

**East Hanover Township
Planning Commission Workshop
Re: Comprehensive Plan
Tuesday, March 18, 2009**

Present:

David Craig, Chairman; Mike Webb, Vice Chairman
Mike Kovach, Member; Donna Lebo, Member;
Dawn Eppinger, Administrative Assistant

Absent:

Glenn Moyer, Member

The workshop was called to order by Chairman Craig at 7:30 p.m.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mrs. Lebo made a motion to approve the meeting minutes from the Planning Commission workshop of January 13, 2009. Mr. Kovach seconded the motion. Being no further discussion, the motion was approved; 4 in favor, 0 opposed.

TOPICS OF DISCUSSION:

1. Comprehensive Plan

- Chairman Craig distributed a handout to the Commission members with a synopsis of objectives which were discussed at the January 13, 2009 workshop. He included on the back of the page his notes for the March meeting, adding the members were welcome to add to them.
- He noted the at January's meeting, they came up with objectives, which was accumulated from the ideas of the Commission. At that time, they all received a copy of the old comprehensive plan and were asked to review it for any items that may have been overlooked and see if they would like to bring any forward into the session regarding the goals and objectives.
- He noted the goals and objectives were strictly what they focused on and not necessarily diving into content so there is an outline of where they want to go so they can "steer the ship" at that point in time.
- He asked if there were any new goals or objectives that they left off the list that they would like to include, especially after reviewing the comp plan or any items in general.
- Mr. Kovach noted it looked like a comprehensive list.
- Chairman Craig answered there were two items that he saw that they didn't really touch a lot on. One was with the preservation of the builds and non-builds environment. There is only one property listed on the national registry and another property, which is his, is listed as eligible for the national registry.

- There was discussion regarding the other property. Chairman Craig noted it was the John Todd property.
- Mr. Webb asked about the criteria for the listing. Chairman Craig noted the applicant would work with the State Historic Preservation Office or the Bureau of Historic Preservation. He gave a brief overview noting there is a form to be filled out, criteria to be met. The cutoff line would be 50 years old and there must be some relevance.
- Mr. Webb asked if the property has to maintain the historic character and cannot have been significantly altered.
- Chairman Craig answered it depends upon the era in time you are looking at. Buildings are living things and evolve over time. You must establish the period of time. Properties can be altered but typically speaking, but the principal façade should remain mainly in tact whatever era in time is chosen.
- Mr. Webb noted a lot of the homes on Jonestown Road, particularly in Grantville or Shellsville, a lot of those go back 100 – 200 years old. In some cases, they have been dramatically changed and others not as much. There might be a lot more cases historic properties around here, though whether or not they would meet the criteria because generally, the exteriors have been changed.
- Mr. Webb gave examples of some of the houses; i.e., Mary Lingle's house., although it has been altered. There were rifle slots in lieu of windows.
- Chairman Craig noted if there is not a grass roots movement that really wants it to be done, there is no sense in doing anything. Public support would be necessary in order to enforce it.
- There was discussion regarding the sites in the township; i.e., Hanover church, parsonage for the church, one room schoolhouse, Fort Hunter.
- Mrs. Lebo added with regard to planning from what Chairman Craig has said, there are specific requirements one needs to meet in order to have the property put on the historical register. She asked how it would be protected in the Township, and added she thinks it would be through zoning which there are some provisions for already.
- Chairman Craig added he does not know if anything needs to be mentioned in the Comprehensive Plan. Is the history important enough for people to preserve it. He added once you get into the other aspects with the zoning, what they want to do in that point in time, they will have to see.
- Mr. Webb answered one of the problems is, if you do not protect it, you can never get it back. It may not be a high priority for individuals today but if there is no stewardship going forward, the Township may be cursed by the descendants for not having tried to save some of it.
- Mrs. Lebo added the old comprehensive plan had a statement in it which she thought be carried over. It says, "assure the identity and preservation of historic structures and sites."
- Chairman Craig answered there is a map that does show high probability; it's located in the back of the book he received from the Historical Society when he moved into the Township.
- Mr. Webb noted just about every house in Shellsville has been identified and a bunch of the houses in Grantville.

