

**WEST HEMPFIELD TOWNSHIP
ZONING HEARING BOARD
April 12, 2016**

The West Hempfield Township Zoning Hearing Board met in the meeting room of the West Hempfield Township Building at 3401 Marietta Avenue, Lancaster, PA, on Tuesday, April 12, 2016. Gary Lintner called the meeting to order at 7:30 pm. Board members Daryl Peck and Tony Crocamo were also present, along with Bernadette M. Hohenadel, Solicitor; Rhonda Adams, Court Reporter; Jodi Heffner, Zoning Officer; and Marsha Beamenderfer, Recording Secretary.

Approval of Minutes

Motion: Tony Crocamo moved, seconded by Gary Lintner, to approve the minutes of the meeting of March 8, 2016, as presented. Carried 2-0. Daryl Peck abstained.

Case 1224 – Sanidad Divina/Caleb Acosta –continued

Mr. Lintner stated that last month when this case was brought to the Board only two members were present. They did not get far with the case due to questions about the information provided. The Board would like to consider the case from the beginning with the three member board. Mr. Acosta was queried as to his thoughts and/or objections to the case proceeding with our full Zoning Board, to which he was agreeable. Mr. Acosta was brought forward to testify and stated that they are a small church, Sanidad Divina, in Columbia. They have been renting for the past ten years and have decided to rent the property at 791-793 Leffler Court to hold church there.

Mr. Lintner stated that the largest issue last month concerned the parking and how many spaces were available at the proposed site. Ms. Hohenadel questioned whether Mr. Acosta is requesting a variance for use of the premises as a church. He stated yes. Ms. Hohenadel also questioned how many parishioners are at the church. Mr. Acosta stated there are 38 people. Ms. Hohenadel questioned what the size of the building was and Mr. Acosta stated that it was 2,200 square feet. Ms. Eva Lezama, a member of Sanidad Divina, stated that when they were here last month they were told they needed to have 56 parking spaces and there are only 52. Mr. Crocamo questioned when they would need the parking and it was stated that they would be using the building in the evenings when the businesses are not using the parking and on Sunday when businesses are not open and they could use all the parking. Ms. Hohenadel asked what the hours of operation would be. Ms. Lezama stated that they have church on Tuesday and Thursday from 7:00 pm to 9:00 pm and currently on Sunday at 1:00 pm but are looking at switching that time to earlier in the morning.

Mr. Peck questioned whether the space they are going to occupy is their space or were they sharing it with someone else. Ms. Lezama stated that the space was their own space. Ms. Hohenadel questioned if they were going to use the space for other reasons than church services and if it would sit empty during the day. Mr. Acosta stated that they would only be going there to pray and that there was no office that would be in use during the day.

Mr. Peck questioned Ms. Heffner if the Township is in agreement on the number of spaces required and Ms. Heffner stated that 56 were required for the whole shopping center. Mr. Peck stated that there were 52 spaces and a variance of four would be needed. Mr. Peck questioned if parking spaces are calculated by the square footage of the building and Ms. Heffner stated the parking was calculated by use. Mr. Peck questioned about the on-street parking and if that could be used.

Motion: Daryl Peck moved, seconded by Gary Lintner, to grant a variance to Section 402.2.A to allow church services and activities at the property at 791-793 Leffler Court during the times and days specified in testimony with the understanding that the Sunday service time may change. Carried 3-0.

Motion: Daryl Peck moved, seconded by Gary Lintner, to grant a variance to Section 707.4 for the required parking spaces to four parking spaces less than the required number of parking spaces. Carried 3-0.

Case 1225 – Phantom Fireworks – Justin Kramer

This application was submitted by Justin Kramer, business manager for Phantom Fireworks, for a variance to Section 402.2.A for permitted uses. Mr. Kramer, whose business address is 555 Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd., Youngstown, Ohio 44502 was sworn in to provide testimony. Mr. Kramer is seeking a special exception for uses not permitted. to have a temporary fireworks tent at the Shops at Prospect, 3985 Columbia Avenue, Columbia. He wants to use a 30' x 30' tent and Mr. Kramer submitted a plot plan showing where they want to place the tent. Mr. Kramer stated that he understood that there was a fireworks tent in that parking lot a few years ago and they are looking to have another tent there. Mr. Kramer stated that his company is different from the previous fireworks company. Mr. Kramer stated that other companies have the tent manned 24 hours a day but Phantom gives the operators a storage container with special locks and at the end of their sales day they pack the fireworks in this container and then are able to go home and get some rest and come back the next day.

