

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

**April 27, 2010**

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

Also Present:

Norman Ulrich, Engineer; Scott Wyland, Township Solicitor  
Dawn Eppinger, Administrative Assistant  
Absent: David Smith, Zoning Officer  
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 Chairman Craig at 7:04 p.m.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

- Chairman Craig noted the February meeting minutes were not approved at the March meeting because there was no quorum.
- **Chairman Craig made a motion to recommend approval of the meeting minutes of February 23, 2010. Mr. Webb seconded the motion. Being no further discussion, the motion was approved, 3 in favor 0 opposed, 1 abstention. Ms. Beaudet abstained from voting, noting her absence at the February meeting.**
- Chairman Craig noted for the February meeting minutes, there would not be quorum.
- Mr. Wyland noted a vote could be taken if there was no conflict. After further discussion, it was decided to vote on the March minutes at the May meeting.

**PLANS TO BE DISCUSSED**

1. Penn National Casino Expansion (expires 05/17/10) – This is a land development plan located at 777 Hollywood Boulevard, Grantville.
  - Mr. Courtney noted his time extension was meant to extend to the second meeting in May. He understands there will be no meeting on May 18, but he will forward a letter to Mrs. Eppinger on Wednesday, noting the extended time to include the May 19<sup>th</sup> meeting.
  - Mr. Courtney noted they will be looking for a motion tonight and handed out information for an additional waiver.

04/27/2010

- He noted there was a trip generation traffic study performed which was resolved with McMahon and an impact study was performed.
- He discussed the impact for the entrance to Bow Creek and read from SALDO Section 402.5.4.2.14. He noted the overall level of service for the intersection operates at satisfactory levels of service.
- Under the ordinance, peak hours for Friday is rated a C and Saturday is rated a D. One of the turning movements level of service is an F, which is the left out. At the peak hour, there is no signal to keep cars moving and efficiently move them onto Bow Creek Road.
- He noted the only way to improve the turning movement to a level of service required under the SALDO would be to put in a traffic signal. The signal warrants applied by PennDOT are not met, so no signal permit can be issued. It was noted the information was supplied to McMahon Associates.
- It was noted additional information and clarifications were provided to McMahon Associates relating to crashes.
- Mr. Courtney further discussed the warrants not being met and that being the justification for the waiver.
- There was discussion regarding changing the egress and exit locations on the property and Chairman Craig asked about a roundabout.
- Mr. Courtney noted as some point in time signal warrant criteria may be met
- It was noted there is not much traffic on Bow Creek Road. The delay is only about a minute during the heaviest peak time being Saturday.
- There was discussion as to when Mr. Ulrich received the waiver. He noted he received it this evening. Mr. Shaner verified the waiver was for the information being discussed.
- Mr. Shaner noted the information was forwarded to Ms. Jodi Evans of McMahon Associates to perform a cursory review on Friday or Monday. She asked for additional information related to police reports and crashes at the intersection. It was noted Ms. Evans is not disputing the delay is not onerous.
- Mr. Wyland noted he view Ms. Evans' email and subsequently spoke with her. He verified what the engineer was saying. He noted her initial point of view was that the level of service is low and would bear some fixing up but a light cannot be installed at the intersection unless it satisfies the PennDOT requirements. It does not appear, according to the facts, that a light is warranted.
- There was further discussion regarding the requirements for a light.
- Mr. Wyland noted there needs to be confirmation on the facts. If it is not warranted, he noted the waiver would be in order.
- There was discussion regarding the health and safety of the public and the level of service in the SALDO to warrant to putting in a light
- There was discussion regarding the level of service not being there to warrant a light.
- Ms. Beaudet noted even with the plan handed in, she does not feel there is enough to even re-work the egress. She does not see it as a major stumbling block and would be willing to entertain a motion for the Board of Supervisors.

- Mr. Webb noted it would have been preferable to have a final review from McMahan.
- Ms. Beaudet noted the Supervisors still have to approve the anything. There was discussion regarding having the information available, it can be recommended approved. She noted if there is any information that turns up, Mr. Wyland would be apprised.
- Mr. Wyland added if facts were uncovered noting a light was needed, it would be brought up to the supervisors.
- There was further discussion regarding making an informed decision.
- Mr. Ulrich asked if the only thing they can see for the applicant to improve the intersection would be a light and the light cannot be installed because the warrants are not triggered per PennDOT
- Mr. Ulrich noted if this is the case, noting the Planning Commission could act on the waiver, adding in the waiver between now and the Board of Supervisors meeting, provide them with some information if based on information from McMahan that could be done to improve the level of service. If not, the light cannot be put in anyway. The ordinance is saying this is the direction, but if PennDOT says no, it cannot be done.
- There was discussion noting a roundabout would not work because the volume would still be there coming off the driveway.
- There was discussion regarding the criteria for the roundabout from PennDOT being different than a light.
- There was further discussion regarding the traffic coming out of the casino.
- Mr. Wyland noted Ms. Evans' other issue in the traffic report was the light warrant at Fox Run and Bow Creek Roads.
- Mr. Courtney noted two studies were provided. One was a site access study and one was a supplement for offsite intersections that they had done counts. The intersection of Fox Run and Bow Creek does meet signal warrants. He noted they will be discussing with the Board, does the Township want Penn National to put in a signal.
- There was further discussion regarding the light and traffic
- Mr. Wyland noted Ms. Evans spoke of a gap analysis for the traffic. He added the gaps would be created by installing the light.
- Mr. Wyland discussed Act 209 and getting a credit for an item which was included in the Township's capital improvement plan.
- There was discussion regarding having Penn National put in the light and getting credit because it is on the capital improvement plan and the difference in cost to the Township as opposed to Penn National doing the work.
- **Ms. Beaudet made a motion to recommend approval of the waiver for Section 402.5.4.2.14. Mr. Moyer seconded the motion. During further discussion Mr. Webb asked Ms. Beaudet to make a minor modification to condition the approval on no additional negative information being determined in the full evaluation of the data from McMahan coming to light would warrant a light between now and when the Supervisors act on the**

