

**DERRY TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
November 6, 2013**

CALL TO ORDER

The Wednesday, November 6, 2013 Derry Township Planning Commission meeting was called to order at 6:03 p.m. in the meeting room of the Derry Township Municipal Complex, 600 Clearwater Road, Hershey, PA, by Chairman Matt Tunnell.

ROLL CALL

Commission Members Present: Matt Tunnell, Chairman; Joyce St. John, Vice Chairwoman; Gregg Mangione, Secretary; Ned Wehler; Glenn Rowe

Commission Members Absent: None

Also Present: Chuck Emerick, Director of Community Development; Brandon Williams, Assistant Director of Community Development; Diane Krug, Dauphin County Planning Commission representative; Jenelle Stumpf, Community Development Secretary

Public Registering Attendance: Sydney J. Ruble; Micki Molinari; Anthony J. Molinari; Dan Schiavoni; Patti Schiavoni; Ron Lucas, Stevens & Lee; Eric Mountz, Traffic Planning & Design; Keith Heigel, Light-Heigel & Associates; Kenny Hinebaugh, Evans Engineering; Ty Eby; Anne Searer; Gilbert Jenkins; Gail Mongold; Sam and Linda Kelly, 857 Zurich Drive, Hummelstown; Sharon and Bill Bikle, 570 Hilltop Road; Sandy Ballard, 650 Cocoa Avenue; Matt Weir, 1986 Church Road; Kathy and Steven Seidl, 1312 Sand Hill Road, Hummelstown; Tracy Devenyi, 828 Zurich Drive, Hummelstown; Sally Griffith, 1318 Sand Hill Road; Greg and Mary Ann Gregory, 1320 Sand Hill Road, Hummelstown

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

On a motion made by Vice Chairwoman St. John and seconded by Member Rowe, the Planning Commission unanimously approved the minutes of the October 1, 2013 meeting as written.

OLD BUSINESS

A. Report of the Board of Supervisors' action regarding the Preliminary/Final Land Development Plan for East Point Trade Center – Building C, Plat #1234

Mr. Emerick stated that the Board of Supervisors conditionally approved the plan.

B. Report of the Board of Supervisors' action regarding the Revised Preliminary/Final Land Development Plan for Milton Hershey School Capital Improvements, Plat #1237

Mr. Emerick stated that the Board of Supervisors approved the plan.

DERRY TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
November 6, 2013

C. Review and recommendation of proposed Ordinance No. 637 to amend Chapter 225 (Zoning) of the Code of the Township of Derry by defining and regulating formula fast casual restaurants

Mr. Emerick explained that when this ordinance was initially presented, the Dauphin County Planning Commission made a negative recommendation. Based on that recommendation, Mr. Emerick revised certain aspects of the ordinance so that it would be more defensible; however, it seems as though the Dauphin County Planning Commission's second review resulted in an even more negative recommendation. Mr. Emerick thinks the time has come for the Derry Township Planning Commission to make a recommendation on the ordinance, even if it is negative, so that the issue can move forward to the Board of Supervisors. Mr. Emerick added that the Township's solicitor, Jon Yost, has reviewed the revisions and finds them acceptable. Mr. Emerick summarized the revisions as follows:

1. Modified the enabling section of the ordinance to correct language that appeared to overly protect only the local economy and local establishments.
2. Removed the application of the Chocolate Avenue Preservation Overlay district requirements from areas not subject to those standards. This requirement has been replaced with 225-176.A.(2) of the Zoning Ordinance.
3. Allow 4 formula fast casual restaurants in what is planned to be the more comprehensively-developed area of the Village.

Chairman Tunnell stated that the Uniformity clause of the Pennsylvania Constitution makes it hard to treat businesses differently. He understands the concept of the ordinance and does not think it is inappropriate to make provisions for locally-based restaurants, but he has a hard time with the ordinance as a planner and a Planning Commission member because it does not follow the MPC and is bad planning. He strongly supports the architectural controls to maintain a desirable downtown, but this ordinance seems to be taking the matter past the role of planning.

Vice Chairwoman St. John asked why formula fast casual restaurants need to have an extra burden of design restrictions.