Mr. Lintner questioned what is preventing someone from backing up with a rollback truck and hooking up to the container and taking it away. Mr. Kramer stated that with the kind of storage containers (Mobile Minis) they use he has never seen anyone do this in the many years of working with Phantom Fireworks. Mr. Kramer stated that there are other ways that people break in and even those have been extremely rare.

Mr. Peck questioned the types of fireworks that would be sold. Mr. Kramer stated that it was ground based sparklers, ground based sparkling devices, and novelty items. Nothing they sell explodes. He also stated that nothing being sold is illegal in Pennsylvania. Mr. Peck questioned on the plot plan that the sales dates were June 24, 2016 through July 4, 2016 and hours of operation being 10:00 am to 10:00 pm in June and 9:00 am to 11:00 pm in July. Mr. Kramer said yes. Mr. Lintner questioned the number of employees staffing the tent. Mr. Kramer stated that during the day they recommend two people working – one to run the register and the other to help the customers and keep an eye out for theft. As it gets closer to the July 4 holiday they recommend three or four people staffing. Mr. Lintner stated that the certificate of insurance enclosed with the packet names West Hempfield Township as the certificate holder. Phantom Fireworks will have another certificate naming Brixmor Property Group and they will take care of that when they write the lease.

Mr. Peck questioned on the Plot Plan Exhibit A the placement of the tent and the storage trailer up against the green space and not in the inner circle of the parking lot. Mr. Kramer stated that they like to have it as close to the road so that people driving by can see the display. Ms. Hohenadel questioned if there would be signage and Mr. Kramer stated that the enclosed photo shows the signage which are vinyl banners placed on the side and the roof of the tent. Ms. Hohenadel questioned if there were any signs placed off the tent and Mr. Kramer stated that if allowed they would place yard signs and the feather dancers and directional

signs. Mr. Peck questioned about the Police Department being informed about the tent and Ms. Heffner stated that yes they have been given notice. Mr. Peck questioned about the fire protection in the tent. Mr. Kramer said there are two dry chemical fire extinguishers and they also have access to water extinguishers so if the Township would require one of those they can have it delivered.

Motion: Daryl Peck moved, seconded by Tony Crocamo, to approve a use not provided for as a Special Exception to Section 101.7 to allow a temporary tent for the sale of Pennsylvania legal fireworks at the property at 3985 Columbia Avenue with the following conditions:

1. Tent must be erected as depicted in the application.
2. Tent uses no more than 5 parking spaces.
3. Sale dates be limited to the dates described within the application.
4. Selling hours be as described within the application.
5. The signs be placed as described before the Board.
6. The fire protection be as described before the Board.
7. All other aspects be as described before the Board. Carried 3-0.

Case 1216 – John & Rose Spangler – 775 Prospect Road

John Spangler, 226 Main Street, Landisville, and Joseph Nadu, 2760 Charlestown Road, Lancaster, were both sworn in to provide testimony regarding the property at 775 Prospect Road, Columbia. Mr. Spangler stated that this was a continuance from the meeting of October 13, 2015 when they were seeking a variance from section 301.3.A.1. It was contested by the Board and they were told that it met all the criteria but the Board wanted to make sure what would be built on the lot once they grant the variance. Mr. Spangler was told that when he had the building footprint to bring it back to the Board and they would go from there. Mr. Nadu is going to buy the property contingent on the variance being granted and he submitted the building footprint as to what will be on the lot. Ms. Hohenadel stated that her firm does represent Mr. Nadu in some matters but nothing related to this case. Mr. Peck questioned Ms. Heffner whether this case was advertised and Ms. Heffner said yes.

Mr. Nadu presented a drawing showing the impervious surface and blacktop currently there and the new structure he proposes to build. Mr. Nadu stated that it is just a few more square feet than the existing impervious and they are allowed 1,000 square feet without doing stormwater work. Mr. Nadu feels that the plan meets all the criteria as far as the building envelope. Mr. Lintner questioned whether Mr. Nadu would be living there himself or would he be putting it up for sale. Mr. Nadu stated that he was unsure of his plans at this time.

