

Dover Township  
Planning Commission Minutes  
June 7, 2023

Chairman Wayne Hoffman called the regular Planning Commission meeting to order at 7:06 p.m. Members present: Monica Love, Eric Harlacher, Justin Bigham, Mark Miller, and alternates Stephen Stefanowicz and Anthony Pinto. Also present: Solicitor John Baranski, Zoning Officer John McLucas, Engineers Terry Myers and Cory McCoy, Recording Secretary, and four citizens.

I. **Minutes**

**Motion** by Bigham, second by Miller, to approve the minutes of the meeting of May 3, 2023. All members voted aye; motion carried. For the record, all future advice of Attorney Baranski will be referred to as ‘sage advice’ as was noted in the minutes of May 3, 2023.

II. **Plans**

No new plans for consideration.

III. **Ordinances**

Draft Joint Zoning Ordinance update

**Part 1 – Title, Purpose, Community Development Objectives**

1. Existing part and draft proposal provided for comments

Discussion:

From Mrs. Love, incorporate the existing Part 1 into the proposed language. Good idea. From Section 102: Purpose, item A9, is this necessary? Same Section, item A3, does that belong? How about 103, A8, to encourage citizen participation in the land use decision making process – Mr. Myers thinks that there should be a fair number of Special Exceptions in order to get resident input. However, Mr. McLucas said that too many Special Exception requirements tend to ‘gouge’ the citizens to pay to go before the ZHB. How about combining 103 A7 and 8? *Yes, combine and incorporate into the existing document.*

Section 102: Purpose, *add proposed 1 to the existing framework?*

Section 27-103, *add Borough references.*

Section 27-102, purpose of Chapter, *remove ‘morals’*

Section 27-105, conformance and permits, *remove*

Section 27-106, conflicting provisions, *keep*

**Part 2 -- Definitions**

1. Existing part and draft proposal provided for comments  
The chart was referenced. Need definition for Accessory Apartment.

**Part 6 – Specific Standards for Uses**

1. Proposed Article II, definitions, adaptive reuse, *strike/reword* applies to structures not initially designed for permanent residential use.

2. Add adaptive reuse to the existing document, *by Special Exception*.

Proposed adaptive reuse permitted uses, A, d, *remove* provided that there are no sales of alcohol on the premises. A, g, add Community/Senior Center. A, h, change Board of Supervisors to Zoning Hearing Board.

Discussion was held on the old Shur Fine building being turned into apartments. Would that be objectionable to the Planning Commission? No one's done that to date because of the zoning ordinance restrictions.

Mr. Pinto and Mrs. Love are okay with adding the adaptive reuse section in general. Mr. Miller isn't quite sure yet; Mr. Bigham thinks that the Planning Commission doesn't need to address this just now; more properties will be affected in the future. Mr. Harlacher is okay with it, but Chairman Hoffman says don't include it.

3. In the proposed document: Adult and Sexually oriented business – discussion was held about this use being within 1000 feet of any lot that is zoned residential; 500 feet of the lot boundary of any existing school, day care center, etc. *Make the distance the same from the daycare, school, etc., just to confirm the documents/distance, but revisit this issue.*

4. Animal Day Care, new use – B- *add* If exterior care areas provided, must meet Kennel requirements. *Remove D, outdoor lighting, if any, shall be shielded and reflected away from adjoining properties so that no direct beam of light, but only diffuse or reflected light, enters adjoining properties.*

Would these uses (animal day care, animal grooming) be permitted as a home occupation? Probably.

*In the definitions, for animal day care, change animals to domestic pets.*

Should there be a limit on the number of animals permitted? Mr. Pinto isn't comfortable with a pet day care/kennel/groomer as a home occupation in a residential area.

In general, it was agreed that it's good to have animal day care in the ordinance.

*The number of animals shall be harmonious with the size of the building and lot size,* per Mr. Myers' recommendation. This would permit the ZHB to determine the number of animals allowed.

Discussion was held on Pet Boarding and Kennels. Mr. Harlacher suggested taking four categories and making them into two. *Use Pet Boarding, Kennels, Grooming, and Animal Day Care and reduce to two categories. Perhaps examine Animal Hospital and Veterinary Services as well.*

5. Art Gallery – after discussion, it was recommended to *strike Art Gallery* totally. No need to set it apart from another use. Will revisit this.

