

Dover Township  
 Planning Commission Minutes  
 March 7, 2018

Chairman Wayne Hoffman called the regular Planning Commission meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. Members present: Anthony Pinto, Eric Harlacher, Carol Kauffman, Brian Kimball; alternates Michael Curley and Justin Bigham. Also present: Solicitor John Baranski, Zoning Officer Georgia Sprengel, Engineers Terry Myers and Cory McCoy, Recording Secretary, and 14 citizens.

I. Minutes

Corrections to the minutes of February 7, 2018: page 3, second paragraph of Item B, Dover Area School District plan, under requested waivers – should be “plan sheet size,” (Section 22-501.2.A); waiver of required financial security (Section 22-602.1), and third paragraph, “agreements that were made when [not “with”] the current intermediate school was built...”

**Motion** by Harlacher, second by Kauffman, to approve the minutes of the meeting of February 7, 2018, as amended above. All members voted aye; motion carried.

II. Zoning Case

A. ZHB 18-1 – Bell Mark, 4500 West Canal Road; request for four (4) Variances in Ag Zone: Sections 27-902, expansion of non-conforming use; 27-402.5.G, lot coverage; 27-703, parking spaces; and 27-402.5.B.(2)

Dave Jones of Stock and Leader, was present on behalf of the applicants, who would like to add a 9,000 (150' x 60') square foot addition in the Ag zone. The use of the existing facility is light manufacturing and warehousing. Jeff Spangler was also present. He walked the Planning Commission members through the proposal.

Variances requested: *expansion of a non-conforming use* (Section 27-902). The applicant would be permitted to expand up to 35% of the building size, and they are requesting a Variance for 600' over the permitted expansion, which Mr. Jones feels is a de minimus Variance. Variance: *lot coverage* (Section 27-402.5.G); they propose a combination of 38.6% of impervious coverage, which is 5.26 % over permitted; and Variance: *parking*, need 75 spaces, they currently have 69 spaces. Variance: *lot size* of 5 acres. Lots 11 and 12 are under both five acres. Total site size is appropriate and in compliance at 5.48 acres. They are planning to combine two of the three lots on this site. There is a large area of wetlands and a tree line, plus a septic area and a slope and a stormwater basin. The proposed addition will be in a “broad swale” area that leads back to the stormwater basin.

Dale Miller explained this business. They manufacture machines that print labels, etc. The proposed new area will house engineering space and a showroom to enable them to show their machines to visitors.

Why can't they build it at 8400 square feet to comply with the ordinance? They cannot lay it out and make it work in that small of an area.

Lot sizes were discussed. Why not combine all three lots? Perhaps the owner might want to sell that lot in the future. If they were to combine all the lots, they would not need to worry about the lot size. This is a sort of gray area, and they've put it on the

table just in case they need it. Currently it's a stand-alone lot, and nothing that they are proposing will affect that size. *Mr. Baranski thinks that they do not need to request that Variance for the lot size.*

They do need the Variance for the expansion of the non-conforming use. The Planning Commission members agree that this makes sense.

The lot coverage Variance makes sense, too, if the Township were to grant the expansion of the building. The Township can hardly say they can build a facility and not anticipate that this will increase the impervious coverage.

The storm water basin will likely need to be modified. There's room on the lot to expand the size of the area.

How about the parking spaces? Mr. Dale Miller reported that there are 15 sales people on the payroll, but they are never on the premises. Why count them in the number of employees? Consensus was that this Variance can be withdrawn as it likely isn't needed. The number of employees on the largest two shifts comply with the requirements, so indeed, this Variance is moot.

**Motion** by Harlacher, second by Pinto, to recommend approval of Variances 1 and 2, expansion of the non-conforming use and exceeding the impervious coverage (Sections 27-902 and 27-402.5G). All members voted aye; motion carried.

**Motion** by Pinto, second by Harlacher, to recommend that the other two Variances (3 and 4) be deemed not applicable (Sections 27-703 and 27-402-5B(2)) and be stricken from the application. All members voted aye; motion carried.

### III. Plans

#### A. PL-18-1 – Dover Area School District – Subdivision Plan and Land Development Plan

Cheryl Love, ELA Group, was present on behalf of the applicant. This plan was before the Planning Commission last month and was tabled to permit the applicant to address some open items.

One open item was an open walking trail from site to site. Students will be transported by bus; the trail will not be used nor maintained by the applicant.

Parking – the applicant exceeds the required number of spaces.

