

**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 23, 2006**

**Page 1 of 3**

The Penn Township Planning Commission (PTPC) met on October 23, 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 the Township Office. The meeting was recorded to aid in the preparation of the minutes. Chairman Chism called the meeting to order.

Chairman Chism opened the meeting informing the visitors that the PTPC is meeting to discuss and to make a recommendation on the question of whether a Planned Residential Development Ordinance (PRD) is to be allowed in the Township.

**PLANNED RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT (PRD)** - Chairman asked for any comments from the public on the question of a PRD.

**Brian Foster** – Mr. Foster offered that he had some questions. What other municipalities in the area have PRDs and do they find them beneficial. Engineer offered that he has not been involved in any PRDs but from reading about them, some municipalities like PRDs and some don't.

Mr. Foster asked how many in South Central Pennsylvania municipalities have PRDS. Engineer offered that he didn't know the exact number, but he could name approximately half a dozen that have PRDs regulations.

Mr. Foster asked of those municipalities who do have PRDs do those municipalities receive requests from developers for variance of the zoning ordinances to place a PRD in an area not designated for it. Engineer offered that it is not uncommon for a request for variance or request a zoning change to come from a developer. Mr. Foster asked if those request get honored. Engineer replied that it would depend on the request.

Mr. Foster presented a traffic volume count from the Penn Township Comprehensive Plan dated 1994. He offered that the 1990 average annual traffic volume was between 13,584 and 18,925. Out of the same Comprehensive Plan one of the community attitude question was with the 11/15 traffic volume and hazards should a transportation study be done through HATS program. 78.5% of the people surveyed responded that yes a traffic impact study should be conducted.

## MINUTES OF OCTOBER 23, 2006

### Page 2 of 3

Mr. Foster handed map from PennDOT's web site showing the annual average traffic volume for SR 11/15 to be 12,000. He continued that a lot of the traffic since 1994 went over to SR22/3222. He offered that if the Township were to have PRD, there would be a significant increase in population and therefore would have an increase in that annual daily traffic volume.

**Tom Reynolds** – Mr. Reynolds asked if a PRD creates a tax surplus. Chairman offered that he did not know that answer. Mr. Reynolds asked how much of a tract would be placed in open space under a PRD. Chairman offered that would be determined at the time the plan is presented.

**Lucinda Novinger** – Ms. Novinger offered that in the Penn Township Comprehensive Plan, specifically in the future land use section, the common thread throughout this section was an area being called an environmental sensitive area. I think we could consider the mountain an environmentally sensitive area. All environmentally sensitive areas must be considered during any development. Ms. Novinger offered that the zoning ordinance already provides for high-density development. A lot of work has been put into place with the zoning, open space development and the comprehensive plan and I believe that to allow a PRD would be to throw all that work out the window.

**Melvin Campbell** - Mr. Campbell offered that he is concerned with the traffic increase as well. He continued that Norfolk Southern owns land between Windsor and the river and Norfolk southern is not lenient on anyone crossing their tracks. Mr. Campbell offered that he would like to know if there is a PRD that has 900 acres set aside, what rate would this land be taxed. He offered that he asked about the retention ponds and if the ponds location has to be perked and where a retention pond has to go. He offered that he was told, no the percs did not have to be done, but in this case the percs would be done. He then asked how it was determined how large and how many retention ponds would be needed. He offered that the reply was that Windsor would take the 100-year stormwater calculations and average the years.

**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.

**Peter Thompson** - Mr. Thompson offered that a recommendation not to have a PRD ordinance does not prevent the topic coming up later. He asked the Township to review all the land in the Township that would be eligible for a PRD. It was mentioned that a minimum number of acres for a PRD be set. Mr. Thompson suggested a minimum of 200 acres. He offered that from this number the Township could determine how many areas in the township could be a proposed PRD. He asked how the Township could evaluate the effects of this decision if the Township didn't know the potential impact of PRD development. He also asked if the Township is making a decision for one developer or for 10 potential developers. He finished by stating that the Township should make sure we manage development and development not manage us.

## MINUTES OF OCTOBER 23, 2006

### Page 3 of 3

**Monte Supko** – Mr. Supko offered that if there is development on the mountain that he would like to see it designed as Perdix is already designed.

**Craig Rahenkamp** – Mr. Rahenkamp offered that it isn't a question of if there will be growth but what mechanism is used with the growth. He continued that it is the opinion of Windsor that a PRD benefits both the developer and the Township. He offered that a PRD process gives more latitude to the municipalities and a saves the developer money that could be spent on more infrastructure.

Chairman called for a motion or discussion on the question of PRDs. Mr. Maguire offered that the zoning ordinance provides for a mixture of housing and lot sizes, the proposed modification to the Open Space Development Ordinance allows for closer development along with preserving natural features.

After discussion and upon a Maguire/Dalla Piazza motion, the PTPC voted unanimously that provision for PRD not be included in the Penn Township Zoning Ordinance.

After discussion, the consensus of the PTPC is to meet and discuss the Natural Features Overlay 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