Chairman Tunnell stated that he agrees with the Dauphin County Planning Commission's recommendation that the ordinance should not be adopted. Mr. Emerick asked if it would be better to regulate the formula fast casual restaurant use through a conditional use process. Chairman Tunnell answered that he is indifferent on that matter. Member Wehler noted that a benefit of the conditional use process is that each case would be evaluated individually. Chairman Tunnell wondered if any other municipalities have successfully instituted such restrictions. Mr. Emerick noted that to his knowledge, Derry Township is the only municipality in Pennsylvania that has a fast casual restaurant ordinance.

Member Wehler thinks the proposed regulations seem very restrictive and will make it even more difficult to attract investments in the downtown area. Chairman Tunnell added that the ordinance does

**DERRY TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
November 6, 2013**

nothing to advance downtown development. There are already adequate regulations in place regarding the design of the downtown properties.

MOTION

Vice Chairwoman St. John made a motion to support the Dauphin County Planning Commission's recommendation that proposed Ordinance No. 637 not be adopted.

Member Wehler stated that the vision for downtown Hershey cannot be realized unless the critical mass of attraction in the community (for example: restaurants, arts, culture, retail, etc.) is developed and in place, and to try to regulate formula fast casual restaurants is not going to bring about the critical mass that is needed to have the thriving downtown that is desired.

Secretary Mangione seconded Vice Chairwoman St. John's motion, and it passed by a unanimous vote.

NEW BUSINESS

A. Review and recommendation of a waiver from filing a land development plan as requested by The Hershey Company regarding the construction of contractor buildings at the West Hershey Plant

Mr. Emerick explained that The Hershey Company's West Hershey Plant is located along the northern side of West Chocolate Avenue, in the Industrial zoning district. The Hershey Company desires to construct 5 small buildings for use by contractors that frequently visit the site for maintenance purposes. These buildings are proposed to be used as storage area and workshops. The total area of the buildings will be less than 3,250 square feet, yet there will be no increase in impervious area. The project will not require any new stormwater improvements, roads, sidewalks, employees, or parking areas, and no new traffic trips are anticipated to the property as a result of these improvements.

Kenny Hinebaugh, Evans Engineering, represented the proposal. He stated that the buildings will be completely independent from the main manufacturing facility and are accessory to the principal use.

MOTION

Secretary Mangione made a motion that the Planning Commission recommend to the Board of Supervisors that the requested waiver from filing a land development plan be granted. Vice Chairwoman St. John seconded the motion.

Member Wehler asked what provision is relied upon to be able to authorize the waiver. Mr. Emerick responded that the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance states that if more than 2,500 square feet of *principal* building is being added to lot, a land development plan is required. The proposed buildings are accessory structures, therefore a waiver can be granted.

The motion passed by a unanimous vote.

**DERRY TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
November 6, 2013**

B. Review and recommendation of Zoning Petition No. 2013-01 as filed by Molinari & Ruble Partners, L.P. to change the zoning classification of the properties addressed as 1250 Sand Hill Road, 890 Hill Church Road, 822 Hill Church Road, and 918 Hill Church Road; and to amend the text of the Zoning Ordinance by incorporating regulations for Age Qualified Residential Communities

Mr. Emerick stated that this petition addresses two separate requests. The first part requests that approximately 34.5 acres of land, with parts fronting on Bullfrog Valley Road, Hill Church Road, and Sand Hill Road, be rezoned from Neighborhood Commercial and Agricultural/Conservation to Suburban Residential. The second part is a proposal to permit a text amendment to the Zoning Ordinance to allow for an 'Age Qualified Residential Community' as a conditional use in the Suburban Residential zoning district.

The site proposed for rezoning is comprised of 4 individual, improved properties. One property is presently zoned Neighborhood Commercial and the other three are zoned Agricultural/Conservation. There is another tract that is apparently available for development which could be incorporated into this proposal. It is adjacent to Koons Park and could add approximately 5 acres to the proposed development. If it is not a part of the proposal, the 5-acre tract will end up in a reverse spot zoning situation, being stranded between the Suburban Residential and Neighborhood Commercial districts.

Mr. Emerick noted that traffic and stormwater management are two important issues that need to be discussed at length. The 1991 Comprehensive Plan noted all roads fronting this property have design deficiencies of width, slope, and alignment, and that fact remains true when these road conditions are reviewed to current standards. Stormwater has long been an issue in this area of the Township. Special care will need to be taken in erosion control, stormwater management design, and general landscaping of this property to protect the properties downslope.

The second part of this petition is for the addition of a provision (or text amendment) to the Zoning Ordinance to allow for Age Qualified Residential Communities as a conditional use in the Suburban Residential district. Mr. Emerick went over his review comments regarding the proposed text amendment.

