

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

January 26, 2010

Members Present: David Craig, Michael Webb, Glenn Moyer
Michael Kovach, Marie Beaudet

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

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 Temporary Chairman Craig at 7:03 p.m.

REORGANIZATION

An election of officers took place.

- a. Chairman – Mr. Kovach made a motion to nominate Mr. Craig for Chairman. Mr. Webb seconded the motion. Being no further discussion, the motion was approved, 4 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstention, Mr. Craig
- b. Vice Chairman – Mr. Moyer made a motion to nominate Mr. Webb for Vice Chairman. Being no further discussion, the motion was approved, 4 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstention, Mr. Webb.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- Mr. Webb made a motion to recommend approval of the meeting minutes of December 22, 2009. The motion was seconded by Mr. Moyer. Being no further discussion, the motion was approved 3 in favor, 0 opposed, 2 abstentions due to absences; Ms. Beaudet and Mr. Kovach.

PLANS TO BE DISCUSSED

1. Penn National Casino Expansion (expires 04/25/10) – This is a land development plan located at 777 Hollywood Boulevard, Grantville.
 - Mr. Charlie Courtney, representative for Penn National, noted plans were submitted to the Township and are currently pending.
 - He noted they can do a brief presentation and noted there were a number of

waivers brought before the Commission in December, many of which there was already a recommendation. There are three additional waivers to be discussed. Mr. Jim McCarthy of McCarthy Engineering introduced himself and gave a brief overview of the plan.

- He noted they are proposing roughly a 45,000 square foot addition to the existing casino, which is mostly located on top of the existing valet parking lot.
- He noted there are some modifications proposed to the existing storm water basin. They are adding a water quality basin and some grading improvements for the 100 year storm.
- He added there will be additional landscaping coming into the Bow Creek Road access to the loop road and in the area of the basin.
- He noted it will be one story and hold the same roof line as the existing casino.
- Mr. Smith noted he provided a list of comments to the Engineer, Attorney, and the Commissions which were released the day of the meeting.
- He added there are 11 comments, noting comments 6 through 11 basically deal with a section in the ordinance where if the proposed addition exceeds 35 feet in height, certain other requirements will kick in.
- He noted items 2 through 5 are from the Section 449 for zoos, amusements/theme parks, automobile race courses and horsing racing facilities with related wagering.
- He noted Mr. Courtney and Mr. McCarthy received the comments the morning of the meeting.
- Mr. McCarthy acknowledged Mr. Smith's comments and noted they will probably be addressed with a supplemental.
- Ms. Beudet asked if the plan has to be accepted for review first before the official review.
- There was discussion regarding acceptance of the plan.
- Mr. Wyland noted he expected for the plan to be officially.
- There was discussion noting the previous plan before the Commission was a sketch plan.
- Chairman Craig asked for a recommendation.
- **Ms. Beudet made a motion the Penn National Casino Expansion plan be accepted for review. Mr. Moyer seconded the motion. Being no further discussion, the motion was approved, 5 in favor, 0 opposed.**
- Mr. Courtney noted they are planning on attending the first Supervisor's meeting in March to update them as to where they are in the planning.
- He noted the table games legislation has been adopted. They previously spoke about having two construction phases; the first phase would be putting table games in the existing facility and the second phase would be the expansion.
- He noted Mr. Smith may be contacted as the modifications to the existing floor plans are completed.
- It will be followed by construction of the proposed addition, which they would like to start in June.
- It was noted June would be commencement of the construction.
- Chairman Craig asked if there is a timeline for getting the games up.

