



Planning Commission Meeting Minutes  
March 6<sup>th</sup>, 2024

Chairman Wayne Hoffman called the Planning Commission meeting to order at 7:00 PM on March 6<sup>th</sup>, 2024. Members present: Eric Harlacher, Justin Bigham, Mark Miller, Monica Love, and alternates Anthony Pinto and Stephen Stefanowicz, also present; Solicitor, John Baranski; Zoning Officer, John McLucas; Township Engineer, Terry Myers, Cory McCoy, C.S. Davidson, and the Recording Secretary. There were seventeen members of the public present.

**I. Approval of Minutes from February 7<sup>th</sup>, 2024, Planning Commission Meeting.**

**Motion** by Bigham, seconded by Miller to approve the Planning Commission Meeting Minutes from February 7<sup>th</sup>, 2024, as presented. All members voted aye; motion carried.

**II. Plans**

- a. PL 23-9 – 5061 Carlisle Road (Formally Bald Hills Distillery) – Preliminary/Final LD Plan & Lot Line Amendment – 108 Outdoor Storage Spaces (Boats/RV's) & 185 Enclosed Units – Business Park District

Chairman Hoffman recused himself from participating in the discussion and voting on Plan 23-9 due to a conflict of interest. Vice Chairman Harlacher assumed the role of Chairman and led the discussion.

Eric Johnston with Johnston & Associates, Inc. along with Ken Snyder, applicant was present on behalf of PL 23-9 – 5061 Carlisle Road, Preliminary/Final LD Plan & Lot Line Amendment for 108 Outdoor Storage Spaces and 185 Enclosed Units located in the Business Park District. This plan is being resubmitted to the Planning Commission from the meeting on February 7<sup>th</sup>, 2024, with a few of the administrative items being completed since then. The plan is now labeled with the phases that will be completed. They also addressed a concern that was brought up at the meeting in February regarding the length of the entrance leading up to the secured gate. They made some changes to the plan that pushed the security gate back and reworked the buildings so that it would leave enough room for two units to pull in off Route 74 before entering the secured area to prevent stacking along Route 74. They also added some plan details regarding the dump station and details to the wash-down area to include the catch basin. The notes regarding the on-lot sewage flow have been enhanced along with the buffer area at the rear of the property that abuts the agriculture zone. The new proposal shows a regular chain link fence with an opaque planting buffer on the outer side of the fence.

A concern was raised regarding the type of buffer evergreen plant listed for the buffer. Buffering should be consistent to screen the neighboring properties. There will be a note on the plan that would make the applicant maintain the screening to be a level 3 screening.



Planning Commission Meeting Minutes  
March 6<sup>th</sup>, 2024

Another concern was the depth of the entrance and whether two RV types of vehicles could pull in and be out of the cartway and the type of gate being installed. It was stated that there would be enough room for two RV-type units that could easily be accommodated at the entrance, the type of gate that will be installed will swing upward to provide quicker access. It was also noted that there is a safety loop to prevent multiple vehicles from entering upon the gate opening without entering their code, as the gate will not open for exit if the code is not entered upon entrance.

Another concern regarding buffering the neighboring property was mentioned and it was recommended that the entire length of the property line be buffered with supplemental buffering. An additional note will be added to the C.S. Davidson approval letter to reflect this.

*A recommendation was made to the Board of Supervisors at the February 6<sup>th</sup> meeting that the Planning Commission members are not in favor of requiring this applicant to extend the sewer to serve this lot, as it is not economically feasible. The consensus was all members were in favor of this recommendation.*