New lighting will be provided, with no spill-out lighting to adjoining properties.

Traffic impact study – will provide striped areas and other traffic-directing measures.

Additional ROW will be dedicated along the front of the school's property, should the Township accept that dedication. The road would not be installed until the other portion of the project, the extension of Intermediate Avenue, is completed and the roadway is aligned.

Walking path to the baseball stadium is added.

Meike Driscoll was also present to corroborate information on the dedication of the ROW on the extension of Intermediate Avenue. The school project is moving on a different timetable than the extension of the road, and the school certainly will not impede any progress in that regard. The school project proposal has tried to plan ahead for the expansion to occur in the future, assuming and hoping that it does indeed move forward to completion.

Regarding the traffic study, Mark Henise, ELA Group, discussed the findings. The study addressed five intersections as requested. Recommending that left-turn lanes be constructed although the applicant will defer that construction for a year or so pending the extension of Intermediate Avenue. It was noted that these left-turn lanes will be constructed prior to the opening of the school, no matter what. The only variable would be the actual length of the lanes, which would depend on the extension of Intermediate Drive. Right-turn lanes are not recommended due to physical circumstances. Mayfield Street was discussed. Can traffic be restricted from going onto Mayfield? Make it a right-turn only out of the parking lot? If it's assumed that Intermediate Avenue will be completed, then there's no traffic going up that way. Not the best solution. Whatever is done should not adversely affect the residents on Mayfield Street. Would it help to put a peak-time crossing guard at that location? Possibly.

Is there a one-way in and one-way out entrance? Ms. Love and Mr. Henise explained. Also present: Discussion was held on ingress and egress at the parking lot and getting the students from one side of the road to the other for sports activities after school. There can be an activity bus to accomplish this safely. It was noted that a Security Risk Assessment is being performed to make sure each school and area are as safe as possible at all times.

Steve Stefanowicz from the audience said that the main concern of the residents on Mayfield is: is there room for two-way traffic on that road?

Has a traffic study been done on the intersection of Canal and North Salem Road? If not, why not? Mr. Myers explained that when the scope of work was done for the study for the School's LDP, the preparers did not realize that there were going to be any changes to the Canal/North Salem intersection. The concern is that the changes brought about by the school project (one additional bus) will generate a fair amount of increased traffic at that intersection. Does the Planning Commission want the applicant to add this intersection to their traffic study? If the increase by one bus doesn't change the amount of traffic at the intersection, then, Mr. Baranski said, the Township cannot ask the applicant to include that intersection in its study. It's not the applicant's problem if the intersection is already a mess. This area desperately needs attention and has for many years.

Does Mr. Henise foresee any difficulty obtaining the proper permission from PennDOT to accomplish the improvements to the roads? No. Mayfield Street is a Borough street, and the Borough would need to apply for that permit. Mr. Pinto doesn't feel that the improvements proposed to Main Street and Mayfield Street are a good idea, taking into account student drivers making a left-hand turn onto Main Street. He feels that this should not be a major intersection to handle traffic. It was noted that if PennDOT were to deny any of the permits for any of the proposals, the applicant would need to modify its plan to address this. Mr. Henise noted that the traffic numbers for the current situation warrant a left-turn lane. The left-turn traffic backs up at that intersection now, a less than desirable situation.

Would the applicants add to the plan how students will be bused from school to school or school to field? Discussion was held – it's not appropriate to put this note on the plan, but Mr. Myers feels that it should be in the form of a letter directed to the Township. Attorney Driscoll would like to address and discuss the matter with the Supervisors and come up with a solution.

Mr. Hoffman asked how the applicant will handle coordination of the “out with the old, in with the new” phases of the building project. A representative for the school project explained how this will be accomplished. How about the measures for the wellhead protection area concerns? These measures are included in the plan. Mr. Myers noted that the wellhead is a Borough issue, but the Borough agreed to proceed under the Township’s wellhead protection measures. How about stormwater? Their plan is being reviewed and revised.

C. S. Davidson’s letter of March 1, 2018, was discussed. Waivers requested: plan sheet size (Section 22-501.2.A); financial security (Section 22-602.1); parking lot screening (Section 22-1103.12.A); parking lot planting islands (Section 22-1103.12.C); and parking lot divider islands (Section 22-1103.12.E).

**Motion** by Harlacher, second by Kauffman, to recommend approval of the waivers requested as referred to above: Section 22-501.2.A, plan sheet size; Section 22-602.1, financial security; Section 22-1103.12.A, parking lot screening; Section 22-1103.12.C, parking lot planting islands; and Section 22-1103.12.E, parking lot divider islands. All members voted aye; motion carried.

