

Dover Township
Planning Commission
PRD Special Meeting Minutes
June 8, 2022

Chairman Wayne Hoffman called the special Planning Commission meeting to order at 6:25 p.m. Members present: Justin Bigham, Mark Miller, and alternate Stephen Stefanowicz. Absent with prior notice: Eric Harlacher, Anthony Pinto, Monica Love. Also present: Solicitor John Baranski, Zoning Officer John McLucas, Engineers Terry Myers and Cory McCoy, Recording Secretary, and four citizens.

The purpose of tonight's meeting is to discuss a PRD (Planned Residential Development) Ordinance

Paul Minnich, Barley Snyder, offered commendations to the staff and solicitor for all the work that was put into this ordinance draft. Indeed, lots of work and words have gone into the draft.

Chairman Hoffman recused himself from voting on this ordinance as he has an interest in the real estate involved. Justin Bigham assumed the role of Chairman.

Mr. McLucas reported that the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors had a joint meeting on this PRD ordinance. Sites were visited to give members a better idea of the concept of a PRD.

Mr. Stefanowicz spoke to several people who asked about the minimum lot size. A minimum lot size of 5 or 10 acres seemed very small to some questioners. Minimum lot size is 25 acres at this point. It's permitted in R3, R4, Commercial, and Business Park zones. Another question is should underground utilities be required. This requirement might already be included in the SALDO, so that's good.

From Mr. Myers, under §27-1304, the time frames seem fairly short. §27-1304.2.E, within 60 days of filing the application, a public meeting shall be held by the Board of Supervisors unless waived by the applicant. Also, under §27-1304.2.F, the time for submission to and review by the YCPC seems really short. Also, under § 27-1305.6.A, Final Approval, "within 45 days of the regular meeting of the Board of Supervisors, the Board shall grant final plan approval..." that's pretty quick! Any changes that must be made will need to go back to the engineer or designer, and time flies, so... Mr. Myers noted that the original submission would be a conceptual layout only, which would then proceed right to a final plan, with a decision rendered in 45 days. Currently, for a subdivision, there's a 90-day timeline, so this is half of that. Some Planning Commission members thought that this PRD conceptual plan approval preceded the regular subdivision and land development process, which has its own timelines. There have to be timelines, though, so the plan doesn't just sit idle for ages. Mr. McLucas thought that there'd be a separate subdivision and land development plan filed *after* the original conceptual plan submission. *Mr. Myers feels that the 90-day requirement is better. But if the MPC says it must be 60 days, can the Township make it 90 days? A question to be checked.* Mr. Minnich checked, and it seems that the MPC takes precedence. The applicants just end up requesting/granting an extension of time.

Is the Planning Commission involved in the final plan review? Unanswered.

It was noted that the engineering for the conceptual plan will be considerably less than the engineering required for the Final Plan.

Also, throughout the document *be consistent between “applicant” and “landowner.” See below.*

A map was reviewed. Where might a PRD be permitted in the Township? There aren't many areas with 25 acres minimum, in the appropriate zones. §27-1302.2 shall read *“The PRD shall consist of a lot of at least 25 contiguous acres.”*

Keep as permitted in R3, R4, Commercial, and Business Park? Yes. R1 was omitted to keep that zone in low density housing, plus the ordinance requirements would be conflicting.

Is it clear as to how the units are calculated? Is the total area calculated before or after the commercial use is removed? Subtract the required commercial area off the total main tract (gross), then calculate the number of units permitted or not? Discussion was held on the pros and cons of each choice. **Decision:** *Page 7, §27-1308.3.B shall read: “The minimum portion of the planned residential development for commercial uses shall be 25% of the net site area. For purposes of this section, net site is the gross site area minus all existing street ROWs.” (This must be consistent with the SALDO and Zoning Ordinance).*

Tentative approval: Page 2, §27-1302.4, public water and sewer, yes, this makes sense. #5, okay. §27-1303, Optional Preapplication Meeting -- Pre-application *can remain optional* (even though Mr. Myers would prefer it to be mandatory.) *All throughout the ordinance, change “landowner” to “applicant.” On page 3, §27-1304.2.B, the MPC reference should be ~~40707(4)~~. E and F are fine under this section. On §27-1304.4, strike paragraph A, and make B paragraph A, so that A will now read: “The official written communication.... and shall be noted on the zoning map.” (should be map, not ma.)*