- Mr. Courtney answered they cannot operate until the Gaming Control Board has the operations down. They were planning on six months to get through the process.
- He noted while they are building the addition, they would want to have the table games operating.
- Mr. Wyland noted for clarification they intend to operate table games just as soon as the Pennsylvania Gaming Control Board authorizes Penn National to operate them in the existing space, adding it is a matter of getting licensure from the GCB. Mr. Courtney acknowledged Mr. Wyland's statement.
- Mr. Kovach noted he understands the bulk of the addition will be on what is now parking lot and asked what the percentage of additional impervious would be created.
- Mr. McCarthy noted it would be 2,800 square feet.
- Mr. Ulrich noted with his cursory review letter, noting they will be SALDO, Zoning and Storm water and adding they will be just major and not small text changes.
- Mr. Ulrich read over his cursory review letter.
- There was discussion regarding site distance. Mr. Courtney noted the modification was left for Mr. Ulrich's review. There was discussion regarding having the Commission review it.
- There was discussion regarding the width of the roadways.
- Chairman Craig noted because the comments were just generated, he would like to get the opinion of the Director of Public Works.
- Mr. Courtney noted getting input from Mr. Longreen was a good suggestion.
- There was discussion regarding setting up a meeting with Mr. Longreen, Mr. Ulrich, Mr. McCarthy and Mr. Courtney.
- Mr. Webb asked for Mr. Ulrich to notify the Commission members of the meeting in the event anyone would be able to attend.
- Mr. Ulrich noted his comment regarding sidewalk requirements and added based on a site visit on January 6, there does not appear to be any areas along the existing perimeter streets where sidewalks were observed to be needed, a good idea, suggested; he noted there were two interior sites that may need to be considered associated with existing parking.
- Mr. Ulrich pointed out on the map the areas where he recommended possibly adding sidewalks to the interior.
- Mr. McCarthy noted the one area is in the bus area, adding Penn National does not want pedestrian traffic in that area and that is the reason for no sidewalks in that area.
- There was discussion regarding the area of recommended sidewalk where pedestrian traffic has worn the grass area.
- Mr. McCarthy noted they are not prohibiting pedestrian traffic but they do not want to encourage it.
- There was discussion regarding forwarding the information to the Planning Commission.
- Ms. Beudet asked if there was a waiver on the sidewalks. Chairman Craig answered for the perimeter sidewalks only.

- Mr. Ulrich clarified the PDF would be for the two recommended sidewalk areas and the road issues.
- Chairman Craig noted if some of the issues go away as a result of the meeting, the Planning Commission would not need the extra paperwork.
- Mr. Ulrich continued with his cursory review.
- Mr. Ulrich noted there was a site visit regarding street trees.
- There was discussion regarding the storm water. Mr. Ulrich noted they are requesting a waiver for the sizing of the pipe system. The discussion dealt more with the upgrade of Basin #3 to comply with the ordinance as a trade-off.
- There was discussion regarding Penn National agreeing to the upsize of the basin. Mr. Webb added there was also to be some regarding to ensure surcharge did not go down into direct discharge but made it to the basin as well.
- There was additional discussion regarding the basin.
- There was discussion regarding rewording of the original waiver request to note this would be a way to meet the intent of the ordinance.
- Mr. McCarthy noted the waiver request was more for the waiver of the upgrade of the pipes to not be upgraded for the hundred year storm and instead they implemented the other suggestions of Mr. Ulrich and the Planning Commission.
- Chairman Craig added the information should be added to the waiver showing they are justifying the ordinance by meeting the intent.
- Mr. Courtney noted it is reflected on the revised plan.
- There was discussion regarding the wording of the waiver request, noting in justification the intent of the ordinance will be met.
- Mr. Ulrich suggested having the waiver contingent upon basin #3 being designed for compliance of the rest of the ordinance.
- There was additional discussion regarding the wording of the ordinance.
- Mr. Ulrich noted the basin will be reviewed again the basin geometry, the basin routing and all of the requirements of the storm water ordinance that wouldn't necessarily require the applicant to landscape the basin, the geometry, the routing the freeboard requirements, lining of the spillway, etc.
- There was discussion from Mr. McCarthy noting one would not want to tear down an established berm and take out the anti-seep collar.
- Mr. Wyland noted it is a matter of documentation and to take a look at the current wording. He suggested reviewing it and either supplementing it or changing it in some way for documentation.
- Mr. Ulrich asked for clarification of the Planning Commission for Basin #3 and the geometry requirements. He asked if it is their intent as much as possible for Penn National to comply with the storm water ordinance without going into major excavation
- Mr. McCarthy noted the basin is landscaped in accordance with the ordinance. He added the current basin is structurally sound and it is not their desire to rip it up. They looked at the ordinance to comply with everything possible without any major construction to the basin itself and without compromising the structural integrity of the basin.
- There was discussion regarding fencing around the basin.