**plan. Ms. Beaudet noted she amended her motion to include the language that no further information from McMahon would warrant a light that would be permitted by PennDOT. Mr. Moyer noted his second still stands. Being no further discussion, the motion was approved, 4 in favor 0 opposed.**

- Chairman Craig noted the applicant would be looking for a recommendation on the plan to the Board of Supervisors and asked for a motion.
- Mr. Webb asked about the agreements if they will be completed.
- Mr. Wyland answered they may or may not be completed, but it is not uncommon to have the plan approved conditioned upon the agreements.
- Mr. Courtney noted it is typically done after final approval.
- Mr. Ulrich noted if anyone does make a recommendation, it can be conditioned upon LTL's letter dated April 16, 2010, it will be covered.
- **Mr. Webb made a motion to recommend conditional approval to the Board of Supervisors conditioned on all outstanding items on the LTL plan review of April 16, 2010 being affirmatively met. Mr. Moyer seconded the motion. Being no further discussion, the motion was approved 4 in favor, 0 opposed.**

2. Shirk Subdivision Plan (expires 5/23/10) – This is a seven-lot subdivision plan located at 113 North Crawford Road, Grantville

- Chairman Craig noted the expiration date of the plan is May 23, 2010, and commented the applicant provided a 90-day grant of extension.
- Mr. Wyland noted the Board of Supervisors will need to vote on it, but the Planning Commission did not have to act on it.
- Chairman Craig noted there was no new revisions submitted, but there were representatives present
- Mr. Jim Smith of Fischbach Morgan and Mr. Shirk were present.
- Mr. Smith noted he received the zoning comments, met with Mr. Smith and addressed the comments, noting there were intermittent streams in the developed area and were mislabeled on the plan. They were identified as streams. The environmental specialist noted there are intermittent; therefore no riparian buffers are required.
- He noted the flood plain is now depicted on the plan and clear site triangle.
- He noted he met with Mr. Ulrich and went through the comments that they would like submit waivers for.
- He discussed 402.3.4, existing features.
- Chairman Craig noted typically the engineer is asked to do a site visit to see if any of the items would be warranted.
- He discussed Section 601.1 and 601.2, natural features of the site, noting they are trying to avoid wetlands.
- Mr. Ulrich discussed this and noted he agreed with the waiver, adding they were doing the best they could with the area
- Mr. Smith discussed LTL comment #24 and noted it is an 8-lot subdivision. The

existing street will not have a lot of traffic and they do not feel it is necessary to widen the road for a minimal amount of traffic.

- Mr. Smith discussed LTL comment #35, sidewalks along existing street. He noted there are no existing streets, and it is a collector road and does not warrant sidewalks or curbing.
- Mr. Ulrich noted #36, sidewalk along the proposed cul-de-sac. He noted there are two-thirds of one side of the cul-de-sac that does not front on anything. It is something that for storm water purposes, would be better not to put in. He said a 28-foot cartway is adequate.
- Mr. Smith discussed lots that may allow additional subdividing. He proposed to place a note on the plan that states that lots 1-3 and 6-8 would not be developed in the future, but the larger parcels 4 and 5 which are 22 acres would be allowed to be developed at a future date.
- There was discussion regarding future plans for the lots.
- Mr. Webb discussed cul-de-sacs and the footprints for lots 4 and 5.
- Mr. Ulrich noted there is an elevation drop and what you don't see here and what you could see here is different. There are only an additional 7 homes versus what could be there. He noted Lot #4 looks to be landlocked with the basin and the drop off. As far as Lot #5, they would access from a different road such as a PennDOT entrance off Route 22.
- Mr. Smith discussed locating the trees and noted the area they are disturbing is immature forest. The mature forest is down by the creek. The land is 80 acres and there will be approximately 4 acres of disturbance.
- Mr. Webb noted street trees were intended to provide aesthetics. Mr. Smith noted they will be provided street trees.
- Mr. Ulrich noted note #47 talking about the location of trees. Mr. Webb noted, as in another plan, a note can be provided stating there will be no construction in the areas of significant forested areas.
- Mr. Smith noted the trees will be located in the areas of disturbance, but they didn't feel it was necessary to identify the ones on the other side of the creek.
- RCP for storm water conveyance. Mr. Smith noted in a discussed with Mr. Ulrich noted the last leg of the storm water conveyance system should remain as concrete pipe, it would be acceptable to provide plastic pipe throughout.
- Mr. Ulrich added the he would like to see the storm water outfall pipe remain as concrete. He noted the Township is headed in this direction.
- There was discussion regarding cross pipes and parallel pipes.
- Mr. Smith discussed architectural finish for outlet structures. He noted they understand putting a face on the area that is visible, but not the one down in the basin.
- Mr. Ulrich noted if the other areas are developed, it would have to withstand the full brunt of the ordinance. On Lot #4, with the buffers, flood plain and steep slopes, he asked if there was a thought to where you might want to do it.
- Mr. Smith noted he did not think there was. It would be difficult with the creek.

