

Chairman Wayne Hoffman called the Planning Commission meeting to order at 7:02 PM on April 3rd, 2024. Members present: Eric Harlacher, Justin Bigham, Mark Miller, Monica Love, alternates Anthony Pinto and Stephen Stefanowicz, Other Township Representatives in attendance were John Baranski, Solicitor; John McLucas, Zoning Officer; Terry Myers and Cory McCoy, Township Engineers with C.S. Davidson; and the Recording Secretary. There were an estimated 100 members of the public present.

I. Approval of Minutes from March 6th, 2024, Planning Commission Meeting.

Motion by Miller, seconded by Bigham to approve the Planning Commission Meeting Minutes from March 6th, 2024, as presented. All members voted aye; motion carried.

II. Plans

a. PL 23-6 - Bull Road Logistics - Preliminary Land Development Plan - 200 Acres Lot Consolidation & 3 Warehouses totaling ± 1.9M SF – Industrial District

The above-referenced preliminary land development plan revised March 18, 2024, prepared by Langan Engineering proposes three separate warehouse buildings (total ±1,890,000 SF building footprint). The site encompasses a total of 198.98 acres and will primarily access Bull Road with emergency access provided to Fox Run Road.

The following statement was read by the Township's Solicitor at the start of the meeting:

When an applicant presents a plan for commercial development on a property in Dover, the applicant's plan must go through the land development process.

The Planning Commission before you tonight is part of that process.

The Planning Commission is a recommending body that makes recommendations to the Board of Supervisors. The Planning Commission does not approve or deny plans. The applicant must demonstrate their plan conforms to all relevant sections of the zoning ordinance for the zone they are developing in, while also adhering to the townships' land development standards found in the township's Subdivision & Land Development Ordinance.

The requirements of Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance were drafted to take into account a project's traffic impact, the need for water/sewer improvements, stormwater management for the project, environmental impact, outside agency approvals, our Comprehensive Plan, along with many other design-related concerns.



The applicant is proposing access to and from Bull Road for its project. Bull Road is state road and therefore PennDOT has the legal control over the improvements required to Bull Road and intersections along Bull Road. The township does not. Prior to this project being proposed, the Bull Road and Canal Road intersection has been designated by the county & PennDOT as one of the most congested, non-signalized intersections in York County. This intersection has been anticipating improvements, either through lane widenings & signals or with a roundabout, for a number of years. These intersection improvement also coincides with surrounding, regionally significant projects such as the Freedom Square Development in Conewago Township, as well as a long-term plan to build an Exit 26 interchange at I-83 and Canal Road that is under consideration with the state & Federal Highway Administration. Significant road & infrastructure improvements are anticipated to occur with the proposed project. The Township is committed to hearing the public's concerns and adequately planning for the associated impacts, such as traffic, that come with a project of this magnitude. The plan for this project can be found on the Township's website which has been uploaded and available since 9/6/2023. Both Conewago Township & Dover Township have indicated a roundabout is the preferred improvement as traffic queues tend to be shorter, roundabouts tend to have less accidents, and the long-run maintenance costs of traffic lights is overall higher for the municipal entity. This Plan in question will be reviewed and commented on at tonight's meeting. A recommendation will be made on the plan and then the plan will be forwarded to the Board of Supervisors for consideration. Again, the applicant must demonstrate their plan complies with the zoning ordinance and subdivision and land development ordinance. If Preliminary approval is obtained from the Board of Supervisors, the applicant will then need to file a Final Land Development Plan with the township. The Land Development plan will return to the Planning Commission for review and then to the Board for final approval. Final plans, in all essential aspects, must conform to the approved preliminary plan and significant changes cannot be required by the Township. If the applicant demonstrates tonight and at the Board of Supervisor's meeting that their plan meets all the applicable zoning and subdivision/land development ordinance sections, it is illegal for the governing body to deny the plan. In addition to meeting all applicable requirements of the zoning and subdivision/land development ordinances, the applicant's plan must comply with all state and federal regulations associated with the environmental impacts, highway access, and permitting, as well as all other local regulations, including stormwater management. Tonight's plan review is merely the first step in a long process.

We encourage our residents to voice their concerns to ensure this or any other project is developed in a manner that conforms with our regulations, the laws of the Commonwealth, and adequately addresses the impacts our residents may experience from such a project.



Charles Courtney, McNees Law; Tom Hilley, Hines Warehouse; Whitney Zimmerman, Hines Warehouse; Shaun Haas, Langan Engineering; Karl Pehnke, Langan Engineering and Environmental Services; Briana Pampuche, Langan Engineering were all present on behalf of Bull Road Logistics, Preliminary Land Development Plan. This plan was tabled from the January 3rd, February 7th, and March 6th Planning Commission meetings.

Mr. Courtney gave a brief overview of the proposed project which includes 3 warehouse buildings to be located on the former Glen Gery Site which is within the current growth boundary of Dover Township. It is also located in the Industrial Zone and has been zoned Industrial since 2006. This plan implements the current Comprehensive Plan for Dover Township. They are before the Planning Commission tonight to present the latest revision of the plan. They will also present tonight the Traffic Impact Study which has now been accepted by PennDOT.