Mr. Peck questioned about the plot plan drawing and what the shadings represented. Mr. Nadu stated that the dotted line through the hatched-illustrated area shows the existing layout of the lot which is paved out beyond where he is building. The hatched area is the new house, the garage and the new driveway. Where it double hatched is the existing driveway to which he will be adding two other pieces of driveway. A portion of the existing driveway will be removed where the house will be placed. Mr. Lintner questioned that where the existing driveway is there is a portion that shoots to the north and is this where the pre-existing mobile homes were. Mr. Spangler stated that two were to the north and one to the south. Mr. Peck questioned if the proposed home was in the building envelope and Mr. Nadu stated yes. Mr. Peck asked if Mr. Nadu had a description of the elevation. Mr. Nadu stated that they would put a house no more

than three feet above existing elevation to get the proper slope away from the house.

Mr. Peck questioned if the Board had the amount of the dimensional variance that was needed and what was the acreage of the lot. Mr. Spangler stated that it was .64 acre and Mr. Peck stated that he would need a variance of .36 acre. Mr. Peck asked if Mr. Nadu was going to build a single-family home and Mr. Nadu said yes.

Motion: Tony Crocamo moved, seconded by Daryl Peck, to grant a variance for the property at 775 Prospect Road, Columbia, to Section 303.3.A.1 to allow a lot less than one acre, a variance of .36 acre bringing the lot to 15,682 square feet for the construction of a single family dwelling. Carried 3-0.

Case 1226 – Vegee Sardi –509 Goldfinch Drive

The application was submitted by Vegee Sardi but the property owner is Sirirat Sritulanondha for the property at 509 Goldfinch Drive, Columbia.

Ms. Vegee Sardi of 4701 Bluebird Avenue, Columbia, was sworn in to provide testimony. Ms. Hohenadel stated for the record that a letter had been submitted from the owner of the property authorizing Ms. Sardi to act as her designated representative. Ms. Sardi is a childhood friend of the property owner and since Ms. Sritulanondha lives out of the area she requested that Ms. Sardi represent her at this hearing. Ms. Sardi is a resident of West Hempfield Township and lives across the street from Ms. Sritulanondha's lot that is for sale.

Ms. Sardi stated that Ms. Sritulanondha is requesting a variance to construct a single family home on a lot that as zoned requires 25,000 square feet, but the lot for sale is only 19,000 square feet which is less than the required lot size. The property owner is also requesting an extension for this variance as she would like a potential buyer to have additional time to draw up plans and build on the property in the near future. It is understood that they will then have 18 months to build with this time extension. Ms. Sardi stated that the drawing enclosed shows that the home does fit within the current setbacks and there are neighboring properties that are the same size as her lot and that a single family dwelling would easily fit. Mr. Lintner stated that there are some lots that are smaller than the lot in question. Mr. Lintner questioned if there was public sewer and public water and Ms. Sardi stated yes to both questions.

Ms. Sardi questioned the Board what the standard setbacks would be for this lot. Ms. Heffner stated that it was a permitted use and that the side yard setback would be a minimum of 10 feet and 25 feet minimum in the rear and the front would either be 30 feet from the street right-of-way or 45 feet from the street center line, whichever is the greater. Mr. Peck stated that they granted this same variance for some other properties in this neighborhood recently because all the lots are undersized in this development.

Motion: Daryl Peck moved, seconded by Tony Crocamo, to grant a variance to Section 303.3.A.2 of 6,000 square feet to build a single family dwelling at the property at 509 Goldfinch Drive, Columbia, with the condition that everything be carried out as described before the Board. Carried 3-0.

Motion: Daryl Peck moved, seconded by Tony Crocamo, to grant a time extension of one year for pulling the permit for the property at 509 Goldfinch Drive, Columbia, per Section 1005.4.G with the final date to pull the permit being October 12, 2017. Carried 3-0.

Case 1227 & 1228 – Custom Home Group, Inc.

Dan Siegrist of Custom Home Group, 1302 Lancaster Pike, Quarryville, was sworn in to provide testimony. Mr. Siegrist is seeking a variance to Section 303.3.A.1, a lot less than one acre. The sizes of the lots are .4 acre for the properties at 528 Betty Lane (Lot No. 4) Columbia, and 536 Betty Lane (Lot No. 6) Columbia. Custom Home Group wants to build a structure on the lot with a total impervious surface of 2,200 square feet and a total limit of disturbance of 4,600 square feet. This development has subdivided lots that are the same size as these lots.