A traffic study was submitted with this proposal, and it showed no appreciable level of service drop at any of the existing intersections adjacent to the property. The traffic study also notes that based on field observations at the study area intersections, paved shoulders and the travel lanes currently accommodate pedestrian and bicycle traffic. Mr. Emerick commented that while this statement may be true at the intersections, there is little to no accommodation for pedestrian or bicycle traffic along the roadways on any of the frontages of this property. The traffic study makes no mention of the existing roads' deficiencies of width, alignment, or grade, or their ability to support this added traffic.

Mr. Emerick commented that the proposal may be appropriate, but it does not seem timely. While this proposal would remove some Neighborhood Commercial-zoned land, which could otherwise be developed more intensely, a substantial amount would still exist. The development of that land, combined with this proposal, could overwhelm the deficient road system. Mr. Emerick suggested that the Planning Commission table this item for further consideration at a future meeting to allow the

DERRY TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
November 6, 2013

applicant time to prepare, and for staff to review, a proposal that would address the many concerns presented.

Mr. Emerick stated that the Dauphin County Planning Commission supports the proposed amendments. Diane Krug, representative for the Dauphin County Planning Commission, added that the Commission found an Age Qualified Residential Community to be an appropriate approach for residential use within the Township, and that rezoning the properties to Suburban Residential is consistent with the 1991 Comprehensive Plan.

Vice Chairwoman St. John asked if Mr. Emerick's review comments would have to be addressed prior to construction on the development starting. Mr. Emerick responded that it depends on how the Planning Commission wants to view the conditional use for the Age Qualified Residential Community. Vice Chairwoman St. John asked if Mr. Emerick's review comments were for items that need to be provided in conjunction with this proposal. Mr. Emerick stated that if the Planning Commission found any of the modifications to the text to be warranted, then that text would need to be revised and reviewed again by the Dauphin County and Derry Township Planning Commissions.

Secretary Mangione asked for the reasoning behind the Dauphin County Planning Commission's change in recommendation (from what was represented in their draft letter). Ms. Krug responded that staff prepares the draft recommendation, but it is not official until the Commission acts on it. In this case, the Commission disagreed with staff's opinion.

Member Wehler noted that Mr. Emerick mentioned 40% impervious and 50% vegetative coverage, and asked if that is what is in the text. Mr. Emerick stated it is what is in the text as presented, and that it is basically modeled after the Attached Residential district regulations. Member Wehler stated that there was also mention of 4 units per net developable acre, and asked if that is regardless of the units being multi-story or single story. Mr. Emerick responded that is correct, it is a net density.

Ron Lucas, Stevens & Lee, represented the applicants and stated that the rezoning request is consistent with the Township's 1991 Comprehensive Plan and Dauphin County's Comprehensive Plan. Based on the current zoning map, there is only one area in the Township that is zoned Suburban Residential, and the proposed development would be an infill site. It is a logical location for more Suburban Residential zoning. Mr. Lucas stated it is important to note that there is currently only one vacant Suburban Residential tract in the Township. The zoning map shows isolated tracts of Agricultural/Conservation zoning all over the Township, so it would not be out of character for the 5-acre tract mentioned by Mr. Emerick to remain Agricultural/Conservation if the surrounding zoning is changed. Reverse spot zoning indicates something being taken away from a property owner, and in the case of the 5-acre tract, it is currently and would continue to be zoned Agricultural/Conservation. Mr. Lucas also stated that Mr. Emerick's review comments on the proposed text amendment are unnecessary, as most of these ordinances are very brief. Since the Age Qualified Residential Community is being proposed as a conditional use, any conditions could be addressed through the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors review process. There would also be a separate land development plan review process.

DERRY TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
November 6, 2013

Mr. Lucas stated that the applicants will provide an executed restrictive covenant agreement and escrow to the Township Solicitor so that the agreement can be recorded with a land development plan that meets the age-restrictive requirements. The applicants have been in real estate for years and feel that there is a need for an age-restricted community. Mr. Lucas commented that the proposed development site is in an attractive location because it is close to the Medical Center, and added that not everyone wants to live in the Village of Hershey.

