

Dover Township
Planning Commission Minutes
May 5, 2021

Using a virtual meeting format, Chairman Wayne Hoffman called the regular Planning Commission meeting to order at 7:02 p.m. Members present: Anthony Pinto, Justin Bigham; alternates Brian Kimball and Mark Miller. Absent with prior notice: members Eric Harlacher, Michael Curley, and alternate Stephen Stefanowicz. Also present: Solicitor Charles Rausch, Zoning Officer John McLucas, Engineers Terry Myers and Cory McCoy, Recording Secretary, and two citizens (Katie Craven and Jonathan Allgyer).

In the absence of Mr. Harlacher, Mr. Curley, and Mr. Stefanowicz, both Mr. Kimball and Mr. Miller will be voting members for tonight's meeting.

I. **Minutes**

Chairman Hoffman had a question in the Correspondence section in the minutes of April 7, 2021, about the Bross application for glamping use. Mr. McLucas clarified the wording. The question involved Dover Township's signing off on the plan, even though most of it is in Paradise Township. Dover Township has a right to comment on any plan with similar circumstances (no development in Dover Township). There was no correction or amendment to the minutes. All good.

Motion by Bigham, second by Kimball, to approve the minutes of the meeting of April 7, 2021. All members voted aye; motion carried.

II. **Zoning Cases**

None this month.

III. **Plans**

A. Thermal Logistics Mini-Storage sketch plan (SK-21-1); corner of Dogwood and Carlisle Roads in the Commercial District

Jonathan Allgyer, 2736 Willapa Drive, Dover, was present on this plan. This plan was presented in 2017. An entrance with ROW was installed from Dogwood; storage units were placed. Mr. Allgyer recently purchased 3600 Carlisle Road. There's a house trailer on the property, which he thinks is not actually permitted to be on this lot. He would like to remove the house trailer, which is in disrepair anyway. This is a commercial lot; the expanded use would want to share the same access; and he's proposing to put more storage units on this lot. There would be an additional driveway placed from the access ROW to the newly placed storage units.

Discussion was held on the requirement of a 20' buffer and level 2 screening along the adjacent residential lot. Mr. Allgyer asked about requesting a Variance for that requirement. Mr. McCoy noted that to obtain a Variance would require proving a hardship, and that may be difficult. So noted. Mr. McCoy suggested that there should be enough room to comply with the requirement, but it might affect the access drive. Mr. Allgyer said he can make that work. He also noted that the new storage building will have a lower ceiling/roof height out nearer the road, so that it wouldn't be so imposing

looking from the road and to the neighboring properties. It was noted that the applicant owns each of the lots in question, so he would be affecting himself, essentially.

Mr. McLucas suggested obtaining the small portion of Sycamore to connect it to Mr. Allgyer's other lot. The applicant will entertain the idea.

Also, there are a few different uses on this lot, which concerns Mr. McLucas a bit, but that is another discussion entirely. Each use must meet the minimum dimensional lot standards for each use. How about combining all the lots into one large lot/parcel? Then he could do away with the ROW. Food for thought.

Would a land development plan be required for an expansion of his current use of storage units? Mr. Myers checked; a 35% expansion would be permitted *without* a land development plan. But Mr. Allgyer isn't expanding the current structure, he's adding another structure. Plus, he's over the 35% permitted anyway, so he will just file a LDP. If he obtains the portion of Sycamore, would the setback change?

Discussion was held on the ROW and whose property it's on and how it would be affected if the applicant combined the properties.

Who owns the ROW? Is it Township property? What does the applicant need to do to obtain it? Rausch – if it was dedicated but not adopted within 21 years, it's not township property. There might be private rights involved, so Mr. Allgyer would need to contact each other property owner or involved person to obtain the ROW by quiet title. Plus it would be helpful to have a legal description prepared. Perhaps the applicant can appear in person next month.

IV. **Ordinances for Future Discussion**

Common Ownership Merger (COM) -- nothing ready for tonight

Short-term rentals – nothing ready for tonight

Tiny homes -- Katie Craven, 316 Primrose Lane, Mountville, was present on this issue. Mr. McLucas noted that he has received many calls for tiny homes, which are smaller than 750 square feet; they are also smaller than a manufactured home. This appears to be a housing trend, and the Planning Commission should be aware and on top of things.

