Dover Township
Planning Commission Minutes
January 4, 2012

Chairman Wayne Hoffman called the meeting to order at 7:05 p.m. Members present: Monica Love, Anthony Pinto, Amy Brinton, and Eric Harlacher. Absent: alternate Carol Kauffman. Also present: Zoning Officer Georgia Sprenkel, Solicitor John Baranski, Engineer Terry Myers, Recording Secretary, and three citizens.

I. Minutes
Motion by Love, second by Pinto, to approve the minutes of the meeting of December 7, 2011. All members voted aye; motion carried.

II. Reorganization
Motion by Love, second by Harlacher, to nominate Wayne Hoffman as Planning Commission Chairman for 2012. All members voted aye; motion carried.
Motion by Pinto, second by Brinton, to nominate Monica Love as Planning Commission Vice Chairman for 2012. All members voted aye; motion carried.
Motion by Brinton, second by Love, to nominate Anthony Pinto as Planning Commission Secretary for 2012. All members voted aye; motion carried.
Mr. Hoffman reported that Mr. Hansman was not reappointed to the Planning Commission. The members would like to thank Mr. Hansman for the time he served on the Planning Commission. Mr. Harlacher will now be an official voting member; Carol Kauffman will be the alternate.
Mr. Hoffman thanked the other professionals for their services to Dover Township.

III. Zoning Cases
None this month.

III. Plans
None this month.

IV. Other Business
Marlin and Andrea Crone – Shelly’s Restaurant – 3071 Carlisle Road
Marlin and Andrea Crone were present. They thought that the Township was going to re-zone the properties behind their site. In December, the Township contacted the Crones and asked them to get letters of approval from the neighbors stating that they have no problem with the Crones’ proposed use. One of the properties is government-owned and is up for sale. Mrs. Crone has obtained approvals from Fink, Small, O’Connor, Breach, tenants in Spangler’s property, and the people in the trailers on the other side of the street. She requested a waiver of
the requirement to get a signature of approval regarding the property owned by Fannie Mae. She has spoken with the realtor selling the property, who is not interested in helping unless the Crones are interested in purchasing the property (which they are not). Mr. Baranski would like to have the exact address of the property in question to be certain which is being waived. Mrs. Sprenkel confirmed that Fannie Mae is indeed difficult to deal with because of the paperwork and chain of command involved in getting any questions answered. If this property is rezoned to Commercial, any prospective purchaser will know this up front. The point was made that there was an intercom in use for the gas pumps on this site, so the neighbors are already subject to that noise, etc. The wording of the ordinance is the problem, actually, because the way it's worded, it excludes a majority of the commercial properties/businesses in the Township. How about a text amendment? The Board of Supervisors dismissed that idea. Discussion continued on the likelihood of the Board's approving this if it were brought up again.

Mr. Hoffman noted that the McDonald's speaker was hard to hear at the fence around that property, maybe 50-75 feet away. Properties at 200 feet from the speaker likely would not hear the Crones' speaker at all. Perhaps the volume of the speaker could be adjusted. The Crones are more than willing to comply with any Township regulations and any neighbor concerns to successfully shield this business from the residential section/use.

Mrs. Love would like to omit #5 from Section 620 completely and require screening with fencing, trees, and shrubs. From the Zoning Ordinance dated March 14, 2011; page 106, the following resulted –

Motion by Love, second by Pinto, to remove #5 from Section 620 “no part of the subject property shall be located within 200’...” AND to replace it with: “a buffer planting strip #2 and a fully opaque minimum 6’ high, maximum 8’ high fence or similar structure (retaining wall) shall be required along any adjoining residential use or residentially zoned property.” All members voted aye; motion carried.

Madelyn Shermeyer, from the audience, feels that an argument might be made that a resident could be having a picnic in his backyard with the drive-through right next door, and that could be a problem. There are actually quite a few properties in this Township that have this same situation.

End of discussion on the Crone request.

THEN, they started in on the Zoning Review...
Section 27-620, remove #1, re-number all subsequent items.
Discussion on daycare facilities, from very small to very large. Change the length of time to “not to exceed 24 consecutive hours.” In which zones does the Township want to permit childcare businesses? Mrs. Sprenkel has a problem with permitting some of these types of care facilities in especially the R4 zone. She doesn’t want to have the commercial-type daycare businesses in the residential zone. How about a daycare in a trailer park? Wouldn't the Department of Public Welfare have something to say about that? There are regulations for space, yard,
etc. Look at the other uses in any zone to see if this particular use will fit in and make sense.

Child daycare center, large, 16 or more children, permitted by special exception, yes in commercial, business park, village; no in industrial, any residential zone, conservation, agricultural.

Child daycare center, small, 7-15 children, permitted by special exception in commercial, business park, village, R3, R4; not industrial, conservation, agricultural, R1, or R2.

Domiciliary child daycare – permitted by special exception in commercial, business park, village, R1, R3, R4, Agricultural, Conservation.

Domiciliary adult care home – permitted by special exception, same as domiciliary child daycare (above). Length of time should be "not to exceed 24 hours."

Nursing care facility – add "other than a residence" -- permitted by special exception in commercial, business park, and village; no Ag, conservation. If part of campus-style or age-restricted housing, yes in R3.

Question on whether personal care facility classification is necessary. If so, Personal care facility – permitted by special exception in commercial, business park, village. Add "single-family" dwelling. Mr. Baranski will study and report back.

Mrs. Love suggested that the Planning Commission look at halfway homes as well.

Motion by Love, second by Pinto, to adjourn. All members voted aye; motion carried. The meeting adjourned at 9:14 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Julie B. Maher,
Recording Secretary