

DERRY TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
June 2, 2016

CALL TO ORDER

The Thursday, June 2, 2016 Derry Township Planning Commission meeting was called to order at 6:02 p.m. in the meeting room of the Derry Township Municipal Complex, 600 Clearwater Road, Hershey, PA, by Chairwoman Joyce St. John.

ROLL CALL

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

Commission Members Absent: None

Also Present: Chuck Emerick, Director of Community Development; Brandon Williams, Assistant Director of Community Development; Chris Brown, Derck & Edson; A. J. Schwarz, Environmental Planning & Design; Jenelle Stumpf, Community Development Secretary

Public Registering Attendance: Mark and Lindy Plevelich, 1061 Greenhill Dr.; Robert K. Erwin, 1745 Brookline Dr.; Susan E. Peters, 1132 Draymore Ct.; Carolyn Stoner, Hershey Medical Center; Susan Kreider, 1405 Woodhaven Dr.; Judy Lyter, 445 Drayer Dr.; Trish Foster, 2439 Raleigh Rd.; Susan Leitzell, 545 Windsor Ct., Hummelstown; Noah, Mike, and Vicki Gesford, 1336 Fox Glen Rd., Hummelstown; Dan and Gail Tunnell, 1156 Draymore Ct.; Dale Holte, 2279 Southpoint Dr.; Steve Ramis, 2015B Southpoint Dr.; Carol Gisselquist, 29 W. Governor Rd., Hershey; Randy Wright, 1342 E. Derry Rd., Hershey; Todd Pagliarulo, 321 Concord Ct., Hershey; Roy Michaelson, 1169 Wicklow Ct., Hummelstown; Phil Friedrich, 440 W. Chocolate Ave.; Justin Betti, WGAL-TV; Kelly Fagley, 538 Cedar Ave.; Deb Malaro, 1245 Stonegate Rd., Hummelstown; Peg Darr, 579 Windsor Ct.; Stephen Hinkle, The Hershey Company; Ken Gall, Hershey Trust; Anne Searer, 2125 Carey Way, Hummelstown; Brian Shiflett, 1565 Landvater Rd.; Susan Werkman, 941 Muirfield Dr.; Bill Jersey, 1158 Draymore Ct.; Tony Seilz, Delta Development Group; Robert Werkman, MD; Desiree and John Brougher, 35 Ethel Ave., Hummelstown; Sandy Ballard, 650 Cocoa Ave.; Paul Thompson, 73 Elm Ave.; Julie Neal; Dennis Burd; Ronald C. Furlan, 1903 Limestone Dr., Hummelstown; Juliet Waldroon, 1241 Coolidge Ave., Hershey; Jan and Matt Weir, Church Rd.; Nancy Tulli, Draymore Ct.; Dave Weaver, 1163 Galway Ct.; Paul Myers, 545 Windsor Ct.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

On a motion made by Secretary Tunnell and seconded by Vice Chairman Rowe, the Planning Commission unanimously approved the minutes of the May 3, 2016 meeting, as written.

**DERRY TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
June 2, 2016**

OLD BUSINESS

A. Report of the Board of Supervisors' action regarding the Preliminary/Final Land Development Plan for the Milton Hershey School Staff Homes on Crest Lane, Plat #1266

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

NEW BUSINESS

A. Review and comment on the Draft Zoning Ordinance

Chris Brown, Derck & Edson, explained that the updated and revised draft Zoning Ordinance is a direct outgrowth of the 2015 Comprehensive Plan. This process started as an audit of the existing Zoning Ordinance, which was adopted in 1993. It has been noted over the years that there are a number of issues or deficiencies with the existing Zoning Ordinance regarding current development trends and the nature of properties in the Township.

Mr. Brown referenced the Land Use Table in the draft Ordinance and stated that in the existing Ordinance, one has to go page by page, zoning district by zoning district, to figure out what uses are permitted in each district. The proposed Land Use Table contains the same information but presents it in a much more user-friendly, tabular format. In the Table, 'P' means Permitted; 'SE' means the use is permitted by Special Exception; 'C' means it is permitted by Conditional Use; and 'O' means the use is permitted by an overlay.

