

**EAST HANOVER TOWNSHIP  
DAUPHIN COUNTY, PA**

**COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING MEETING #10 SUMMARY**

February 17, 2010 – 7:00PM TO 9:30 PM

**IN ATTENDANCE:**

**East Hanover Township Planning Commission**

David Craig (DC)	Chairperson
Marie Beaudet (MB)	Member
Glenn Moyer (GM)	Member

**East Hanover Township Board of Supervisors**

Tom Shutt (TS)	Supervisor
----------------	------------

**Consultants**

Leo R Scott (LS)	Community Planner
Nanci Sarcinello (NS)	Community Planner

**Members of the public present at the meeting.**

Leah Rowand - Environmental Planner – Tri-County Regional Planning Commission-(LR)

Jon Andrews - McNees Wallace & Nurick LLC – Representative of Penn National Gaming (JA)

**MEETING SUMMARY**

1. **CALL TO ORDER 7:00 PM**
  - a. Introductions.
  
2. **REVIEW OF AGENDA**
  - a. NS – Informed PC on change of meeting agenda to move Review Schedule of Remaining Tasks to an earlier Item.
  
2. **REVIEW MEETING #9 SUMMARY**
  - a. PC offered no comments on the Meeting 9 Summary.
  
3. **PRESENTATION OF SCHEDULE OF REMAINING TASKS**
  - a. NS provided the following milestone dates for PC Consideration
    - 3/17/2010 - Date of Public Workshop II
    - 3/18/2010 – Consultants to provide PC Complete 1<sup>st</sup> draft of the Plan for review.
    - 3/24.2010 – PC Workshop (without consultants)
    - 4/27/2010 – PC meeting to consider forwarding 1<sup>st</sup> draft of the Plan to the Board of Supervisors (BOS)
    - May to June – 45 Day required consistency review period for the Plan
    - June or July – BOS Considers Adoption of the Plan

- b. NS informed the PC that the planning process is currently within schedule and scope. The 3/17 meeting will be the last scheduled meeting with the consultants. Any additional consultant meeting attendance or tasks outside the current scope of the planning project may require the PC request additional funding from the BOS.
- c. NS asked the PC if it feels the need for any additional meetings or tasks. DC indicated that the PC would wait for the results of the 3/17 meeting to decide on last steps for the plan.
- d. MB indicated concern that various parts of the land use map and plan that need to be changed to avoid potential down zoning issues. (These Changes are discussed in Section 4) MB also indicated that if this plan is being completed with Grant funds that all necessary changes should be made as soon as possible.
- e. TS indicated the unlikelihood of the BOS to support provisions of additional funds outside the scope of the current funding for additional work on the plan.

**4. DISCUSSION OF THE DRAFT FUTURE LAND USE MAP**

- a. MB inquired where High Density Residential would be provide – NS responded that the Mixed Use District would provide for High Density Residential and that the mixed use district would also cover uses currently offered in the Village Overlay zoning.
- b. MB indicated concern that the drafted small-scale commercial district would potentially result in the loss of current Highway Commercial zoning rights to land owners along Rt. 22. NS stated that this might reduce the number of small-scale commercial opportunity.
- c. DC indicated that the purpose of this proposed future land use is to provide for clusters of commercial land use around intersections and to reduce the number of curb cuts along Rt.22. Concern with potential of changing zoning for small properties and approvals from Zoning Hearing Board.
- d. MB stated that revisions in the Township Ordinances could alleviate the effects of curb cuts and place responsibility for maintenance of commercial egresses on township roads to commercial property owners. TS agreed that commercial zoning on Township does cause a maintenance problem that needs to be addressed. TS suggested that there should be no more commercial property allowed along Township Roads.
- e. DC indicated that commercial development could grow in the area of the intersection of Sand beach Road and Rt. 22 if more effective traffic controls were present. TS and GM stated the future likelihood of a traffic signal to be placed at that intersection.
- f. PC discussed further, reviewed map and directed consultants to make additional changes to revise the Small Scale Commercial Land Use along Rte 22. Changes were indicated for properties near Meadow Ln. and Hill Dr, which would restore commercial land use to those properties.
- g. MB requested further explanation of change commercial recreation to conservation land use, North of mountain road and east of firehouse road. DC responded that the reason was to allow land use consistent with East Hanover Township, Lebanon County

adjacent to the Township and that this area contains headwater streams. DC added that the current use of the land would be consistent with the proposed future use. TS stated that this is not a sufficient reason for such a significant change.