- Mr. Kovach noted to state everything they have been talking about, the objective would be to ensure that consideration is taken to maintain identified sites of historical significance.
- Mrs. Lebo noted to add the word “protect” so it would be maintain and protect.
- Chairman Craig asked if Mr. Kovach was referring to “known and unknown” historical sites. Mr. Kovach answered he said identified and added the Historical Society did a really nice job with how everything is plotted.
- Mr. Webb answered it is very difficult to protect something that is not known. He further noted it the PC would almost have to indicate, “those sites as they are identified or if they are identified” that the Township will make an effort to try and protect them.
- Chairman Craig suggested the wording, “maintain and protect historic sites that are currently identified and those that present themselves in the future.” He noted someone could get all their permits and then when they start the process, find an archeological site so this may not be the best language.
- Mr. Webb answered this is not bad language because the determination at that point is will not necessarily stop the project but will delay it until they can get someone to go in and attempt to record, document and preserve what portions can be preserved. There was further discussion regarding documentation of sites.
- Mrs. Lebo noted under the current ordinances whenever development does take place it has to be cleared and it’s only those who are identified.
- Mr. Webb noted when the sewer was put through, the Township was required to have archeologists surveying the entire line looking for any Indian sites primary or any other historic sites that might have been in the line. Again, there was public funding associated with that.
- Mrs. Lebo asked what happens when those kinds of things are found. She is not sure it is automatically places it as a landmark because they find arrowheads on their property all the time.
- Chairman Craig noted a lot of times they will initially do a pedestrian survey, or a shovel test pit and give their opinion.
- Mrs. Lebo noted regarding the new system the Township will be getting that with the GIS system everything will be documented. She recommended getting a note that historic sites should be one of those included. That stays with the Township and if going forward things are uncovered it would become part of the record.
- There was discussion regarding natural features and archeological sites. Chairman Craig note there are any number of features the Township deems worthy of savings or preserving because it is part of the heritage or history of the Township.
- Chairman Craig noted the goals and objectives can be identified but LTL will have to identify how those goals and objectives can be achieved and Mr. Wyland has to be in tune to say they are defendable.
- Mrs. Lebo asked if the PC is still entertaining discussion as expanding on the list of objectives. Chairman Craig answered yes.

- Mrs. Lebo noted in glancing over the list under “Maintain the quality of life”, she would like to add, “protect against environmental pollution.” She would like to add it as a separate goal and objective.
- Mrs. Lebo discussed the goal and objective listed under protection of small streams and noted after some discussion she would like to add, “Protect the water quality and the environmental integrity of Bow Creek, Manada, Swatara creek and small streams and their tributaries.”
- After discussion about adding season streams, Mr. Webb noted the problem with seasonal streams is that they are really not a stream. They are a water course and it is very difficult to protect them environmentally. Part of the way of determining whether or not you are successful in protecting a stream is looking at the community invertebrates. With an intermittent stream, these communities are not developed. If they dry up, the habitat goes away.
- Mr. Webb added if you look at the clean stream law, if there is a pollution discharge even if it is not discharged directly to the stream but manages to make it to the stream, there is still prosecution under the law.
- Mrs. Lebo asked about the wording of her statement. Mr. Webb noted her statement of the goal covered it fairly well.
- Chairman Craig added this is the “wish list” and even though this is going to be the comprehensive plan, it has minimal teeth. It sets the stage for the rest of the planning to follow. The rest of the planning should say at that point how it is going to be protected and how vigorously. At this point, he thinks the PC can be very topical in nature and more broad and they can drill down as they move through each step. Once this section is completed and the PC is told it can be done and how it can be done, they move on to the zoning, the SALDO, etc. That is when they get into the meat of things.
- Mr. Webb added the ordinances are where the difference is made, because of the intent of the ordinance with interpretation and the law.
- After discussion of the different creeks, Mrs. Lebo clarified the multi-creek watershed is not specific to East Hanover Township. It runs over several townships.
- After some discussion, Chairman Craig determined Mrs. Eppinger would not be needed at the meeting, other than to transcribe the tapes. The flipping of the tapes would be done by Mr. Webb.
- Chairman Craig reiterated the wording for the streams would be, “Protect the water quality and environmental integrity of Bow, Manada, Swatara creeks and their tributaries”.
- Chairman Craig asked for additional items.
- Mrs. Lebo noted she understood the last time they talked about the preservation and protection of wetlands in conservation and environmentally sensitive areas and did not see it noted on the list.
- Mr. Kovach asked if she was referring to the items, “Bring back the environmental conservation planning area”.
- Mrs. Lebo answered yes, that was part of the conservation planning. Chairman Craig noted he thought it was intended to be encompassed under the work with adjacent townships. He may have gotten lost with that issue previously.