Mr. Brown stated that the proposed Ordinance contains a new Zoning Map. It is not substantially different from the existing Zoning Map. There will also be maps showing the overlays. The existing Ordinance has more traditional environmental overlays such as Airport Safety Zone, floodplain, etc. The draft Zoning Ordinance proposes Thoroughfare, Environmental, and Development Approval Areas overlays. Through the overlays, the Township will be able to provide the incentive to develop in a manner that protects certain things such as the aesthetic or the character of an area of the Township, and empower certain uses that fit the character and nature of place in targeted areas but should not be permitted everywhere within a zoning district.

Mr. Brown explained that each zoning district will also have a "dashboard view" page that provides a more graphic and legible approach to the zoning district requirements. Finally, Mr. Brown noted that another new aspect of the draft Zoning Ordinance is the Master Plan approval process.

PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENTS

Vice Chairman Rowe commented that in regard to the corridor overlays, he is concerned about the Hersheypark Drive corridor and preserving access to the Park. If more traffic signals and driveways are added along Hersheypark Drive in conjunction with future development, accessing the Park will

DERRY TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
June 2, 2016

become problematic. Is there anything in the proposed Zoning Ordinance that will help with access management? Mr. Brown responded that this issue will not be addressed specifically by the corridor overlays; however, within the Master Plan approval process, there is a lot of specific talk about access management, traffic impacts, and understanding the effect of additional development on surrounding areas. He added that the Thoroughfare Overlays are more about aesthetics.

Chairwoman St. John asked if a developer will be required to address, as part of the Master Plan process, the issue of the surrounding infrastructure being able to support the traffic that will be generated by the proposed development. Mr. Brown answered yes. The Master Plan process refers to a specific set of required documents that need to be submitted, including infrastructure and traffic plans. The developer will need to plan for those aspects of the development but at a Master Plan level so that there is a holistic approach to traffic mitigation. Chairwoman St. John questioned if the maintenance responsibility for the infrastructure will fall on the Township. Mr. Brown said it depends on the project and the nature of the improvements. If the improvements are related to the project, they will be the responsibility of the developer.

Member Santostefano commented that he thinks this is probably the most user-friendly Zoning Ordinance he has ever seen, and he hopes the general public will see that as well. He also thinks the Zoning Ordinance is a good interpretation of the intent of the Comprehensive Plan.

Member Wehler noted that within the Policy, Goals, and Objectives section of the Zoning Ordinance (§225-103), there is reference to the intent to preserve natural, scenic, and historic values in the environment; preserve forests and wetlands; prevent overcrowding and congestion in traveling and transportation; and preserve prime agricultural and sensitive environmental areas. He then asked the consultants to describe how they went about writing the Zoning Ordinance to achieve those goals. Mr. Brown responded that in addition to the overlays, which speak specifically to some of those environmental and characteristic features, there is another map in the Zoning Ordinance that addresses floodplains, steep slopes, and environmentally sensitive areas. A lot of this information was carried forward from the existing Zoning Ordinance. Language was added regarding the preservation of trees, particularly in the sand hills and the heavily-forested areas of the Township. The consultants' goal was to be able to achieve density while putting less of a burden on the natural ecosystems.

Member Wehler asked how this Zoning Ordinance preserves and assures open space. A. J. Schwartz, Environmental Planning & Design, stated that §403.2.1 (Sensitive Environmental Resources) and §403.2.2 (Floodplain Overlay) address the environmental overlays. The current Ordinance already has requirements regarding limited disturbance areas. The consultants continued those requirements but also expanded them. Member Wehler asked if the requirements are more tied to environmental characteristics than to fundamental land use. Mr. Schwartz answered that is true. He added that the overlays are intended not only from an aesthetics standpoint but also a utilitarian standpoint to address stormwater and watershed management.

Member Wehler asked how the avoidance of traffic congestion is accomplished when the proposed Zoning Ordinance allows a buildout that would greatly increase the population. Mr. Brown

DERRY TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
June 2, 2016

responded that to a certain degree, those types of developments are going to occur on large tracts and the developer will have the option of using the Master Plan process that requires a much more holistic approach to traffic mitigation on the front-end of the project. Member Wehler questioned if the Master Plan process is successful, how could the Township otherwise be successful with the piecemeal development approach? Mr. Schwarz stated that the road overlay is not just about aesthetics, it is also about addressing the fact that in the future, certain roads may need to have additional capacity. Also, the Official Map will document which corridors have the ability to support additional traffic and where those road improvements would be needed.