C.S. Davidson's letter dated March 1<sup>st</sup>, 2024, was reviewed. Outstanding SALDO items are: 1. The following comments are related to the level 3 buffer strip and plantings (§22-1103.11. B.3.c). a.) Walls, ornamental structures, fences, and berms may be used to achieve 100% opaqueness as required by level 3 screening. Clarify if the proposed fence (Keynote #6) referenced on sheets 4 and 7 is to be screened. Additionally, the aforementioned notes shall be consistent, and a detail of the proposed fence shall be added to the plans. b.) Provide level 3 screening details and notes regarding the requirement of the number of each kind of tree required to be planted every 100'. **Add c.) Supplemental landscaping along the Northern property line to meet Level 3 screening.** 2. Within the designated growth boundary, where a subdivision or land development is within 1,000 ft of an existing sewer main or where the Township's official sewage plan (Act 537) provides for the installation of such public sewage facilities within 5 years, the subdivider shall provide the subdivision with a complete sanitary sewer system to be connected to the existing or proposed sewage system, if in the Township Board of Supervisors' opinion, it is feasible. The feasibility study shall include a financial analysis for a potential sanitary sewer extension to the site. (§713.2. B), 3. Sewer Enforcement Officer approval shall be obtained for the proposed RV dump station use and anticipated flows. Existing and proposed flows should be included as a note on the plans. 4. Label on the plans and provide details for the vertical 6" concrete curb. 5. Delete keynote 14 and renumber accordingly. 6. General note 24 regarding the 6-month construction requirement has been provided, therefore waiver request #2 regarding §704.B shall be removed from the coversheet. 7. Prior to final plan approval, a disk in an electronic format compatible with the Township GIS system should be provided. (§ 22-501.2. A), 8. Name, address, seal, signature, and date of the Professional Engineer/Surveyor shall be added to the plan, certifying the accuracy. (§22-



Planning Commission Meeting Minutes  
March 6<sup>th</sup>, 2024

501.2. F), 9. The legal and/or equitable Owner's notarized signatures must be added to the plan certifying concurrence with the plan. (§22-501.2.H), 10. SWM plan approval needs to be obtained from the Township Engineer. (§22-602.3), 11. Verification shall be provided indicating that the Erosion and Sedimentation control plan was approved by the York County Conservation District. (§22-602.4), 12. Public Improvements Security is required in a form and amount acceptable to the Township, prior to final plan approval (§ 1201.1), 13. The applicant shall address all outstanding comments made by the Fire Marshall, 14. The applicant shall address all outstanding comments made by the Public Works Director, **Add:** 15. *Safe stop and sight distance.* **Change notes 17 to 16 on the plan.** **Add 17.** *Change out the larix larcina tree on the planting schedule for a different planting.*

Mr. Myers made the applicant aware that they would be protected for 5 years to do the phasing structure proposed. If for some reason the phasing is not completed within that 5-year period they will be subject to any changes made to the zoning ordinance or subdivision land development ordinance. If they anticipate it will take longer, they may want to add extra protection by adding additional detail to the plan for approval.

They are seeking conditional approval based on the letter and a few cleanup items that were discussed at this time.

**Motion** by Bigham, seconded by Miller, to recommend approval to the Board of Supervisors for Plan 23-9, 5061 Carlisle Roads Preliminary/Final Land Development Plan & Lot Line Amendment, Mini Storage Facility with outstanding items 1-17 in the SALSO from C.S. Davidson's letter dated March 1<sup>st</sup>, 2024, addressed. Motion passed unanimously, with Chairman Hoffman abstaining. Motion carried.

- b. PL 23-6 - Bull Road Logistics - Preliminary Land Development Plan (Former Glen-Gery Site) - 200 Acres Lot Consolidation & 3 Warehouses totaling ± 1.9M SF – Industrial District

This plan was tabled at the January 3<sup>rd</sup>, and February 7<sup>th</sup>, Planning Commission meetings. The applicant has requested that the plan be tabled once again to the April 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2024, Planning Commission meeting.

The chairman requested that those in attendance with concerns regarding this plan give their concerns to the Planning Commission members so that they can consider those concerns upon review of this plan.