- Mrs. Lebo noted to add, “Preservation and protection of wetlands, floodplains, conservation areas, steep slopes and other natural features and resources”. She added it could be modified.
- There was discussion from Chairman Craig regarding LTL getting a draft together for the PC. At some point, the sections will need to be presented to the public at large.
- Chairman Craig asked if Mr. Kovach had any items.
- Mr. Kovach added this is a very comprehensive list and it is good the PC spelled out streams and so forth. As long as the intent is made clear to LTL and they can present a draft back for the PC to review, that would be fine. He voiced a concern about an apartment complex.
- Mr. Kovach asked if the phrase, “Balance types of development” is too broad. Chairman Craig answered this is where LTL’s help is needed because you cannot say what it not wanted.
- Mr. Webb added if there is something that is not wanted in the community, it cannot be stated as such, but the requirements that are needed to be met at a high enough level that it would not likely to be a good place to locate a certain type of development. He specifically referred to the top of the mountain, which would be a prime place for a couple thousand wind turbines right along the ridge. Right now it is not likely to occur because it belongs to the federal government.
- Mrs. Lebo reminded the members there are no ordinances to regular wind turbines. If anyone would come into the township for them, there is nothing there.
- Mr. Webb added one of the things the Township does not want to do is make it very difficult for people to do alternative energy. Going forward, those types of energies are going to have a lower footprint on the community as a whole though they may have a bigger impact on the immediate neighbors.
- Chairman Craig asked Mr. Webb if he would like to add anything to the goals and objective.
- Mr. Webb answered the only thing he thinks is missing from the goals and objectives is there is nothing in them to address reversing pro-active goals to existing conditions. He spoke of the area being forest at one time and the trees being lost to farming and believes the Township should be promoting the growth of trees for a couple of reasons which are: they reduce air pollution as a result of filtration, they reduce ambient temperatures, they help prevent flooding, particularly in a riparian areas.
- Mrs. Lebo noted she disagreed with the statement. Mr. Webb answered if there are adequate trees a lot of the rain will stay in the foliage. Mrs. Lebo responded the trees fall into the water and create dams, either from the banks or inland. When flooding occurs, the trees wash to downstream properties and create dams and property damage. There are two sides to the coin. It is one that the County and Chesapeake Bay promotes to have treat plantings in the riparian buffer zone. Strictly for the reason of ambient temperature and to flourish fish habitat, but the other side is what about flood plain management. A lot of time in high water situations, it washes down and collects and creates dams.