Secretary Tunnell commented that the proposed Zoning Ordinance is preceded by a long and exhaustive Comprehensive Plan process in which many community members were involved. He asked where on the Zoning Map the new Zoning Ordinance varies from the Comprehensive Plan, in terms of use, and where zoning changes are being made. Mr. Brown responded that to a certain extent, the new Zoning Map is endeavoring to implement the Comprehensive Plan throughout the entire Township, so it is difficult to say exactly where the areas of change are. There are several zoning color changes; however, the permitted uses are very consistent with the 2015 Comprehensive Plan.

Member Wehler inquired about the O9, O8, etc. designations that appear in some of the tables. Mr. Schwarz explained that 'O' stands for 'Overlay', and the number identifies which overlay district is being referenced.

Member Wehler commented that over the years the Planning Commission has dealt with numerous requests for waivers regarding the installation of sidewalks and asked if the Zoning Ordinance addresses that. Are certain areas designated as areas where the Township desires to have sidewalks? Is there any guidance on the matter? Mr. Emerick responded that the sidewalk requirements in the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance were recently amended to allow the Township to require a fee in lieu of the installation of sidewalk in areas where sidewalk is not desired by the Township. That way, the developer is still contributing to the walkability of the Township. Prior to that amendment, the options were either for the Township to grant a deferment of installation, grant a waiver, or require the installation. Also, the Official Map will define areas where sidewalk should or should not be. Sidewalk regulations are typically not addressed in a Zoning Ordinance. Member Wehler stated that during the Comprehensive Plan process there was a lot of discussion about having a walkable and bike-able community, so he was hopeful this Zoning Ordinance would address that. Mr. Emerick replied that some allotments were made with setbacks in the downtown area to encourage walkability and noted that the Comprehensive Plan makes recommendations regarding the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance and Official Map in addition to the Zoning Ordinance.

Chairwoman St. John asked if a developer who chooses the Master Plan approval process for a large tract of land must include the entire tract in the Master Plan, or if they are allowed to divide it into phases. Mr. Schwartz stated that the intent is for the developer to represent the entire parcel, even if not as much detail is provided for areas of the tract that are designated as future development areas. Mr. Emerick thinks that the section in the Zoning Ordinance regarding the Master Plan approval

DERRY TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
June 2, 2016

process should include language requiring the developer to present a sketch plan showing future street connections through adjacent, undeveloped properties when the subject property is landlocked. Chairwoman St. John clarified that her concern is the overall impact of the development of a large parcel of land on the surrounding infrastructure still will not be addressed. Mr. Schwartz responded that when he says “future development area”, the developer may need to take an honest, hard look at what they think that future development will be, and if the details of the future development change after the Township approves the Master Plan, the developer must receive approval from the Township for the proposed changes.

Vice Chairman Rowe asked the consultants to explain the incentive for a developer to use the Master Plan process if they may have to revise it several years later. Mr. Brown responded that the incentive is to think holistically and plan a smart and thoughtful development. Specific incentives could be increased density as a tradeoff for more consolidated, organized open space or the ability to adjust setbacks and lot configurations to create more of a town center or collegiate campus concept.

In response to a question from Secretary Tunnell, Mr. Brown stated that the Master Plan process cannot change the permitted uses within the zoning district, and the regulations were intentionally drafted that way. Secretary Tunnell asked if the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code would allow it. Mr. Schwarz stated that he would have to do some legal research. Secretary Tunnell commented that allowing a change of use under the Master Plan process could be a way to protect the Township from situations such as what happened with the development of Sheetz at 777 Middletown Road where what was initially discussed during the zoning change and what ended up being constructed were different things. How can the Township make sure that the unintended consequences of a zoning change and piecemeal development do not occur? Mr. Brown responded that the way to protect is through the base zoning. The Master Plan process is not open for a debate on uses. That is part of the reason the consultants started including the overlays on the Zoning Map so that certain uses could be empowered in the overlay areas without the unintended consequences of rezoning occurring.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Dale Holte, 2279 Southpoint Drive, member of the Deer Run Homeowners Association and the Middletown Road Coalition. Mr. Holte stated that he has some reservations with these changes and noted that the public was not involved in the process of drafting the proposed Zoning Ordinance. During the 2015 Comprehensive Plan review process there was a lot of public input and reassurance from Township officials that the adoption of the Comprehensive Plan would not change base zoning in the Township. Mr. Holte stated that the proposed Zoning Ordinance changes the base zoning dramatically. Referencing the book *Beyond Rust: Metropolitan Pittsburgh and the Fate of Industrial America* by Allen Dieterich-Ward, Mr. Holte stated that decision making should be broadly based; too much concentrated power, political or economic, undermines the creation and pursuit of new ideas. Mr. Holte opined that the danger in what is proposed is that the zoning change may fail the critical test of placing too much decision-making power in too few hands.

