

**APRIL 19, 2007 SUPERVISORS' PUBLIC HEARING:**

The Mount Joy Township Board of Supervisors held a Public Hearing this date at 7:15 p.m. as publicly advertised, at the Mount Joy Township Municipal Office, 902 Hoffman Home Road, Gettysburg, PA 17325, to receive public comment, oral or written, on a proposed ordinance amending Section 110-152 (Traffic Impact Study) of the Township's Zoning Ordinance to ADD a new sub-section "R." ELIMINATING THE NEED FOR A TRAFFIC STUDY WHERE A USE IS LOCATED WITHIN A TRANSPORTATION SERVICE AREA AND THE APPLICANT PROVIDES A CERTIFICATION THAT THE ANTICIPATED TRAFFIC WILL NOT EXCEED THAT PROJECTION BY THE LAND USE ASSUMPTIONS REPORT ADOPTED AS PART OF THE TRAFFIC IMPACT FEE PROCESSES; and REPEALING sub-section "O." of Section 86-18 (Street and highway standards) of the Township's Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance AND REPLACING IT WITH A CROSS REFERENCE TO SECTION 110-152.R. OF THE TOWNSHIP CODE.

Board Chairman James W. Waybright convened the Public Hearing with the following others in attendance: Supervisors William J. Chantelau; George L. Scott; and Samuel L. Dayhoff; and Secretary Brenda J. Constable.

Citizens in attendance were: R.J. Knouse; Jim Hockenberry; Audrey Weiland and Jerry Althoff representing the Planning Commission; Carol E. Holtz; Pam & John Roman, and Audrey Sanders all representing the Watchdog Group; Sally Alexander; Harry Walker; and Aaron Young, Reporter for *The Gettysburg Times*.

**Board Chairman stated** the purpose of the public hearing as listed above. He also noted that notice of this Public Hearing was advertised in *The Gettysburg Times* on March 26, 2007 and a Proof of Publication has been provided. A complete text of the proposed Ordinance was made available for public review at the Township Office and at the Adams County Law Library in the Adams county Courthouse.

**Board Chairman Waybright stated** that the Adams County Planning and Development Office has submitted written comment dated March 22, 2007 on this proposed Ordinance and supports the proposed amendments. He further stated that the proposed Ordinance will be on the Supervisors' agenda during the regular meeting following this public hearing.

**Mr. Waybright:** At this time, we will open the floor for public comment on the Ordinance only. Anyone wishing to speak, please stand and give your name and address.

**Sally Alexander:** I live at 1735 Barlow-Two Taverns Road. When there was a public hearing held before passing the Act 209 Traffic Ordinance, there were a lot people at the hearing, they were upset, voicing their concerns about road widening and relocations of roads and at that time, you said the project lists in the Act 209 papers were just concepts, nothing was set in stone, it was just a way the township had to collect fees from developers for future road improvements if they were needed; no projects were definite. But it seems to me that the new zoning text amendment that you are planning on passing tonight, eliminating the need for traffic studies because the study has been done by the Act 209, gives the

Act 209 concept legitimacy. It seems they have moved from concepts that no one should worry about to become the holy grail of traffic reports and I think, just like any issue that development raises such as sewer or water, traffic is a very serious subject and should be looked at very closely with utmost care, requiring a developer to give \_\_\_\_\_ and car trips that is aligned with the number of trips, the Act 209, instead of a complete traffic overview, it is in my opinion, giving developers a free ride.

**Mr. Waybright:** Anyone else? Last guy in the door speaks.

**Lou Shuba:** Vice-Chair, I don't know what's been said but I heard something about 209. I'm Vice-Chair of 209. I would like to have the Supervisors consider having a public hearing, not hearing but discussion; I would be more than happy to sit there and explain to some of the people on what the thinking that went into some of the items on Act 209 because I, as I read in the paper, I know that there are people that look at something and they see numbers and they have no idea what the numbers mean, how they got there, the discussion that occurred to make those numbers get there, and what transpires, so I would be happy to do that. To give you an example of what I am talking about, I saw a letter in the paper recently, the numbers that were used in the paper may be correct, may have come from the report, however, as far as I'm concerned, the way it was presented, the information was totally erroneous and to give you an example on why; 1) the township has no control over Route 97; 2) there is a proposed road possibly in the future connecting Barlow-Two Taverns Road and Hoffman Home Road; the only thing about that is that there is a possibility. Until such time that a need arises it is only a possibility; where it goes, if it ever goes, would be based on an engineering study. So what you see on the map only indicates that there is a potential project that it means absolutely nothing until such time that a need arises; it just allows the township an opportunity to collect funds from developers that if the need arises, there is money available to build that road if in fact the people in charge at the time decide to put that road in because there are other possibilities we talked about. In a lot of these situations of what is going to happen will depend on PennDOT. PennDOT for example, will not allow two traffic lights in that area so if you look at the proposal it indicates that Hoffman Home Road and coming off of that road, don't know the name of the other road coming from Bonneauville (Two Taverns) would have to be perpendicular to each other for one traffic light. Now, some of the situations we discussed indicate that the state might allow a right-hand turn off of 97 onto Barlow-Two Taverns Road. They might allow a right-hand turn off of Barlow-Two Taverns Road onto 97, but no left-hand turns onto Barlow-Two Taverns Road. So then that leaves you up in the air, well what do you do if they allow you to do that? Then that means people living on Barlow-Two Taverns Road have to do what they are doing now, they have to come all the way back to King Road or to White Church Road to get out on 97. So that's a possibility; no one knows what PennDOT will allow the township to do in the future so the worst case scenario is, after a lot of discussion, and if we have this hearing or discussion, I can get more into it, let's go with a worse case scenario. If in fact it reaches a point that you have to put a road in, at least you have the money from

the developers to do it. If not, it is going to come out of the townships, the citizens' pockets. So that type of thing, I would be more than happy to discuss in a meeting; some of the thinking that went into these things. The 209 presentation is strictly an engineering study, there is not one project that is cast in stone, not one. All of those projects on there are potential projects so that the township can collect revenues that if the need arises then they would have the funds to do that. If the need doesn't arise, the money goes back to the developer; it's just that simple. The thing is based on the current zoning that is in effect right now and the way to prevent all that from happening; very easy, don't sell your land, or if the farmers can put their land into the preservation program, or people can sell their TDR rights. Every acre that gets preserved reduces all of that impact. Thank you.

**Mr. Waybright:** Thank you. Any other comments? No other comments, the hearing is closed.

Hearing closed at 7:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Brenda J. Constable  
Secretary