

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Danelle Del Corso called the meeting to order at 6:01 p.m. (present by Zoom). Other Supervisors present were Patti Hartle (present by Zoom) and Bob Strouse (present by Zoom). Planning Commission Members present were Lorin Nauman (present by Zoom; Jeff Martin (present by Zoom); Andrew Meehan (present by Zoom); Marty Mehring (present by Zoom); Joe Soloski (present by Zoom) and Rick Bates (present by Zoom). Staff present were Denise Gembusia, Township Manager (present by Zoom); Amy Smith, Township Clerk (present by Zoom); Jeff Stover, Township Solicitor and Corey Rilk, CRPA (present by Zoom). Residents & others in attendance: Reed Moyer (present by Zoom) and Lyn Gotwalt, (present by Zoom).

Absent: David Piper & Chuck Beck.

OPENING ANNOUNCEMENTS

More information is available on the website: www.halfmoontwp.us

- This evening's meeting is being LIVE recorded on C-NET's YouTube channel <https://www.youtube.com/user/CNetCentreCounty>
- The township is asking for resident's email addresses for important updates and notices even if you signed up in the past. To sign up, visit www.halfmoontwp.us and click on the CONTACT US button on the homepage.
- We're looking for residents to volunteer on various committees and boards. If you would be interested in volunteering, please visit the township website for more information on these vacancies.

2. CITIZEN COMMENTS

There were no citizen comments.

3. AGENDA

- ***MOTION: Ms. Del Corso moved to approve the agenda with the addition of introductions; Mr. Nauman seconded; Vote 9-0-0; Motion Carried.***

4. BUSINESS

- a. Introductions
All the Board of Supervisors and Planning Commission members introduced themselves.
- b. Review Draft Planning Commission 2021 Workplan
 - i. Update the official map – Mr. Meehan questioned what exactly the Planning Commission is looking at to update on this map and is there going to be some guidance from the Board of Supervisors. Ms. Gembusia stated the official map was updated but was not recorded so now is the time to update the map to include future growth. Mr. Strouse questioned what the difference was between the official map and the small area plan. Mr. Meehan stated the official map is planning for all of the township and the Small Area Plan was designed for the eastern end of the township. Ms. Del Corso commented the Small Area Plan is a guiding document.
 - ii. Review and amend the driveway ordinance
Mr. Strouse questioned what need to be amended in the driveway ordinance. Mr. Nauman commented that there are no more private roads so the ordinance needs to be amended to state that driveways or shared driveways need to access a public road. Ms. Gembusia explained that although private roads will no longer be approved for subdivision plans, there are still lots that access existing private roads.
 - iii. Review the RPD standards and applicability
Mr. Nauman stated there are some issues in the current RPD standards dealing with setback discrepancies and having multiple road length descriptions throughout the requirements.
 - iv. Review the zoning districts
Ms. Del Corso stated there had been recommendations so the Planning Commission could start with the foundation and have potential suggestions that could be reviewed as a starting point. Mr. Nauman stated the western end of the township has changed since the last zoning district update with the preservation of properties so the focus should be on the eastern end to cap development.

- v. Creation of Ridgetop Overlay District (open space)
- vi. Steps, actions to reverse dry township designation
Ms. Hartle questioned whether there was anything in the bullets that would not come to the Board of Supervisors prior to any action being taken. Ms. Gembusia stated she is not sure how the dry township designation will play out and if it is necessary to go to the Board of Supervisors since it gets decided by the electorate. Ms. Gembusia explained this is a petition process and there are interested business owners. Ms. Gembusia stated if this designation would change there may need to be considerations for new or modified ordinances. Ms. Hartle questioned whether this item belongs on a Planning Commission workplan. Ms. Del Corso commented that she questioned that as well, but it could start at the Planning Commission and see where it goes. Mr. Meehan stated if a referendum reversing the dry designation would pass, the Planning Commission should be looking at what type of zoning it belongs in and review that ahead of time. Mr. Stover commented that there is an electorate petition that gets submitted to the County Commissioners for the electors to vote on so the only issue for the Planning Commission would be zoning. Ms. Hartle suggested taking this off the workplan.
- vii. Incentivizing fire protection/suppression, if possible
Ms. Gembusia stated fire protection is becoming an issue with dwindling volunteers so the Planning Commission will review ways to possibly help alleviate this problem.

