
E.) Pierre/Eleanor Maeder Minor Subd Pl

Location/Zoned: Tunnel Hill Rd/R-1

Submission Date: 3-06-07

Mr. Maeder had been in contact with Mgr Grumbine in regards to his plan. The dedication of Windsor Drive needs to take place before this plan can move forward for approval. Although the process has begun for the dedication of Windsor Drive, it has not been completed to date. The Roadmaster has submitted a punchlist to LVEDC for completion before a dedication can take place.

F.) George W / Marian L. Heist Final Subd Pl (lot Add)

Location/Zoned: Old Ebenezer & Tunnel Hill Rd/C2A Submission Date: 4-02-07

Revised plans had been received as of 4-01-08. Legal descriptions have been received and must be reflected on the revised plan submission. Sol Wolf provided the revised deed today (4-14-08). The Municipal Authority must review and approve at their May meeting.

G.) Holiday Inn Express Final Subd/Land Dev Pl

Location/Zoned: E Cumberland St

Submission Date: 7-20-07

Revisions had been received 2-29-08. A comment letter has been provided to members for their information. A meeting had been held 4-02-08 with County representatives to discuss revisions to the traffic study (TIS). One of the revisions requested was the removal of the Brusters name from the information. Due to changes for the proposed building itself, a revised capacity agreement is needed as well as a developer's agreement with the Authority.

H.) Herman/Patricia Dundore Minor Final SubdLocation/Zoned: N 4th Ave & E Canal St

Submission Date: 8-28-07

Nothing new has been received on this plan.

I.) The Crossings @ Sweet Briar Prelim Subd

Location/Zoned: Kimmerlings & Mt Zion Rd

Submission Date: 10-03-07

Scott Miller of Stackhouse Bensinger was present to discuss this plan. Scott explained that the layout of the proposed development has not changed since they have last seen it. Scott reviewed some of the previous discussions and some changes that had been requested. He displayed a color coded graph showing the revisions for this preliminary plan as they are discussed at various times. The blue reflects the most recent requests from the Planning Commission and Twp staff.

The County had requested all lots that front the main street or access site for the development to comply with the non-cluster design requirements. That means all the homes located on the main street will meet the requirements for the R-2 zoning district. All other lots on the side streets will be cluster design. The side distance between the units had been a concern. The easements between the units will meet the requirements of 30 feet. The proposed open space requirements were discussed. Scott described some of the features that are being discussed for placement in the open spaces for this development. An actual location for the various features has not been shown as the requirements are still being reviewed. The owner has concerns about the placement of some of these features.

The next issue that Scott wanted to discuss with the Planning Commission was the Age Restricted Development Ordinance. He is asking the members to take a look at the Ordinance and then make a recommendation to the Supervisors. The Solicitor for the Twp and the County will conduct their inspection of the document and then a Public Hearing can be scheduled. Chp Martin suggested to the Commission members that they read through the Ordinance.

The Crossings @ Sweet Briar Prelim Subd (con't)

Member Allwein questioned the mention of a structure being not more than 3 stories high and a notation of (2 ½). Why the 2 different figures? Scott stated that is common language used for a 35ft height for a building. When he looked at the statement, Miller agreed it was a typo and should read as two and one half stories. Member Allwein next questioned the lot sizes called out and the house being 60% of the lot. Some conversation followed about the existing Ordinance and the proposed Ordinance and the confusing language regarding lot sizes and square footage for the structures. Scott Miller told Member Allwein that the language can be modified to reflect the footprint of the house will be the same as the non-cluster design.

Member Smeltzer questioned the procedure for this proposed Ordinance. Mgr Grumbine said the Planning Commission members and the Board of Supervisors have received copies of the revised ARD Ordinance to review. The Planning Commission is being asked to make a recommendation to the Supervisors on the revised Ordinance. Member Smeltzer said he does not feel comfortable making a recommendation at this point in time. Mgr Grumbine reminded him the commission had already made a recommendation to the Supervisors at their February meeting for the requested waivers and Ordinance. Member Allwein had mentioned a few concerns he had regarding the Ordinance and this is the revised Ordinance before them now. This is merely a courtesy to show the Commission members the revised language in the Ordinance. She explained the Commission is not being asked for a recommendation to the Preliminary plan. What they are being asked for is a recommendation for the Age Restricted Development Ordinance. This Ordinance is not pertaining to this plan, specifically. However once the Ordinance is adopted The Crossings @ Sweet Briar development will have to comply with the Ordinance.

