

MINUTES

LOWER SWATARA TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION

**REGULAR MEETING
DECEMBER 21, 2023, 7:00 P.M.**

Meeting was called to order by Chauncey Knopp at 7:00 P.M. with the following present:

Chauncey Knopp, Chairman	Jim Diamond, LST Solicitor
James Young, Vice Chairman	Don Fure, Director of Codes, Planning & Zoning
Dale Messick	Richard Snyder, Planning & Zoning Coordinator
Howard Crawford	Shawn Fabian, HRG
Tonya Condran, Recording Secretary	Alexa Korber, DCPC

Others present:

Matt Fisher, R.J. Fisher	Ron Burkholder, Colony
Caleb Krauter, HRG	Chris DeHart, LST
Sarah Young, KCH	Bill Briegel, KCH
Ben Heisey, R. J. Fisher	Ron Paul, LST

Absent: Kimber Latsha

ROLL CALL & PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Mr. Knopp asked if there was a motion to approve the November 16, 2023, meeting minutes. The motion was made by Mr. Messick and seconded by Mr. Crawford. All were in favor. Minutes were approved.

OLD BUSINESS:

a. MASD New K-3 Elementary – Planning Commission File PC#2023-01. The Preliminary / Final Land Development & Lot Consolidation Plan proposes to consolidate three (3) existing parcels into one (1) new parcel, measuring 125.99 acres. Also, said Plan proposes to construct a new K-3 Elementary School, District Administration Office, Operations Building, parking and access drives, associated utilities, and associated stormwater management / PCSM facilities.

Plan was tabled at the request of MASD.

NEW BUSINESS:

a. Colony at Old Reliance, Phase 1 – Planning Commission File PC#2023-07. The Final Subdivision & Land Development Plan for Phase 1 proposes to subdivide a 58.321-acre tract of land into 53 single-family lots, 12 duplex lots, 1 commercial lot, 2 open space lots, and 1 residual lot. The residual lot will accommodate two (2) future phases. Also, said Plan proposes to realign a portion of Longview Drive; and construct a new sanitary sewer main, local streets, a parking lot, a tot lot, associated utilities, and associated stormwater management / PCSM facilities.

Ben Heisey, of RJ Fisher & Associates, explained the next step of the process with Phase 1. It is essentially the northern half of the Colony at Old Reliance project. This Phase 1 includes a lot of amenities such as the Tot Lot, the realignment of Longview Drive, and the off-site Sanitary Sewer extension. He said most of the Stormwater Basin will be installed with this phase and will be utilized for erosion and sediment control.

Mr. Heisey went on to say that there were a handful of comments, nothing that they have any concerns with addressing as far as technical aspects. There are some standard administrative items that will be taken care of right before final approval. He then asked to answer any questions anyone may have on Phase 1.

Mr. Knopp asked if there were any questions from the Planning Commission.

Mr. Messick asked if there was a Rec Fee arrangement agreement set.

Mr. Fure answered that it is not yet. He said that is one of the administrative comments that is still outstanding.

Mr. Heisey said the intent would be a Fee In Lieu Of. But we haven't established what that amount is yet.

Mr. Messick asked about Page 1, Item 32. Sanitary Sewer Agreement to be approved. He asked if that will be taken care of through the Municipal Authority.

Mr. Fure answered yes, there is an agreement for a sanitary easement being worked out. He believes this is near completion.

Mr. Diamond said it is not done yet, among other things that need to be finalized, but the document they are fine with. He added that it is sort of housekeeping stuff, as long as they all come together. He added that there has also been a little discussion about timing. He said there are a lot of scenarios in getting an easement document to be recorded when the pipes are already in the ground. He said the other way you can handle it is to give the easement for the ground and then do a bill-of-sale once the pipes are in the ground. He said this is sort of what the procedure was in the original easement that went through the school property; there was an easement sitting there with no pipe going through it for a long time. However, that original easement was terminated and traded for a different location. Mr. Diamond feels we should have an easement as a condition of approval, and that if nothing happens in the next couple of years, the owner can terminate the easement. He added that HRG is comfortable with all the metes and bounds, and he is comfortable with all the legal wording, so everything is ready to go but it is not sitting here signed by the bank.

Mr. Heisey said he believes the intent is to establish the easement. The agreement is in place and the documents are set up, but they originally thought they only needed Ron Kreider to sign off but there are additional layers to establish ownership.

