

**MINUTES  
NORTH LEBANON TOWNSHIP  
PLANNING COMMISSION  
MAY 8, 2006**

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 .....	Chairperson
William Tice .....	Member
John Scheer .....	Member
A. Bruce Sattazahn .....	Member
Cheri F. Grumbine .....	Twp Manager

Also in attendance at this meeting were several members of the public.

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

**COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC**

There were no Comments from the Public this evening.

**MOTION TO APPROVE MEETING MINUTES**

The minutes from April 10, 2006 were available for action however the Commission members did not have the opportunity to review the information. It was decided to table the approval of the minutes until the June meeting.

**MOTION** was made and seconded to table action on the minutes from April 10, 2006. Unanimously carried.

**ACTIVE PLANS FOR REVIEW, DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATION**

**A.) Briar Lake Phase III Final Subd Plan**

**Location/Zoned:** off N 8<sup>th</sup> Ave & E Maple St/ R2

**Date Submitted:** 2-27-06

Scott Miller of Stackhouse & Bensinger was present to review the details of Phase III for Briar Lake. Phases I & II had been previously approved. He reported nothing has changed from the Preliminary plan approval. A few minor issues that existed with the public facilities were cleaned up and taken care of during the plan processing of this particular phase. This phase is the phase that is located off N 8<sup>th</sup> Ave and wraps around to an entrance off E Maple St. It also will contain several townhouse units. Mgr Grumbine reviewed a letter dated May 8, 2006 from Lebanon County Planning recommending approval of the Briar Lake Phase III Final Subdivision Plan. After some discussion, Chp Martin asked the members if anyone had any other questions regarding this plan? None were asked.

**MOTION** was made and seconded to recommend approval of the Briar Lake Phase III Final Subdivision Plan. Unanimously carried.

---

---

**ACTIVE PLANS ON HOLD WITH LEBANON COUNTY PLANNING DEPT**

The following plans are all still under review with Lebanon County Planning.

**A.) Woodlea Phase 3 Final Subdivision Pl**

**Location/Zoned:** Gary Ave & Watson St / R-2  
**Submission Date:** 10-28-04

**B.) Spring Creek Preliminary Subd Plan**

**Location/Zoned:** Kimmerlings Rd  
& N 8<sup>th</sup> Ave/ R-1 & R-2  
**Submission Date:** 1-10-05

Chris Sellers from Saxinger & Black was present to discuss the Spring Creek Plan. Ms. Sellers did a quick review of details regarding this particular plan. She then asked the Commission members for any particular questions or comments. Mgr Grumbine told the members that they had previously discussed utilizing "boulder wall" and it has now been decided to utilize "redi-rock" throughout the various locations in the development. One issue that was not addressed on the comment list had been one regarding a retainer wall and a small oiece of land to be conveyed to the existing Basselgia lot. This owner must approve the wall prior to any plan approvals. Ms Sellers stated that this is still an issue that is being addressed with the owners. She said the decision to use redi-rock as opposed to the rock boulder option would make the maintenance of this wall even easier. There was an issue the with speed limit signs meeting PADOT's specifications. Approval must be received from the North Lebanon Twp Municipal Authority to allow a driveway for Lot #108 of Briar Lake to cross over the 20 foot proposed sanitary sewer easement.

A note about replacing catch basins was listed on the comment list. Mgr Grumbine mentioned that the curbing note for the north side of Kimmerlings Rd was missing on the plans. Some discussion was held about the types of catch basins being noted on the plans. Member Scheer started a conversation about the responsibilities of maintenance issues with the inlets as well as the walls that are being discussed. He mentioned a wall in Lebanon that he considers unsightly. Will this wall area become an issue like that wall? Member Sattazahn replied not if the walls are installed correctly. He said he is involved with this type of material in his business and the installation is important. After some discussion Member Scheer questioned the homeowners being responsible for any damages done to these walls. Chris Sellers confirmed that the homeowners are responsible for repairs. She explained many of the advantages of the redi-rock being utilized for the various walls located throughout this development. The conversation again returned to making sure the owner of the lot #21 is aware that they will be responsible for maintenance issues. Ms Sellers informed the Commission that the information would be found on the deed itself when the property is sold. Member Tice questioned the possibility of Lot #21 not getting sold. Who is responsible then? He was told the developer or builder would then be responsible.