- Mr. Courtney discussed landscaping and the waiver. He noted the feedback was to essentially not to request the blanket waiver but show where they would be willing to add landscaping. He noted three PC members went out prior to the workshop on December 29th.
- He noted the PC suggested planting trees and buffers. The information was taken to the owners of Penn National and shared with their Landscape Architect.
- He indicated they will show their proposed plan, noting there are areas towards the rear which would not receive plantings.
- Mr. Terry Souders, a consulting landscape architect for Penn National introduced himself. He showed a plan and noted there is no species that was specifically identified.
- He noted there was 1400 lineal feet, which according to the ordinance means 28 street trees, 50 feet on center. He noted aesthetically, it would not work. He proposed to take the street trees and cluster them to make them more natural.
- He noted they would be located in the right-of-way but they have to be careful because of a swale. He noted the buffer planting would have to impede on private property for this.
- He noted the purpose is to screen the mobile home park for their benefit and the benefit of Penn National.
- He noted it would be a combination of 28 evergreen and 14 canopy trees. He discussed the ordinance and noted what it will look like in the future is important.
- He discussed the planting of the trees and the placement. He noted to pay attention to the species and information on deer-resistant trees. He added the evergreens cannot be planted close to the canopies that it shades out the evergreens.
- He discussed the other proposed areas and the problems such as a six-foot barbed wire chain-link fence. He noted in one area there is a swale that limit's the plantings. There are also overhead wires and the permission of the utility companies. He noted the manure barn has planted material which will eventually grow.
- Chairman Craig asked if they are looking at other areas. Mr. Souders noted the area discussed is the one area they know there are no problems.
- Mr. Courtney noted they are proposing some additional trees around the new basin, additional trees along the main entrance drive.
- There was discussion regarding the ordinance with plantings. Mr. Courtney noted they would like to put street trees in the area where they will have the most impact, which will be internally and along Fox Run Road.
- He discussed the plans and the ordinance requirements with plantings, noting the addition is being proposed at the front of the entrance.
- He noted for a variety of reasons including space limitations and security, they are not in favor of putting trees along the back side Firehouse Road and Mountain Road.
- There was discussion regarding bus parking area where tractor-trailers have been pulling.
- Mr. Webb discussed the life of the species of plantings. He asked if Penn