- Mr. Webb answered he is not just talking sticking trees along the riparian. In general, the Township should probably be promoting a lot more trees and planting than what is happening for this point. If they are planting outside the riparian, there may not be as much rain making it to the runoff. The worst thing is have is mowed grass.
- Chairman Craig answered this is why everyone agrees it is important to maintain as much as the mountainside as possible. That is the headwaters for the aquifer and by keeping the trees, they act as a filter for cleaning the water as it comes down.
- Mr. Webb pointed out there may be other things that the PC should be looking at as proactive things to try to make changes when the opportunity is there for change. He touched on the stormwater ordinance and noted the same type of philosophy should be incorporated into what the PC is doing as they go forward. Every time the Township goes through the development process, the end result from an environmental point of view should be a net reduction in pollution.
- Mrs. Lebo agreed but she is not following with the trees and requiring the replacement of trees, do not allow taking down a certain type of trees.
- Chairman Craig added by enforcing that with no waivers, etc., all of that helps quality whether it is air, water and just ambient temperature and quality of life. He went on to note the PC is going in a good direction because it is proactive.
- Mr. Webb noted one of the items the PC may end up saying is 'no construction within 300 feet of floodplain.' It might involve things like requiring commercial facilities to put in pollution or water clean up standards for the discharges from their parking lots as opposed to simply running it into a culvert and running it into a retention basin and then dumping it out into the stream. Maybe an oil-water separator will be required to catch it. There are pillow-type materials for oil absorption. These sorts of things may be a requirement in order to reduce the impact on groundwater a requirement on large water users will have to recycle a percentage of their water.
- Mrs. Lebo added there is a provision in the stormwater ordinance for recycling.
- Mr. Webb noted it has not been implemented. Mrs. Lebo answered
- Chairman Craig answered maybe one of the proactive items would be to buy development rights along the streambeds to some extent so the Township can create those buffers; walking trails, nature trails. Though he cautioned when there are large walking trails, there are no police and safety would be an issue.
- Mrs. Lebo added realistically is one takes a look at the watersheds, it would be very difficult to put walkways, especially along Bow Creek because of the topography of the land and accessibility. She asked about funding.
- Chairman Craig answered there could be grants. Mr. Webb added currently there is a .052 acre donation per housing unit. That is very small.
- Mrs. Lebo added that was very interesting and a good point because right now that is required for recreational area and raised the question what is that was expanded into the conservation area as well. Chairman Craig answered that could be a mixed use area.

- Mrs. Lebo answered in reference to Mr. Webb's original statement, it is not that she is opposed, she just does not like the blanketed statement of trees in the riparian buffer.
- Mr. Webb noted what he was trying to say was rather than getting caught up in the details of what the specifics of the end products of the goal are is that the goal should be that the Township, through the comprehensive planning process looks to ameliorate existing conditions and improve through the development process improve the overall standard of living for the community as a whole.
- Chairman Craig noted another objective would be, "Proactive goals to reverse existing conditions which degrade the overall quality of life":
- Mrs. Lebo added to also consider property values.
- Mr. Webb discussed property values as related to commercial development and is typically in very positive environmental locations. Other things that come to mind are other types of innovative techniques that allow you to create a sustainable development process.
- Chairman Craig noted he would like to keep the wording about property values in the phrase because waiver requests are not allowed based on a monetary value.
- Mr. Webb answered maintain and enhance property values can be a goal for a comprehensive plan. It would not be a matter of saying about getting a waiver because it costs too much but rather a way of saying, "we want to do these things to help maintain and enhance the property values of the Township.
- Mrs. Lebo added when developers come in, they want to want to maximize full build out on the property so they can maximize on the dollar not caring who is by them and the effects on those around them. That is a good objective to list.
- Mr. Webb answered from his point of view is a reasonable goal.
- After discussion, Chairman Craig changed the goal to read: "Proactive goals to reverse existing conditions which degrade the overall quality of life. These actions should help to maintain and enhance quality of life and property values."
- Chairman Craig noted the only other thing that was not brought up was public services and asked if this should be addressed; sewer, water, police protection, emergency services. Is there something in the planning goals that need to be addressed.
- Mr. Kovach suggested balancing types of development as not to overburden infrastructure such as schools, fire, emergency services, water and sewer.
- Mrs. Lebo asked if it is an ongoing conclusion that wherever infrastructure goes that where development will follow.
- There was discussion regarding the sewerage of Partridge Hills and Englewood with one group saying the Township as a whole should pay for it and the other group saying just those individuals should pay for it. Is there something in place to have the developer pay for these types of expansions.
- Mr. Webb noted one of the things important for this Township to keep in mind when it comes to the capital intensive infrastructures is the upfront of paying for putting it in is the little bit of pain. The real big pain comes from maintaining it and the longitudinal costs associated with the projects. From a practical point of view from a long term fiscal stability on a small township, the real key is to minimize the amount of infrastructure that you build and maximize the utilization

of what you already have and then use your funds to maintain what you have in the best possible shape. That really makes the most amount of sense from an environmental point of view and a fiscal point of view. The downside is there would be less large-scale development requiring sewers.