The discussion moved on to the traffic study that had been completed for this area. Ms Sellers reviewed a letter regarding the results of the traffic study. The letter concluded there was not a traffic light warranted according to the figures received when the study had been completed. An alternate suggestion had been made by Doug Plank to install a multi-way stop or restricted turning lanes. Using PADOT guidelines, these intersections do not generate the numbers needed for placement of a traffic light, according to this study. Chp Martin asked the Commission members to make their suggestions to Ms Sellers about the intersections and the solutions they think might help this situation. Chp Martin stated the intersection at 7<sup>th</sup> Street is a nightmare at certain times of the day and the times and numbers sited in the traffic study did not seem realistic to her.

Member Scheer said it is his opinion that all developers should have to provide bonds to cover the expenses of the traffic issues in the future. He does not feel the people living in the Twp today should have to pay for these costs that are going to be added from recent developing. After some discussion the Commission members told Ms Sellers that they feel strongly that the traffic questions they have about these areas still need to be answered.

---

**Spring Creek Preliminary Subd Plan (con't)**

A multi-stop intersection would not be an acceptable resolution to them. Chris Sellers said she would try to arrange to have Doug Plank meet with them to discuss their questions and comments. Some discussion was held about the issues with the schools and enrollment. Mgr Grumbine explained that would be the school district's responsibility and we are not permitted to reject a plan for this reason. A question was asked about how many units are depicted in this plan? The answer was 38 single-family lots and 31 townhouse units for a total of 69 lots. It was agreed there would have to be some better suggestions for the traffic issues and questions more developing will create.

**C.)Homestead Acres Phase IV Final Subd Pl****Location/Zoned:**off Grace Ave/R-1**Submission Date:** 8-04-05

Chris Sellers also discussed the plans for Homestead Acres Phase IV with the Commission. Information about the bridges that will be crossing over the wetlands in this area has just been provided to Wilson Consulting and Rick Bolt, LCPD Engineer. Some information is still pending from DEP according to Chris Sellers. She repeated several of the items that had been on the latest comment list and informed the Commission of all the items that are now completed. Members of the Commission did not have any further questions for Ms. Sellers.

**D.)Gensler Preliminary/Final Subdivision Plan****Location/Zoned:** Mechanic St & Sandhill Rd/ R2**Submission Date:** 9-20-05

There has not been any new information provided on this plan.

**E.)Aaron/ Ruth Shirk Minor Subd Plan****Location/ Zoned:** Water St / AG

(Lot Addition)

**Submission Date:** 10-20-05

After the Supervisors adoption of Ordinance No. 1-2006, which adopted new policies for Planning Module submission, the Shirk plan must now provide the planning module waiver application that is applicable with this type of minor subdivision.

**F.)Brian Amerman Minor Subd Plan****Location/Zoned:**off Narrows Dr/ R2**Submitted:** 12-08-05

This plan is also on hold with no new information having been received.

**G.)Randy Ebersole – Eight- E-Limited Land Dev Plan****Location/Zoned:** Cumberland St &  
15<sup>th</sup> Ave/C2A**Date Submitted:** 2-27-06

This plan is still on hold with County Planning.

**ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION / COMMENTS FROM COMMISSION MEMBERS:****A.) Zoning Amendment Request – W Maple Street**

Bruce Sattazahn told the Commission members he is excusing himself from this topic. Member Tice asked Bruce if he had spoken to the other residents that own homes in the area he has requested a zoning amendment for. Bruce replied he had spoken to most of the homeowners with the exception of the corner lot. Some of the owners have stated they would be in attendance at the meeting to offer support for the requested change. Everyone he had spoken to voiced no opposition to the requested change to a Commercial zone. The question of a change in taxation was asked. This proposed change would not affect taxes unless countywide changes were to be enacted. Chp Martin said she has no opposition to the change to Commercial. She asked each of the members to voice their opinions on the rezoning request. All members indicated their agreement to the proposed amendment for the W Maple St properties and cited their reasons.

**MOTION** was made and seconded to recommend approval for the zoning amendment request pertaining to the Sattazahn properties located on W Maple Street. Unanimously carried.

---

**B.) Kreider Property on Tunnel Hill Rd**

Member Scheer mentioned the Kreider's questions about reviving the plan for a chicken farm on the property located off Tunnel Hill Rd. Some discussion was held on the problems that surfaced several years ago when the proposal first was received in the Twp. The biggest problem is still the truck traffic involved with the chicken operation and the shared common lane that has to be used for access to the farm. Questions were asked about the fact that Tunnel Hill Rd is a State road. The legal questions that are raised when granting approval, or denial, were also discussed.

As there was not any other items to discuss the members were in agreement to adjourn.

Respectfully submitted,

Theresa L. George  
Recording Secretary