- National is planning on replacing the trees at the main drive that died.
- There was discussion noting they would not be replacing those trees.
 - There was discussion regarding the groomsmen cottages.
 - There was discussion regarding the plantings currently listed in the SALDO.
 - Mr. Souders noted on the other end of the six-foot fence with security and maintaining the shrubs. He noted he is not sure what shrubs can be planted around horses.
 - Mr. Courtney noted part of the overall plan is, they are moving throughout the site. Part of the plan will be to make improvements where needed to the back side, for which plans will be submitted.
 - Mr. McCarthy noted six of the barns on the back side have already been replaced. The plan is to have them all replaced, which there is a total of 26. He briefly noted the washing stalls will be put inside and discussed other plans.
 - Mr. Wyland asked if procedurally the plantings that are proposed are they in support of the waiver request but there is not much detail as far as detail and asked if they are intending to develop a more detailed plan based on the results of tonight's meeting to supplement the record with specifics.
 - He asked if there is any part that will go on the plan itself.
 - Mr. McCarthy answered a supplemental sheet will be submitted and amend the plans to include the changes.
 - Mr. Wyland confirmed Penn National will have one supplemental sheet to include all the plantings and reference with the waiver requests and it is part of the plan.
 - Mr. Courtney noted they will do that and noted before they leave they will summarize where they are at with the waivers.
 - There was a brief discussion regarding the waivers.
 - There was discussion regarding the master plan.
 - Mr. Courtney discussed the Township was previously shown the master plan and a copy can be provided. Ms. Beaudet noted the back side plan was also included.
 - There was discussion regarding land development plans for changes on the back side and it was noted they fell within the agricultural exception.
 - Mr. Courtney noted the back side will not always look the way it does currently because there are improvements that need to be made.
 - Mr. Courtney recapped the waivers. He noted the preliminary/final plan waiver was approved by the Board.
 - Section 602.3.4 - upgrade to existing streets, there was a previous recommendation; he noted there is a plan by Mr. Ulrich that will be reviewed
 - Section 609.1 - sidewalks; it was recommended subject to Mr. Ulrich's inspection and with respect to external sidewalks it was determined there is no need.
 - Chairman Craig noted Mr. Ulrich made that recommendation and the PC would work off his recommendations.
 - Mr. Courtney continued:
 - Section 610.1 - curbing; it was discussed
 - Section 618.1.5 and 618.1.6 - tree survey; the PC previously recommended approval; there will be a note on the plan there will be no trees removed as part

of the development except for new trees just planted in the area of the proposed expansion

- Section 618.7 and 618.8 - street trees and buffer; this was discussed. He asked for further input.
- Chairman Craig noted Mr. Souders was going to go back and look at the bus area and not just using trees.
- There was discussion regarding grading and species and the submission of a more formalized plan and screening the buses from Mountain Road and additional trees at the basin already shown on the plan; proposed trees around the proposed expansion
- Chairman Craig noted there was discussion regarding basins #1 and #2, noting there is berm. Mr. McCarthy noted the basins will be expanded with future development.
- There was discussion regarding the area between the two basins. Mr. Courtney noted there will likely be further development so they did not want to plant trees just to have them ripped out.
- There was discussion regarding further expansion and adding an additional basin.
- Mr. Ulrich noted they are not changing Basins #1 and #2; they are changing Basin #3 and will comply with the landscaping requirements.
- Mr. Courtney noted they will come up with more fully engineered plans showing the landscaping along Fox Run; they will evaluate and hopefully propose the area of the bus along Mountain Road.
- Chairman Craig discussed the snow removal from the upper deck and the way the de-watering system from the track dumps out adjacent to the area and the silt fence; they were concerned about the use of salt on the deck and dumping it off. He noted to get feedback from Mr. Ulrich on this issue.
- Section 618.12 - landscaping within detention basin; a recommendation was previously made.
- Section 307A.1 - 100 year flood - this was previously discussed.
- Section 617.2 - wetland buffer - relating to proposed swale; there was discussion noting there was middle ground and there will be vegetation so there will be no erosion issues.
- Section 308.J. - basin fences - Mr. Courtney noted this was not previously discussed and relates to Basin #3 and the proposed infiltration basin.
- There was discussion noting this was an adult facility; however, a previous plan was required to have fencing. There was further discussion regarding fencing.
- Mr. Wyland noted nothing is being waived for future development and future more intensive uses and it can be made clear the recommended waiver for purposes of this construction project only and the Township reserves its rights with respect to any other uses that may be more intensive. He noted anyone on or near it will be a trespasser, and he presumes this waiver is for the current construction.
- There was discussion regarding the liability lying with the landowner and not the Township.
- There was discussion regarding a hotel and the master plan. It was noted the