- Mrs. Lebo does not think that would prevent development.
- Chairman Craig, along with the other members, added another goal: “Public services: sewer (tie into 537), water, police, emergency. Maximize the utilization of existing infrastructure and its potential to alleviate the burden of expansion and maintenance costs. (this item will be discussed further at next meeting).
- There was discussion regarding Englewood and Partridge Hills. Mr. Kovach noted he asked about the neighborhoods around it. You may have those neighbors who want to hook up and if a developer says there is a main running down past the farm and if the farmer wants to sell him the land, he will question why he can’t build there, access the main and develop.
- Mr. Webb noted it would have been more efficient to run to the existing plant. They may have been a classical example of having a small package plant that handled just them as opposed to making it a large scale operation. The downside is the existing additional capacity and the logical is they will maximize the utilization and in the process basically put more pipes in the ground. The other thing you have to be careful with is it is one thing to say they will have the developer pay for it. The Township would then take on ownership of them and the developer would not pay for the maintenance and upkeep.
- There was discussion that the list of goals and objectives will be sent to LTL.
- Mr. Webb noted for Mrs. Lebo that other advantage of maximizing utilization of existing infrastructure is it means any development you have at this point typically is lower density and less impact because you have to provide for the utilities self-contained within the development process.
- Mrs. Lebo asked what stops expansion. Mr. Webb answered the biggest thing that will stop it is if you are at capacity and in order to be able to take another large EDU user and you tell the developer the only way they can get it is to provide the capital to allow the Township to upgrade the treatment plant one module size which might provide for 100 EDU’s and associated plumbing. He also mentioned about some of the monies going into a fund for maintenance. If it is set up correctly, the fund will be able to grow.
- Mrs. Lebo answered there are a host of guidelines that when monies have to be allocated and used for specific things; i.e., sewage. This would be a question to pose to Mr. Wyland to see if that is even feasible to do. In an ideal world it would make sense. That is part of the problems we are having now.
- Chairman Craig asked if the PC wanted the goals and objectives listed in the 1993 Comprehensive Plan or in the LDARG plan with one overall goal followed by goal statements, and supporting objectives in the following categories. Or should the PC wait until LTL gets back to the PC on how they think the goals and objectives should be flushed out.
- Mrs. Lebo asked at what point LTL will be involved in the process. She thought they were going to be after the preliminary work.

- Chairman Craig answered since the Planning Commission kind of outlined what they believe their goals and objectives are at this point. These can be sent with the idea they will be reviewed by LTL, collate them and get them in some sort of order and substance so maybe some of them mesh together, some of them don't and tell the PC how they can achieve the goals.
- Mr. Kovach answered there may be a model or a template for this kind of thing and it very may well be by category as Chairman Craig has it listed.
- Mr. Webb added if he remembered correctly he was under the impression that the breakout that was used under the LDARG plan was currently what was required under the MPC for a comprehensive plan for each of the areas.
- Chairman Craig noted formatting can be left up to LTL because they will know essentially what the requirements are according to what the governing laws are that are out there. He will e-mail the list out, along with what was done at the March 18th meeting, which will be in red. He will send it out and make sure everybody is comfortable with what was discussed. Once everyone gets back to him, he would give Glenn the opportunity to add anything and once he gets Glenn's comments, he will send it to Norm at LTL and copy Mr. Wyland and the Supervisors noting they are the goals and objectives being forwarded to LTL.
- Mr. Kovach asked if Mr. Ulrich would be invited to one of the workshops and ask him to please come with a model or template he uses.
- There was discussion regarding waivers and what is "undo hardship". They agreed this may be something for Mr. Wyland to decide.
- Mr. Webb added getting an answer to the question is really important to stay fair and equitable to all applicants.
- Mrs. Lebo brought up about the PA Appalachian Trail Act and noted it was received by everyone. It is about municipal planning and is required. She asked one of the bullets be amended to add under "preservation and protection of wetland"...to add and important recreation and natural resources. This is considered a recreation and natural resource.
- Chairman Craig noted after the word "steep slopes", they will add "and other natural resources and other recreational areas."

ADJOURNMENT

Being no further discussion, Mr. Webb made a motion the workshop be adjourned. Mrs. Lebo seconded the motion. Being no further discussion, the meeting was adjourned at 10:02 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Dawn Eppinger