Mr. Diamond added that partnership has a little more formality to it.

[More discussion ensued on the legal issues of easements and mortgages.]

Mr. Heisey said, long story short, the agreements have been created and they are ironing out the last details.

Mr. Messick added that on Sheet 1, Item 31 – realignment of the curb is to be done as part of Phase 1, but he didn't see any details on the width of the road, what Longview is now or what it will be, if the curb is realigned. He continued that there are no construction details at all for this road seen on the plan.

Mr. Snyder made his apologies to Mr. Heisey and the equitable owners who were here tonight for not having the comment letter to them yet. He said we are going to get that comment letter done next week and forward it over to them. He then responded to Mr. Messick's concern and said that was one of the items they had asked, to clearly indicate on the plan set to give the current right-of-way that is out there versus the proposed right-of-way. It was a little unclear where the existing right-of-way is, the line

doesn't appear to be completed. So, he continued, that will be one of the comments, to show clear indication of what the new right-of-way is going to look like compared to the existing, and any legal documentation necessary regarding those driveway extensions. That needs to be done before the plan is recorded.

Mr. Heisey said they have a profile of the realignment and grading showing that the driveways are being extended to the new curb.

Mr. Briegel added that they are not realigning the right-of-way, it is staying as depicted.

Mr. Messick interjected that that was not his question. His question was about the realignment of the curve, obviously the road would have to be rebuilt and there are no details on the prints that he saw as to how the road will be built. 2 inches of blacktop? 5 inches of blacktop?

Mr. Heisey said that they were speaking more towards the question that Mr. Snyder had raised. But to answer Mr. Messick's question, the construction of the road would follow the construction detail for a local road's pavement specification.

Mr. Fabian added that right now it is just showing the street paving details. So maybe they could just add additional clarification.

Mr. Snyder explained more about the street paving using the overhead projector of the site plan.

Mr. Crawford asked since we are not requiring sidewalks along Longview Drive, is it possible to put a blacktop walking-path from Old Reliance to the new Colony?

Mr. Heisey said he would look into that. He said right now they only have one portion of the proposed public street that crosses the stream there, but that is not proposed to be completed in Phase 1. They do have a paved path that is going to be coming off of old Colony, but they were looking to install that until they got the supporting public streets installed. But he said they could look at installing something temporary as a pedestrian access.

Mr. Crawford said if they could look into that he would appreciate it. There are a lot of people who walk in Old Reliance so it would give them a different way to travel if they had that access.

Mr. Briegel said there is a significant grade distance that drops down behind there. He doesn't feel it is feasible.

Mr. Crawford pointed out that he was thinking about where the power lines come through there, not close to the road.

[More discussion ensued using the overhead projector.]

Mr. Knopp asked for any other questions; there were none. He then asked Mr. Snyder for any comments from the Township Staff.

Mr. Snyder said that most items were a few drafting items, and the rest were administrative items. The staff is ok with the plan.

Mr. Knopp asked Mr. Fabian for any comments from HRG.

Mr. Fabian said there were a couple of clarity items just to clean up and make sure there are no confusions. HRG noticed that there are some minor adjustments on the stormsewer, so they just asked for the revised calculations, but he doesn't anticipate anything that they revise being problematic. He said they discussed the street widening and the curb location, so they were the only other things he wanted to comment on. The rest were administrative items.

Mr. Knopp asked Ms. Korber for any comments from DCPC.

Ms. Korber asked about Lot 14 being a commercial lot. Is there any idea what is going in there yet or is it just available space?

Mr. Heisey responded that there is no end user established at this point.

Ms. Korber asked if the common areas and the filtration basins and such would be maintained by the Homeowners Association.

Mr. Heisey said ultimately yes.

Ms. Korber then asked about the swales that go through people's individual lots and if that would still be on the HOA to maintain.

Mr. Heisey said there are a few lots with portions of swales going through them, so there would be easements established. But anything within the lot would be the lot owner's responsibility to maintain.

Mr. Knopp asked Mr. Diamond for any further comments.

Mr. Diamond stated that he had nothing other than the plan notes for the easements.

Mr. Knopp asked for any questions/comments from the Public.

Mr. Paul asked for clarification on how the road is widening on the curve at the intersection of Powderhorn Road.

Mr. Heisey explained that it is not proposed to extend the whole way down to the other intersection. It will taper back into the existing cartway before that.

[Mr. Fabian pointed out on the overhead projector where the curve would be.]

