

Halfmoon Township Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
7:00pm February 17, 2008

Attendance: Lorin Nauman, John Stevens, Bob Eberhart, Rob Brooks, Larry Fennessey and new members Joe Tyka and Jordan Finkelstein. Members Absent: none. Others present: Seb DeGregorio, CRPA; Greg Love, Zoning Officer; Karen Brown, Township Manager, Becky Brooks, minute taker.

- I. Call to order- Chair Lorin Nauman called the meeting to order at 7:05 pm.
- II. Minutes. There were a few edits in the February 3, 2009 minutes, which were corrected. **Motion. Mr. Stevens moved to accept the edited minutes. Mr. Brooks seconded. Vote 4-0.**
- III. Public Comments. None.
- IV. Reports.
 - A. CRPC. Mr. Fennessey reported that he volunteered for the position of liaison for the State College Borough Water Authority in his role as CRPC representative. There was also discussion about rezoning an area in Houserville, which would allow building (affordable housing) in a flood plain. In general, it was thought to be a poor idea.

B. Zoning Officer.

Mr. Beck is resubmitting rezoning because he ran out of time.

The BOS opted for a 5-mile radius around any property for the location of parkland associated with the new requirements.

The veterinary on the corner of SR 550 and Smith Road will either construct a new septic system or sell the property.

C. BOS. Ms Brown reported.

At their last meeting they reviewed the scheduled work items.

They will also look into hiring a new Township Manager because Karen Brown is retiring in January 2010.

The PC needs to appoint a member to the codification sub- committee. The first meeting is March 4, with Kathleen Yurchak. John Stevens graciously volunteered to be on the committee.

Andy Merritt was appointed to the BOS. The position he fills goes through the end of the year, 2009. There will be three spots to fill next year- a 2-year term, a 4-year term and a 6-year term.

- V. Barr Farm Property discussion. These are the properties that cross districts - Village and R-1. The PC wanted to make sure that the language in the village district ordinance is clear enough. The apartment building lot has a 5-acre attachment because of a sewage issue. There are 7 properties: lot #1 is where the store/pizza restaurant is, lot #2 is the apartments + the 5 acres. Lot #3 is 47.99 acres, lot #4 is the pastor's house- 1.22 acres, lot #5 is the back lot - 23.89 acres, Lot #6 – along SR550 is 9.16 acres, and Lot # 7 is 54.45 acres. Mr. DeGregorio reviewed his handouts - the chart and the map, and discussed various issues. Section#2 deals with the expansion of the apartment property so that a safe septic system is a possibility. It seems it would be possible to make more apartments. Lot 5-A should not be sold separately.

There was discussion about lot# 3 (and #7) and allowable density. (In the conditions listed on the plans for the subdivision and lot consolidation, the back areas of those lots are labeled A1/R1. Lot # 3 cannot have more than 48 DUs (48 acres) on the basis of the language in the Ordinance. Lot #7 can have 54 DUs (possibly 56 because of the exemptions). There was discussion about the land efficiency factor. It is possible that out of the 48 acres between 31-38 acres are developable. The developer could build on 1-acre lots, or smaller lots in the village district with more open land in the back of the property. Is the language tough enough in B-1? If the exemptions are not used, they are gone because the land has been rezoned. One-half of the land must be open space (24 and 26 acres, respectively)

Mr. Eberhart talked about Ms Foster saying that the whole piece of land being one parcel, but it is not, there are separate deeds.

In the village district both commercial and residential are allowed. The limiting factor is the total floor area within the district. In the Village District 33% of the building must be residential.

There was discussion about the Graham property, which used to go up to the ridge. It was subdivided into 2 lots, north and south of SR550. The north side is now in rural preservation. Does that count as rural preservation for the entire property? (Lot # 7 still has 2 exemptions.) There was a detailed discussion about the history of the land, and the future possibilities seem to be clear.

- VI. Lighting Ordinance. Mr. DeGregorio reviewed the document and discussed certain aspects briefly. Existing nonconforming lights can be replaced, and do not have to conform to the Ordinance, although the PC would like people to consider new, more efficient and full cut-off options. Utility companies do not have to conform to the Ordinance. There were a few minor editorial comments. **Motion. Mr. Brooks moved to approve the document with the noted changes, and send it on to the BOS. Mr. Stevens seconded. Vote 7-0.**

The meeting was adjourned at 8:40pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Rebecca Brooks