DERRY TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
June 2, 2016

These changes will bind the Township and its residents for many years. There should be more review and discussion before the Zoning Ordinance is adopted.

Randy Wright, 1342 East Derry Road, stated that he is encouraged by the proposed Palmdale Chocolate Avenue Overlay because it would be nice to see sidewalks and landscaping in this area. Mr. Wright commented that his neighborhood is almost entirely single family dwellings. There are some duplexes and apartment units that existing prior to the current Zoning Ordinance. The proposed Palmdale Mixed Use zoning district would allow many commercial uses and Mr. Wright does not see how those uses could possibly fit into the character of the neighborhood. The Derry Road Overlay would allow for even more commercial and high density residential uses. The main points of access for the properties in Mr. Wright's neighborhood are from the alleys behind the properties. Will the proposed commercial uses' points of access also be from the alleys? Mr. Wright was offended when he learned that the Zoning Ordinance proposes that East Derry Road should be a thoroughfare. He has fought for 29 years for it to *not* become a thoroughfare and in his opinion, traffic should be directed to Lingle Avenue, the Hersheypark Drive extension, and East Chocolate Avenue so that the east end of East Derry Road can be closed off. Mr. Wright requested that the Palmdale Mixed Use district be refined to better reflect and preserve the majority of the existing uses, and that the Derry Road Overlay be eliminated because in his opinion, it is not necessary.

Dave Weaver, 1163 Galway Court, noted that there is a significant increase in the number of permitted uses in the proposed Planned Campus West district and asked how many of those uses are subject to the Master Plan approval process. Mr. Brown responded that a fairly large portion of the western side of the Township would have the opportunity to use the Master Plan process. Mr. Weaver asked if that means uses could be established without Master Plan approval. Mr. Brown answered yes, as long as they are permitted uses. Mr. Weaver and his neighbors in the Oakmont area are concerned about the lack of consideration for some of the long term effects of potential future development without proper forethought for traffic, stormwater runoff, erosion, etc. Has there been discussion about the potential tax burden on the school district and what significant development would result in as far as increased school and educational needs? Mr. Weaver stated that he is not necessarily opposed to the zoning change, but he does not think there is any need to rush this process without getting some baseline data together to determine what the long term effects of the development might be.

Steve Ramis, 2015B Southpoint Drive, President of the Southpoint Homeowners Association, member of the Middletown Road Coalition. Mr. Ramis stated that during the Comprehensive Plan process, the residents were told there would be no wholesale changes to zoning; however, now that is being proposed. The proposed additional permitted uses will open up opportunities without the Township, Planning Commission, or the public being able to see what is planned before the developer begins construction. Mr. Ramis is also concerned that increased traffic from future development will adversely affect Middletown Road.

Chuck Gassert, 1345 Bradley Avenue, commented that agricultural land should not be viewed as something that has to be developed in order to be useful. There is also a great aesthetic value to

DERRY TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
June 2, 2016

agricultural land and open space. Regarding the Planned Campus West district, it seems as though some of the changes that are being proposed are being made in response to developers' pre-existing plans instead of the opposite, which is how it should be done. He is concerned that some of the proposed improvements for this area would potentially involve a lot of additional people and traffic, which would make existing traffic problems worse. Mr. Gassert thinks the Township needs to further study the impacts on traffic, stormwater, sewer capacities, school capacities, fire protection, police protection, etc., because they could be severely impacted with significant development in the Planned Campus West area.

