The Mt. Joy Township Supervisors held a workshop meeting on Monday, March 12, 201, at 10:30 AM in the Township municipal building located at 902 Hoffman Home Road, Gettysburg. All Supervisors, Dayhoff, Waybright, Chantelau, Rogers and Scott were present. Also present were Township solicitor, Walton V. Davis, Township engineer, Mark Lewis of Herbert, Rowland and Grubic, Inc. and Township secretary, Bonnie L. Koontz.

The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the Planned Golf Community ordinance proposed by The Links at Gettysburg. Present representing The Links were Rick Klein, Atty. John White and Robert Sharrah.

The public had been invited to attend; however, no members of the public were present.

Atty. White began by stating that a similar workshop had been held on February 12, 2001, at which time the Herbert, Rowland & Grubic memo of January 3, 2001, was reviewed. Since then they have met with Mark (Lewis) and reviewed the draft. As a follow-up to the February 12 workshop, and the meeting with Mark on March 1, 2001, there is now a March 5, 2001 draft.

Discussion during the workshop included the definition of "Zero lot line dwelling." Klein commented that zero lot lines are working in other parts of the country and might work here. These are almost connected by a porch or covered patio, and could be as close as 5-10', a very high density product. Sharrah commented that one wall could sit on the lot line. White commented that it appears that the traditional single-family home is not what people are now looking for; they don't want a big yard to maintain. There is access from the front and from the rear for fire protection. Dayhoff questioned that if some are closer than 20', could one be of brick or some other fire-proof material. There was discussion of revising the wording to fit what they have; 'There shall be a minimum separation between buildings of 20'.'

Chantelau noted that the building height of three stories now says not to exceed 45′ – was 40′.

On page eight of the draft, paragraph 8, the mix of residential uses added zero lot lines, not to exceed more than 5% of the total dwellings; should be of the minimum 25% single-family dwellings. Zero lot lines may be classified as single-family dwellings.

Chantelau asked for clarification of the number of dwellings. Sharrah answered 268 to 275.

Atty. White noted that at the top of page 10, the words "At the Land Development Plan Approval stage" have been added. On page 9, there was discussion over "the Applicant shall not be required to pay tapping or connection fees otherwise assessable under Pennsylvania's Municipality Authorities Act". Also on page 9, paragraph 10, #2, Chantelau asked in regard to "not becoming financially burdensome to the Township" how this would be enforced. White responded that a bond would be posted. Chantelau then asked if this would be in perpetuity and Lewis suggested that this be a recommended condition that they accept responsibility.

White noted that on page 11, under commercial lots, the draft now says no more than 22 acres of the project area may be devoted to commercial uses.

White also noted that on page 12 there is a major change as now the hotel/motel/conference center would require a separate conditional use application to be filed. Discussion followed as to whether the maximum number of rooms should be stated now.

Waybright noted that on page 12, where the sq. footage of the convenience store is stated, if this included storage area, too. It was recommended to change this to 3,000 sq. ft.

White stated that on page 15, the formula to calculate the area of the golf course has been plugged in. Lewis added that easements over private property shouldn't be included in the golf course area. There should be a minimum perimeter of 40 stated for tees and greens.

Davis, referring to page 16, regarding wells adversely affected by golf course water usage, asked if the water usage wasn't for the entire project—not just the golf course. There was discussion about some type of draw-down test. Sharrah suggested that wells adversely affected should be limited to any well within one-quarter mile of the property boundary or any Planned Golf Community water source.

(It is noted that Atty. Davis left the meeting at 12:10 PM.)

Atty. White commented that in regard to golf cart crossings, at-grade crossings are prohibited except those pre-existing.

Waybright, returning to page 15, #5, asked if the clubhouse, pro shop, pool, pool house and tennis courts are considered part of the golf course or the community area. Sharrah said to consider as commercial; they are part of the 22 acres.

There was discussion of a drawing of a cul-de-sac.

In regard to lighting, the maximum height is 16'. A photometric lighting plan will be included in the land development plan submission.

On page 24, in regard to stormwater management facilities, White commented that where possible, water will be stored and used on the golf course.

There was discussion about landscape screening and berming of the planned golf community's commercial uses.

There was discussion of the size of the conference center meeting room(s). It was recommended that the meeting room space area in the conference center not exceed 45,000 sq. ft.

Waybright asked if there was a guide to what percentage each use uses and was answered "no".

Following additional brief discussion, the workshop adjourned at 12:37 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Bonnie L. Koontz Secretary