

Dover Township
Planning Commission Minutes
December 2, 2015

Chairman Wayne Hoffman called the regular Planning Commission meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. Members present: Anthony Pinto and Carol Kauffman. Absent: Amy Brinton and Eric Harlacher. Also present: Solicitor John Baranski, Zoning Officer Georgia Sprenkel, Engineers Terry Myers and Cory McCoy, Recording Secretary, and six citizens.

I. Minutes

Motion by Pinto, second by Hoffman, to approve the minutes of the meeting of November 4, 2015. Two members voted aye; Kauffman abstained. Motion carried.

II. Zoning Cases

No cases this month.

III. Plans

A. Lighthouse Baptist Church, 5005 Carlisle Road, Land Development Plan
Adam Davis, Chris Richie, and Pastor Walsh were present on this plan, which involves a 27K square foot addition to the church, which is located in the Business Park Zone. There will be some reconstruction of the existing parking areas, new parking configuration. Existing storm basins will be modified to handle stormwater. There will be grading on the eastern area of parking lot to permit future athletic fields. Mr. Richie reported that the addition will be used for a gymnasium, offices, classroom areas; it will afford more storage for church and school facilities. Existing use is church and school. Parking space requirements have been met. Total property is nearly 18 acres.

Waivers requested: additional ROW and cartway widths on Carlisle Road and George Street; street trees on Carlisle Road and George Street; buffer/screening to the adjacent Ag Zone property, and three waivers associated with stormwater. Discussion was held on the waiver for the buffering – right on the other side of their property is a tree line, driveway, and a house. Mr. Hoffman feels that there's ample space between the church addition and the next property to currently sufficiently screen the church's property/use. How about in the future, though, if the church further alters this property with something that would create noise, etc? Is granting the waiver now forever granting the same waiver in the future? For example, if they added a picnic pavilion and seating, etc., no further screening would be required. If they wanted to build another building, that's different. If the rear of the property were to be developed further, the Planning Commission could require that the applicant appear in front of the planning commission for an extension of that waiver or be required to add screening relative to that new future use.

Motion by Kauffman, second by Pinto, to recommend approval of the waiver request for Section 22-1103.11, to eliminate the need for additional buffering/screening. All members voted aye; motion carried.

The waiver for additional widening was discussed. The additional traffic created by the use of the building will likely not affect the current traffic volume.

Motion by Kauffman, second by Pinto, to recommend approval of the waiver request for Section 22-704.b, ROW and cartway widening on George Street and Carlisle Road. All members voted aye; motion carried.

Mr. Myers feels that the existing trees along George Street and the other existing trees meet the requirements. The waiver is, therefore, not required.

Stormwater waivers requested:

1--basin to be located within the building setback (existing in the setback).

Discussion was held on this existing non-conformity. Mr. Myers feels that this waiver is warranted for this situation, as it existed before the ordinance requirements were changed.

2—side slopes of the same basin; ordinance requires 4:1; they are proposing 3:1 to get the volume they need. This slope may certainly be safely mown with a tractor. The applicant will be using a special seed and temporary degradable matting to ensure rapid growth for minimal erosion.

3—fencing around the basins. Currently, there is no fence. Mr. Davis noted that during a 100-year storm, the depth of the water in the basins would be 3.5' and 3.9'. Mr. Myers would rather see partial fencing, where the basin abuts the parking area. That fence need be only 4' high and could be chain link, or something similar with not greater than 2" spaces throughout. The applicants were thinking about vinyl fencing.

Motion by Pinto, second by Hoffman, to recommend approval of the waiver request for Section 19-301.11, to permit *Basin 2* to be within the setback along the George Street frontage. All members voted aye; motion carried.

Motion by Pinto, second by Kauffman, to recommend approval of Section 308-8-3.A.3, to permit the maximum permitted side slopes for detention or retention basin to be 3:1 for *Basin 2*. All members voted aye; motion carried.

Motion by Pinto, second by Kauffman, to recommend approval of the waiver request for Section 19-308.3.a.7.a, to not require fencing *with the exception of the area between Basin 2 and the parking area on the south side*. All members voted aye; motion carried.