Brian Shiflett, 1565 Landvater Road, President of the Derry Township School District Board of Directors, stated that he and the School District's Superintendent, Joe McFarland, jointly prepared the comments that Mr. Shiflett is presenting. Some may assume that the School District would be adverse to changes in land use regulations that could lead to significantly higher student enrollment, but what is important to the School District is its understanding of the scope and timing of enrollment changes, plus having a sufficiently expanded tax base to fund any increased number of students in the schools. Currently the schools are running at close to functional capacity, but below capacity. The School District may decide through the course of its ongoing educational plan to pursue changes to its facilities, and if presented with shifts in long-term enrollment patterns, ideally the District should merge those requirements into a common planning effort. Doing so will result in making more informed decisions and smaller likelihood of wasting taxpayer dollars. Mr. Shiflett stated that the School District's initial review of the draft Zoning Ordinance has not yet generated any significant student enrollment concerns within their 5-10 year planning windows. The School District recognizes that the continued potential of residential-to-commercial conversions within the two mixed use districts could be a decreasing factor on student enrollment projections. The District will further study the proposed Planned Campus West district and the Master Plan approval process for potential enrollment impacts and taxable assessment base impacts. Mr. Shiflett stated that in today's dollars, it requires about \$700,000 worth of a taxable assessment base, plus \$2,000 annually in School District-collected EIT and occupation taxes to fund a student's education in order for the School District to break even. He asked the Planning Commission to consider whether the spectrum of uses in the Planned Campus West district will generate those levels of local tax revenue if a significant amount of residential dwelling units are developed, thereby increasing student enrollment projections. Mr. Shiflett stated that the School District will continue its collaboration with the Township to ensure its understanding of the draft Zoning Ordinance.

Secretary Tunnell asked if the School Board has given consideration to the location of schools, particularly elementary schools, based on demographic changes in order to minimize bussing and the amount of time kids spend being transported to and from school. Mr. Shiflett answered that in the past it was a consideration, but it is not currently in the School District's plans. He does not think zoning changes will influence that decision because it is advantageous to have all of the students on one campus.

DERRY TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
June 2, 2016

Sandy Ballard, 650 Cocoa Avenue, had the following questions and suggestions:

- Is there any way to mark the things that have not changed in the Zoning Ordinance so the public can be informed?
- On Page 1, §225-103 (Policy, Goals and Community Development Objectives) states that one of the goals of the Zoning Ordinance is preventing blight. Ms. Ballard stated that she did not see where the Ordinance addresses blight property maintenance issues and wondered if it is mentioned in a specific section.
- On Pages 2 and 3 and throughout the document, reference is made to additional information that is available at the Township offices. Ms. Ballard suggested that items which include this reference should also include a link so the public can view the additional information online instead of having to go to the Township offices.
- Regarding the Zoning Ordinance Land Use Table on Pages 5 through 8, there should be a key on each page to identify what 'P', 'SE', 'C', etc. mean.
- On Page 14, §225-206.H.13 states that parking spaces are a permitted encroachment in required yard areas for single-family detached, single family semidetached, single-family attached, two-family detached, and multifamily apartment dwellings having less than four dwelling units per building. Ms. Ballard asked if that means parking would be allowed in front of the building or dwelling. Mr. Emerick responded that those regulations are already in the current Zoning Ordinance. Ms. Ballard questioned if that is permitted throughout the Township because allowing parking in front of buildings does not create a nice, encouraging atmosphere for walking.
- Regarding the concept of 'screening', on Page 15 it is referred to as 'visual screen' and on Page 54 it is referred to as a 'landscaped buffer.' Ms. Ballard does not think that landscaping provides enough of an opaque screen to block the view of a parking lot. The term 'screening' should be defined so that the level of transparency can be measured.
- On Page 25 (the Environmental Overlay Map) there is a small gap in the designation of the stream that runs in front of the library.
- On Page 48, §225-401.7 (Bicycle Parking Standards) states that a facility for securing a minimum of 2 bicycles shall be provided any time a non-residential parking facility is modified. Ms. Ballard asked what happens if it is a large facility - won't there be a need for more than 2 bicycle parking spaces? Mr. Emerick responded that Township staff and the consultants were not focused on large properties because the large companies usually take care of their employees who want to bike to work. The concern was for the smaller properties to ensure that some type of bicycle parking facility is provided. The Zoning Ordinance also provides a capped incentive for the developer to provide extra bicycle spaces. Ms. Ballard suggested that the

DERRY TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
June 2, 2016

regulations should be revised so that more spaces are required for larger properties. Mr. Brown stated that bicycle parking should be a public facility. For example, bike racks are part of the streetscape design for the public realm of the downtown area. The consultants were trying to make bicycle parking equitable for everyone.

