Dover Township
Planning Commission Minutes
June 1, 2011

Chairman Wayne Hoffman called the meeting to order at 7:06 p.m. Members present: Monica Love, Anthony Pinto, Amy Brinton and Carol Kauffman. Absent: Bill Hansman and alternate Eric Harlacher. Also present: Zoning Officer Georgia Sprenkel, Solicitor John Baranski, Engineers Terry Myers and Karen Wilson, Recording Secretary, and seven citizens.

I. Minutes

One small correction, page 2, third full paragraph, middle of paragraph. The sentence that reads “A different access route than Route 74 would be idea;” should read “ideal” not “idea;” Motion by Love, second by Kauffman, to approve the minutes of the meeting of May 4, 2011, with the above correction. All members voted aye; motion carried.

The minutes from the meeting of April 6, 2011, were discussed. On the last page, second paragraph, the Township Manager requested that the following sentence be deleted: “The point was made that the change in zoning was advertised and no one came to ask anything about this plan.” On discussion tonight, Mrs. Sprenkel offered that the Manager asserted that this statement isn’t true; that someone affiliated with Terra Vista did indeed come to one or two meetings to discuss the proposed zoning change. Memories were unclear at tonight’s meeting, however, as to exactly who came in and at which meeting and what was said. Mr. Hoffman felt that if that comment was in the minutes, someone at the April 6 meeting did say it, and that it ought to remain in the minutes, BUT APOLOGIZE FOR AN UNTRUE STATEMENT. The research done after the April 6 meeting indicated that this statement is apparently in error and the Planning commission regrets the error, but did not remove the statement from the minutes of April 6, 2011. Motion by Love, second by Pinto, to approve the minutes of the meeting of April 6, 2011, noting the discrepancy as discussed above, and permitting the UNTRUE statement to remain in the minutes. All members voted aye; motion carried.

Motion by Brinton, second by Love, to authorize the Planning Commission Secretary to sign the Planning Module for Esther Flohr. All members voted aye; motion carried.

II. Plans

A. PL 11-2, Esther Flohr – 3-lot subdivision, Blackberry and Carlisle Roads, Conservation Zone

Lee Faircloth was present with Mary Chronister and Tim Flohr on this plan, which involves a subdivision of a 75-acre farm on Old Carlisle and Blackberry roads. The roads naturally subdivide the property. The farm house is on Lot 1, a 20-acre lot. The Estate wishes to subdivide the three parcels as they are separated by the roads. No building is planned for any of the lots.

Ms. Wilson reviewed the comments on the C. S. Davidson letter dated May 27, 2011. It was noted that this subdivision was reviewed under the new SALDO and Zoning Ordinance. Outstanding comments: Zoning 2, front setbacks for lots along arterial roads.
shall be at least 50 Feet. (add to cover sheet); SALDO 2, GIS disk (Section 501.2.A); 4, engineer’s signature/seal (Section 501.2.F); 6, owners’ signature/seal (are both signatures necessary? It depends on the wording of the will; the applicants will check and report back) (Section 501.2.H); 13, location of existing water lines (Section 501.2.O); 20, list waivers, descriptions, ordinance section references, conditions, and approval dates on the cover page; 21, street addresses (601.2.C); 22, PA DEP Planning Code number (Section 601.2.L); added 25, add note on the plan regarding the private drive; added 26, building permit application note.

Waivers requested: Section 501.2.R, contours; 704.b, existing street improvements (ROW on Sky Top Trail; cartway on Carlisle Road, Old Carlisle Road, and Sky Top Trail); and 501.2.0, wells and septic systems within 400' of each property.

Motion by Love, second by Pinto, to recommend approval of the waiver requests on the Esther Flohr plan for the following Sections as outlined above: 501.2.R; 704.b; and 501.2.0. All members voted aye; motion carried.

