

DRAFT – SUBJECT TO CHANGE

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

January 25, 2011

Members Present: Marie Beaudet, Glenn Moyer, Curtis Cassel
Members Absent: Michael Webb, Heather Davis-Sloniger

Also Present: David Smith, Zoning Officer, Norm Ulrich, Engineer
Dawn Eppinger, Administrative Assistant
Absent: Scott Wyland, Township Solicitor,
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 Chair Marie Beaudet at 7:05 p.m.

REORGANIZATION

An election of officers took place.

- a. Chairman – Mr. Cassel made a motion to nominate Ms. Beaudet for Chair. Mr. Moyer seconded the motion. Being no further discussion, the motion was approved; 3 in favor, 0 opposed.
- b. Vice Chairman – Mr. Moyer made a motion to nominate Mr. Webb for Vice Chairman. Mr. Cassel seconded the motion. Being no further discussion, the motion was approved; 3 in favor, 0 opposed.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- Mr. Cassel made a motion to recommend approval of the December 28, 2010 meeting minutes. Mr. Moyer seconded the motion. Being no further discussion, the motion was approved 3 in favor, 0 opposed.

PLANS TO BE DISCUSSED

1. Gesford Family (expires 3/22/11) – This is a 3-lot final subdivision plan located on North Hill Drive, Grantville.
 - The Gesford Plan and the Via Plan were discussed at the same time because they were submitted by the same engineer, Grove Associates.
 - Ms. Beaudet noted the plans for both the Gesford and Via plans were not submitted two weeks before the January Planning Commission meeting and

DRAFT – SUBJECT TO CHANGE

asked Mr. Ulrich if the issue will be addressed at the next meeting.

- Mr. Ulrich noted he received a call from Ms. Tiffany Trea of Grove Associates wanting further explanation on the process, noting she was confused. Mr. Ulrich added there was a conference call between himself, Ms. Tiffany Trea and Mr. Bud Grove of Grove Associates.
- He noted Ms. Trea and Mr. Grove understood they did not have the plans for the Gesford and Via families submitted in a timely manner, and he added he explained at length the submission process to them.
- Mr. Ulrich explained to the applicants' engineers they submitted the plans in a timely manner in November and it was accepted and a letter was issued by LTL for discussion at the December meeting. He noted the applicants' engineers understood they missed the submission for January.
- Mr. Ulrich also explained to the applicants' engineers the first time a submission is made, it must be made three weeks in advance and reviewed at the next meeting.
- He further explained to the applicants' engineers the due date for any subsequent submissions would be two weeks prior to the Planning Commission, with a review letter at the following meeting.
- He added the applicants' engineers noted they were not aware of that and were disappointed they could not go back and forth between themselves and Mr. Ulrich until it was worked out.
- Mr. Ulrich noted he reiterated to Mr. Grove the process but noted in the past with projects this small in nature, if the Planning Commission is okay with it, Mr. Ulrich did not have a problem with going back and forth directly with the applicants' engineers. He noted Mr. Smith might have issues with zoning that the applicants' engineers could work with Mr. Smith directly.
- Mr. Ulrich noted it was explained to Mr. Grove that the Planning Commission is not nearly as concerned with the Via or Gesford subdivision as they are with setting a precedent and what happens when that subdivision comes in with a 15-lot subdivision and wants the same type of situation or a if a 35-lot subdivision. At some point, there is a problem and the Planning Commission and ultimately the Township is concerned about the precedent.
- Mr. Ulrich added he informed the applicants' engineers he would present the idea to the Planning Commission regarding working directly with the engineer. He noted upon the decision made by the Commission, he would inform Grove Associates of the results.
- There was discussion regarding the process of how to submit plans and how to resubmit plans. Ms. Beaudet noted she has no problem with Mr. Ulrich and Grove Associates going back and forth since it is a small plan but would like to have it documented that it is being looked at as a special favor to the Gesford and Via families because it is a very small plan and in no way is this a precedent-setting situation.

