



Mailing Address

**P.O. Box 277
Dauphin, PA 17018**

Office Address

**10 Elizabeth Avenue
Dauphin PA, 17018**

Phone: 717-921-8128

Fax: 717-474-8146

Middle Paxton Township

**MIDDLE PAXTON TOWNSHIP
Planning Commission
Meeting Minutes
October 12, 2015**

The October 12, 2015 meeting of the Middle Paxton Township Planning Commission was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Vice Chair Jeffrey Smith. The following members were present: Gary Deimler, Jeff Smith, Bill Kotkiewicz, Don Morse and Ralph Stone. Also present was Julie Seeds, Recording Secretary and Ed Fisher, with Light-Heigel, Township Engineer.

Following the Pledge of Allegiance, Mr. Deimler moved to approve the meeting minutes for September 14, 2015, Seconded by Mr. Kotkiewicz. The motion carried unanimously.

OLD BUSINESS:

1. Middle Paxton Township-Dauphin Borough Joint Comprehensive Plan

Ms. Seeds reported the final draft of the Middle Paxton Township-Dauphin Borough Joint Comprehensive Plan was advertised for Public review. The review period is 45 days. In addition, the consultants Environmental Planning and Design, also sent the final draft plan as required to all the surrounding municipalities, Central Dauphin School District, and Tri County Planning Commission for their review and comment. Once the review period is over, all comments will be reviewed by the Joint Comprehensive plan Committee.

2. Preliminary Subdivision/Land Development Plan for The River View at Middle Paxton

Representatives from LDI & Associates were in attendance to present a revised Preliminary Subdivision/Land Development Plan dated July 15, 2015 and revised September 21, 2015, prepared by Dave Weihbrecht with Advantage Engineering. In addition, numerous residents were in attendance with questions and concerns about the plan.

Eric Clancy with LDI & Associates presented the plan. Mr. Clancy reviewed the following key points

- a. A portion of the property is zoned R-3 (High Density Residential) which allows one (1) unit per 8,000 square feet.
- b. The traffic counts from the original traffic study by the engineering firm of Traffic Planning and Design Inc, in 2011 and the recent study from the September 18, 2015 report did not change significantly and in some cases the count went down.
- c. Mr. Clancy addressed concerns from the last meeting that people coming from the proposed apartments may turn right onto Hagy Lane; Mr. Clancy feels due to the extra driving distance this would not happen frequently.
- d. Stormwater run-off at Hagy Lane was a concern at the last meeting. LDI stated infiltration basins were tested and will infiltrate well. In addition, with concerns of storm water run from

Hagy Lane, Mr. Clancy indicated inlets were added on the plan at each access to address this concern. The inlets were not shown on the plan but will be added according to their engineer.

- e. Traffic concerns were again addressed by LDI. Planning Commission member, Don Morse, noted that R-1 (Low Density Residential) was zoned along Hagy Lane as a buffer to separate from the R-3 (High Density Residential). Planning Commission members questioned and suggested why an entrance off of Allegheny Street is not considered on this plan. Commission Member, Jeff Smith commented the initial Traffic Study from the report he read examined one (1) entrance off Hagy Lane and one (1) off of Allegheny Street.
- f. The future phases of the entire site were discussed. LDI noted they do not know at this point what the future of the remaining tract will entail. A few Planning Commission members felt it was important to have a master plan to show the entire context of the site and the members stated it is also within their right according to SALDO, Section 305.AC, to request a master plan.
- g. Members of the Planning Commission questioned the infrastructure of the future commercial development and the connectivity to the residential development and to Hagy Lane. Concerns regarding the commercial users accessing Hagy Lane in lieu of Allegheny Street was discussed.
- h. Don Morse questioned the land between Hagy and Hecks, is it already subdivided and if it is does it need to be separated from this plan?

Ed Fisher, Township Engineer, reviewed and summarized the updated comments from his letter dated October 09, 2015. At this time it appears 35 of the 70 original comments on the plan have not yet been satisfied. In addition, nine new comments have not yet been addressed by the developer. The general consensus of Ed Fisher was most of the comments could be addressed satisfactorily with some added discussion between him and the developer.

In addition, the following items were also noted they were not completed from the engineers report; sewer module not yet completed, E&S Plan needs work and details, site distances were discussed along with the speed limit on Hagy Lane. The site distance was calculated at 35 MPH and the speed limit on Hagy Lane is 55 MPH.

Elijah Yearick with Tri County Planning Commission reviewed his comments. Most comments were clerical in nature but also suggested a master plan; a future phased plan for the entire site.

Public Comments on the LDI Plan were heard. Approximately 12 members of the public spoke on the plan. Most resided on Hagy Land and Hecks Drive. The comments are summarized below:

- a. Significant concerns about the two (2) access points onto Hagy Lane. Are there any other options?
- b. Concerns of additional traffic and the impact it will have on Hagy Lane.
- c. Concerns that there isn't a master plan for the entire site.

- d. They do not believe the traffic study is correct.
- e. The development will increase population by 8%.
- f. Believe the R-1 District was meant to be a buffer of the R-3 High Density District.
- g. Concerns with commercial traffic using Hagy Lane.
- h. Upgrades to Hagy Lane should occur and paid for by the developer.
- i. Can other options be looked into, including Affection Lane?

The Public Comment period ended at 8:37 PM.

Discussion ensued between the Planning Commission Members and the Township Engineer, Ed Fisher.

Mr. Fisher noted that as a Township we cannot enforce deed restrictions. A time extension was discussed to give the developer time to review the comments and clean up outstanding items. LDI did not respond to a time extension.

Mr. Morse moved to recommend denying the plan based on all the outstanding engineering comments and the issues still remaining. Seconded by Mr. Deimler. Motion carried with three votes in favor, (Morse, Deimler, Smith) and two votes opposed (Kotkiewicz, Stone).

NEW BUSINESS:

No new business

Board Member Comments

No Board Member Comments

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 9:04 p.m. Mr. Deimler moved to adjourn the meeting, Seconded by Mr. Stone. The Motion carried unanimously.

Respectively Submitted,

Julie A. Seeds
Recording Secretary