Mr. Lintner questioned whether the lots to either side of 528 Betty Lane are available and Mr. Siegrist stated they are not available. Mr. Lintner questioned that on the plot plan for these properties there is a well pictured on the property. Mr. Siegrist stated that there is no public water on this property but there is public sewer for the property. Mr. Peck questioned whether the proposed house was for the current owner and Mr. Siegrist stated that it would be built by Custom Home Group after they settled on the property. Mr. Lintner questioned if they had a prospective buyer for this property as well or if Mr. Siegrist was purchasing the lots for his own endeavors. Mr. Siegrist stated he was purchasing the property to build the home for resale and that there is as yet no prospective buyer. Mr. Peck questioned if the house that has been set forth with the application is what they are anticipating on building and Mr. Siegrist stated yes. A photo of the GIS mapping of the property location was presented as Applicant's Exhibit No. 1.

Mr. Lintner questioned what the slope of the land is from Betty Lane to Norwood Road and Mr. Siegrist stated that the slope is from Betty Lane to Norwood Road and the lower part is on Betty Lane. Mr. Peck questioned about the property on 528 Betty Lane having two front yards and Mr. Siegrist stated yes that it would. Mr. Siegrist stated again that he is asking for a variance to build a home on a lot less than one acre.

Ms. Hohenadel spoke to Steve Misel, 519 and 520 Betty Lane, Columbia, who was in the audience and she asked if he wanted to be a party to the proceedings. By doing this he would then have the opportunity to ask Mr. Siegrist questions, present testimony, make a statement on the record arguing for or against. If Mr. Misel would do this, then he would be entitled to receive a copy of any written decision that was issued by the Board and he would have certain appeal rights thereafter. Mr. Misel decided to do this and was sworn in as a party to the proceedings. Mr. Misel has a home on the property at 519 Betty Lane and 520 Betty Lane is a vacant lot.

Motion: Tony Crocamo moved, seconded by Daryl Peck, to allow Mr. Steve Misel, 519 and 520 Betty Lane, Columbia, to be a party to the proceedings to Case 1227. Carried 3-0.

Mr. Misel stated that his concerns have always been water runoff as well as the well water. Mr. Misel questioned about the one foot pipe that comes off Norwood Road and dumps all the water from Norwood Road onto those lots which eventually runs onto Betty Lane and across to his lots. Mr. Siegrist stated that he was not aware of the pipe and if it was tied into stormwater. Mr. Misel stated that it just runs onto both of those lots. Mr. Siegrist stated that it would have to be worked out with the Township and Mr. Lintner stated that Mr. Siegrist, by Township rule, would have to address any water that is leaving his property. Mr. Siegrist then stated that it is always their practice to comply with what the Township requires for stormwater runoff of the pipe or if it was tied.

Mr. Crocamo questioned whether the property at 536 Betty Lane (Lot No. 6) also has this pipe on that property. Mr. Misel stated that the water runs down Norwood Road into storm grates that the Township put in and the water runs down onto both of these lots by the pipe at each property. One pipe is sticking out of the ground about one foot in the center of the lot and the other is just about on the property line.

Motion: Daryl Peck moved, seconded by Tony Crocamo, for Case 1227 to grant a variance to section 303.3.A.1 of .6 acres to construct a single family dwelling at the property at 528 Betty Lane, Columbia, with the condition that everything be carried out as presented before this Board. Carried 3-0.

Ms. Hohenadel questioned Mr. Siegrist if the testimony he would provide with respect to the property at 536 Betty Lane, Columbia, would be the same. She asked if they could incorporate the testimony that was presented in support of 528 Betty Lane into the record for the property at 536 Betty Lane, as it would be the same and he is asking for the same relief. Mr. Siegrist stated yes to all questions. Ms. Hohenadel asked Mr. Misel if he would like to be party to the proceedings for 536 Betty Lane as well. Mr. Misel stated yes.

Mr. Peck questioned if the lot size was exactly the same and Mr. Siegrist said yes but the house will be different. Mr. Peck questioned if there was a copy of the GIS mapping for the property at 536 Betty Lane to attach to the case packet. Mr. Siegrist presented that and it became Applicant Exhibit No. 1 for Case 1228. Mr. Crocamo questioned if there was anything that they wanted to add to the testimony at 536 Betty Lane and Mr. Siegrist stated no.

Motion: Daryl Peck moved, seconded by Tony Crocamo, for Case 1228 to grant a variance to section 303.3.A.1 of .6 acres to construct a single family dwelling at the property at 536 Betty Lane, Columbia with the condition that everything be carried out as presented before this Board and with the same discussion they had in the previous case regarding the de minimus nature and/or the lot size of the surrounding properties. Carried 3-0.

Case 1229 – Treztark II, Ltd.