DRAFT – SUBJECT TO CHANGE

- Ms. Beaudet asked Mrs. Eppinger to write a letter to Grove Associates and to obtain the verbiage from the Township Solicitor. She added she will call Mr. Wyland regarding the information needed in the letter but noted the Planning Commission will need to vote on it because she was only voicing her opinion and not necessarily the opinion of the Planning Commission
- Mr. Cassel noted he could understand the Gesford plan being pushed back, but with the Via plan, they are just moving lot lines and would not really be setting a precedent. He added the lots are already subdivided.
- Ms. Beaudet commented if it was okay with the Planning Commission, she would make a motion they have Scott write a letter the decision of the Commission is an exception and have it very tightly parametered as to why this is being done. There was a consensus with all three Commission members that Mr. Ulrich could work directly with the applicants' engineers and for the Township Solicitor to write a letter explaining this was not precedence.
- Mr. Smith noted realistically all that is being done is the plan will be reviewed at the February meeting. The plan will not be accepted for review. Nothing is being done at the January meeting to either plan. Realistically, is it even further out there than if the Planning Commission were to say the 13 days that they were to have it in did not meet the statute.
- Mr. Ulrich noted it was interesting Mr. Smith brought that up because that was one clarification he was looking for from the Planning Commission. He noted he does not mind working with the applicant, has done it in the past, as long as he gets direction from the Planning Commission.
- He added he explained to Mr. Grove how the process worked with the submission being followed by the letter of the ordinance that since the submission date was missed, the plan would actually be accepted at the February meeting and a review letter for the March meeting.
- Mr. Ulrich noted he told Mr. Grove he did not mind going back to the Planning Commission to let the Commission know a review could be done with a discussion at the February meeting. He also commented to Mr. Grove if there are items to be worked out, Mr. Ulrich and Mr. Grove could work back and forth with the idea of coming to the March meeting looking at some type of approval.
- There was discussion regarding the waivers and keeping track of them.
- Mr. Ulrich noted if he understood the Planning Commission correctly, he will have a review letter ready for the February Planning Commission meeting. Mr. Smith noted he will have a review as well.
- Ms. Beaudet noted the Commission previously gave a consensus to Mr. Ulrich to review the plan.
- Mr. Ulrich noted Mr. Grove said there still may be something little after the review. He added as long as it is something little, it can be worked on between February and March to get the items taken care of.
- Mr. Smith noted if there are any outstanding issues at next meeting, the

DRAFT – SUBJECT TO CHANGE

applicants' engineers should be made aware the plans need to be in 14 days prior to the March meeting.

- Mr. Ulrich commented the applicants' engineers would turn in a plan in 14 days if there was going to be a review letter at the following meeting; however, if the applicants' engineers would want a review for March, he would ask any submission be received in three weeks before the meeting.
 - There was discussion noting the review can take place, but Grove Associates will receive a letter as to why it is being done with both the Via and Gesford plans.
 - Ms. Beaudet reiterated there was a consensus from the Commission regarding the verbiage to come from the Township Solicitor.
2. Via Family (expires 4/21/11) – This is a final subdivision plan located on Carlson Road, Hummelstown.
- As noted above, discussion on the Via plan took place at the same time discussion on the Gesford plan as shown above.

NEW BUSINESS

1. Norm Ulrich – he noted he received no new information on the Hilton Garden plan.

ADJOURNMENT

Being no further business Mr. Cassel made a motion to adjourn the meeting was 7:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Transcribed by Dawn E. Eppinger

Cc:	Board of Supervisors	Planning Commission
	Keith Espenshade	Marie Beaudet
	John Nelligan	Mike Webb
	Dave Marshall	Glenn Moyer
	Tom Shutt	Heather Davis-Sloniger
	George Rish	Curtis Cassel
	Deb Casey, Secretary-Treasurer	Norm Ulrich, Township Engineer
	David Smith, Township Zoning Officer	Scott Wyland, Township Solicitor
	Leah Rowand, D C Planning Commission	Zoning Hearing Board