3. Devonshire Heights Road (expires 5/23/10) – This is a one-lot subdivision plan located at 8685 Devonshire Heights Road, Hummelstown
- Chairman Craig noted an extension of time was also received by the applicant. He added there were no new updates and a representative for the applicant was present.
  - Mr. David Bitner introduced himself as a representative for the applicant and noted he received a review letter.
  - He noted he spoke with Mr. Ulrich and went through the letter and identified additional waivers.
  - He discussed 402.3.4, identify existing features within 200 feet (LTL comment #7); he noted one lot subdivision does not really affect anything; existing features on the residential lot directly to the left are shown and the entire tract boundary. He noted in speaking with Mr. Ulrich, he also did not feel there was no need to get within 200 feet. There is no water, sewer, or storm water facilities.
  - Mr. Ulrich noted the lot is approximately 35 acres and they are only chopping off one acre. He agreed with Mr. Bitner.
  - Section 402.3.1, existing contours, (LTL Comment #5); noting the reasons as above.
  - Mr. Ulrich noted he might have issue had he not physically been at the lot and looked at it. There is a drop off that is going away from the lot.
  - Mr. Bitner discussed Section 402.4.15, drainage plan (LTL comment #12); in speaking with Mr. Ulrich, he suggested asking for the waiver because they are disturbing less than 5,000 square feet of impervious area so they would be under the minor land disturbance activity in the storm water ordinance.
  - Mr. Ulrich agreed with Mr. Bitner and noted for him to continue with the waiver because a note can be put on the plan noting they will comply but the information that is submitted now could change. When a building permit is pulled the storm water permit would be required.
  - There was discussion regarding it being a deferment as opposed to a waiver.
  - Mr. Wyland clarified it should be submitted as a waiver.
  - Mr. Bitner discussed the curb and sidewalk sections, 609.1, and 610.1; along existing streets. He noted it is a rural area and there is no curbing and sidewalk in the area. It would just be for 100 feet.
  - Section 618.7.1, street trees. Mr. Webb noted there is a reason for having them aesthetically and environmentally. Mr. Bitner noted there are some existing trees in the front and half of the lot has a buffer.
  - There was discussion noting if a waiver is submitted, a noted might need to be added noting no trees will be removed.
  - There was discussion regarding putting a column at the end of each agenda of “Open Items” and adding the expiration date or the date the preliminary plan was approved and carrying it down from the top of the agenda.

- Mr. Bitner noted he may have to speak with Mr. Wyland regarding an existing septic system on an adjacent lot that is noted as an approximate location but the surveyors marked it as being partially on lot 2 of the subdivision. There was discussion regarding providing an easement now or if lot 2 is developed.
- Mr. Wyland noted it was not on the applicant's property.
- There was discussion regarding sending the revisions directly to Mr. Ulrich and noting it on the copy sent to Mrs. Eppinger.

## **OTHER BUSINESS**

1. Zoning Ordinance Immediate
  - Mr. Ulrich noted Mr. Smith and Mr. Wyland are working on the technical wording for "heavy equipment". He noted he will put a letter out to the Board and outline the outstanding issues.

## **NEW BUSINESS**

1. Comprehensive Plan
  - There was discussion regarding the status. Mr. Ulrich noted the 537 plan is making progress so the Board can become more comfortable for the public meeting.
2. Cursory Review and Plan Review
  - Mr. Ulrich discussed the review process in an effort to streamline the process. He suggested having generalized comments.
  - There was discussion regarding picking updating the flow chart at the next workshop
  - There was further discussion regarding the cursory review process Mr. Ulrich noted it was more cost efficient.
  - It was noted the first month the plan will be accepted and then discussed the following month.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

**Ms. Beaudet made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 8:23 p.m. Mr. Moyer seconded the motion.**

Respectfully submitted,

Transcribed by Dawn E. Eppinger

**ITEMS TO BE WATCHED**

1. Hilton Garden Inn Sewage Planning Module – Component 4A
  - No revisions have been submitted. Preliminary Plan approval was approved by the Board of Supervisors on March 17, 2009.
  
2. SALDO Revisions, Long Term
  - Discussion on the SALDO revisions have been temporarily put on hold until the Zoning Ordinance Immediate revisions have been completed.

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	