Scott Miller explained that the Commission is being asked to recommend the Ordinance so that the process can move to the next stage, which would be schedule a public hearing. Their client does not wish to proceed with engineering of this development until the decision on this Ordinance is made. The lot sizes will be affected if this Ordinance is adopted. It will determine the cluster design or non-cluster design. Member Smeltzer questioned the planning for a 55+ community and the determination of a major thoroughfare. Miller said the Twp determines whether or not it is a major thoroughfare. He explained the plan they are looking at is a conceptual drawing. They will of course revise according to County and Twp comments. Mgr Grumbine told the commission members about some of the conversations between Landmark and the Twp regarding the adjoining Spring Creek.

Miller said he is going to mention a possibility that is, at this time, theoretical. There is some talk about the adjoining development, Spring Creek. Scott said some sketches have been done that would eventually connect to N 8th Avenue. He cautioned the members this is all theoretic at this point and may never come to be. If it should proceed, a provision is being looked at to provide minimum acreage requirements for an area that is shaded green on his drawings. Should any of this come into being, a specific plan would have to be developed to show the connections of the 2 different developments. A draft of the language to go along with the theoretic plan is being provided to the members for their information, at this time.

Member Smeltzer questioned the cluster design being implemented if the Spring Creek and the The Crossings @ Sweet Briar should be connected.

The Crossings @ Sweet Briar Prelim Subd (con't)

Miller discussed some of the topographic problems (steep slope) involved with one of the areas located between The Crossings @ Sweet Briar and Spring Creek. Member Sattazahn mentioned that there would be 3 Twp roads to access the development instead of just 2 Twp roads, Kimmerlings Rd, Mt Zion Rd and N 8th Ave.

The properties facing Kimmerlings Rd would remain as R-1 and would not be designed according to the cluster design. Scott reminded the Commission that this talk is still conceptual and is not a definite. Should these 2 proposed developments be combined, an additional 53 lots would be created. Member Martin asked about the completion of the thoroughfare road. Miller reminded her that it would be completed in phasing with the thoroughfare being completed in Phase 2.

Member Smeltzer said he is not comfortable making a recommendation on this Ordinance tonight. After some discussion it was decided the Commission would make a recommendation at their May meeting. Mgr Grumbine stated she would inform the Board that they could advertise the hearing for the May 19th Supervisors meeting and that they would have a recommendation from the NLT Planning Commission at their May 12th meeting. Miller requested that the commission continue to review the Ordinance and relay any concerns or requests to Mgr Grumbine before the May meeting so that he can have any revisions of language drafted into the document for the Commission's May meeting. Chp Martin asked the commission members if they were in agreement with this suggestion. The members indicated their agreement.

Member Sattazahn asked about the walking trails located in the community. Will every home have a direct access to the walking trail from their property? Scott replied no, not all of the lots will. Sattazahn said, so the people without access to the trails will have to walk out into the street to gain an access point to the walking trail. Scott replied that is possible. Member Smeltzer asked about winter maintenance of the walking tails located in Briar Lake. He was told the association takes care of the maintenance. Paul Zimmerman informed the commission that when Landmark had met with some of the residents from 2 of their other 55+ communities, they reported that one of their requests was to *not* have sidewalks and maintenance issues. They preferred the walking trails. They also mentioned stone dust was more acceptable to them than the actual blacktop materials for the trails.

Member Sattazahn asked how these types of features plays into the American Disability Act. Miller stated that some areas will have crosswalks. But because this is a private community, it is not required. Certain areas must have accessible routes, such as the community center. Member Allwein asked if the walking trails are being designated private to the community or will they be available for outsider use. Scott replied the trails will be private to the residents of the The Crossings community. However, a recreational fee is being paid to the Township for this development.

Member Allwein told Scott he does not understand a notation on Page 6 in regards to "ILF". What does that mean? Scott replied it stands for Independent Living Facility. Charlie asked about the mention of the "Federal Fair Housing Act". His question is, shouldn't it refer to the "current" Federal Fair Housing Act. His concern is that if the regulations change will the development have to operate under the most current regulations.

The Crossings @ Sweet Briar Prelim Subd (con't)

Scott said it is usually understood that the most current regulations are followed but he would ask for the attorney's opinion on this issue.

Member Tice asked about the proposed additional parking. Is the area at the recreation center the only additional parking that will be offered? Scott said the shared parking at Briar Lake is by the same design and has not presented any problems. It was decided to offer the same parking options for this development.

Scott questioned if a formal request for a public hearing should be made. Mgr Grumbine replied the Board of Supervisors meeting is this Monday. He can attend and make the request at that time. Scott stated he would prepare a written request and present it to the Board on Monday night. Mgr Grumbine indicated her agreement.