Mr. Young asked where things stand on terms of finalizing the agreement for a Fee In Lieu Of. And why is HRG recommending waiver instead of a deferral of sidewalks and curbs?

Mr. Diamond explained that there is no ordinance or other legal thing that would require a Fee In Lieu Of. That is a voluntary offer, and he believes it was in trade for a waiver rather than a deferral. Because if the sidewalks/curbs are deferred, they could be required anytime. But they would then be double paying for it, which is why they are requesting the waiver vs. the deferral. So, Mr. Diamond said it does make sense to him that if they are going to voluntarily go down the road of a Developer's Agreement version of the Fee In Lieu Of that everyone is happy with, then that would presumably be the end of it.

Mr. Fabian reiterated that there would be nothing to defer.

Mr. Snyder said in this case the way it ended up was that during the preliminary plan approval, at the Board of Commissioners level, they acted specifically on the plan and separately on the waivers. There were three options that were presented to them with the Fee In Lieu Of versus the waivers. They accepted the fee in lieu of the curb and sidewalk along the entire frontage but that had to be coupled with the fact that if they accept that Fee In Lieu Of then the waivers would be accepted. So that way there wouldn't be any "double dipping" clause on there. That approval was granted subject to the developers entering into a Developers Agreement specifying that the agreed upon amount and that would be executed prior to final approval and recording of the Phase 1 plan.

Mr. Young asked where it says in terms of negotiating that finalized agreement.

Mr. Snyder said it would be between the developers and their attorneys creating that document to be submitted to our attorney. They were given an email on Mr. Snyder's behalf transferring that information that they would be the ones responsible for creating the Developer's Agreement, then submitting it to Mr. Diamond, copying the Township. The Township would then make sure everything we wanted in that Developer's Agreement is there. Upon final plan approval, it will be decided to enter into that agreement.

Mr. Young then asked if that will be a condition of what we do tonight.

Mr. Diamond said absolutely.

Mr. Knopp asked for any other questions/comments. There were none at this time.

Mr. Knopp then asked the Planning Commission to address the waivers:

1. Request for a waiver of the curbing, §22-606. Developer is proposing to pay a Fee In Lieu Of the installation of the curbing.

- Mr. Young said that based upon the advice received from the Township Engineer, the Township Solicitor and Township Staff, with the negotiations of the Fee In Lieu Of, he recommends that we approve the waiver.
- Mr. Diamond interjected that we should make it a conditional approval.

- So, Mr. Young’s motion was changed to say we recommend approval conditioned upon a recorded Developer’s Agreement providing for the Fee In Lieu Of principal, as a condition of final approval. (This is for both §22-606.)
- Mr. Messick seconded the motion.
- All were in favor.

2. Request for a waiver of the sidewalk, §22-607. Again, the Developer is proposing to pay a Fee In Lieu Of the installation of the sidewalk.

- Mr. Young made the same motion for §22-607 (sidewalk) that he did with §22-606 (curbs).
- Mr. Messick seconded the motion.
- All were in favor.

Mr. Knopp asked the Planning Commission what they would like to do with the overall plan of The Colony at Old Reliance, Phase 1.

- Mr. Young made the motion to recommend to the Board of Commissioners the approval conditioned upon the recording of the mutually acceptable Developer’s Agreement; and addressing of any outstanding comments raised by the Township; and recording of the easement for the off-site gravity sanitary sewer main; and recording of easement instruments for any public infrastructure or stormwater management that may be on private lots.
- Mr. Crawford seconded the motion.
- All were in favor.
- Plan was approved.

b. Union Knoll, Final LDP – Planning Commission File PC#2023-08. The Final Land Development Plan proposes to improve a 22.775-acre tract of land with 111 townhouse units, a leasing office, a community pool, private streets, access drives, and parking lots. Also, said Plan proposes to construct improvements along Oberlin Road (S. R. 441), associated utilities, and associated stormwater management / PCSM facilities.

Matt Fisher, of R. J. Fisher & Associates, explained that this is the plan that was approved as a preliminary plan back in April 2023. He then went through the couple of small changes that were made since that preliminary approval. The eastern access drive was pushed a little to the west to get some additional sight-distance. Their traffic engineer looked at that for the PennDOT HOP (Highway Occupancy Permit) and that was the main plan revision. In addition to that, they have a conceptual HOP plan that they provided to them as far as what the widening of the lanes and intersections will look like.