6. Asphalt/concrete plant - permitted by Special Exception in the Industrial Zone. In B, *remove* or temporary from the wording. In C & E, change Board of Supervisors to Zoning Hearing Board. *Remove F, lighting, entirely.*

7. Beverage Distributor - should also be permitted in the Commercial Zone. This should be covered by either retail and/or warehouse. *Remove the Beverage Distributor category entirely.*

Brewery - how about the permitted distance from other uses/zones? Should this be included under the tavern use? Is a brewery a manufacturing facility and should it be included in the Industrial Zone? Currently, manufacturing is only permitted in the Industrial Zone. *Add 'brewery' to the uses permitted in the Industrial Zone. Distillery, same as brewery, add into examples of manufacturing.*

*STOP ZONING ORDINANCE DISCUSSION HERE FOR TONIGHT.*

**IV. Zoning Cases**

No new cases. **Updates only:**

ZHB 23-3, Tracey Deakin – Variance denied by ZHB.

ZHB 23-4, Modane Marshall – ZHB approved Special Exception.

Mr. McLucas noted that lot standards will be addressed at a future discussion.

**V. Other Business**

Planning Commission Chairman comments – Heritage Senior Center

Chairman Hoffman mentioned that Don Zeigler and Jay Mummert keep calling Mr. Hoffman about the Heritage Senior Center. He informed these gents that there are/were grants available for a project of this nature. Mr. McLucas gave some details on the ownership of the Center, noting that if the Center goes defunct, the land in question will return to Township ownership. Chairman Hoffman noted that Mr. Zeigler and Mr. Mummert indicated that they would be willing to relinquish ownership of the land/Center to the Township so that the municipality could obtain funding, etc. Thoughts? Mrs. Love suggested taking that idea to the Board of Supervisors. Perhaps the Senior Center could be affiliated with the Township as a separate entity. Mr. Stefanowicz recalls that the Center was making plans to move forward with building a facility, but nothing has been implemented yet. Is the problem that there's no 'lead person' to get this project underway? Is the Center the Township's responsibility? Part of the issue is that the Senior Center is occupying space in the Township's Community Building, which the Township would love to reclaim for recreation purposes. Perhaps some senior members of the Planning Commission might attend the next Senior Center meeting to make some inquiries and offer some suggestions.

Public comment – Eric Naylor, 2951 Schoolhouse Road, requested that the Planning Commission think carefully about the people who live in and love this Township when making zoning changes, especially with regard to solar farms and the financial gains that are offered to the landowners who may be tempted to give up their farmland to solar companies. Solar companies should work with the people of the Township to everyone's benefit. It was noted that this is indeed a concern all around.

Mr. McLucas noted that the update to the solar ordinance includes industrial zones. Indeed, how is a farmer to make as much money from farming as a solar company will offer? But, how can the Township take that option away from the ag residents?

Mr. Naylor hopes that all uses can be responsible for each zone.

Chairman Hoffman is concerned with property owners' rights. He mentioned food security, farmable land as a natural resource, whether farmland can actually be returned to farmland after it was used as a solar farm, homes/industry needing a fair amount of land, and he feels that we don't need to 'suck up land' for something that will only last 15 years or so (a solar farm).

Gina Myers, 1046 Rohler's Church Road, asked if she could receive a copy of the documents that the Planning Commission will be reviewing tonight. She might want to wait until the Planning Commission reviews the documents tonight. She submitted her proposed changes to Mr. McLucas, using the YCPC ordinance as a model. Mr. McLucas has forwarded those recommendations to Attorney Baranski for his sage advice.

Mrs. Myers thinks that the distance of a porn shop, etc., needs to be farther away from schools, etc. The Planning Commission only confirmed the two distances in the new proposal. They did say they will revisit this issue.

**VI. Correspondence**

Thank you to Recording Secretary Julie Maher for her years of service to the Dover Township Planning Commission.

Consider holding special meetings in June for discussion on the Zoning update. A Work Session will be held on July 12, at 6 p.m., to further discuss the zoning ordinance amendments. The next regular meeting will be held on July 12, at 7 p.m.

**Motion** by Love, second by Bigham, to adjourn. All members voted aye; motion carried. The meeting adjourned at 10:28 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Julie B. Maher,  
Recording Secretary