

**MINUTES
NORTH LEBANON TOWNSHIP
PLANNING COMMISSION
FEBRUARY 12, 2007**

The regularly scheduled Planning Commission meeting of North Lebanon Township was held at the North Lebanon Township Municipal Building, at 725 Kimmerlings Road, Lebanon PA, at 7:00 PM. The following Commission members were present:

| | |
|--------------------------|-------------|
| Darlene Martin | Member |
| William Smeltzer | Member |
| William Tice | Member |
| A. Bruce Sattazahn | Member |
| Charles Allwein | Member |
| Cheri F. Grumbine | Twp Manager |

Also in attendance at this meeting were Earl Meyer , Director of Lebanon County Planning Dept and several members of the public.

7:00 PM -- CALL TO ORDER / PLEDGE TO FLAG

MEETING MINUTES APPROVAL

MOTION was made and seconded to approve the minutes of January 8, 2007. Unanimously carried.

PLANNING MODULES FOR RECOMMENDATION

There are no planning modules available for recommendation this evening.

ACTIVE PLANS FOR REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATION TO BOARD

There are no plans ready for a recommendation this evening.

PLANS ON HOLD WITH LCPD

The following are plans that are still on hold with the Lebanon County Planning Department. Any additional information for any of these plans has been included with your packets.

A. Homestead Acres Phase IV Final Subdivision

Location/ Zoned: off Grace Ave / R1 District Date Submitted: 8-04-05

The Engineer has been in contact with Mgr Grumbine on any outstanding issues. It is expected that DEP will soon be ready to release the joint permit regarding the proposed bridges for this phase. Saxinger and Black hopes to have the plan ready for finalizing in time for the March meeting. Wilson Consulting pointed out an issue with a portion of the bridges being located outside the Twp right-of-way, a group the Twp had hired to review all the various issues associated with the bridges. In addition, an agreement with the developer and Mr./Mrs. Artz must be executed pertaining to the temporary cul-de-sac located on Artz's property. .

B. Lorraine Bisson Minor Subdivision Plan (Lot Addition)

Location/Zoning: Tunnel Hill Road/R-1 & Ag Districts Date Submitted: 9-08-06

This plan involves a lot addition and requires a legal description and new deeds, which have not been submitted to the Twp office. Also there are fees owed to the Municipal Authority.

C. Seyfert & Seyfert Prelim/Final Subd Plan (1 lot)

Location/Zoned: Grubb Ave/ Ag

Date Submitted: 11-29-06

The Municipal Authority has not received the Planning Module information. The signed P&R agreement has been received but no fees for P&R have been paid.

D. Arnold Acres Minor Subd Pl (1 lot)

Location/Zoned: Weavertown Rd/ Ag

Date Submitted: 12-05-06

The Municipal Authority has indicated approval of the sewer design for this plan. Also there are outstanding fees to be paid to the Authority.

E. Ebersoles East Lebanon Final Subd/Land Dev PlanLocation/Zoned: Rte 422 & 15th Ave/ C2A

Date Submitted: 12-05-06

Revised plans, reflecting the comment list, are to be provided to the Twp. The Municipal Authority has approved the sewer design for this plan.

RECEIVING OF NEW PLANS**A. Brooke LP Subdivision Plan**

Location/Zoned: Sandhill Rd/ Beta Ave

Date Submitted: 1-26-07

This subdivision plan shows the division of a lot containing 34,671 sq ft into 2 separate single-family residential lots. Lot A will access from Beta Ave and Lot B will access from Sandhill Rd. The driveway permit for Lot B will need to be secured from PADOT as Sandhill Rd is a PADOT road. The members discussed the cul-de-sac area on Beta Ave.

MOTION was made and seconded to receive the Brooke LP Subdivision Plan. Unanimously carried.

B. Seyferts Orchard Subdivision Plan – Revised Lot #8

Location/Zoned: Mt Zion Rd

Date Submitted: 2-06-07

This plan is showing revision to lot #8 of the previously approved Seyferts Orchard subdivision. Seyferts needed to retain the existing access lane on the east side of Mt Zion Rd to their existing Orchard. Per Sheila Wartluft and Mike Kneasel of the Waste Water Dept, no sewer review work is needed as it had been completed with the previous plan approval. This revised lot will preserve access to the rear lands of the Seyfert property.

MOTION was made and seconded to receive the Seyferts Orchard Revised Lot #8 plan. Unanimously carried.

C. Brusters Prelim Subdivision/Land Dev Plan

Location/Zoned: Narrows Drive/C2-A

Date Submitted: 2-12-07

This subdivision/land dev plan shows the corner of Narrows Dr and Rte 422. The plan depicts 2 lots being subdivided from the remaining lands owned by Truck Terminal Realty Co. The land dev portion of the plan shows the construction of a Brusters ice cream facility. All Twp and Municipal Authority submission fees have been paid. The members reviewed some of the details shown on the preliminary plan. All Commission members expressed a concern about the number of parking spaces shown and the possibility of requesting a traffic study. Some discussion was held about how this plan submission seems to differ from the original sketch plan that had been submitted some time ago, which included a hotel on the adjoining lot.

ITEMS FOR COMMENT & DISCUSSION**A. Earl Meyer – Director Lebanon County Planning Dept**

Earl Meyer was introduced to all the Planning Commission members. He explained he was asked to attend tonight to discuss anything they might like to discuss pertaining to planning, subdivision and land development recommendations as well as any other related subjects. The conversations started with explaining some of the duties of the Planning Commission that are outlined in the Municipality code. The governing body sets the perimeters for the municipality's planning commission and dictates what is expected from the members. NL Twp utilizes their Planning Commission as a recommending agency. A discussion about the procedure for recorded minutes from the meetings was held.