Outstanding items: Zoning 1, all outdoor play areas shall be sufficiently screened and insulated so as to protect the neighborhood from inappropriate noise and other disturbances. The proposed tree line along the proposed Intermediate Avenue, nearest the baseball field, should be extended to at least the width of the baseball field; SALDO, 1, GIS disk (Section 22-501.2.A); 2, engineer’s signature/seal, (Section 22-501.2.F); 3, owner’s signature (Section 22-501.2.H); 6, title of the plan set should be revised to “Lot Consolidation and Final Land Development...” The land development plan sheets should show the lot in question as a single lot (Section 501.2.L). The existing lot line to be extinguished is still shown on sheet CS-08; 7, recording information for all existing and proposed easements and ROWs should be shown on the plans (Section 22-501.2.M). Recording information is needed for proposed easements shown on sheet CS-12. Provide hatching for the proposed ROW in the easement plan legend on sheet CS-12; 8, ROW should be established on the plans for the extension of Intermediate Avenue from the existing street to the western property line (Section 22-501.2.M). The proposed ROW measures 32’ from the centerline of Intermediate Avenue to include the sidewalk, but is stated as 30’ in note L-33 on sheet CS-09; 9, All existing environmentally constraining resources including watercourses and bodies, woodlands, wetlands, springs, floodplains, and other significant natural features should be quantified and noted on the plans (Section 22-501.2.P). Regarding Dover Borough Well No. 6, the following should be added to the plans: a) the location of the Zones be clearly delineated and identified on the plans; b) Source Prohibitions contained in Sections 26-211, 26-212, and 26-213 for the appropriate Zones be listed on the plans; and c) Dover Borough requests that Section 26-251 – *Reporting Requirements for Hazardous Materials Spills* be listed on the plans. Dover Borough should be listed as the contact agency; 12, planning module approval for the projected sewage flow increase will need to be obtained from PA DEP (Section 22-502.2); 13, a transportation impact study shall be submitted with the preliminary plan for land developments involving 75 or more parking spaces (Section 22-719.2.B); 14, stormwater management plan approval (Section 22-502.8); 15, soil erosion and sediment pollution

control plan approval (Section 22-602.4); 16, suitable documentation should be provided that the plans are in conformance with ordinances and regulations governing the extension of utility services (Section 22-602.9). Approval from the Township for modifications to the sanitary sewer should be provided; 17, copies of approved DEP and Army Corps of Engineers permits shall be provided (Section 22-602.12); 18, fire hydrant installation approval (Section 22-713.3.D); 20, where differing pipe sizes meet at a junction, the tops of pipe should match instead of the inverts; 21, all comments from the Township Public Works Department must be addressed prior to final plan approval; 22, the note at the existing sanitary sewer manhole on sheet CS-27 should be revised to state: *“School District responsibility for the grinder pump force main starts at the manhole.”* and [added] 23, letter of intent regarding the activities protocol transfer of students via activity bus; and [added] 24, add a note to incorporate items 4 (construct a 150’ eastbound left-turn lane and a 75’ westbound left-turn lane on Canal Road at the intersection of Intermediate Drive/existing high school driveway. This improvement will require a PennDOT HOP. This improvement should be completed prior to the opening of the new high school;) and 5 (restripe Main Street to provide a 100’ northbound left-turn lane at the intersection with Mayfield Street. This improvement will require a PennDOT HOP. It should be completed prior to the opening of the new school) from the Summary of Recommendations from the Traffic Impact Study 698-024, done by Mark Henise of the ELA Group, Inc., dated March 2018.

**Motion** by Harlacher, second by Kauffman, to recommend approval of the Final Land Development Plan of Dover Area School District, subject to the satisfactory resolution of the following items from the C. S. Davidson letter referred to above: Zoning 1; SALDO 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, 22, added 23, and added 24.

*Discussion:* Mr. Kimball asked why the letter of transfer protocol is the Planning Commission’s concern. This is a concern of the Planning Commission for the Board of Supervisors to consider, the safety of pedestrians in the Township. Everyone agrees wholeheartedly that it’s everyone’s concern. All members voted aye; motion carried.

#### IV. Other Business

Nothing at this time.

**Motion** by Kauffman, second by Pinto, to adjourn. All members voted aye; motion carried. The meeting adjourned at 9:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Julie B. Maher,  
Recording Secretary