The traffic engineer, TPD, is also working with the School District so they have some synergy there with one engineer. He believes the TIS (traffic impact study) has been approved through PennDOT at this point and they are actively working on the official HOP plans to go in.

Mr. Fisher went on to say that they are in receipt of the Township's comments, and they have no issue working with staff and addressing any of those comments. He feels they are fairly minor. He said he did notice as he was looking through the plan that the deferral for the curbing was still on the plan as a carry-over from the preliminary plan. They are showing curbing along there as part of the HOP plan, so they are going to withdraw that deferral request.

Mr. Fisher stated that is the summary of the changes they have, and he then asked for any questions/comments.

Mr. Diamond said the big issue is the sewage. We came to a determination that we are at full capacity until that major upgrade gets done. We cannot issue any EDUs until that is done.

Mr. Messick asked if we got an update on the timeline of this project.

Mr. Diamond said the timeline has been extended. He asked Caleb Krauter from HRG to elaborate.

Mr. Krauter explained that he represents the Municipal Authority. The sewer improvements project for the Capital Campus Interceptor is looking to get the permit approvals by the beginning of 2025. They will be looking to start construction of that towards the end of 2025 with completion in midyear of 2026. This is currently the anticipated schedule that has been communicated with all parties. We hope to accelerate that at all possible costs, but that is the existing schedule.

Mr. Messick asked what happened to the 2024 starting time. He said with coming to the meetings, 2024 was the time that was talked about.

Mr. Krauter explained that there are two main reasons for that. First, with working with the Developers, DEP wanted the Authority's commitment to the project attached to the first Planning Module for the Land Development; we anticipated that going in early

this year, but it was just submitted a couple of weeks ago. So that was about a 6-to-8-month delay. Also, looking at the funding options for all parties, it's going to take a few extra months. We are looking at different funding options right now but that also added more time to it.

Mr. Fisher stated that Triple Crown does understand this. They have had discussions with the Municipal Authority, so they are mainly trying to get all the approvals in place, so when the time comes, they are ready to move forward as quickly as possible.

Mr. Diamond affirmed that it makes sense to the Township to do a conditional approval. There is also talk about at some point proposing some level of work "at risk" but he didn't feel we needed to discuss that now.

Mr. Fisher agreed, saying once the timeline is a little more concrete, we can get deeper into that.

Mr. Knopp asked if there were any other questions from the Planning Commission.

Mr. Messick asked about the Rec Fee arrangement. Does owning their own facilities affect the Rec Fee?

Mr. Fure explained that is a comment the Staff has for them to address. So, we are just waiting for Triple Crown's response on that. They do have a clubhouse, a Tot Lot, and a public pool for their community.

Mr. Messick also asked about measurements and dimensions. He said he didn't see any specific measurements along 441 for the widening of the road. Is it 2 feet? 4 feet? He said it does show the curb and it does show that there is a shoulder, but there are no dimensions on the width of the road. Is this something that should have been part of the submission?

Mr. Diamond said that would be coming from PennDOT.

Mr. Fisher said PennDOT has a TIS approved currently; the traffic engineers are working through the detailed designs. There will be a lot more detailed drawings coming when the PennDOT plans are approved.

Mr. Fabian added that they do have notes to refer back to that, that this is being shown on a conceptual level until that HOP has been submitted and reviewed and approved by PennDOT.

Mr. Messick then asked if at this point, we are looking at some kind of conditional approval, will it come back to be revisited?

Mr. Diamond said no, we actually should be very specific to the Board of Commissioners for their approval consideration. If we are doing a conditional approval, it becomes an appealable thing, and the Developers would have 30 days to appeal the decision. So, if we are not comfortable with something, we want to work through that. The big item is the issuance of the EDUs. But it cannot be with a comment like “work in progress”, if we think there is an open question, we really need to work through that.

Mr. Snyder added that in this case, that is the reason they put the note at the bottom. This box reads “State Road improvements shown with this Plan are for informational purposes only and subject to change. State Road improvements must be constructed according to the approved Highway Occupancy Permit.” So, anything within the right-of-way is all subject to standards set forth by PennDOT and their traffic engineers and staff will be looking at that to make sure those standards are met with Publication 408. And then if there would be any reflective changes based upon comments they would receive from PennDOT, not only would they revise the plans from PennDOT but they will also adjust these plans accordingly. So, he then asked Mr. Diamond if we could essentially move this plan forward with that note being on there.