- hotel would be approximately 3,000 feet away from the basin.
- Mr. Webb noted the waiver approval should be conditioned upon any further construction on the site and the basins should be re-evaluated.
 - There was discussion regarding not taking any official action on the plan because of the timing of when Dauphin County received their information.
 - Mr. Courtney noted they will work with Mr. Ulrich, the waiver requests will be in line, tighten up and hopefully there will be a recommendation at the next meeting.
 - Chairman Craig asked for modified waiver requests earlier than the next meeting and asked for the professionals to review them and give the PC guidance at the February meeting.
 - Mr. Courtney noted they have been working closely with the Township's consultant and would like to continue to do so and wanted to make the Planning Commission aware.
 - Mr. Courtney noted when Mr. Ulrich's comments are received and the plan is resubmitted, he wants to make sure from a process standpoint what the procedure is.
 - There was discussion regarding having a formal acceptance of revisions to plan and the timeline for the review of the plans.
 - Chairman Craig noted Penn National benefited greatly with the submission of the sketch plan and the open dialogue with the Township and professionals.
 - There was further discussion regarding obtaining a review and the timeline for plans and revisions.
 - Mr. Ulrich explained the submission process for initial and following submissions. He noted if agreeable to Penn National and the Commission, he would be able to have the review letter ready before the next meeting, if he would have the material to review three weeks in advance.
 - Mr. McCarthy agreed to it. Mr. Ulrich noted more burden would be on LTL and he would be willing to do it if the Planning Commission was agreeable.
 - Chairman Craig noted the direction would need to come from the Board. They try to stick to their SOP. The deviations would come at the request of the Board.
 - There was further discussion regarding previous direction from the Board giving the Planning Commission and the professionals the go-ahead to work with Penn National
 - Mr. Wyland noted it was his understanding in circumstances when information is submitted in a timely manner the signal from the Board was, and if everything is moving along, do not delay review of the plan if it is in order.
 - There was further discussion regarding resubmissions and the Standard Operating Procedure. Chairman Craig noted his concern that everyone is treated equally.
 - There was discussion regarding a lengthy review process and having the developer end up in a position of control with the calendar and extensions.
 - There was discussion regarding the professionals having the time and opportunity to review the plans.
 - There was discussion regarding forwarding the revised plans directly to Mr. Ulrich.

- There was discussion regarding reviewing plans; it was brought up the gist of a conversation with the County was the Supervisors would not be able to take any action until reviewed by the County.
- Mr. Wyland asked Mr. Ulrich how reviews are handled in other municipalities. Mr. Ulrich answered plan acceptance noted revision of plans is handled differently. He noted he mentioned having plans being submitted at Planning Commission meetings to be reviewed at the following meeting.
- He noted they are unique with their administrative completeness and is typically done at the office level where the number of plans are counted and is not as detailed or comprehensive as East Hanover.

2. Bow Creek Mall - Conditional Use

- Mr. Courtney was present as the representative and noted because the project is unique because it is a shopping center with a restaurant. The restaurant is a special exception and the shopping center is a conditional use.
- He noted Mr. Smith pointed out a requirement, a specific performance standard for shopping center that requires to be serviced by public water and public sewer. There is no public water in the Township. The special exception was scheduled for February 3 and conditional use for February 16.
- He offered a continuance for the conditional use will be March 16th and the special exception will be earlier in March. He will be back in February to discuss the application.
- There was discussion regarding the applicant having the ability to go to the PUC.

3. Ketterline Builders/ Devonshire Heights Road - Planning Module

- Chairman Craig turned the floor over to Mr. Smith
- Mr. Smith noted Mr. Willard reviewed the module as the Sewage Enforcement Officer and approved the module. The site has a primary and alternate septic system as well as an alternate system for the residual land where the existing home is located.
- He noted there was information that needs to be filled out with deed references, and he will contact the applicant for the information.
- He noted Component 4A is a section for municipal planning agencies and asked if they would like him to go over each answer or have Mrs. Eppinger and himself to fill out the forms.
- It was noted the County filled out Component 4B as part of their review process
- The Commission indicated they would like to go over the form and discuss the answers.
- Mr. Smith reviewed the form with the answers. There was a brief discussion as to how the form would be filled out.

OTHER BUSINESS

1. Hilton Garden Inn Sewage Planning Module – Component 4A
 - Chairman Craig noted no revisions have been received to date.