Mr. Myers reviewed comments on the C. S. Davidson letter dated November 20, 2015, and the stormwater management review addendum dated December 2, 2015: open 3, engineer's signature/seal (Section 501.2.F); 5, owner's signature (Section 501.2.H); 10, show clear sight triangles at Carlisle and George Street and identify the clear sign triangle easement within the property (Section 22-501.2.CC); 12, submit a feasibility report in duplicate concerning the availability and/or adaptability of sewer and water facilities in or near a proposed land development (Section 22-503.1). A water use projection will need to be submitted. Information regarding existing on-lot disposal system design, capacity, existing flows and future anticipated flows as a result of this building addition should be provided on the plans; *recalculation of the numbers was requested*; 13, GIS disc (Section 22-601.2.A); 15, erosion and sediment pollution control plan approval (Section 22-602.4); 21, establish a 20' wide drainage easement along the existing channel that flows from Carlisle Road to the northwestern point of the property; (Section 22-714.2); 22, stormwater management plan approval (Section 22-1001.1); 24, public improvement security (Section 22-1201.6); and 26, show the existing pipe type and size for the water

main and the existing service; any proposed new connections to the water system and details of how the connection is to be made.

Lengthy discussion was held on Item 21, identifying the wetlands as a drainage easement, actions that could affect the downstream property; the responsibilities of identifying the area as an easement, and requiring the applicant/property owner to come before the Township if a change is made. Pastor Walsh asked about accessing the part of the property that lies on the other side of the wetland/easement. That was his concern about identifying this area as a wetland, and disturbing it is prohibited. Mr. Myers noted that the church could conceivably build a bridge across the wetland area to access the other part of the property. Mr. Hoffman didn't want to add the requirement that the applicant come to the Township if it changes the easement area because a higher agency doesn't mandate that action. Mr. Myers admitted that this requirement is indeed a burden that the Township places on that property owner, but he feels it's important for preservation of the area and the protection of the residents.

Motion by Pinto, second by Kauffman, to recommend approval of the Final Land Development Plan for Lighthouse Baptist Church, subject to the satisfactory resolution of the following items on the C. S. Davidson letter referred to above: 3, 5, 10, 12 (with the calculation modification request being added), 13, 15, 21, 22, 24, and 26. All members voted aye; motion carried.

IV. Other Business

A. Deb Snyder – Lark Lane property

Deb Snyder, 3440 Admire Road, was present on this proposal. She currently has a wedding venue on her property. She would like to expand the use to include the building at One Lark Lane (adjoining lot) property. The house on this property is bank-owned, and someone would need to live there as required by the ordinance, and there was a question of whether the structure would be considered “historically significant or architecturally interesting structure, etc.” The wedding venue would need to be an accessory use to the principal use on this lot. Mrs. Snyder doesn't want to live in that house, as she lives on the farm adjacent to this property, where her business is located. The two properties were once on the same parcel. She would need a reverse subdivision to combine the lots. She could then continue to live in her residence, and the wedding venue would be the accessory use of the lot. She would like to still operate her barn wedding venue. She isn't interested in offering breakfast or billing the building as a bed and breakfast. She would be able to add the required parking area. She would need to check with the building code to see if she could add a stove, sink, and fridge area in the garage for use by the caterers. The extra house use would need to be associated with a “milestone” event.

This use is permitted as a Special Exception in this zone (Ag), as long as the properties are combined. She will need to go to the Zoning Hearing Board for approval. Odds are in her favor for approval, if she meets all the requirements of the Special Exception.

A related conversation was held on the use of fireworks at the venue. Apparently, there have been complaints about the noise. This might be considered a “detriment to the neighborhood.”

B. Traffic Study – Bupp/McNaughton property on Bull Road

Mr. Myers presented this information. These applicants had previously requested a modification to the Zoning Ordinance to permit them to do an age-restricted housing project in the R-1 zone. They now have preliminary approval for single-family housing; they want to make them into duplexes for “age directed” housing. These would be fee simple lots. Do they need to do a traffic study? They would be going from 130 single-family units to 196 duplexes. They would be adding 64 more units, but probably decreasing the estimated traffic flow by 160 trips per day, based on who will be living there (in this type of community). Would the Planning Commission be inclined to recommend approval of a request to forego a traffic study? They’ve done all sorts of calculations to predict the volume of traffic and number of trips, etc. Would that be good enough? There was no traffic study done for the previously approved plan. In lieu of a traffic study, the applicant/developer would pay a certain amount of money per lot. They would request a waiver of the traffic study. The Planning Commission members felt that it would be better to accept the fees in lieu of a study and put those funds toward necessary improvements.

Motion by Kauffman, second by Pinto, to adjourn. All members voted aye; motion carried. The meeting adjourned at 9:09 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Julie B. Maher,
Recording Secretary