Chairman Wayne Hoffman called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. Members present: Monica Love, Anthony Pinto, Eric Harlacher. Absent: Amy Brinton and alternate Carol Kauffman (with prior notice). Also present: Zoning Officer Georgia Sprenkel, Solicitor John Baranski, Engineer Terry Myers, Recording Secretary, and two citizens.

I. Minutes
One correction to the minutes of the meeting of May 2, 2012: remove the word "whole" from the first paragraph ("one whole citizen.")

Motion by Love, second by Harlacher, to approve the minutes of the meeting of May 2, 2012, as amended. All members voted aye; motion carried.

II. Plans
A. Sketch Plan – Richard Rufle – Land Development Plan, Carlisle Road

David Hoffman was present on behalf of the applicant, who was also present. Mr. Rufle owns the property at the intersection of Carlisle and Royal Street, a vacant lot in the Commercial zone. He would like to construct a building in which to restore vehicles. Proposed is a building size that is adequate; with that size, however, some concessions would be required to resize the buffer from the 20' required to 10'. This property is bordered on one side by a residential use, and on another side by a residential zone.

Access would be onto Royal Street. How much traffic would this business generate onto Royal Street? Mr. Hoffman feels that it will have a minimal impact. Royal Street is only two blocks long. The proposed building would be a concrete-wall building and would blend in with the neighborhood. He will restore street rods, etc., and might put one on the lot for sale, on occasion. He will not be running any restoration or repair business from this location. Why this location? He got a good deal on the lot, as it was in foreclosure. He will not be building any residence on this lot. He just needs a place to work on his restoration projects. Mr. Hoffman feels that this lot is a bit difficult to work with; any decent-sized building will need to encroach into the setback. Complying with the setback would result in a much smaller building, limiting its possibilities for use.

Six parking spaces are shown in compliance with the ordinance. Calling it "Vehicle sales and service" would require more spaces, which the applicant cannot provide. How about the fact that the access drive is not 100' from the intersection? The applicant cannot comply with this regulation. If it's called Vehicle Sales and Service, he might need to request a Variance for the parking/access drive situation. Do the two storage bays inside the building count as parking spaces? Yes.
The other issue is that this is the only use on this lot. How about making an office in the building which would be the principal use and the garage would be the accessory use. Two parking spaces are required for the office space. What exactly would his office be? Typically an office building or office use has appointments associated with it. Mr. Rufle does have his own business as an LLC. This would help the office/garage cause. With only one or two spaces required and provided, there would be no need for two access drives. He can probably comply with the 100' distance from the intersection if there's only one access drive and two to four parking spaces, but it would fall within the buffer zone. The parking buffer is 20'. This is a Zoning issue. Can he put an access drive in the buffer?

Discussion was held on the buffer waiver request, from 20' to 10'. Is it good to have the building right on the 10' buffer line? It would be that way forever, Mr. Baranski reminded the Commission members. Any subsequent purchaser would be locked into that distance. How about enlarging the buffer joining the property of Mabel Bievenour, as that lot will likely remain in residential use for years to come. That seems to make sense. Could he live with a 58' long building rather than a 68' building? Or move the building closer to Carlisle Road? It was suggested that the applicant move the building closer to Carlisle Road as much as possible; then the waiver request would be for a minimal distance. It would be ideal, of course, if the waiver request were for the absolute minimum required.

Other possible waivers: curbs and sidewalks along the streets, and street widening. The Planning Commission members feel that curbs and sidewalks are not necessary. Street widening is likely not necessary either.

They will move the building closer to Carlisle Road and re-configure the parking, the setbacks, and buffer area.

III. **Zoning Cases**
None this month.

IV. **Other Business**
Nothing at this time.

**Zoning Changes Review/Discussion**
Discussion was held on the Ashcombe plan with the residential lots. John Thornton still owns the property where Stauffer's is. The access has become obliterated by Stauffer's accessories and supplies. There's a businessman who wants to purchase a lot for his business; it would need to be rezoned Commercial, with access through the Commercial zone, not through the R-3 zone. A land development plan would not be required, as the building is already there. How do the Planning Commission members feel about this re-zoning option? Would part of the cul-de-sac then be in the Commercial zone? Can the Township require that the applicant do away with the access? How would they be prevented from using the access in question? Build a berm?
Re-zone on the condition that the access is not used?  Is that contract zoning? Make them clean up the access area that is so messy now?  Can’t actually tell the applicant/owner that the Township will re-zone the lot but they can’t use that access.

Does everyone agree with the re-zoning to Commercial?  Motion by Love, second by Harlacher, to recommend that the property that the Three Monkey business is interested in, behind Stauffer’s of Kissel Hill, parcel number 24-34-134, be rezoned from R-3 to Commercial, and that the Planning Commission recommends that all access be through the shopping center.  All members voted aye; motion carried.

Motion by Love, second by Pinto, to adjourn.  All members voted aye; motion carried.  The meeting adjourned at 9:53 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Julie B. Maher,
Recording Secretary