- On Page 50, under §225-402.2 (Community Heritage Buffer Areas), reference is made to “the normal water line” and on Page 56, under §225-403.2.2 (Floodplain Overlay), reference is made to “the top-of-bank” of any watercourse. Ms. Ballard thinks those terms need to be defined and used consistently.
- All defined terms should be in bold text throughout the document.
- On Page 51, §225-403.1.C.2 (regarding the Palmdale Chocolate Avenue Overlay) states that “*bike lanes, sidewalks, or a combination thereof shall be provided, where feasible, by applicants proposing development.*” Ms. Ballard then learned that “where feasible” means “possible to do easily or conveniently.” She recommended that the wording be revised to state that the bike lanes or sidewalks shall be put in unless there is a hardship on the developer. Mr. Emerick commented that if the installation of sidewalks or bike paths was made a requirement in the Zoning Ordinance, it would mean that every property in the Township that currently does not have sidewalks or bike paths would be in violation of the Ordinance. He reiterated that these amenities are regulated under the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance. Ms. Ballard argued her point further. Mr. Brown stated that the discussion of the installation of sidewalks would not come under the Zoning Ordinance and the section that Ms. Ballard is referring to would not change the requirements of the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance. Ms. Ballard responded in that case, the proposed wording in the Zoning Ordinance is inconsistent with the requirements of the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, and it should be revised.
- On Page 55, §225-403.2.1.B states in part: “*Sensitive environmental areas shall not be physically disturbed or used for any use other than...*” Ms. Ballard thinks the term “physically disturbed” needs to be defined so that everyone is on the same page.
- Regarding §225-403.2.2.G (appeals and variances in the Floodplain Overlay) on Page 69, Ms. Ballard stated that there is a special kind of definition for variances in the Floodplain Overlay and asked if that changes the normal hardship standard for variances. Are there two different standards, and is that legal? She also asked how “good and sufficient cause” for the variance is determined. Mr. Emerick stated that FEMA requires this language. Ms. Ballard responded that maybe the wording should be revised to state “as defined by FEMA”, because “good and sufficient cause” is a vague term.
- On Page 85 (regarding signs), §225-403.5.D.G seems to imply that the Township buildings would be allowed to have flashing, beacon, strobing, moving, animated, or scrolling image signs. Ms. Ballard thought that the Township was not in favor of these types of signs. Mr.

DERRY TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
June 2, 2016

Brown commented that this section is intended for safety controls, and language can be added to clarify that.

- On Page 100, §225-403.5.J seems to say that numerous flashing signs would be permitted along Hersheypark Drive, and Ms. Ballard is not sure that is what the Township really desires. She is also concerned that this would “open the floodgates” for allowing flashing signs throughout the Township.

Ron Furlan, 1903 Limestone Drive, asked how the proposed Zoning Ordinance will affect existing properties that are already under development. For example, could the Sheetz store on Middletown Road be allowed to increase the number of gas pumps after the Ordinance is adopted, leading to increased traffic to the site?

Sandy Ballard, 650 Cocoa Avenue, commented that during the Comprehensive Plan process, there was a lot of focus on the desire for preserving open space and promoting infill development. Ms. Ballard thinks that if we want open space, there needs to be some kind of official mechanism in place to buy open space or trade development credits to acquire the land. These issues do not appear to be addressed in the Zoning Ordinance. Mr. Brown noted that aspects of the Downtown Core Overlay and other overlays focus on infill development.

Phil Friedrich, 440 West Chocolate Avenue, stated that the comments made this evening are valuable because they help the process move forward as it should. The draft Zoning Ordinance has clearly been developed by using the Comprehensive Plan as a platform. The regulations in the Downtown Core Overlay, whether they relate to signage or setbacks, give the average person the opportunity to easily understand what is allowable or encouraged.

Member Wehler commented that this document was presented as a draft, and the Planning Commission and the public had an opportunity to discuss it and provide comments. He did not hear any comments that are incongruous with the process or the document.

OTHER BUSINESS

None.

**DERRY TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
June 2, 2016**

ADJOURNMENT

On a motion made by Secretary Tunnell, seconded by Member Santostefano, and a unanimous vote, the meeting adjourned at 8:11 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Matthew Tunnell
Planning Commission Secretary

Submitted by:

Jenelle Stumpf
Community Development Secretary (*stenographer*)