*Donald Hess, Little Creek Development*, referenced an article from the York Daily Record and has concerns about the size of this project and the traffic on roads that would be passing through residential communities. He feels the roads were not designed to handle the prediction of 1500 trucks per day, which he stated would equate to 2 trucks per minute assuming those



Planning Commission Meeting Minutes  
March 6<sup>th</sup>, 2024

trucks are running 24 hours a day. In addition to the 533 cars in fifteen minutes during a shift change with the 800 jobs that are stated to be created on country roads. We already have considerable delays on Bull Road to get to Route 30. He also has concerns about the houses that would be affected by eminent domain and the houses that sit on “blind hills” that could be struck by trucks. He feels that they are not practical roads for that amount of traffic.

*Sheridan Spangler, 3710 Bull Road*, has concerns about eminent domain and the effects it will have on the value of his property if he ever chooses to sell. He feels that they would have to widen Bull Road and to do that it would take a lot of his front yard. He also has concerns about the safety of the roads with that much traffic being added.

*Adam Cataldi, 1590 Butter Road*, also has concerns about the safety of the roads, he feels that these roads were not constructed for the predicted 1500 trucks at max capacity per day. It will create a lot of safety issues with sight corners and terrible intersections. Delays on these roads already exist. He also feels that the trucks will not follow the “approved” route and will end up on roads that are not suited for large trucks. He also has concerns about the aesthetics of Dover and the overall livelihood of Dover. He is not an opponent of this project. He understands that development must happen but has many concerns for the future of Dover.

*Rick Hake, 990 Jug Road*, questioned whether a roundabout or a traffic signal is being proposed for the current four-way stop at the intersection of Canal Road and Bull Road. He is the current owner of three of the properties that sit at that intersection. He stated that he did receive a letter from that state regarding eminent domain. He also has concerns about the added traffic at that intersection as it already gets backed up now.

Mr. Myers provided an update on the recent meeting where PennDOT presented the options that they are looking at. PennDOT does have a contract with an Engineer to do the project. The first step with the contract was to do an Intersection Control Study and come up with alternatives that would work. Those alternatives were reviewed with PennDOT, and the Township provided them with input. Property owners in the area of the intersection have received letters mentioning eminent domain, solely to enter the properties to do the surveys. PennDOT presented 4 alternatives, 2 with signal lights and 2 with different locations of roundabouts. There has been no final decision made at this time.

*Donald Leonard, 971 E. Canal Road*, has concerns about the cost the homeowners are going to face with being mandated to connect to the public water systems due to the requirement for the water main to be extended for the proposed warehouses. He also has concerns about the traffic, noise, and lighting from the proposal that will affect the residents in that area. It was noted that there are screening plans that will need to meet certain standards. It was also noted that when the proposed plan is being reviewed there will be discussions held on what the



Planning Commission Meeting Minutes  
March 6<sup>th</sup>, 2024

impacts will be and how it will affect those residents that will be required to connect to the public water system.

*Sharon Hogue, 898 E. Canal Road*, expressed her concerns regarding what will happen to her business that currently sits at the intersection (*Dottie's*) of Bull and Canal Roads and when she would be notified about the intentions of the intersection. She has invested a lot into her business to serve the community and has a lot of concerns about eminent domain.

*Mary Hamm, 1501 E. Canal Road*, has concerns including the wall that is being proposed, the lights, and the truck traffic. She feels that our local roads were not built to handle the amount of traffic the proposed warehouses will generate. She also expressed concerns regarding the public water system that will be extended and how far the extension will be required. It was explained that the water system would be extended just beyond the Northern York County Regional Police Station, the rest of the extension would then be picked up by the Solar project for further extension down Canal Road. It was questioned whether the developers have met with the Hamm's regarding the proposed wall and the screening. Mrs. Hamm noted that they had a meeting with the developers back in January regarding the wall and screening. The developers reached out again and informed the Hamm's that they were planning to run the water and sewer connections through their lane using the utility easements. They were to provide the Hamm's with a copy of those utility easements, but they have not been received as of today. The utility easements are not listed on her deed.

