

**Penn Township Planning Commission**  
**Perry County**  
**100 Municipal Building Road**  
**Duncannon, PA 17020**  
**(717) 834-5281 Fax: (717) 834-6854**  
E-mail Penntownship@earthlink.net

**MINUTES OF OCTOBER 16, 2006**

**Page 1 of 5**

The Penn Township Planning Commission (PTPC) met on October 16, 2006 at 6:30 p.m. in the Municipal Building. PTPC members present were Edward Chism, Brian Maguire, Art Dalla Piazza, Rachel Mullen, and Ken Martz. Others present were Township Secretary Helen Klinepeter (Secretary) Township Engineer Max Shradley (Engineer), and Christopher Knarr. A list of visitors attending is available in Township Office. The meeting was recorded to aid in the preparation of the minutes. Chairman Chism called the meeting to order.

**Visitors** - All visitors were acknowledged.

**CORRESPONDENCE** – Secretary presented the PTS letter authorizing RETTEW to work on the language for Planned Residential Development, the PTS decision letter on the zoning amendment submitted by Rhoads & Sinon and the PTS letter denying the Kinkora Pythian Home Land Development Plan. Secretary also submitted for the information of the PTPC the Formulas for Success: Housing plus services in Rural America from the Housing Assistance Council. Secretary presented the PCEDC letter that accompanied the As Built Plans for the Business Campus One.

**SUBDIVISION AND LAND DEVELOPMENT PLAN (SALDO)**

**Jason Gehman Final Subdivision Plan, File # 2006- 08** – Secretary presented the comments from Zoning Officer, Engineer, and County Planning Commission for review. Mr. Marlin Peters of Lou Hartford's office represented Mr. Gehman. Mr. Peters informed the PTPC that he had not reviewed the comments received. Engineer offered that one of the zoning comments are the steep slope elevations. Engineer asked if the contours on the plan are surveyed. Mr. Peters answered that the contours are from the USGS maps.

Mr. Henry Holman, a neighbor and Supervisor of the Township, offered that he is questioning the accuracy of the plan. He offered the following comments. The corner markers are not in place. He offered that he had shown where three of the pins were and that the fourth pin shown on the plan does not exist. He continued that the septic system for the existing house is not shown correctly on the plan. The septic is directly behind the house. The scale shown on the plan is incorrect. The actual scale is 1 inch equals 50 feet. Mr. Holman offered that the plan shows three wells with two of the wells being within 100 feet of another. The three septic systems are shown within a 400-foot area of each other. On one of the lots the proposed well is shown on the slope and with the septic system being proposed on one side of the road. This lot so that piping would have to be placed under the road with the septic being pumped up about

## MINUTES OF OCTOBER 16, 2006

### Page 2 of 5

an elevation of 30 feet. He continued that any excavation would cause stormwater runoff being deposited onto his property and stream. Mr. Holman addressed the limits of the Township right-of-way and stated that the utility pole shown is not in the Township road. He informed the PTPC that the trash truck and snowplow does not turn around at Mr. Gehmans house. His private property, with permission, is used as a turn around for these vehicles.

Chairman offered that the slope elevations and the correct distances of township roads should be shown on the plan. Mr. Holman requested that he attend the placing of all monuments so that for all parties' are in agreement.

Engineer reviewed his and County's comments. After discussion and upon a Dalla Piazza/Mullen motion, the PTPC voted unanimously to table the Jason Gehman Final Subdivision Plan, File # 2006- 08 for review and action of comments.

**Doug McGonnel Flood Plain Application** – Secretary presented the Flood Plain Application for Doug McGonnel to build a house along Shermans Creek. The PTPC discussed the flood plain boundaries. Mr. McGonnel explained that the 50-year flood plain boundary is on the extreme top of the bank and elevations that were shot show that the water line is 3.5 feet below the 50-year flood plain boundary. He continued that the 100-year flood plain boundary is at 353 feet. He offered that the building is being built upon an existing foundation and that the new home will be built on pylons to allow floodwaters to flow beneath the structure. There is a 13-foot drop from where the house will be to the water line. After further discussion on the codes for building in a flood plain and upon a Maguire/Martz motion, the PTPC voted unanimously to recommend approval of the Doug McGonnel Flood Plain Application contingent upon Engineer's approval.

### **OLD BUSINESS**

#### **OPEN SPACE DEVELOPMENT**

**Page 2 – d** - The consensus of the PTPC was to remove the word "precautionary" in the second sentence.

**Page 4 – a.** – The consensus of the PTPC was to remove the word "precautionary" in the second line.

**Page 4 – b.** – The consensus of the PTPC was to remove the word "precautionary" in the second sentence. The consensus of the PTPC is to add the wordage "in the" to the last line before the word Yield Plan.

**Page 5 – 2.** – The consensus of the PTPC was to replace the word "reminder" with "remainder" in the third line from the bottom of that paragraph.

**Page 8 – 3.** – The consensus of the PTPC was to replace the wordage "water, streams" with water bodies, springs and streams".

**Page 10 – 14** – The consensus of the PTPC was to remove the word "State".

## MINUTES OF OCTOBER 16, 2006

### Page 3 of 5

**Page 13 – 9.a** – The consensus of the PTPC was to add the word “and” to “Final Plan and depicted”.

**Page 16 - (2)** - The consensus of the PTPC was to replace the wordage “water, streams” with water bodies, springs and streams”.

**Page 16 - (4)** – The consensus of the PTPC was to delete the word “Precautionary”, the parenthesis before streams and after swales on page 17.

**Page 20 – (4)** – The consensus of the PTPC was to add the wordage “for all types of farming operations” between “dwellings and General and”.