Under §27-1305 Final Approval – discussion was held on phasing. *If there’s phasing, it’s good to see the overall engineering via a preliminary plan. Mr. Myers is concerned that a phased plan (after the tentative plan approval) will have piecemeal engineering bits here and there.* §27-1305, page 4, final approval, last sentence was examined. *This must be changed. Staff will work this out.*

§27-1305, Final Approval, Remove F1, G – fine. H—fine. I – fine. 3 and 4 are good. 5 – this will stay the same here. If there’s a preliminary plan, public improvements may be built. 6 – same. A and B are okay.

§27-1306, Financial Security – fine. Discussion was held on §27-1308, Uses. *Cross-reference the standards to the additional specific requirements in the Zoning Ordinance for each use.* Discussion was held on the feasibility of a hotel in a PRD. Mr. Bigham can't see including a hotel within a PRD. He feels it doesn't make sense to include the hotel beside a residential use. Mr. McLucas said that the Board of Supervisors and ICDC have been pushing for a hotel/conference center in Dover Township for quite some time. And, of course, it would need to look appropriate within the PRD. Maybe it should just be nearby, not included in the PRD. How about: instead of hotel/motel, make it hotel/conference center? Mr. Minnich thinks it might be unlikely to include a hotel on this site, based on its location. But keep the option open. *Keep it in.*

§27-1308, Uses Permitted, under 3.C, Maximum impervious surface. *This sentence shall read: “On any portion of the planned residential development...shall*

exceed 60% of the lot site area dedicated to commercial uses. (80% impervious coverage is permitted for hotel/motel or conference center uses.) Keep it at 60 percent lot area, not permit 80 percent for a hotel.

§27-1309, Maximum dwelling units – 1, residential districts – “shall be calculated based on lot area as follows:” Discussion was held – if the PRD is in the R4 zone, where density is permitted at 8 per acre, and the PRD permits only 3 units per acre, is it right to restrict the density in that underlying zone? Go with “*Maximum number of dwelling units shall be 5 units per acre based on the total lot area.*” Still need to refer to the underlying zone for the minimum lot size.

§27-1310, Mix of housing types – does the Township want to encourage more single-family and multi-family homes? Discussion was held on how to get a good mix of housing types. Can we say that *there must be a minimum of three housing types?* Yes. So, §27-1310.1A—*a maximum of 50% single family detached; B -- 35% single family semi-detached; C -- 35% two-family detached; D -- 35% single family attached; E -- 60% multiple family dwellings.*

§27-1311, Additional Standards, 1-8, all fine. Add 9: *minimum lot size – cut and paste residential lot size requirements from R3 zone; add commercial lot size from the commercial zone.*

§27-1312, Parking – mostly fine. 1. *Parking requirements shall be in accordance with Part 7 of the Township Zoning Ordinance.*

§27-1313, Streets and access drives -- all fine.

§27-1314, Open space –1. “*A minimum of 30% of the lot ~~gross tract~~ area...*”

Section 27-1315, Enforcement and Modification of the Plan -- *Governing documents to be developed.*

Section 27-1316 – from the MPC. Fine.

Mr. McLucas read Mrs. Love’s comments – most comments were addressed tonight. *If phased, show some commercial use with some residential use in each phase. Open space must be accessible from either a lot or a street.*

How about the traffic impact? That would be addressed at the final plan stage, according to the SALDO.

Staff will make the revisions and present to the BOS work session at the end of June.

Mr. Stefanowicz will be a voting member for tonight’s meeting.

Motion by Miller, second by Stefanowicz, to recommend the revisions to the PRD ordinance to move it to the June 27 work session. Three members voted aye; *Chairman Hoffman abstained.* Motion carried.

The next regular Planning Commission meeting will be held on July 6, 7 p.m.

Motion by Miller, second by Stefanowicz, to adjourn. All members voted aye; motion carried. The meeting adjourned at 9:31 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Julie B. Maher,
Recording Secretary