2. Zoning Ordinance Immediate
 - Mr. Ulrich introduced Linda Cluck noting she is handling the re-writes for the Zoning Ordinance Immediate and the SALDO Revisions, Long Term
 - He noted tonight would be the night to bring any concerns. He added Mr. Smith brought up concerns about the woodland protection section, noting from a management standpoint, it will be difficult to manage.
 - He noted they will review the comments and make changes. They would like to be able to meet timelines and budgets set up by the grants.
 - He noted the changes tonight will be forwarded to the Supervisors and DCPC
 - Ms. Cluck noted the following:
 - There was a comment under disturbed area and questioned whether to not it should be recently disturbed. There was discussion regarding this.
 - Earth Disturbance Activity - Mr. Smith caught a typo
 - Hedge Row - it was noted in one area a woodland was defined as a hedge row; why is there a definition of hedge row.
 - There was discussion regarding a hedge row not necessarily meeting the definition of woodlands.
 - There was discussion regarding adding shrub or tree shrub into the definitions
 - There was discussion regarding protection zone and construction fences for trees
 - Accessories structures were discussed adding to back yards - it was noted “no construction activity” would be allowed if there is even a canopy on a tree.
 - Timeline of 3 years was discussed Item #3 under woodlands
 - There was discussion regarding the diameter of trees
 - There was discussion regarding having 10 trees in a quarter acre
 - Mr. David Marshall discussed the measurement of diameter
 - There was discussion regarding timber harvesting and construction
 - There was discussion regarding regeneration through stump sprouts
 - There was discussion regarding protecting the Township from developers
 - There was discussion regarding timber to sit before selling to developer to see if it regenerates and then the percentage that can be harvested.
 - Chairman Craig noted once an area is defined as woodland, it would always be woodland even though there has been encroachment
 - There was discussion the Conservation District approves the timber plans
 - There was discussion regarding clear cuts
 - Mr. Marshall noted the County approves the E&S plan which must be posted on site; he noted if construction is taking place stumps will be removed; if there is timber management, the stumps will remain for regeneration.
 - There was discussion regarding if the intent is to always have as woodlands, make it 100 years
 - Mr. Marshall noted the difference may be between land clearing and timber

management - when the stumps are removed this may be the trigger mechanism for land development

- There was discussion regarding the definition of woodlands and conservation - the purpose is the value to the Township is both aesthetic and functional; Ms. Cluck continued to read from the definition
- Ms. Beaudet noted there needs to be a point where the Township is not stepping on property owner's rights but still preserve the land which can be done through zoning
- Ms. Cluck suggested in order to get the zoning done quickly, this could be left out for now and could be put in the SALDO and the only place it would ever apply would be to the developer.
- There was discussion regarding groundwater recharging.
- There was discussion regarding the Township having a duty to have places that help slow the movement of water during rainfall, helping to maintain property taxes and property values.
- Ms. Cluck noted the zoning immediate was to try and get some things quickly in place to protect against development
- There was a consensus with the Commission to move the woodlands section to the SALDO
- There was discussion regarding access drives - a driveway is a single family house. The definition of access drive way read for everyone
- Ms. Cluck noted the entire driveway ordinance was redone and the definitions were included
- Mr. Kovach noted if one paved surface serves two homes on either side that is an access drive; shared driveways are prohibited
- There was discussion regarding neighboring fighting about access drives and bringing their fight to the Township
- There was discussion regarding the land development definition which is found in the MPC and cannot be changed.
- There was discussion regarding exclusions in association with the land development definition
- There was consensus regarding keeping the definition intact.
- There was discussion regarding farm activity and waivers and anything over 1,000 feet is required to obtain a storm water permit.
- There was discussion regarding streamlining the process to take up less time of the Board of Supervisors
- There was discussion regarding water body, wetlands which includes swamps and marshes. It was noted the definition came from DEP. It was also noted there are matching definitions in the storm water ordinance and dual uses.
- There was discussion regarding steep slopes and deed restrictions. Deed restrictions would supersede zoning.
- Mr. Smith asked why would the Township be tasked to track deed restrictions. There was discussion regarding the enforcement. It was determined it would be a civil matter.
- There was discussion regarding removing feasible or economically reasonable;

possible was suggested. Ms. Cluck noted if it is in the zoning ordinance, the Zoning Officer would make the determination. It was decided both words would be removed