Mr. Diamond said, yes, absolutely.

Mr. Young added, with respect to the HOP, he saw something with PennDOT had sent it back for revision and resubmission. How extensive is the revision? And what is the status of the resubmission?

Mr. Fisher responded that the HOP has not been submitted yet. He believes that is relating to the TIS. He stated that he is not the traffic engineer, but he is under the impression that the TIS is approved.

Mr. Fabian said that his understanding was that they are producing the HOP plans now.

Mr. Diamond stated that since the School District is also in the middle of that, it is a pretty complex thing, but it's an easy "check the box" kind of thing.

Mr. Fisher added that the crosswalk was moved to the eastern side of the lane because the School District preferred it on that side for better access to their walking path.

Mr. Fabian asked if they were going to modify the guardrail there.

Mr. Fisher said they would have to.

Mr. Knopp asked for any other questions from the Planning Commission.

There were none at this time.

Mr. Knopp asked for any questions/comments from the Township Staff.

Mr. Snyder reported that he had forwarded all the Township's comments to Mr. Fisher yesterday. The biggest comment that they had to work through is basically a question with nomenclature. That is there is a provision within the Zoning Ordinance that indicates that plans shall not be designed or encouraged to have traffic back out from a parking space into an actual travel lane or active street, whether it is considered public or private street. Currently, the plan notes that are on here, both drives are considered private streets, and thus the provisions in the Zoning Ordinance kicks in so that all the parking spaces in front of the blue buildings will be doing such, so not in accordance with that. He stated that he and Mr. Fisher had a discussion on that just yesterday. It also says in our Ordinance that streets, whether public or private, shall be built to Township standards. These streets would be 8 feet short in width. So, if somewhere down the line, they would sell the property or dedicate the streets to the Township, the Township would refuse to accept dedication of the existing roads. He went on to say that changing the nomenclature from streets to access drives would clean up those deficiencies. So that will be taken care of. Other than that, everything else was either drafting or administrative issues.

Mr. Knopp asked for any questions/comments from HRG.

Mr. Fabian said that his biggest question (concerning the curb and deferral) got clarified here tonight. He said they also asked for specification on the exact asphalt mix. Same thing with some of the stormsewer calculations, but he doesn't feel these things will create an issue.

Mr. Knopp asked for any questions/comments from DCPC.

Ms. Korber asked about the gas easement for Buildings 8, 9, 10, & 11. If they would ever have to dig that up, is there any chance they would get cut off up there? Is that the responsibility of whoever is digging?

Mr. Fisher said that would have to be coordinated with the property owner as far as alternate means of access, whether it is a diversion or whatnot.

Ms. Korber then asked about the internal sidewalk. Why does it just cut off? Is it because of the front drives

Mr. Fisher said that was correct. Those three buildings have garages and driveways, so because of how much of that section is driveways, it would just be an awkward section to take the sidewalks.

Mr. Diamond asked to clarify that it is mostly all private, so would we need any easements for the public to walk off of the streets.

Mr. Fabian stated that they had talked about a future project along N. Union and easements being provided for that if it were to be pursued.

Mr. Fisher says he does recall the discussion, but he doesn't remember exactly what was said.

Mr. Diamond said that he feels a condition of a recorded easement document acceptable to the township solicitor and engineer line up with what is on the plan.

Mr. Snyder added that they are proposing that the sanitary sewer mains are going to be dedicated to the Township Authority and therefore they have noted on the plans a 30' wide sanitary sewer easement.

Mr. Diamond added that any easements shown on the plan in favor of the Township or the Municipal Authority, we would want to have instruments recorded as a condition.

Mr. Messick asked why those specific sewer mains are being dedicated to the Township.

Mr. Krauter replied that because the manholes going through there are on a private drive and not a public roadway, it needs sanitary sewer easements through there.

Mr. Diamond said that since it is being kept as private streets, we want to be clear that with the easement document, we would not have to pay to restore the ground to its original condition. Or maybe we will; we would have to think that through.

Mr. Krauter said that on the other side, for context, the desire by the Staff and our recommendation for dedication of the sewer is for 111 homes for a HOA to carry the cost for any repairs to that would many times cause issues because it is expensive to do.

[More discussion ensued on sewer easements.]

Mr. Messick asked if the whole main sewer system (which would include about 15 manholes) would be all dedicated to the Municipal Authority.