Mr. Mehring suggested prioritizing the workplan. Ms. Gembusia moved the workplan items into what she believed as being the order of priority.

- Update the official map
- Review and amend the driveway ordinance
- Incentivizing fire protection/suppression, if possible
- Review the RPD standards and applicability
- Review the Zoning districts
- Creation of Ridgetop Overlay District (open space)
- Preparation for possible reverse of dry township designation

Ms. Del Corso requested Ms. Gembusia review the strategic planning session the Board of Supervisors had last year and share goals and themes with the Planning Commission members.

Mr. Nauman questioned whether the Planning Commission should work on the workplan and present it to the Board of Supervisors after completion. Ms. Gembusia stated each item should be brought to the Board of Supervisors individually as it is completed.

- c. Discuss Board & PC Communications & Expectations
Ms. Del Corso stated the Board of Supervisors would like to see the Planning Commission more than once a year because communication is important. Even if the Planning Commission is an advisory board the Board of Supervisors weighs heavily on the Planning Commission recommendations. Ms. Del Corso commented she would like to see a memo from the Planning Commission when a plan is reviewed, voted on and forwarded to the Board of Supervisors. This memo should include reasoning behind any recommendation made by the Planning Commission. Ms. Del Corso suggested that a member of the Planning Commission be present at a Board of Supervisors meeting when they are reviewing a subdivision plan or bringing any other item to the Board for consideration. Ms. Hartle stated it is helpful to have an explanation if the Planning Commission made a recommendation for the Board to approve a waiver or plan if it does not meet current ordinances.

Mr. Strouse suggested having joint Board and Planning Commission meeting on a quarterly basis for the next year with the possibility of meeting two times a year in upcoming years. Ms. Del Corso stated she is okay starting with quarterly meetings. Ms. Del Corso questioned whether the Planning Commission had any expectations of the Board of Supervisors. Ms. Del Corso stated if there were any expectations they could respond by email to the supervisors.

HALFMOON TOWNSHIP BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
MEETING MINUTES

FEBRUARY 17TH, 2021
PAGE 3 OF 3

Ms. Gembusia requested Mr. Stover provide an explanation on why the Planning Commission would suggest approval of a waiver versus not approving the waiver. Mr. Stover stated the MPC permits waivers of Subdivision/Land Development requirements provided the owner can show a hardship. Mr. Stover commented that the hardship would have to be a unique circumstance that prevents them from being able to follow those requirements. Mr. Stover stated this is what the Board has to weigh is whether the hardship is unique to the requirements. Ms. Del Corso commented that sometimes residents don't fully understand what hardship means and thinks it is a financial hardship. Ms. Gembusia stated that there are times when it is a self-created hardship.

d. Update for all Plan review Process

Ms. Gembusia stated when she started there was not a solid procedure in place for reviews so she feels that changing the Planning Commission meetings to once a month may help streamline this procedure.

Ms. Gembusia reviewed the process:

- Plan(s) due by 15th of the month
- Staff comments due no later than 14 days from plan submission
- 7 days for developer to respond to comment letters
- Plan goes on Planning Commission agenda for discussion only
- If Planning Commission has comments plan goes back to developer and developer has 7 days to respond and provide a revised plan
- Staff will then have 7 days to respond to revisions
- Plan goes back to Planning Commission where action is intended
- If the plan needs a third review, the developer's escrow begins being charged. If the Planning Commission recommends approval to the Board of Supervisors, the plan will then be added to an upcoming Board meeting agenda

Mr. Nauman thanked Ms. Gembusia for coming up with the timeline and hopes this will move plans ahead more efficiently. Mr. Nauman thanked the Board of Supervisors and Planning Commission for a productive meeting.

Ms. Gembusia questioned whether the Board of Supervisors and Planning Commission were okay with the 6:00 p.m. start time for joint meetings. Ms. Gembusia will send out potential meeting dates.

e. Any other items

Ms. Del Corso thanked everyone for their attendance and input. Ms. Hartle thanked the new members of the Planning Commission.

5. **GOOD & WELFARE**

There was nothing reported.

6. **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business before the board, the regular meeting was adjourned at 7:03 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Denise Gembusia,
Township Secretary

