

**HALFMOON TOWNSHIP
Planning Commission Meeting
April 5, 2016**

Present: Jason Little, Chair; Kathy Kelley; Mike Brown; Lorin Nauman; Melissa Gartner; Bob Strouse

Others Present: Tammy Terosky, Recording Secretary; Susan Steele, Township Manager; Ken Soder, Zoning Officer; Erica Ehly, CRPA; Trish Meek, CRPA

Not Present: Jeff Martin

Citizens Present: None

1. Call to Order:

Chairman Little called the meeting to order at 7:09 P.M.

2. Citizens Comments:

None

3. Approval of Minutes:

Mr. Little motioned to approve the March 1, 2016 minutes. Mr. Nauman moved Ms. Kelley seconded. Vote in favor 5:0.

4. Zoning Text and Map Amendment:

- a. PA Municipalities Planning Code (PMPC) Guidelines were distributed by passed out Ms. Ehly. Ms. Ehly referred to the Summary of the binder.

Comments included:

- 1) Home occupations; making no change
 - 2) Intergovernmental agreements with adjacent municipalities; attachment 1.b(2)
 - 3) Review permitted uses proposed for each district and provide a practical “worse-case scenario” and potential limitations
 - 4) Do not hinder external alternative energy uses such as wind and solar and determine existing regulations; regional concern/Attachment 1.b(2) Pg 4
- b. Summary of joint meeting with the board of supervisors discussion items in March

Regarding number 2):

- Ms. Ehly stated that for the Multimunicipal agreement, the Commission and Board need to listen to local governments and identify areas where we would foster these agreements; also, legal review is needed.
- Mr. Soder stated that if you have contiguous municipalities it will work.
- Mr. Little commented that the PC is addressing the request of the supervisors to look into this.
- Mr. Nauman questioned—how do you find out what other municipalities have for needs for the provisions.

- Ms. Meek suggested to come up with acreages and classify them with different uses .

Regarding number 3):

- Mr. Little stated that the Supervisors' feedback was what was being changed, removed, etc.
- Ms. Ehly reiterated the Supervisors' concerns regarding having a 3-D view of commercial and what would be allowed on a certain sized parcel.
- Also, what is the worst case scenario next to these other uses when the land is very built out.
- Questions regarding the ability to rezone and permitted uses in the C1 zoning district, along with future uses were discussed.
- Mr. Soder stated that the key issue is that anything that is going to change has to be rezoned. Also, if you can argue the rezoning and you are providing commercial land, you are providing your fair share.
- Mr. Little mentioned that the only place being changed is for a mixed use area, allowing for some commercial.
- Ms. Ehly indicated questions regarding the 6000 sq ft component being inconsistent with the guidelines for parking and other allowances. What will that translate into?
- A discussion regarding the definition of a minimum building area occurred with the determination that separate definitions regarding a buildable area, building size and other components should be addressed.
- Mr. Little concluded that further consideration, details and definitions for terms referred to in number 3) need to be investigated and determined at a future time.

Regarding Number 4):

- Ms. Ehly stated the necessity for being able to verify *why* and on what basis the limits for wind turbines and other alternative sources of energy are listed as they are. Currently alternative energy sources are being greatly encouraged.
- Ms. Steele and Mr. Little commented that these are proposed amendments to the zoning ordinances and that not all factors are of the highest priority.

Regarding Number 5):

- Consider mini-cell tower regulation.

Regarding Number 6):

- SWOT analysis/attachments 1.b(6)

Regarding Number 7):

- Address affordable housing possibly by requiring a percentage of development in the PCD to be affordable housing, similar to the Ferguson Township Workforce Housing Ordinance/Attachment 1.b(7)
- Mr. Little stated that this is addressed in next phase. We require it based upon density. The ordinance may need to define it differently; we need an idea of where we want to go with affordable housing in the PCD.
- Mr. Soder stated that Patton Township has a commercial transitional district. A percentage of the land they are rezoning has to be given toward affordable housing. The land trust receives

the property. Individuals own the home but not the land. The owners can only make a small profit when selling. This keeps it within the category of affordable housing.

- Affordable Housing discussion:
 - 1) Review of the Ferguson Township workforce housing ordinance and how adjacent jurisdictions address affordable housing.
 - 2) Discuss alternative affordable housing measures, such as development standards for certain zoning districts, including smaller minimum lot sizes, maximum lot sizes, etc.
 - 3) Provide a local definition of affordability.
- Ms. Ehly stated that: locally 13% can qualify for affordable housing. That number can go above 120% above the medium income, so people can qualify for subsidized housing. That is not necessarily is the cost of the units. This will be paid for with some form of tax or from the other units in the development.
- Discussion of the reason for affordable housing; the appropriate model for determining affordable housing; expanded population growth and other items included.
- Determinations that: it needs to be reviewed more if necessary; possibly send up the ordinance as it is and find out how the BOS would like to proceed; possibly a need to review what Patton has done for the affordable housing; and a need to figure out how to turn affordable housing into units/acre into some other part of the planned community housing development. Need to have numbers verified for feasibility.

Regarding d) Review of March 24, 2016 proposed amendments:

- Solicitor's comments are posted.
- Mr. Soder: A1 district maximum coverage. Perhaps a better way to present it may be with a percentage. Limits the persons' ability to do things. As the acreage grows, the percentage for use grows.
- Mr. Little suggests changing to up to 20% of building on that site.
- Page 2 A1 district:
All approved moving it to accessory use.
- Page 1 AR district:
Minimum and maximum should be listed.
Review of lot with on A1 and AR; side setbacks to AR are changed to 50'.
- Page 1 R1 district:
Delete forestry practices cannot be limited to 10 acres or larger parcels.
- Page 1 R2 district:
Accessory uses livestock production should be limited in some way on smaller parcels.
At the next meeting the language allowing having Ag practices available for people on a limited basis will be removed.
- Page 1 C1) Limiting churches to the C-1 district could be a problem. Change the use of the church available in Ag and Residential. Wind turbines are a conditional use. Strike from commercial.
- Page 1 M1) Strike the Ag uses in M-1. Strike 1a page 3 PCD; strike similarly qualified person.
- 255-10 4c) : What is considered major in unit count 5% or 30%
Need to define major and minor change.
- Page 11: The impervious cover age limits might be a little low for the higher density areas.

C1 is now 45%, so leave it as is.

- Page 12: The height limit might be too low to permit achieving the allowable density. Height limit approved to change from 45' to 50'.
Setbacks off of the public and private right of way changed to 100'.
- Page 14: Need to come up with a classification system for land uses. Mr. Little will look at the reference 255H and determine what is needed.

Adjournment:

Due to time constraints, the meeting was suspended at this point in the agenda. The next PC meeting will continue with the unaddressed agenda issues and proceed normally. Mr. Little motioned to adjourn. Mr. Nauman moved and Ms. Kelley seconded. The vote was unanimous. This meeting was adjourned at 9:40 PM.

Respectfully submitted,
Tammy Terosky
Recording Secretary