Mr. Krauter confirmed that.

Mr. Knopp asked for any questions/comments from the public.

There were none at this time.

Mr. Knopp asked the Planning Commission what they would like to do with the waiver they are requesting for the stormwater easements around the roof drains. They are requesting that they cover the easements with a note on the Plan instead of showing them on the plan set themselves.

- Mr. Messick made the motion to recommend approval
- Mr. Crawford seconded the motion.
- All were in favor.

Mr. Knopp asked the Planning Commission what they would like to do with the overall Plan itself.

Mr. Diamond suggested one of the conditions be worded carefully about the EDUs so that it doesn't come off like it is a condition to the recording of the plan. So instead of just saying "approval conditioned upon the issuance of EDUs", it should be "subject to the condition of the commencement of any improvements, construction, or issuance of building permits is conditioned upon the issuance of EDUs by the Municipal Authority."

Mr. Fisher said he didn't know that they wanted a condition on any construction starting. He feels the intention to be that once the Township has a definitive schedule, there is a lot of site work to be done before ever getting connected to the sewer. So once the Township has a definitive path forward or timeline, they would like to get started on that site work to kind of line up to where those EDUs are, and then that work would be "at risk" obviously.

Mr. Diamond said that is different then. He was thinking we were not getting into at-risk yet, but if they want to start construction, they will have to come in here again and say "we would like to propose to amend that". But we would need to talk through that more and we would need a very definitive point.

Mr. Fisher interjected that, just to clarify, they're not looking to get started immediately or this Spring, it is still quite a way out. But he wanted to make sure they were not locked in so that they could not start in the future until those EDUs are absolutely available.

Mr. Diamond stressed again that we must have something clear and definitive about what that is, what can be done, and then nail down the at-risk part, like how much the Township is willing to allow to be built at-risk.

Mr. Messick asked that since they're not going to start tomorrow, would it be warranted to table it until the next meeting where we can have the exact wording of the approval.

Mr. Diamond said that makes sense. He doesn't feel there are any big reservations about starting at-risk. But how much would we want to have done.

Mr. Fisher stated that he understands you don't want all 111 units done and just sitting there without sewer connections.

Mr. Messick added that there are still some outstanding technical details needing to be cleared up, but then also we would need the exact wording of how we want to make the motion so there is no question about it.

Mr. Crawford added if the Municipal Authority gets all their permits and has the plan out there, and we know then plan is going to be done at that point if they have the permits and the funding, that would be the point when he could start; but it sounds like it is still a year/year & a half away once they have all the permits. So, it would, after that point, be pretty definitive that they are going to go through with it.

Mr. Diamond said they may be envisioning that they want to do some things a month or so from now or in the Spring, and maybe that's ok, but that is what we need to sort out.

Mr. Fisher said he doesn't believe that is the intention.

Mr. Diamond says he understands that this is such a big project, none of us can imagine it not happening now. On the other hand, if technically the world comes apart, it gets put on a different timetable. He went on to say that he doesn't have any conceptual problem with an at-risk on this particular project, he just wants us to be very clear about what we are saying.

Mr. Crawford said he agreed with Mr. Messick that we should table this until next month when the right wording is presented to them about the conditional approval suggestion.

[More discussion ensued on the timeline of the project. The time is not a problem at this point.]

Mr. Knopp asked for a motion for this plan tonight.

- Mr. Crawford made the motion to table the plan until next month so that we can get adequate wording for the conditions.
- Mr. Messick seconded the motion.
- All were in favor.
- Plan was tabled.

c. TOC Oberlin Subdivision – Planning Commission File PC#2023-09. The Final Minor Subdivision & Land Development Plan proposes to subdivide one (1) residential lot from an existing 11.41-acre tract of land. Also, said Plan proposes to construct a new single-family dwelling, a driveway, associated utilities, and associated stormwater management / PCSM facilities.

Plan was tabled at the request of the Applicant.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

There were no further comments/concerns at this time.

OTHER BUSINESS:

January 25th Meeting - The next Planning Commission Meeting will be scheduled for Thursday, January 25, 2024, at 7:00 P.M.

GOOD & WELFARE

ADJOURN:

A motion was made by Mr. Messick and seconded by Mr. Crawford to adjourn the meeting. All were in favor.

Meeting adjourned at 8:07 P.M.

Respectfully Submitted,

Donald A. Fure, Director of Codes/Planning & Zoning