Regarding Mr. Emerick's text amendment review comments, Mr. Lucas stated that this type of community usually consists of condominiums or something similar, because the buyers normally want one-story units. They do not want a plot of land that they are responsible for and because of that, there will not be lots or a need for a right-of-way of the common driveway. The development will not contain a Township street, so there would be nothing for the Township to maintain or plow. This development will contain a different type of density because it is a different type of use – there are no lots. Regarding the realignment of the intersection of Bullfrog Valley Road and Sand Hill Road, this was attempted to be done by the Township before, and the key property owner was not interested in cooperating to allow it to happen. Mr. Lucas believes that if the Township would attempt the realignment again in the future, it would be an expensive and controversial project.

Keith Heigel, Light-Heigel & Associates, stated that the private common access drives are proposed to have 3 connections – Sand Hill Road, Bullfrog Valley Road, and Hill Church Road. Porous pavement is proposed for the pedestrian/bicycle paths throughout the development, and the paths will connect to existing public parks. Although 96 units are proposed, there are only 48 building footprints and therefore a smaller disturbance. There have been a lot of innovative stormwater best management practice designs and this development will provide an opportunity to use some of those new concepts, which will be beneficial to the downstream properties. Sensitive areas have been identified and conservation easements are proposed to protect those areas. Reforesting is also proposed. The development will not be a burden on the School District because no children will be living there. Pocket parks are proposed throughout the development. Mr. Heigel believes this development is an example of a smart growth concept. The common access drives would be private and would be owned, operated, and maintained by the developer. The width of the access drives would accommodate emergency vehicles but would not have extensive additional runoff. On-street parking is currently not required. The narrower streets would provide their own enforcement in regards to speeding and traffic calming, and the applicants believe they will discourage pass-through traffic. There will be no impact to threatened or endangered species and no impact to federally-listed species or wetlands. The reforestation will be included in the conservation easements. The applicants have identified 8 areas where stormwater is discharged from the property, and they believe the proposed development will be able to help mitigate existing stormwater problems in the area. Porous paving is not being proposed on the access drive cartway. Roof drains and driveways would be directed to raingardens.

Eric Mountz, Traffic Planning & Design (TPD), stated that for the traffic impact study, they looked at roadways adjacent to the site and their intersections and found that for the 96 units proposed, there would be 46 AM peak hour trips and 44 PM peak hour trips. Essentially, 40 single family dwellings would be equivalent to the 96 units proposed. TPD also found that the levels of service of the

DERRY TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
November 6, 2013

intersections would operate acceptably, with the lowest level of service being a C. They do not anticipate a detrimental impact.

Member Rowe asked if the isolated 5-acre parcel could be expanded into this development. Mr. Emerick answered that it would make sense. The applicants tried to contact the attorney handling the 5-acre property, but they did not receive a response. Member Rowe asked if the traffic study would be affected by the inclusion of the 5-acre tract into the proposed development. Mr. Emerick believes it would be. Mr. Mountz confirmed that the tract was not included in the current analysis, and a revision would be necessary.

Vice Chairwoman St. John inquired about the dimensions of the building footprint. Mr. Heigel responded that it would be 40' to 50' in width and 60' in depth, and that includes a 2-car garage. Mr. Lucas added that the size of the dimensions reflect the fact that the unit will primarily be one-floor living. Vice Chairwoman St. John asked if there will be any restrictions on the size of the footprint. Mr. Heigel answered that they will allow different looks for the units, but all of the footprints will be similar.

Member Rowe asked if the connected trail through Shank Park is currently paved. Mr. Heigel stated that it is paved to the wooded area, but then it becomes a mulched trail. The applicants propose to improve the trail crossing at Bullfrog Valley Road, add signage, and improve that section of the trail so that it is more bicycle-friendly.

Member Rowe commented that most of these types of developments have amenities such as a spa or a community center, and he thinks that contributes to the success of the development. He asked if the applicants have experienced success with developments of this type that do not have such amenities. Mr. Lucas responded that they did not mandate a community center because of the size of the community. It is possible that the applicants would propose a small community center, but that would be a detail to be worked out during the conditional use process.

Member Rowe asked what would happen if there was a request to change the age-restricted requirement, since it may be unknown how successful the development will be. Mr. Emerick stated that a similar situation occurred with the Rosemont (Highpointe) development – it was originally designed to contain 108 units, and then the developer came back to the Township to seek approval (by way of a revised land development plan) to remove the age restriction. The approval was granted, which resulted in the permitted number of units being reduced from 108 to 90. In terms of the proposed text amendment, assuming it was adopted, Chairman Tunnell asked what would happen if a request was made to not have the development be age restricted. Mr. Emerick stated that he does not know at this point how that would be addressed, but assumed it would require relief from the Zoning Hearing Board.