Ms. Craven presented information on “Intentional Tiny Home Communities.” She is a member of Americorps, doing service work. Through her experience in living in Oregon, she came to value experiences, relationships, and nature above “stuff,” a minimalistic approach to life. She is having a tiny home built and knows of the difficulties in placing these structures.

Are the homes built on site? They are built in the factory, so to speak, but are able to be moved anywhere. They have wheels.

Continuing the presentation... a typical tiny home is 400 square feet or smaller. It is on wheels, which allows the home to be moved. She noted that Hellam Township has adopted a tiny house ordinance, but for tiny homes that are on foundations.

Question from Chairman Hoffman, what's the difference between a tiny home on wheels and one on a foundation?

There is a tiny home community in Elizabethtown, Pennsylvania, on an abandoned campground. People own the home but pay a lot rent, as in a mobile home park.

The presentation gave the benefits of owning a tiny home, which included “environmentally concerned” “simple” and “financially conscious.” Ms. Craven stressed that tiny homeowners are not transients, as many people fear. Land leases are typically six months to a year.

Questions/comments: the land is owned by one individual and that person rents the land to the tiny homeowners, yes. These are basically small mobile homes. Does she want to put these homes into an existing mobile home park or identify new land to place these homes? Either one would work for her. How do the utilities work? Similar to a recreational vehicle. It would be easiest to use an existing park since the hookups are already in place. What makes this different from a “normal” trailer park? The pursuit of the minimalistic lifestyle and focus on community and nature.

The problems arise with the minimum inhabitable square footage.

Cost of a tiny home, the one she’s having built, is \$75K. Large range of prices, depending on the size and square footage, Ms. Craven said.

So where might a use such as this be placed in Dover Township? In an R-4 zone, for sure. But the ambiance of an R-4 zone might not be what the tiny homeowners want. They likely don’t want the “look” of a mobile home park with homes very close together. The owners will likely look to the Conservation and Ag districts for lot size, distance between homes, etc.

How about the question of density? How many units per acre might be permitted?

How about the ones that are on foundations? The IRC now addresses some of this. There is a disconnect with HUD’s requirements and with the Township’s requirements.

It was noted that many tiny home occupants are older folks. There has been an increase in multi-family housing in the last few years. Need to look at new housing trends with regard to age of purchasers as well. The Planning Commission needs to be aware of this trend and be prepared to act accordingly.

This discussion will be continued to an in-person meeting. There’s a lot to consider and to discuss. Perhaps Ms. Craven will come before the Planning Commission at a later date.

V. **Other Business**

Public comments: None at this time.

VI. **Correspondence**

Proposal for creation of Ag Security area at 4220 Paradise Road; 97 acres; Gary and Paulette Poe; Ag District

These applicants want to eventually include the parcel in Ag Preservation. That would bring the total acreage in the Township to around 7100 acres in the security/preservation area. It was noted that with no opposition to this application, after 180 days, the area is automatically included into the Ag Security area.

Motion by Hoffman, second by Kimball, to recommend that the 97 acre-area for Gary and Paulette Poe at 4220 Paradise Road be included in the Ag Security Area. All members voted aye; motion carried.

YCPC letter regarding Fox Run Heights, Conewago Township

This development does not access Bull Road. It is across the road from the Bupp-McNaughton development. The Township has 30 days within which time to respond and/or make any comments. Concerns surround the intersection of Canal and Bull Roads (which are both state roads).

Lastly, there will be a **6 p.m. work session prior to the next meeting** for the Planning Commission members to train on the new technology in the Dover Township Board Room. Mr. McLucas will send a reminder! If the people want pizza, let's do it!

The next meeting will be held on June 2, 7 p.m.... live and in person (after the 6 p.m. work session)! Goodies expected...

Motion by Kimball, second by Bigham, to adjourn. All members voted aye; motion carried. The meeting adjourned at 9:04 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Julie B. Maher,
Recording Secretary