*Joanna Boie, 1416 Wheatfield Drive*, also had concerns about the traffic and the intersections that are not on the list for improvements, such as Kenneth Road and Roosevelt Avenue, Poplar Road and Bull Road, and Church Road and Bull Road; not all of which are in Dover Township but still have back up issues and some also have blind spots. It was explained that the study provided shows that 50% of the truck traffic will be headed east toward Interstate 83. There is a long-term plan to add an exit 26 interchange to Canal Road from Interstate 83. The other 50% would be headed south towards Route 30. After the traffic scoping was completed, PennDOT evaluated the intersections that would need to be improved. Those intersections were Canal Road at Bull Road, Bull Road at Hilton Avenue, and Susquehanna Trail at Canal Road. The impact to the intersections at Kenneth Road and Roosevelt Avenue, Poplar Road and Bull Road, and Church Road and Bull Road did not warrant mitigation. It was explained that the projected 1500 truck trips per day would equate to an estimated 660 trucks per day. It is a projected number that comes from the standards set by the ITE (Institute of Transportation Engineers) for warehouses and goes by the square footage of the buildings being proposed.

*Marlyse Charney, Little Creek Development*, is concerned about the traffic along Bull Road. She stated it would be a significant safety concern with the school bus stops along that road.



Planning Commission Meeting Minutes  
March 6<sup>th</sup>, 2024

She also has concerns regarding the environmental impact and the monetary impact on surrounding property owners and business owners. She would like to be sure that everything is being considered from a resident's perspective. She feels as though this plan has already been approved and would like to be sure everyone understands the process. It was explained that the plan is up for consideration at the next Planning Commission meeting, whether it will be approved is based on the designs presented. The plan has not been approved at this time. The area where the plan is being proposed is zoned Industrial, and a warehouse is a permitted use in the Industrial zone. They cannot legally deny a plan just because they “do not like it”. However, the applicants do need to meet all the requirements before it can be approved. The land was previously used for mining, which is an industrial use.

The chairman thanked everyone for their comments and for expressing their concerns. He stated that many of the members share the same concerns.

### III. Ordinances

None

### IV. Public Comment

*Alex Laderbach, 3809 Stonehouse Lane*, has safety concerns regarding the pedestrian crosswalk located at Davidsburg Road and Tower Drive, he stated that there is a pedestrian crosswalk located there that does not have crossbars painted and no warning signs posted. He is requesting that crosswalk bars be painted, signs posted, and maybe flashing lights to indicate to motorists that there is a pedestrian crosswalk for the safety of the residents trying to cross Davidsburg Road to go to the park or library.

It was recommended that the concern be reviewed by Township staff and have them pull the Highway Occupancy Permit to see if additional warning devices were to be installed and reach out to PennDOT to consider installing higher visibility safety features. Mr. Laderbach was asked to email Mr. McLucas any ideas that he had that would make the crosswalk safer.

### V. Correspondence

- a. The 2023 Subdivision and Land Development Plan Action Report was reviewed by the Planning Commission members.

**Motion** Miller, second by Harlacher, to forward the 2023 Subdivision and Land Development Plan Action Report to the Board of Supervisors as written.



Planning Commission Meeting Minutes  
March 6<sup>th</sup>, 2024

- b. Zoning Ordinance Update has been forwarded to the County for review. The Planning Commission members were asked to review the final draft also.

Mr. McLucas stated that Tiny Homes and the keeping of Livestock were not included in this update. Now that they are through the Zoning Update, he would like to focus some time on the Agriculture Heritage Initiative within the Comprehensive Plan.

**VI. Next Meeting**

The next Planning Commission meeting will be held on Wednesday, April 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2024, at 7:00 PM.

**VII. Adjournment**

Chairman Hoffman adjourned the Planning Commission meeting at 9:40 PM. **Motion** by Bigham, seconded by Love. All members voted aye; motion carried.

Respectfully Submitted by,

Tina Wagner  
Recording Secretary