



---

**Hampton Inn Hotel Land Dev Plan (con't)**

Hoffman explained the building envelope will be limited due to the wetland areas. The stormwater design will be constructed to drain into an existing creek located on the property. The site is serviced by public sewer and public water which is located to the rear of the structure.

Member Smeltzer asked if there is any plan to tie into Joel Dr to the rear of the property. Hoffman reported it had been reviewed but dismissed as the distance is too far and is further complicated because of utility lines already located in that area. Member Martin asked about the permit from PADOT. Is it still valid? She was told it is recorded and has an assigned number, a close out date and is still valid. Hoffman stated it is a 24' low-volume driveway as there is limited frontage for this parcel. In conversation with the client, Hoffman said there is the possibility of this hotel being an 85 room facility as opposed to the original suggested 81 rooms. He also mentioned that most Hampton Inns have an exterior pool. Due to the constraints with this parcel an interior pool is being suggested. As a result of recent conversations there is the possibility of revised plans being submitted.

A Zoning Hearing had been held regarding several variances that had been requested. Mgr Grumbine discussed the Zoning Hearing that had been held. Most of the variances involved not being able to meet required footages in the parking lot. The height of the standpipe needs to be reviewed as the requirement states 35' and would need to be adjusted for a 4-story building. The minimum separation from the building line varies from 8' to 17' as opposed to the stated 20' requirement. The screen plantings from the west wall should be 50' but due to the footprint the distance for the buffer wall is more like 60' to 80'. The final variance deals with the loading spaces for the first floor. Relief was asked to be able to provide 1 loading space with a clearance height of 12'6". The ZHB stipulated the Fire Chief (Weavertown) provide an opinion on the 12'6" height or increasing to a 13'6" height to allow for a ladder truck to fit under the canopy. Member Smeltzer mentioned that with this building location as is, at least all sides of the structure are accessible.

Member George questioned an emergency access. He was answered there is not one shown anywhere on the plan. Member Tice questioned the distance to White's property. Mgr Grumbine replied there is another vacant lot between the Hotel and White's property which is owned by Home Improvement. White's and the Home Improvement lot have a shared driveway for an access. Member Smeltzer agreed with the possibility of a secondary access being reviewed in that area, even if it is a stone lane. Member Tice queried whether that area could be looked at for an emergency access. All members were in agreement they would like to see a secondary emergency access added to the plan even if it is a stoned lane.

**MOTION** was made and seconded to receive the Hampton Inn Hotel Land development Plan. Motion unanimously carried.

**B.) Revised Narrows Glen Plan RE: Swale "E"**

Location/Zoned: Narrows Dr/

Mgr Grumbine explained she has been meeting and working with Rick Bolt, County Engineer, on this request for several months. Landmark is requesting that the Swale "E" located to the rear of Lots 6, 7 and 8 of Narrows Glen be eliminated. Rick Bolt has met with Landmark to calculate redirecting the stormwater to an existing headwall and inlet. Chp Martin questioned how the water will be carried to the inlet. The plan does not indicate how it is going to be accomplished.

---

**Revised Narrows Glen Plan RE: Swale "E" (con't)**

Member Smeltzer had some concerns about the steep drop offs to the rear of these lots. Member George agreed that it is a very steep drop off. Member Smeltzer questioned if this revision is being requested to allow more rear yard space for these lots. Mgr Grumbine indicated that would be her thought after seeing Rick Bolt's comments. She added that Rick Bolt had reviewed the contour requirements with Landmark's Engineer. Member Smeltzer said he would like to see some more details about how the stormwater will actually be redirected. Also he is curious as to the plans for the rear yards on these 3 lots.

**MOTION** was made and seconded to receive the Narrows Glen Revised Swale "E" Plan. Motion unanimously carried.

**ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION/ COMMENTS FROM COMMISSION MEMBERS**

There were no items this evening for discussions.

With no further business to discuss, the meeting was unanimously adjourned.

Respectfully Submitted,

Theresa L. George  
Recording Secretary