

**BOROUGH OF CARROLL VALLEY
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
MONDAY, APRIL 7, 2014 – 7:00 P.M.
BOROUGH OFFICE**

MINUTES

Chairman Ed Kaplan called the meeting to order at 7:00 P.M. The attendance was as follows:

PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS

Present

Robert Verderaime
Ed Kaplan, Chair
Lisa McLeod-Simmons
Mary Davidson
Ron Harris, Mayor
John Schubring
Neal Abrams
David Lillard

BOROUGH OFFICIALS, ETC.

Gayle R. Marthers, Borough Secretary
David Hazlett, Borough Manager
Sam Wiser, Borough Solicitor

Absent

Dan Patton

CONSIDERATION OF THE MINUTES OF THE MARCH 3, 2014 PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

***R. Verderaime moved, N. Abrams seconded, that the Commission accept the minutes of the Planning Commission Meeting of March 3, 2014 with the correction of a typographical error on page 2; line 13 the word “circumstanced” replaced with “circumstances”. Motion passed unanimously.

OPEN TO THE PUBLIC

The following individuals addressed the Commission during the course of the meeting:

- Mr. Charlie Suhr, Attorney for Eluma, Inc. regarding Ordinance #2-2014- Zoning Change Regarding Cluster Developments
- Mr. Rob Thaeler, Adams County Planning Office regarding Ordinance #2-2014- Zoning Change Regarding Cluster Developments and the Southwest Regional Comprehensive Plan
- Dorothy Drechsler, 7 Trout Run Trail, Carroll Valley regarding Ordinance #2-2014- Zoning Change Regarding Cluster Developments

OLD BUSINESS

Ordinance #2-2014- Zoning Change Regarding Cluster Developments. Mr. Kaplan welcomed Mr. Suhr, Mr. Wiser and Mr. Thaeler to the meeting. It was decided by consensus that each question submitted by Mr. Abrams and approved for discussion by Members would be first answered by the Borough Solicitor, and then by Mr. Suhr and finally by Mr. Thaeler. All parties were in consensus with answers with the following exceptions or notations:

Question # 5: Noted that the Ordinance does not limit the number of phases that can be started or under construction at one time.

Question #6: Noted that Forestry is a required permitted use of any land by Pennsylvania Code.

Question #8: Mr. Wiser explained the difference between a Traffic Study and a Traffic Impact Fee Process. He cautioned that if a Traffic Study identifies a problem it may require that the Borough fix the problem or be held responsible for any incidents. Mr. Suhr stated that a Traffic Study is common and compliance would be followed; however, its inclusion would usually be found in the Land Development Ordinance instead of the Zoning Ordinance. Mr. Wiser concurred. Mr. Thaeler supported a Traffic Study; however, all three agreed that the Developer would only be responsible for the roadway where the proposed development intersected with a public roadway. To clarify, the example of Sanders Road and PA Route 116 was used to explain that any Traffic Study associated with the Eluma property would not include this intersection because the planned development does not plan for an entrance or exit in that area. The Study would be limited to the area of Sanders Road that the developer would mark as the egress.

County Concerns not addressed in the 9 Questions:

1. Cluster Sketch Plan is more appropriate for the Land Development Ordinance; however, after discussion; it was determined that it is an additional step meant for transparency and therefore appropriate. The wording of “permitting” the Sketch Plan was also discussed and deemed permissible by all parties.
2. Maximum total building coverage of 30% and the Green Area requirements were discussed at length. Mr. Thaeler expressed concern over the ability to adequately track the numbers. Mr. Hazlett confirmed that similar limitations are already in current ordinances and the zoning officer is familiar with the requirements. No further discussion was required for the topic.

The following action was taken:

***L. McLeod-Simmons moved; D. Lillard seconded that the Commission recommend that Council take action on the Ordinance as written. Motion passed with R. Verderaime voting no.

Ordinance – Amending Chapter 27 Modifying the Number of Principal Structures in Commercial Districts. Mr. Hazlett explained that this ordinance corrects a previous amendment that removed the language addressing the number of principal structures in commercial districts. Although unintentional; this has the potential to cause a considerable hardship to the Borough commercial entities when they want to add buildings to a current site. Having settled the issue that caused this ordinance to be tabled; Mr. Hazlett asked that Members take action:

***R. Harris moved; D. Lillard seconded that the Commission recommend approval of the Ordinance amending Chapter 27 of The Borough of Carroll Valley Code of Ordinances Modifying the Number of Principal Structures in Residential-Commercial Districts. Motion passed unanimously.

NEW BUSINESS

Ordinance – Amending Chapter 21 Addressing the Befouling of Borough Streets and Roadways. Due to the lateness of the hour; this issue was tabled by Members and requested that staff move this issue to the first item to be discussed at the May 5, 2014 meeting.

Southwest Regional Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Rob Thaeler, Adams County Office of Planning gave a brief description of the document and asked that members review it and if there are questions or concerns he would be willing to attend another meeting. Mayor Harris asked that Mr. Thaeler review the Borough’s current Comprehensive Plan and forward any questions or concerns to Mr. Hazlett or Chairman Kaplan.

ADJOURNMENT

*** R. Harris moved; J. Schubring seconded that the meeting adjourn at 10:24 PM. Motion passed unanimously.

Gayle R. Marthers, Borough Secretary