

Dover Township
Planning Commission Minutes
February 3, 2021, *via Zoom*

Using a virtual meeting format, Chairman Wayne Hoffman called the regular Planning Commission meeting to order at 7:05 p.m. Members present: Anthony Pinto, Eric Harlacher, Michael Curley; alternates Brian Kimball, Mark Miller, and Stephen Stefanowicz. Absent with prior notice: Justin Bigham. Also present: Solicitor John Baranski, Zoning Officer John McLucas, Engineers Terry Myers (joined at 7:30 p.m.) and Cory McCoy, Recording Secretary, and five citizens.

I. **Reorganization**

Motion by Harlacher, second by Pinto, to nominate Wayne Hoffman as Planning Commission Chairman for 2021. All members voted aye; motion carried.

Motion by Pinto, second by Curley, to nominate Eric Harlacher as Planning Commission Vice Chairman for 2021. All members voted aye; motion carried.

Motion by Pinto, second by Harlacher, to nominate Michael Curley as Planning Commission Secretary for 2021. All members voted aye; motion carried.

Minutes

Motion by Harlacher, second by Pinto, to approve the minutes of the virtual meetings of December 2 and continued meeting of December 9, 2020. All members voted aye; motion carried.

II. **Zoning Cases**

No cases this month. FYI, the Variance to permit a riding academy and boarding facility was approved by the Zoning Hearing Board on December 16, 2020. The Planning Commission members were provided with copies of the decision. Thanks to Mr. McLucas for providing the follow-up information on this decision. Good to know.

III. **Plans**

A. PL 20-4, Hoffman; 2-lot Revised Final Subdivision; Davidsburg Road, conditionally approved by the Dover Township Board of Supervisors on January 25, 2021.

Motion by Harlacher, second by Pinto, to authorize the Planning Commission Secretary to sign the Component 4A Planning Module. All members voted aye; motion carried

B. PL 20-6, 3206-3212 Partridge Drive (Sunrise Acres); 2-lot Final Subdivision Plan; R-3 Zoning district

Joshua George was present on this plan. The applicant would like to separate these two lots, subdividing an existing duplex so that each half of the duplex is on its own lot. That would result in two existing attached family dwellings. Nothing else is proposed.

Mr. McCoy reviewed C. S. Davidson's letter dated January 29, 2021.

Outstanding items: 1, GIS disk (Section 22-501.2.A); 2, surveyor's and engineers'

signatures/seals (Section 22.501.2.F); 3, owners' signatures (Section 22-501.2.O); 4, note on the Site Data Table that the lot width is measured at the front building setback (Section 22-501.2.N.8.c); 5, show water services on the plan (Section 22-501.2.O); 6, identify the required clear sight triangle easement outside of the street ROW (Section 22-501.2.CC); and 7, all comments from the Township Public Works Director shall be addressed.

Mr. McLucas noted that currently there's a six-month note on the plan for sidewalk installation. No other property in the area has sidewalks, however the subdivision that is the subject of this plan (the corner unit) has a sidewalk very close; it ends at the current plan's rear property line. If the sidewalk for this subdivision plan were installed, it would go only to the corner of the property being subdivided. The Planning Commission members feel that it's fine to just go with the six-month note.

Mr. Kimball asked what the purpose is for dividing the lot. This gives the owner the opportunity to sell the property individually as opposed to a double unit. Mr. McLucas noted that it's a lot cleaner when there are individual lots.

How about if the entire unit (both sides) suffer a fire? Mr. Baranski said that each owner's insurance would take care of the loss and recovery. Nothing unusual about that situation. What if one party doesn't want to reconstruct? Then that half is gone/torn down, and there's only one unit/home remaining.

Motion by Pinto, second by Harlacher, to recommend approval of the 3206-3212 Partridge Drive Final Subdivision Plan, subject to the satisfactory resolution of the open items 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7 from the C. S. Davidson letter referred to above. All members voted aye; motion carried.

C. PL 20-5, Dover Highlands Final Land Development Plan; 180 multi-family dwelling units; R-4 Zoning district

Stacy MacNeal, John Runge, and Trey Elrod were present on this plan. This plan was before the Planning Commission in the preliminary plan stage. The development is on Intermediate Avenue. There will be internal access drives and parking for the apartment building. Construction has begun. The applicants are looking for a conditional approval for this plan. Mr. Myers noted that the applicants have been working with the Township Engineers to address issues and make revisions from the preliminary plan stage.