Earl pointed out that if there are issues the group feels strongly about it is up to the group to make these issues known to the governing body, which in this case is the Board of Supervisors. One of the ways this can be accomplished would be to attend the regular scheduled Supervisors meetings. A rotation of the Commission members' attendance works well. During the meeting the Commission member would have the opportunity to speak to the supervisors and explain the concerns the Commission has on certain issues. This is also an opportunity to ask the Board for additional services that the Commission might feel is needed for specific plan submissions. Many suggestions were mentioned to the Commission on ways to improve the communications with the governing body. Meyer told the Commission that communication with the governing body is the key to successful planning, as the group should act as the "eyes and ears" for the governing body. Meyer questioned if there is annual report completed for the Supervisors. He was told that this report is being completed already.

Earl told the Commission that they could ask the Board for a budget to cover any special issues they might want to have explored. The beginning of the year is the time to let these requests be known. If there is a task that the Commission wants to take on that is not within their normal realm, permission should be sought from the governing body first. At times there are issues that the school district would work with the Commission also.

Member Smeltzer questioned if there are other municipalities that have the Manager attend the Commission meetings in order to communicate to the governing body. Earl stated that it is probably helpful, for communication purposes, to have the Manager attend. However when there are issues to be discussed or decided with the Supervisors, it would be the responsibility of the Commission members to attend the Supervisors meeting and express their opinions or wants. This would send the signal that these are concerns the Commission, as a group, is requesting. Meyer stated this is a valuable tool to the Supervisors, as the Board is often times struggling with several issues at one time while listening to input from all sorts of sources.

The County Comprehensive Plan is another project that Mgr Grumbine asked Earl to discuss briefly with the Commission members. This project is now 2 years into being worked on. The hope is that by summertime it will be completed and ready for release in the fall of 2007. The members were provided with a report on the work completed at this time. Earl explained some of the issues that still need to be discussed and how the County is trying to address some of these issues. One of these topics is the revitalization of some existing areas, such as the town of Jonestown. The importance of rehabbing these existing areas instead of developing our farmlands is of great importance. Quality living for young people starting out is of great concern. Affordable opportunities for the young people who wish to buy properties. A lengthy discussion about updating zoning classifications was held.

Earl Meyer (con't)

The specified procedures when requests for zoning amendments are received involve some of the following: County Planning and the NLT Planning Commission are required to receive the opportunity to review. Earl asked if Sol Wolf typically sends County a letter of notice. Mgr Grumbine replied that the Twp sends a letter to County. Meyer told her that a letter is not good enough any longer. It must be by certified mail or something that shows proof of receipt. A copy must be placed in the Law Library. These are some of the things that should be discussed with Sol Wolf.

Member Sattazahn shared his questions about the theories about wildflower plantings within stormwater retention areas. The idea is get away from frequent maintenance of grass planted in the areas. The plan is that the grasses will only need to be maintained once a year. Earl Meyer stated he was familiar with an area in Jonestown that had used this theory. For the Spring Creek plan a notation is contained on the plan that the maintenance is needed only once a year Sattazahn said. He said he has a real problem that the developer will be gone and the area will become a problem for the township, as it will not be in compliance with the Twp ordinances regarding the heights allowable. Sattazahn said his concern is for after a few years when all the undesirable vegetation grows in and takes over. He said the first 2 years it might look nice but after a period of years it dies off or other vegetation takes over. Meyer said he has not had much experience with these types of plantings. Chp Martin felt ordinances will be needed to cover these types of areas.

The Planning Commission members told Earl Meyer they have had several instances in the past when they felt traffic studies should be required. Earl told the Commission there are several categories that can be used to apply to traffic studies. One of the categories is when the Commission feels the safety of the community is threatened. Earl told the Commission that 2 of the County's subdivision/land development people have indicated they are having a real problem with the way the results of some of the traffic reports are being written. They feel the report makes absolutely no sense and is difficult to read and understand. One answer is to get some training for the individuals that have to work with these reports. After getting some training scheduled, the County decided to allow some of the municipality personnel to attend the training, as they are also struggling to understand the reports.

Member Martin asked Earl how to handle a difference of opinion with what the traffic study results are determined to be. How do we get the traffic studies completed at a time of day when we know is the heaviest traffic flow of the day? Earl agreed that the peak times of day should be studied. Communication of concerns should be voiced to Cheri immediately, so that she can work with County to get the applicants to meet with the Commission and discuss their concerns. Sometimes it becomes necessary to hire what is termed as a "specialist" to get a backup opinion on certain issues. Member Allwein asked what criteria is listed for the scope of a traffic study. He was told that anything within reason of the study could be requested. Meyer told the Commission that sometimes when there are issues within close proximity of another municipality the neighboring municipality should be consulted as to any traffic criteria they might have to offer. Member Sattazahn mentioned the Brusters plan and South Lebanon Twp. Mr. Meyer told the Commission that it is important to collect the traffic information from the developer at their expense, as it is very costly for the Twp to cover the expenses of the traffic studies.

The Planning Commission members thanked Mr. Meyer for his attendance and the discussion. They were all in agreement that it was a very information conversation.

As there was no more business to conduct motion was made and seconded to adjourn the meeting.

Respectfully Submitted,

Theresa L. George
Recording Secretary