J.) Briar Lake Phase 3 Final Subd Revision – Walking Trail

Location/Zoned: E Maple St/

Submission Date: 1-16-08

Scott Miller told the Commission members he was trying for a completed plan for tonight but the plan was held up trying to secure all the signatures. It should be ready for their recommendation to the Board at the May meeting.

RECEIVING OF NEW PLANS**A.) Mary E. Kreiser Minor Subd Plan**

Chp Martin said she remembered this sketch plan from last month. The Commission is now being asked to receive the plan and approve the irregular shape lot. The members reviewed the new plan submission. Member Smeltzer stated this plan appears as logical as it is going to be.

MOTION was made and seconded to receive the Mary E. Kreiser Minor Subd Plan. Unanimously carried.

ITEMS FOR COMMENT & DISCUSSION**A.) Training Program – Possible Scheduling to Host at North Lebanon Twp**

A pamphlet for training sessions was provided to the members. Mgr Grumbine said there are no locations close to us but the information sounds as if it would be valuable. The thought was to gauge interest from the Commission members, schedule a session at the municipal building and invite other local municipalities to attend. She asked the members to take a look and make a suggestion, perhaps September or October. After some discussion it was decided to try for an October date.

B.) Hershey Bare Tract – Heilmandale Area; Traffic Impact

Mgr Grumbine told the Commission members this tract of land is located on the south side of Heilmandale Road immediately after turning off of Rte 72. Member Smeltzer stated it is the former Weirbach farm. Mgr Grumbine stated it is zoned Industrial although the land has been farmed for many years and is a part of the Ag Security area. According to one of our residents the Industrial zoning was assigned due to the railroad line that had run through the area. A 1,550,000 sq ft (34 acres) warehouse is being looked at for this area. The plans are very preliminary. Talks with the potential buyers for the property, to date, have been in reference to traffic issues. A copy of the traffic issues is being provided to the commission to review.

C.) Harold Kreider – Tunnel Hill Road; Chicken Farm

Mgr Grumbine updated the members on the latest information regarding this issue. A demonstration was completed recently using a flatbed truck and 2 flaggers.

Tunnel Hill Road; Chicken Farm (con't)

The flaggers control the traffic while the truck completely negotiated the wide swing, which took all of Tunnel Hill Road, was completed within the road right-of-way. Two neighbors had been there to see the demonstration as well as Leb County Planning and the engineer. Videotaping from 3 different angles was completed so that it could be seen that it could be done. The responsibility of the flaggers rests with the Kreiders. Everybody who was there felt comfortable with this arrangement. The commission discussed the number of truck trips and the cycle for the chickens. Member Smeltzer questioned the feed trucks being able to remain in the proper lane while navigating the lane. Mgr Grumbine said she would need to verify that information. He questioned if the Bonalles were present for the demonstration. Mgr Grumbine replied she had spoken to him on the telephone and he indicated he had been present. He was sitting in his truck on his lane to his property but had to leave prior to the demonstration. Mgr Grumbine told him that when the plan submission is brought to the Twp the neighbors would be notified by letter the same as the first time this plan was reviewed. Anyone can attend the Planning Commission meetings or follow by checking the minutes on the Township website.

D.)Written Decision T-Mobil & Kochenderfer Road

Provided for the Commission members information.

E.) Zimmerman/Klopp Lot Addition – Letter to LCPD

A copy of a letter was forwarded to Lebanon County Planning asking that the plan not receive any more extensions as it has been a year and a half since any movement has taken place with this lot addition.

F.) Spring Creek Update

In addition to some of the earlier conversation Mgr Grumbine wanted to point out some areas of concern for the Township if Landmark purchases this property. When Spring Creek made their proposals with the original submission, the curbing and sidewalk issues were not waived due to some stormwater designs. With the revised stormwater for this area if the issue of whether or not the properties that front Kimmerlings Road should have curbing and/or sidewalks comes up, Mgr Grumbine has asked the Engineer to take a look at the options. In speaking to the Twp Roadmaster there are no existing stormwater problems in this area. If Landmark designs the stormwater to flow south from these seven lots along Kimmerlings Road, she and the Roadmaster didn't feel it would be necessary for curbing. There is no existing curbing or sidewalk along Kimmerlings Road. However the Twp is proposing to widen both sides of the road approximately 3' each side and would like to see the developer widen the south side of Kimmerlings Road along their property frontage. This should also include an overlay because of the street cuts for utilities. The Planning Commission discussed the issues and agreed that we could waive the curbing/sidewalk requirement but would require the 3' widening along the south side of Kimmerlings Road by the developer.

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

Respectfully Submitted,

Theresa L. George
Recording Secretary