The application was submitted by Treztark II, Ltd for the property on Primrose Lane, Condo Unit 2, Tax ID No. 300470810002. Kevin Kratzert of Treztark II, Ltd., Joe Eisenhauer of Light-Heigel Associates, 430 East Main Street, Palmyra, and George Cook of Blakinger Thomas, 28 Penn Square, Lancaster, were all sworn in to provide testimony. Mr. Cook is the attorney for Lancaster Storage, which is the owner of record of the property. Treztark II, Ltd. Has an equitable ownership in Lancaster Storage. He stated they are requesting a variance to Section 401.3.A.6 related to the density of the dwelling units.

Mr. Eisenhauer, project manager with Light-Heigel, began explaining the proposal for the property located on Primrose Lane, Mountville. Applicant Exhibit No. 1 was presented which is a smaller version of the plan that was submitted which shows the intended development. Applicant Exhibit No. 2 is a set of three historical plans submitted to the Township in 1995. The topmost plan is a condominium plan which has been seen by the Township and provides an overview of the entire site. The proposal they will be discussing relates to Unit 2 of the original condominium plan. The condominium plan provides an overview of the entire site of 13.29 acres or 579,085 square feet. The plans show how the tract was developed. There are two hotels, an ice cream shop and a mini golf course currently on the tract. All the historical plans that have been processed through for the development in regard to lot coverage, parking requirements, green space, and setbacks were contemplated over the entire 13.29 acre site.

Some neighboring uses in the area are other commercial structures which include the Highland Common office park which is across Primrose Lane. Applicant Exhibit No. 3 was presented which shows photographs of the neighborhood looking north from the site. Directly across Primrose Lane there are two and three story mixed use structures which include office space on the bottom and apartments on the second and third floor. Looking west is the Mainstay Hotel in the distance; to the south is the ice cream parlor and to the east is the other hotel, Sleep Inn. Mr. Eisenhauer wanted to show that there are uses of a similar nature to what they are proposing directly across the street. There is also a neighborhood development to the west.

As a part of the larger 13.29 acre development site, infrastructure was already built to account for stormwater runoff for this pad in particular as well as the rest of the site. That can be seen on Applicant Exhibit No. 2 which shows the two acres to the southwest of the site which is a large stormwater management basin. This is where all the water generated from the development of Unit 2 will eventually go and where all the water from the entire 13.29 acre site goes. There is also existing utility infrastructure at the site. There are access drives on the east and west and there is public water and sewer serving this site. The plan that was submitted which is Unit 2 is 1.925 acre in size or 83,870 square feet. It has 235 feet of road frontage along Primrose Lane, is located in the C-2 zoning district and on the Lancaster County Comprehensive Plan it is located in an urban growth area. It is on an undeveloped but improved padlot and is located in a portion of the Township that does have other mixed uses.

Mr. Eisenhauer stated that what they are proposing for Unit 2 is a three story mixed use commercial residential structure with a footprint of 8,600 square feet. On the map the Unit 2 condo lines are in bold and calculating for green space, the ordinance requires 35% and they are providing 35% on that particular Unit 2. The actual structure they are proposing is approximately 3,700 square feet of commercial floor area and 15 residential apartments on the first, second and third floors. The ordinance does require that if the apartments are on the first floor they cannot be at the front of the building but must be on the non-frontage side of the lot. Mr. Lintner questioned as to what Mr. Eisenhauer is saying is the frontage of the building. Mr. Eisenhauer stated that the front of the lot is on Primrose Lane and that would have to be the front of the building. This area of the lot is fairly flat which means that all sides of the floor would be exposed and is not going to be built into the side of the ground.

Mr. Eisenhauer addressed the parking requirements for the 3,700 square feet of commercial space and 15 apartments. The ordinance requires one space for every 200 square feet of retail space which is the more stringent of the commercial parking requirements they would have to meet. Mr. Eisenhauer figured out that they would need 18 parking spaces. The ordinance also requires one space per employee on the largest shift. At this time they do not know the user but he was counting on six employees in a space that size. The ordinance requires three parking spaces per apartment which would be 45 required parking spaces for a total of 69 parking spaces. They are proposing 66 standard parking spaces and three ADA accessible parking spaces.