- Mr. Webb asked what constitutes minimized. Ms. Cluck answered the least possible. Mr. Ulrich noted it is the responsibility of the Zoning Officer to make the determination.
- Under Section 520.3.5C, Mr. Smith suggested making it “at the request of the Zoning Officer, he can request the assistant of the Engineer”
- There was additional discussion regarding the Zoning Officer looking to the Engineer for advice but the wording needs to be changed
- Mr. Smith commented are we creating riparian corridor overlay zones and steep slope overlay zone maps as part of the GIS initiative. Ms. Cluck answered for the steep slopes, no, because by definition are based on contours and it is on a site-by-site basis. Mr. Smith noted then by this definition is it not by a specific map.
- Ms. Cluck noted some things have to be objective and up to the discretion of the Zoning Officer.
- There was discussion regarding the word “practical”. After discussion, the word was removed.
- There was discussion regarding “dedicated” which refers to roadways in the Township.
- There was discussion regarding steep slopes and how much can be touched and precautionary and prohibitive.
- There was discussion regarding E&S problems with steep slopes and driveways with steep slopes and the limit of development. Mr. Smith noted this would be more of an experience to find out whether or not the changes would be excessive.
- There was discussion regarding Special Exception - it was not it would be the decision of the Zoning Hearing Board
- There was discussion regarding sheet flow being captured in the storm water ordinance.
- Mr. Webb asked if it would make sense to have definitions with its own manual and they would be consistent between all documents
- Ms. Cluck answered it has not been done any place else to this point.
- It was noted there is a riparian map in the Park and Recreation plan; it was asked if it would be revised to incorporate other areas to the definition of what the Township would have
- There was discussion regarding removing the map from the Park and Recreation plan and discussion regarding intermittent streams not showing up being interpreted as a riparian buffer.
- There was discussion regarding the definition of perennial or intermittent stream as a contributing watershed and place the onus of proving it on the developer.
- There discussion regarding breaking the connection between the riparian map and the Zoning Ordinance.
- There was discussion regarding how realistic the schedule is.

- Ms. Cluck noted the Subdivision changes can be put off until the Zoning changes are completed.
 - Mr. Ulrich noted the idea was to get the comments back from PC and put it in final draft comment form and from there it would go to the Board. The SALDO can be stopped until the changes to Zoning are done. The timeline was prepared to hold LTL to. If it is not realistic, it can be revised.
 - Ms. Cluck suggested it can all be put together, get put into ordinance form and send it out in a draft form
 - Mr. Ulrich noted there will still be another opportunity to make changes. If there are areas on there that need to be looked at, changes will be put in yellow. Ms. Cluck noted the changes that are suggested can be made in handout form under “will do”
3. SALDO Revisions, Long Term
- It was agreed upon that the revisions to the SALDO would be put on hold until the Zoning Ordinance changes were completed..

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Moyer made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 11:45 p.m. Mr. Kovach seconded the motion.

Respectfully submitted,

Transcribed by Dawn E. Eppinger

Cc:	Board of Supervisors	Planning Commission
	Keith Espenshade	David Craig
	John Nelligan	Mike Webb
	Dave Marshall	Mike Kovach
	Tom Shutt	Glenn Moyer
	George Rish	Marie Beaudet
	Deb Casey, Secretary-Treasurer	Scott Wyland, Township Solicitor
	David Smith, Township Zoning Officer	Norm Ulrich, Township Engineer
	Zoning Hearing Board	
	Leah Rowand, Dauphin County Planning Commission	