noted it was revised.
- There was discussion questioning whether or not additional Light Industrial was needed.
- There was discussion noting the corner of 22 and 743 was listed as mixed use..
- Mr. Webb noted regarding the three corridors, 743, Bow Creek and in the edge as you approach 39 for places to have commercial establishments. Mixed uses is designed for walking areas.
- Chairman Craig read from the mixed uses and noted the commercial that would be located around there would be amenities that would aid in reducing car traffic
- There was additional discussion regarding having mixed uses adjacent to existing village areas but on a four lane highway, it is not likely to have individuals walking back and forth across the highway.
- **There was discussion noting the carnival grounds should be shown as park and recreation; adding there is also a football field down there**
- During discussion regarding the mixed use for the area of Toy Tech
- There was discussion regarding ensuring Grantville is listed as a village
- There was discussion regarding the location of Light Industrial being close enough to housing but not have it in their backyards; needs to be close to infrastructure
- During discussion regarding Light Industrial, Mr. Webb voice his concern regarding the potential for spills into surface waters, adding to put them in locations where they are not likely to be able to have unrestrained discharge into surface waters.
- There was discussion regarding the locations of where Industrial and Light Industrial would be located.
- There was discussion regarding existing commercial properties.
- **Chairman Craig clarified they suggested existing to go to Light Industrial with the exception of Texas Eastern.** They indicated they drew on the map the areas they were discussing.
- There was discussion regarding truck terminals and conditional uses found in Section 444.
- There was discussion regarding the zoning Section 444 and was read aloud by Mr. Webb
- During discussion, it was noted the rest stop would be the only place for a truck terminal It was asked if it was provided for at some point.
- There was discussion noting the map provides no Light Industrial for access onto I-81 or Bow Creek. There was discussion regarding special exceptions.

DRAFT – SUBJECT TO CHANGE

- It was noted through the zoning ordinance that truck terminals are currently not provided for and allocated.
- There will be an Industrial/Light Industrial on Route 743 which would provide for some of the conditional uses. There was discussion noting definitions for both would have to be done.
- It was noted this area would be located in the area on the map listed as Potential Commercial/Office Park
- Agricultural Low Density – Chairman Craig read from the explanation page.
- There was discussion currently it is one per acre, but given the soil types, setbacks, second fields, it becomes 1+ to 2 acre size.
- There was discussion noting as a result, there may be a number of non-conforming lots
- Medium Density Residential – Chairman Craig read from the explanation page
- Mr. Webb noted conservation subdivision design allows them to reduce the size of the lots, similar to the Preserve of Bow Creek; noting the lots were smaller but half of the property was reserved as conservation This can be down if there is sewer
- There was discussion regarding the conservation subdivision design. If there would be 100 acres, and 10 would be environmentally constrained, there would need to be 60 acres of open land and the remaining 40 would be a density bonus to pack in the full 100 houses in 40 acres.
- It was noted the advantage to a developer and the Township would be less infrastructure
- **It was noted they will look at the verbiage of the Conservation Subdivision Design.**
- Mobile Home Park – there was discussion regarding it remaining unchanged.
- There was discussion regarding the existing village area that is shown with the electric corridor that goes through should be shown as a non-developable area
- The listing of the Township-owned properties and the school were discussed to ensure they were on the map.
- There was discussion regarding the listing of the Fire Company.

ADJOURNMENT

Being no further discussion, the workshop was adjourned at approximately _____ p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Dawn Eppinger