- h. JA indicated that the all Penn National lands in the Township are considered a “campus” by the owner. JA stated that the proposed change to land use would lead to an abrupt change in land use from the most valued to the least valued. JA indicated that all lands owned by Penn National should remain at land uses reflected by the current zoning and that the map should reflect this.
- i. NS asked PC if all lands with Commercial Recreation Zoning, including those north of Mountain Road, should be reverted back to this land use. All answered “yes.” NS asked if the conservation land uses east of Firehouse Road , other than Penn National properties, should be reverted back to reflect current zoning. LR recommended that it should as to not have an isolated conservation district to the east of Firehouse Road. PC agreed to revert the land to reflect the original zoning. Consultants were tasked with the change.
- j. NS asked PC if these changes are made to the Future Land Use map, would this constitute a completed first draft for presentation to the public and BOS. PC agreed that the map would be ready for presentation to the public and BOS.

## **5. REMAINING ISSUES WITH FUTURE LAND USE CATEGORY DESCRIPTIONS**

- a. Brief discussion was made on the Potential nature of Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) scenarios. Brief discussion on how TDRs work and how they can be implemented. NS indicted that townships in Lancaster and York counties have experienced benefit from TDRs to protect agricultural lands.
- b. TS stated concern for potential corruption in the sales and purchases of TDRs. NS indicated that there is currently little to no incentive for use of TDRs under the current zoning. Modifications to the current TDR provisions can be put into place to create incentive for its use.
- c. Consultants were tasked with providing mapped locations of prime agricultural soils.
- d. NS presented the future land use categories document to the PC and reviewed each for comment.
  - i. Conservation Open Space Land Use
    - 1. Discussion of lot size and lot layout adjustments to reduce impacts on natural and scenic resources.
    - 2. PC directed consultants to keep lot size and density as it is currently in the draft
    - 3. PC indicated that a statement should be made to add placement of lots to protect naturally significant land.
  - ii. Agricultural / Low Density Residential
    - 1. NS – current draft includes sliding scale (Agricultural Protective Zoning and TDR incentives) to protect agriculture. PC affirmed their desire to use sliding scale and TDR to protect agriculture.
    - 2. DC – requested that consultants provide citation for Prime Agricultural Soils source
    - 3. LR – indicated that TCRPC may have this data already generated offered TCRPC's assistance in accessing the data.

- iii. Medium Density Residential
  - 1. NS confirmed that this will be a TDR Receiving Area
  - 2. NS confirmed that that a statement would be provided to remove the Village Overlay Zone from MDR district and move it to the Mixed Use land use category. MB agreed.
- iv. Village Residential Land Use
  - 1. No changes were indicated for this category
- v. Mixed Use (TND) Land Use Category
  - 1. Will be the area in which VO Zoning characteristics will be provided.
- vi. Mobile Home Park Land Use Category
  - 1. No changes were indicted for this category.
- vii. Small Scale Commercial Land Use Category
  - 1. Map changes (see section 4) were confirmed.
  - 2. MB indicated that comments regarding egress from commercial properties should be provided in this category.
- viii. Large Scale Commercial Land Use Category
  - 1. No changes were indicated for this category
- ix. Commercial Recreation Land Use Category
  - 1. Map changes (see section 4) were confirmed.
- x. Commercial Office Park Land Use Category
  - 1. MB and TS Indicated that potentially similar land use found in Linglestown PA may be used as a model for this classification.
- xi. Industrial Land Use Category
  - 1. Map changes east of Firehouse Road (see section 4) were confirmed.
  - 2. PC requested that “strategically” be removed from paragraph 1.
- xii. Municipal / Institutional Land Use Category
  - 1. No changes were indicted for this category
- xiii. Park and Recreation Land Use Category
  - 1. Consultants to Edit map to convert proposed property at the intersection of Dry Run Rd and Manada Gap Road. This property should be indicated as Rural Agricultural.
- xiv. NS asked the PC if these changes would constitute a final First Draft for presentation to the public and BOS. PC confirmed this.

## **6. REVIEW PLANNING COMMISSIONS EDITS TO THE PARK AND RECREATION MAP**

- a. DC stated that Dawn Eppinger should have the redlined copy of the park and recreation map for Consultants to access. LS will contact her for the hardcopy version.
- b. LR stated that the adjustments that have been made to the Future Land Use map would need to be made on the park and Recreation Map as well.
- c. LR indicated that the Consultants should review the Dauphin County Park and Recreation Plan for further information and consistency in drafting the chapter. No further comments were provided by the PC regarding.

## **7. FINAL COMMENTS AND DISCUSSION ITEMS**

- a. MB – Inclusion of Ft. Crawford in the Historical resources plan is essential.
- b. TS – regarding historical markers – what is the source of the blue metal historical signs that were present in the township in the past – consultants indicated that this is the purview of the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission and they should be contacted.

8. NEXT STEPS AND ACTION ITEMS

- a. Consultants to Provide PC with First Complete Draft of the Plan by 3/18/2010
- b. Consultants are to provide the corrections indicated above to the corresponding sections and maps.
- c. Consultants are to work with Dawn Eppinger on the make up of the advertisement for Public Workshop II.