Mr. Lucas stated that there will be a need for these kinds of communities in Dauphin County. It is not a nursing home or an assisted living facility. The units in the proposed development are projected to sell for approximately \$450,000 each. The traffic study will have to be updated during the land development plan and/or conditional use process. If the age-restriction concept is changed, in addition to getting Township approval, the deed restriction would also be affected.

**DERRY TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
November 6, 2013**

Public Comments

Sandy Ballard, 650 Cocoa Avenue, wanted to clarify that it is not smart growth to build communities in cornfields, no matter how dense they are, unless there are amenities that can be walked or biked to.

Matt Weir, Church Road, commented that people in the Township want to know what will be done about high taxes, traffic congestion, stormwater problems, deforestation, and the quality of the neighborhoods. Rosemont (Highpointe) failed because older people do not want to drive down steep, hilly roads in bad weather, and this community is even further away from town. Regarding traffic, this area is where the traffic originates, and then it becomes a problem at the end of Bullfrog Valley Road. Mr. Weir wondered if the residents of the proposed development will complain about the Township not maintaining their roads, like what happened with the Southpoint development. Regarding stormwater, maybe we should be looking toward preserving some of the natural ability of our land to control water instead of covering 60% of a farm field with impervious coverage. Regarding deforestation, there are many people in the Township who do not want to see the trees cut down. Regarding the quality of neighborhoods, we have to be concerned about what surrounds existing neighborhoods.

Steve Seidl, Sand Hill Road (Chateau of Hershey), stated that he and his wife moved to this area a year ago with the expectation that the surrounding lands were zoned Agricultural/Conservation. He is concerned about stormwater runoff resulting from more impervious coverage; traffic and the condition of the surrounding roads; and the aesthetics of the development in regards to maximum height, density, and tree coverage. He suggested that if the Planning Commission allows the change, it should be consistent with what is there today. He does not think it makes sense to use a 20-year-old Comprehensive Plan as justification for rezoning. Mr. Seidl asked that the Commission not approve something that allows greater density than what the Zoning Ordinance currently allows. Setbacks, height restrictions, and floor area ratio limits for the subject parcels should remain intact. If the zoning is changed, the Township should ensure at that time that the stated intentions by the applicants to maximize the retention of trees are made into specific commitments and documented improvements. Mr. Seidl also questioned why age-restricted communities are being encouraged and whether Dauphin County has looked at that in terms of socio-economic characteristics. Ms. Krug responded that the County did not look at socio-economics, but there are neighboring municipalities that are already providing regulations for this type of community.

Sam Kelly commented that he has been a resident of the area for 22 years, and he is concerned about the line of sight and safety for vehicles traveling on Bullfrog Valley Road, Hill Church Road, and Sand Hill Road. There is also an issue with speeding on Hill Church Road. If improvements are not made to the existing roads, there is the potential for more traffic accidents.

Kathy Seidl, Sand Hill Road, is concerned with the number of units proposed, particularly the ones that will be right behind their property. They bought their property because of the woods, and she is not happy about the thought of losing the trees. She is also concerned about heavy stormwater runoff on Bullfrog Valley Road. Ms. Seidl stated that no amenities are available in this area, and she thinks the location for aging in place is in-town Hershey.

DERRY TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
November 6, 2013

Greg Gregory, a resident of the Chateau of Hershey, is concerned about Sand Hill Road. It is very narrow, with no shoulders and no way to improve it.

Planning Commission Comments

Secretary Mangione asked if a requirement to retain existing trees can be included in the ordinance. Mr. Emerick responded that the current ordinances only permit the removal of trees if necessary for grading, building, parking, etc. Erosion and sedimentation control plans include a “limit of disturbance”, and lately the Dauphin County Conservation District has been requiring this to be marked on the ground to ensure that what is planned on paper is what is done in the field.

Vice Chairwoman St. John asked for clarification on how many units are allowed per net developable acre (NDA) in the Suburban Residential zoning district. Mr. Emerick answered that it is 1.5 units per NDA in the Suburban Residential district; however, the Age-Restricted Community conditional use could allow for up to 4 units per NDA. Vice Chairwoman St. John commented that \$450,000 per unit is not what she envisions to be smart growth.