There’s a private road that is shared by a few residents in the area. There are no formal agreements governing this private road. This could be an issue between the parties, not the Township, but it might be good to show the road/driveway and to be aware of it. Add a note on the first sheet, stating that it is a private drive with the residents having the right to use it? Mr. Baranski’s advice was to have the Estate acknowledge the existence of the driveway, permitting its use. There could be future access issues over this driveway. This driveway/private road has been there and in use since the original farm was in use.

Motion by Love, second by Brinton, to recommend approval of the Esther Flohr subdivision subject to the following open items as referred to above being addressed: Zoning 2; SALDO 2, 4, 6, 13, 20, 21, 22, 25, and 26. All members voted aye; motion carried.

B. Providence Place – Fox Run Road – revise lot line

George Leader was present with Dean McCorkel. This plan has an error on it in the way of an incorrect lot line. The western property line is shown to go through the building. Mr. Leader noted that the applicant didn’t want the mortgage to cover the open land in case they wanted to put something on it so the lot line needs to be changed.

Motion by Love, second by Pinto, to approve the revised plan for Providence Place, 07-129, last revised May 23, 2011, shifting the interior western property line to be outside the building AND with the addition of bearings and distances as requested by Mr. Myers. All members voted aye; motion carried.

C. Zoning Revisions

At this point, Mr. Pinto left the meeting (7:53 p.m.). Mrs. Love reviewed some recommended corrections to the Zoning Ordinance.

Page 39, Section 27-401, discussion was held on the inclusion of a farmstead. Should the Planning Commission include Farmstead in the Conservation zone as a permitted use? Remove all references to “farmstead” in the ordinance.

Page 40, Section 27-401.3.L; outdoor recreation facility; add “see 27-614, Clubs Profit/Non-Profit”
page 40, Section 27-401.3.S and Q. Farm/farmer's Market. It says see Section 27-625, but that's Garden Center; there's nothing for farm/farmer's market. Create requirements for farm/farmer's markets that are different from the Garden Center. Mrs. Love presented suggested amendments; Mr. Baranski will incorporate the suggestions for review.

Page 43, Section 27-402.4.F, include windmill in the exception to height in the Conservation and Ag zones? Yes. Discussion was held on why there are height restrictions in the first place.

Page 47, Section 27-403.3.G, add “no more than” 1,500 square feet
Page 51, Section 27-405.3.B, nursing facility, medical care clinic, or facility; clarification needed. Section 27-619 should be Convalescent/Nursing Home/Large Personal Care Facility.

Page 51, Section 27-405.5.A.1, in the table, the single family detached 9,000 square feet cannot meet the five units/acre density; lower to 8,700 square feet. NO– leave at 9,000 square feet.

Page 51, Section 27-405.5.A (2), maximum height. Changes were recommended in maximum height for several zones to a maximum height of 45 feet, provided all setbacks, etc., are met. It was decided to change the maximum height to 45 feet. Remove references to “stories.” (See wording proposed.)

Page 53, same as on page 51, Section 27-612, should say Convalescent/Nursing Home/Large Personal Care Facility, Section 27-619.

How about group home/child care home/adult care home/child care center? Is this a good place for this use, in the highest density? Why isn’t it permitted in the Commercial Zone? It’s in the R-3 zone. This must be revisited and reviewed. Mr. Baranski will address it.

On another matter, where would a bar be located? The same zone in which a restaurant is permitted? Commercial zone, special exception use? Yes. Village zone? Yes, and change the permitted uses to include a restaurant, deli, tavern, etc. Ag zone? No. Conservation? No. Business Park? Yes, add restaurant and tavern. Industrial, no. Crossroads/Village Overlay? Yes. All by Special Exception. Mr. Baranski will work on drafting the language.

That’s enough for now. The Solicitor and Engineer will meet/discuss/review/redraft in preparation of the next meeting. Next time, they will discuss more changes.

III. Zoning Cases
    None this month.

IV. Other Business
    Motion by Love, second by Brinton, to adjourn. All members voted aye; motion carried. The meeting adjourned at 9:28 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Julie B. Maher, Recording Secretary