

HALFMOON TOWNSHIP
Planning Commission Meeting
Joint Session with Board of Supervisors
July 20, 2010 **7:00 pm**

Present: Danelle Del Corso, Bob Eberhart, Larry Fennessey, Jordan Finkelstein, Lorin Nauman, John Stevens
Absent: Joe Tylka, Sebastian DeGregorio
Others present: Susan Steele, Township Manager; D. J. Liggett, CRPA; Dave Piper, Zoning Officer; Eric Casanave, PennTerra Engineering; Melissa Gartner, recording secretary

1. Call To Order

Chair Lorin Nauman called the meeting to order at 7:02 p.m.

2. Citizen Comments

None

3. Approval of July 6, 2010 Minutes

Motion. Mr. Eberhart moved to approve the minutes of July 6, 2010. Ms. Del Corso seconded. Vote: 6-0

4. Reports

a. BOS Update

The BOS will publish the water/geothermal ordinance and the wind turbine ordinance a second time, and will bring them for a vote at their first meeting in August.

At their meeting this week (July 22), they will discuss Jim Nixon's subdivision and will listen to the consultant for Mr. Mark Maloney give a ten-minute presentation on their development concept for Patton Township. The Township's position at this time is that there will be no approvals until something is applied for. Ms. Steele is looking into a way to recover some of the cost of staff time from working on this particular project. Also, Patton Township has said Mr. Maloney should not resubmit to them until he speaks to Halfmoon Township. Patton Township wants Halfmoon to know that Mr. Maloney is planning to add an access road for emergency services in Halfmoon Township. This cannot be approved by the BOS at their meeting on Thursday, July 22 since no application has been submitted.

b. Zoning Officer's Report

Mr. Piper stated he has nothing to report. He completed his first soil log on July 7. No subdivisions are coming in the near future.

5. Final Subdivision Plat, Halfmoon LLC (formerly Orchard Manor)

Mr. Eric Casanave, PennTerra Engineering, presented the revised plan for the former Orchard Manor development. This is also known as the Jim Nixon subdivision.

The PC had approved this plan in March. In May, DEP rejected the planning module because of the lot configuration at that time. Lots 3 and 4 were previously divided vertically; with the new plat, Lots 3 and 4 are divided horizontally. Access to Lot 4 will be via a shared driveway from Orchard Road through Lot 3. This configuration is more environmentally friendly and follows DEP's recommendations. Because of the reconfiguration, Mr. Casanave needs to resubmit the map to the PC and get BOS approval. It has been reviewed by the Centre Region and Mr. Piper. Mr. Casanave then addressed the written comments from CRPA. The correct acreage (45.2175 acres) is listed on the map. He will add a note that the existing buildings on Lot 1 are actually partially demolished foundations. The plan does now list test pits and shows the correct 100 foot riparian buffer on Lot 1.

Ms. Liggett raised the issue of sewage drain fields in the riparian buffer. Mr. Casanave asked her to list what activities are allowed and what are specifically prohibited in the riparian buffer. After Ms. Liggett read from the ordinance, Mr. Casanave and other PC members discussed that some of the activities and explanations could be interpreted in more than one way. Ms. Steele asked if it would be wise to put a drain field in the riparian buffer. Mr. Casanave explained that normally you would not want a drain field in the buffer. The drain field was not in the wetland area, only on the edge of a drawn-in buffer. Mr. Piper, as Sewage Enforcement Officer, said his recommendation was not to label the primary and secondary septic locations. Mr. Fennessey pointed out that the only test bed that affects the riparian area is #26 on Lot 4, and is a matter of how the graphical representation is shown. He then measured on the map and said that the buffer near #26 was drawn much larger than 50 feet. If it were redrawn accurately, #26 would not fall inside the riparian buffer.

Ms. Steele said in this instance, the sewage encroachment is not an issue, but the ordinance may need to be reviewed. Her main concern is that the plan needs to conform to the current ordinance.

Discussion continued on the issue of the location of the fire protection tank. Mr. Fennessey read the ordinance language and interpreted the meaning as permitting large containers for water treatment. In his opinion, the location of the 4,000 gallon fire protection tank near Orchard Road between Lots 2 and 3 is allowed by the ordinance. In response to a question, Mr. Nauman said the amount of chlorine in this type of tank is similar to that in a home swimming pool. Mr. Casanave said that the fire chief chose the location for its access to Lots 2 and 3 and easy access to Orchard Road.

After reviewing CRPA's list of concerns, the PC members felt that all of the conditions were met with the exception of the drain field near test plot #26 on Lot 4. Mr. Casanave then corrected the buffer zone boundary on the mylar plan so it accurately showed test plot #26 located outside the buffer. He also added the note about existing building outlines on Lot 1 to the mylar copy. The text addition read as

follows: "The building outlines shown on Lot 1 are former building sites and are depicted for informational purposes only."

As a note, this would be the first plan to come through after the riparian ordinance was passed.

Motion. Ms. Del Corso moved to accept the plan pending receipt of DEP's approval and collection of the appropriate signatures. Mr. Stevens seconded. Vote: 6-0.

Mr. Nauman, Mr. Fennessey, and Mr. Piper signed the plan to be recorded.

6. Adjournment

Motion. Ms. Del Corso moved to adjourn. Mr. Finkelstein seconded. Vote: 6-0.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Melissa Gartner
Recording Secretary