After discussion and upon Maguire/Dalla Piazza motion, the PTPC voted unanimously to recommendation adoption of the Open Space as corrected.

### **NEW BUSINESS**

**PLANNED RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT (PRD) ORDINANCE** – Chairman offered that the PTS asked the PTPC to consider if a PRD is good for the Township. Engineer gave a brief overview of the history of the request and what a PRD looks like and how a PRD would operate. He offered that the first decision is whether or not a PRD ordinance is to be considered.

**Craig Rahenkamp, Windsor Companies LLC** – Mr. Rahenkamp offered that a PRD is a process for development. The PRD allows for a tentative approval of the concept or sketch plan. The PRD process allows for a centralized reviewing authority to review the plan for zoning and subdivision and land development purposes. In conventional or Open Space development different boards would review variances in zoning and alterations of requirements. A PRD would eliminate bouncing between the different boards. Mr. Rahenkamp offered that with the R2 zoning in place 1200 units could be placed on that portion of the property. Windsor is not looking to place that many units on the entire 1100 acres. We are not asking for more development than is allowed, instead we are asking for a more expedient process.

**Robert Lightner, Rye Township** – Mr. Lightner offered that he has asked for a list of projects from Mr. Meisken on September 6, 2006 and as of this date he has not received any information. He continued that a PRD is cheaper and easier for the developer.

**Brian Hoser, 22 Frisch Drive** – Mr. Hoser stated that he could appreciate the efficiency of a PRD but there is a broader perspective by bouncing it back and forth. Is there a history of how these different processes work best?

Chairman offered that upon recording of a PRD, zoning and subdivision regulations otherwise applicable to the land cease to apply. He asked if once a PRD plan is accepted by the Township do all the controls have to be in place, and does the subdivision and land development ordinance no longer apply. Mr. Knarr offered that

## MINUTES OF OCTOBER 16, 2006

### Page 4 of 5

the Township would regulate with the developer in the tentative approval stage the density and types of uses allowed. A PRD will lock the developer into a density approximation. He continued that he understands that zoning does cease to apply. A PRD becomes its own zone and the regulations on the plan will apply and take precedence.

Mr. Rahenkamp offered that the PRD includes types of standards to be allowed, such as building setback requirements, stormwater, public or private sewer and water. A discussion on PRDs pursued regarding the density agreement between the Township and developer, and the concept that the density would be set at the beginning of the PRD process. The discussion continued on the idea that despite how the dynamics of the Township may change throughout the PRD process that the density agreement will remain set.

**Loretta Hoffer** - Ms. Hoffer offered that decisions made now will be affecting our children and grandchildren and their children and once we make the decision to take something from us then we will never be able to get it back. She continues that the Township really needs to take its time and the different boards should review the plans so that nothing is missed and to maintain the integrity of our resources. We should not fast track any of that.

Chairman offered that another concern is that our current ordinance allows for a good mix of development. He offered that the sample PRD has less open space than the opens space ordinance which the PTPC has just finished reviewing.

Mr. Dalla Piazza asked if a yield plan is required in a PRD or could a yield plan be put into a PRD. Mr. Knarr offered that the intent is to get away from a yield plan and agree to a gross density or gross number of dwelling units. Under open space you are requiring them to show what could actually be built on the land.

**Monte Supko** – Mr. Supko offered that he would have concerns about the height of buildings in regards to fire protection.

Mr. Dalla Piazza asked how the time of approval for a PRD would be regulated. Mr. Knarr offered that under standard development there is a provision for a time extension. With a PRD both parties would agree upon a time extension.

Chairman asked if the number of units included was the gross acreage or net. Mr. Knarr offered that the number of units is included with the gross acreage. Mr. Dalla Piazza asked about the wetlands, steep slopes and other natural features. Mr. Knarr offered that those features would be addressed during the process of the PRD.

**Brad DiPaolo** - Mr. DiPaolo asked if a build out time limit could be required. Mr. Knarr offered that there is a requirement to submit final plans for each phase of a build out and requirement could state a time limit for that submission.

## MINUTES OF OCTOBER 16, 2006

### Page 5 of 5

**Tom Reynolds** – Mr. Reynolds asked that if there is a problem with the development is there a way to stop the development with a PRD plan. Mr. Knarr offered that there is nothing under subdivision and land development ordinance to stop a development now.

**Monte Supko** – Mr. Supko asked how the mountain would look under the current zoning. Chairman offered that he could not answer that being that there are steep slopes that prevent building above a certain percentage. Mr. Supko offered that a PRD would be a neighborhood type of development. He offered that in a mountain fire it would be better to have the development closer together for a response time.

**Peter Thompson** – Mr. Thompson asked if a PRD ordinance is approved, then all future development could come in under PRD and not open space. Mr. Knarr offered that is not true. A certain number of acres would trigger a PRD to be allowed.

**Brian Foster** – Mr. Foster offered that with a PRD you get the benefit of preservation of open space and much higher density population. He asked if the Township, County and State is able and prepared to deal with a population increase in this area.

Chairman offered that the PTPC has a lot to digest and that another meeting would be held for a decision on this matter. After discussion, the consensus of the PTPC is to meet and discuss the Planned Residential Development (PRD) on October 28, 2006 at 6:30 p.m.

After discussion, the consensus of the PTPC is to meet and discuss the Natural Features and Business Campus One zoning change request on November 6, 2006 at 6:30 p.m.

Upon all business being completed and with a Maguire/Dalla Piazza motion, the PTPC voted unanimously to adjourn the meeting at 10:15 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted;

Brian R. Maguire  
Secretary