Mr. Eisenhauer stated that in the C-2 district both the retail office/commercial use and the proposed residential dwelling in combination with commercial uses is permitted, consistent with the provision that Section 402.2.A.1 allows for all uses permitted in C-1 district. Additional permitted uses by right would be a hotel, which means that they can build a three-story hotel as long as it is under the 40 foot height requirement, which it is. Mr. Eisenhauer stated that with a residential dwelling as a use on a commercial

lot, there is a restriction that there cannot be more than one dwelling unit per 10,000 square feet. If this restriction was applied to this section they would only be permitted to have eight residential dwelling units on this lot because they have 83,000 square feet. They are requesting a variance from Section 401.3.A.6 to allow 15 dwelling units on an 83,870 square foot lot and the requested relief of .79 units per 10,000 square feet for a total committed density of 1.79 units per 10,000 square feet. The Lancaster County Comprehensive Plan identified this as an urban growth area and the targeted density would be 7.5 dwelling units per acre. At that density with 1.925 acres of space they would be permitted to have 14.4 units and Mr. Eisenhower feels that they are pretty close to the recommended density.

Mr. Lintner said Mr. Eisenhower stated that it was an 8,600 square foot footprint and that none of the residential units would be on the front-facing footage of the building. Mr. Lintner questioned how many residential units there would be per floor. Mr. Eisenhower stated that it is going to be a three-story building in which two or three apartments would be on the first floor to the rear of the building. Ms. Hohenadel questioned that in the summary it was referenced that there was ground floor, first, second and third floor of the building and she wondered if the ground floor and first floor are one and the same. Mr. Eisenhower stated that there are only three floors.

Mr. Cook stated on the first floor there are three units, on the second floor, six units, and the third floor. six units. The design has not been done yet and there may be some design reasons to do a different permutation. Mr. Cook also stated that it is undecided if the front of the building may not face Primrose Lane and they may decide to have the front facing the ice cream shop. Once again it was stated that they would decide that when the actual prints would be drawn up.

Mr. Lintner questioned whether it was going to be condos or if it was going to be rental apartments. Mr. Cook stated that it was his understanding that it was going to be rental apartments. Mr. Lintner questioned how they came up with the quantity of apartments there. Was it determined that each apartment needed to be a certain square footage? Mr. Eisenhower stated that the building will be within the height requirements, they will be able to meet the parking space requirements, the utilities are on site within the recognized setbacks and the minimum available floor area in the zoning ordinance is 450 square feet for an apartment. Mr. Eisenhower stated that they are able to comply with all other sections of the Zoning Ordinance by setting that number at 15.

Motion: Daryl Peck moved, seconded by Gary Lintner, to allow Courtney Ackerman, 320 Primrose Lane, Mountville, to be a party to the proceedings to Case 1229. Carried 3-0.


Ms. Hohenadel asked Ms. Ackerman where 320 Primrose Lane was in comparison to the property in question. Ms. Ackerman stated that it was the first residence right beside it and they share a property line. Ms. Ackerman voiced her concerns regarding adding more commercial businesses and more residential apartments. She stated that with the ice cream shop and what is already on the property there are parking issues when there are activities going on at these businesses. She also has a concern with the busyness of her street which is already occurring with the addition of the Winchelsea development. Ms. Ackerman stated that she is dealing with vandalism to her property and is concerned about the additional people associated with the businesses and the apartments. Mr. Lintner stated that Treztark II has already given a satisfactory answer with the 69 parking spaces they are going to put there and what is required by the Zoning Ordinance.

Ms. Heffner questioned about the stormwater runoff on the plan. Mr. Eisenhauer stated one of the prior plans attached to Exhibit No. 2 showed the location of the stormwater facility and an easement, but it does not provide detail on the actual design or construction. Ms. Heffner also provided some questions about the parking from the Township's legal counsel. Ms. Cleary stated that if they are going to develop 15 apartments they will need at least 30 parking spaces for the apartments plus whatever parking the first floor commercial uses require, plus stormwater management facilities for the building and all the parking. Mr. Eisenhauer stated that the Township thought they needed between 30 and 45 spaces and that they are providing 45.

Motion: Tony Crocamo moved, seconded by Daryl Peck, for Case 1229 to grant a variance from Section 401.3.A.6 for Applicant Treztark II, Ltd. for the property on Primrose Lane, Condo Unit 2, Tax ID No. 3004707810002 for an addition of 7 residential units for a maximum of 15 residential units in that condominium unit with the bulk of the construction to be as described in the testimony before the Board. Carried 2-1, Gary Lintner–no.

The meeting was then adjourned at 10:30 pm.

Respectfully submitted,



Tony Crocamo
Secretary