Member Rowe asked if there is any obligation under the Zoning Ordinance to provide the square footage of the units. Mr. Emerick stated that there is no restriction in the Zoning Ordinance for the size or cost of the units. Member Rowe is unsure whether older residents will be interested in buying a \$450,000 home that is not close to downtown.

Mr. Emerick asked if the applicants conducted a market study. Mr. Lucas responded that there is a market for this type of development and its price range.

Vice Chairwoman St. John commented that she is not sure how well the new concepts for stormwater best management practices will hold up, based on what she has observed in a new development close to her residence. Mr. Lucas stated that a significant difference with the proposed development is that it is one lot, not individual lots that would have to be maintained by individual homeowners. Vice Chairwoman St. John stated that the problem was in the design of the stormwater facilities, not the maintenance. Mr. Heigel commented that the applicants will make every effort to exceed the stormwater ordinance requirements.

Secretary Mangione asked what happens if the proposed text amendment is adopted and a different property owner wants to rezone their land to Suburban Residential. Mr. Emerick responded that by overlaying Suburban Residential district lands with the conditional use, as long as the conditions of the conditional use are met, it is then a permitted use and can be allowed on any Suburban Residential lands.

Note: Member Rowe left the meeting at 8:28 p.m.

Sandy Ballard commented that as a member of the Board of Supervisors, she wanted to emphasize that with rezoning requests, it is important to remember that the property owners can change after the rezoning is implemented. What is shown on this sketch may not end up being what is actually developed. Chairman Tunnell agreed that this is a very valid point.

**DERRY TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
November 6, 2013**

Chairman Tunnell asked why a conditional use is proposed rather than a special exception or something else. Mr. Emerick stated that he was concerned about what areas in the Township an age-restricted community could be located. Chairman Tunnell questioned how that differs from a special exception. Mr. Emerick responded that they are similar; however, a conditional use is processed through the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors, whereas a special exception is processed through the Zoning Hearing Board. He added it was his preference that the applicants propose a conditional use in the text amendment, because that way the approval would have to come from the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors.

Secretary Mangione is concerned that if the text amendment is adopted and the age-restricted community is a conditional use, if other developers propose the same thing in the future, they cannot be turned down.

Member Wehler commented that over the years there have been major erosion and runoff problems in the sand hills. The basis for 1.5 dwelling units per net developable acre in the Suburban Residential zoning district has something to do with the geography of the Township and particularly this area. Four units per acre is not compatible with this environment, based on previous experience. Under the Township's Stormwater Management Ordinance, the applicant is required to calculate increased runoff from the development and detain flows above a certain number, and they use a 2-year design storm for those calculations. Mr. Emerick stated that the easier way to explain it is they are required to make the 2-year storm "disappear." Member Wehler stated that the 2-, 5-, and 10-year storms are a lot less water than what Hershey seems to encounter every 2 years. The 2-year storm should be 12 inches of rain, not some number that might be 2.4 inches of rain. The whole Bullfrog Valley Road corridor is unable to handle *any* increase in runoff. For Member Wehler to be comfortable with this proposal, he wants to see a higher level of stormwater control than what is normally required.

Anne Searer, 866 Sand Hill Road, stated that the storm basin at the end of her driveway was never adequate to control the runoff that comes down Sand Hill Road, and it is always full of mud and rock after a rain event. She believes that until what is happening at Hill Church Road is controlled, the runoff will continue to impact properties further downhill. She also commented that when the Medical Center proposed their Hope Drive expansion, their traffic study indicated that the number of increased trips would be minimal and now, whether or not it is a result of the Hope Drive expansion, the amount of vehicles on Route 322 between the hours of 1 p.m. and 8 p.m. is near gridlock most of the time. This development will feed Bullfrog Valley Road, Sand Hill Road, and probably Middletown Road, so the traffic study needs to be extensive.

MOTION TO TABLE

Mr. Lucas asked that the proposal be tabled until the next meeting to allow the applicants to address the concerns that were raised.

On a motion by Secretary Mangione, seconded by Vice Chairwoman St. John, and a unanimous vote, the Planning Commission tabled taking action on Petition No. 2013-01.

**DERRY TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
November 6, 2013**

OTHER BUSINESS

None.

ADJOURNMENT

On a motion made by Vice Chairwoman St. John, seconded by Secretary Mangione, and a unanimous vote, the meeting adjourned at 9:19 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregg Mangione
Secretary

Submitted by:

Jenelle Stumpf
Community Development Secretary