Is there a crossing between Canal Road and the cul-de-sac? No, because, per the traffic engineer, there are no signals or other traffic controls (stop sign) to require the traffic to stop. There are no designated crossings. Why wouldn't there be cross walks? The Planning Commission recommended that the waiver for sidewalks be granted because there was a crossing planned. How about a raised crosswalk? Mr. Pinto feels that just because there's no crosswalk doesn't mean people will not cross the road.

Attorney MacNeal noted the crosswalk was removed based on information received at a staff meeting. The traffic engineer recommended against a crosswalk, so can the Township just require it? The speed limit is recommended at 25 mph. The Township can indeed require the crosswalk against the traffic engineer's recommendation.

Discussion was held on what would make sense. A four-way stop sign wouldn't be good, as there's no intersection. The applicants are willing to do whatever the Township wants.

How about a crosswalk a bit farther south? One of the reasons that the Planning Commission recommended that the sidewalk waiver be approved is because there was to be a crosswalk between Buildings 11 and 6.

If the traffic engineer doesn't buy the recommendation to restore the crosswalk, is the developer willing to install a walking path from building 11 toward the school? No, per Attorney MacNeal.

Mr. Myers noted that the traffic engineer did not like the additional crosswalk being placed between the intersection near buildings 11 and 6 and the cul-de-sac.

Is this just one person's opinion or are there standards to abide by? Mr. Myers noted there are standard practices for sure to govern traffic engineering. The problem would be a liability issue if someone were hit there crossing the street, and the records were such that the traffic engineer recommended against something that the Township did anyway.

Mr. Myers will go back to the traffic engineer to see how a crosswalk might be installed as safely as possible. Mr. Runge will coordinate efforts between Mr. Myers and the traffic engineer to rectify this situation to get a crosswalk installed that will satisfy everyone.

C. S. Davidson's letter dated January 29, 2021, was reviewed. Outstanding items: 1, GIS disk (Section 22-501.2.A); 2, engineer's seal and signature (Section 22-501.2.F); 3, owners' signatures (Section 22-502.2.H); 4, statement by owner offering dedication of streets, ROW easements and any sites for public use which are to be dedicated (Section 22-601.2.J); 5, public improvement security shall be established prior to final plan approval (Section 22-602.1); 6, recreation fees or land (Section 22-718); 7, Sheet 2, Note 28 should be revised to indicate that "the approval of this plan is subject to the Developers Agreement by and among Dover Highlands, LP, the Township of Dover and Dover Township Sewer Authority, dated August 24, 2020, and the Agreement for Road Improvements by and between Dover Township, Dover Area School District, and Dover Highlands, LP, dated January 19, 2021"; 8, type of fencing proposed along back of pedestrian walkway shall be identified and discussed; 9, all Dover Township staff comments must be addressed; AND, *[added]* 10, resolve the crosswalk issue as safely as possible, noting that the Planning Commission highly recommends that a crosswalk be installed to the satisfaction of the traffic engineer with the necessary safeguards."

Mr. McLucas requested that the applicants add the developers' agreement to the plan. No, per Attorneys MacNeal and Baranski, just record the agreement and refer to the recording information on the plan.

There are comments by the Public Works Director that will be addressed as well. That would be part of the Staff comments referred to in C. S. Davidson's comment 9.

It was noted and discussed that originally there were several separate phases to this plan. The applicants are proposing to proceed with Phases 1 and 2 at the same time now. This is to simplify the approval process; the construction plans remain the same, per Attorney MacNeal.

Request for Mr. McLucas – please let the Planning Commission know how the crosswalk issue is resolved, perhaps by putting that information on the relevant agenda of the Planning Commission.

Motion by Harlacher, second by Pinto, to recommend approval of the Dover Highlands Phases 1 and 2 Final Land Development Plan, subject to the satisfactory resolution of the following outstanding items from the C. S. Davidson letter referred to above: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, AND *[added]* 10, resolve the crosswalk issue as safely as possible. The Planning Commission *highly* recommends that a crosswalk be installed to the satisfaction of the traffic engineer with the necessary safeguards. All members voted aye; motion carried.

IV. **Other Business**

Public Comment: Nothing at this time.

Update on the solar ordinance: BOS reviewed the PC's recommendation; updated Ordinance will be provided to the Planning Commission for recommendation at the March meeting.

The next meeting will be held on Wednesday, March 3, 2021. The members prefer Zoom to Google Meet for the virtual format.

Motion by Pinto, second by Harlacher, to adjourn. All members voted aye; motion carried. The meeting adjourned at 8:32 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Julie B. Maher,
Recording Secretary