Mr. Haas stated that they were last before the Planning Commission back on September 6th, 2023. The most recent submission was a partial submission dated March 18th, 2024, which shows a few layout changes relating to the crossing and encroachment of the 180' easement that runs through the property. He explained that currently, the project would sit on three parcels of land that they would like to consolidate into one parcel. The lot consolidation has not taken place yet. Previously this site was a mining site owned by Glen Gery. The permits for the mining operation have been closed out and the property is now owned by the applicant Bull Canal Dover LLC. The zoning for the site is Industrial and Warehousing is a permitted use in the Industrial zone. Three streams are within/adjacent to the site. The first would be the main tributary which splits the northern half of the site and runs along the eastern property line. The second splits the western half of the site, and the third is Fox Run which has a 100-year flood plain associated with it. Several pockets of wetlands exist on site and are currently being analyzed and studied as part of the development package. Any impacts will need to be reviewed and approved by DEP. The Met-Ed transmission line runs 180' wide and runs in the southern direction from Bull Road and Tee's over once it gets to Canal Road. There is also a Texas Eastern Gas easement which is a regional transmission line on the southeast edge of the site. Neither of these will be impacted by this development. The Dover Solar electric easement is located on the southeast corner of the site and could have potential impacts. They are coordinating with the neighboring property owner along with Dover Solar on that. The proposed conditions will be a three-building industrial development speculative warehouse with no tenants, which is very typical for industrial development. Parking calculations are one space per employee for the largest shifts. Building One would be approximately 326 thousand square feet, and Building Two would be a crossdock building and would be approximately 1.09 million square feet, Building Three would



be a rear-loading building and would be approximately 450,000 square feet. The frontage of the site is on Bull Road. This is where the driveway will be located and has been shifted due to the Met-Ed easement. There are approximately nine stormwater basins on the site and after technical studies were completed, the infiltration rates and underlying soils were not conducive to an infiltration design which is typical for a site that was historically used for mining. After reviewing the site with DEP and the applicant's Geotechnical Engineer, it was decided to use a Managed Release Concept Basin, (MRC) a slow-release basin which would take place in small amounts. The watering time for an MRC basin is less than 72 hours. This design would need to be reviewed by the Township Engineers along with DEP for approval. For the stream crossing between buildings two and three, they are proposing a stream relocation and enhancement with a riparian buffer. The public water connection will be accessed from Canal Road and will include a proposed water main extension further east on Canal Road. The public sewer connection will be from an existing sewer main also along Canal Road. The requirement for landscaping for the site includes a 50' buffer along the Northern, Eastern, Western, and Southern property lines with a level three screening requirement which will be met. Lighting will be code-compliant and will not cast over the property lines. Roughly 75% of the acreage would be utilized, but not all would be impervious coverage. The timeframe for completion would be approximately two years (2026-2027). It is the intent that Building One will be completed along with the HOP Driveway requirements and any of the drainage needed for that section of the property and will be operational while Building Two and Three are being constructed. The maximum height for the buildings would be 65' and are typically constructed with tilted concert panels with a steel roof. It was questioned why the number of trees along the Bull Road entrance was less than what was on the previously submitted plan. It was stated that the Landscape Engineers chose to space the required number of trees out more for the health of the trees. There is a berm requirement along with a level three screening, the berm must be 3' high. The plan shows that there are a lot of offsite areas that drain toward that berm, they are proposing the creation of a vegetative channel on the upstream edge of the berm which collects the runoff and takes it to the stormwater basin.

A question was asked regarding how and why the stream will be relocated. It was stated that after the stream was studied it was cited that the stream and the surrounding areas were not in the greatest condition, likely due to the long-term mining use that proceeded the proposed development. The stream had no riparian forest buffer or vegetation surrounding the stream. They are proposing a 50' riparian buffer along the stream to enhance the stream but in doing so they needed to relocate it.



It was also questioned whether there was sufficient sewage capacity and water supply for this project. It was noted that they are coordinating the utility connections with the Township but have not been issued a conveyance confirmation letter or treatment capacity confirmation letter yet. It is their understanding that there is the capacity for both. In addition to those approvals, there is a Sewer Facilities planning module application that they are working with DEP on, and believe there will be an exemption for a true planning module based on the actual sewage flow needed for these facilities. It was noted that the sanitary sewer conveyance capacity as listed in the MOU, they will need to with the Township to upgrade the interceptor to bring it to the capacity needed to serve the proposed site.

They are also proposing a paved emergency access road off Fox Run Road only to be used by Fire Trucks or in case of an emergency.

It was asked how the parking calculations are done when they don't know who the tenants will be. It was stated that it is an estimated number of employees based on the other buildings in the applicant's portfolio.

Mr. Courtney explained that they chose this site due to the strong market in the York area. The tenant demands remain high, and the vacancy rates remain extremely low. Central Pennsylvania is in the top three markets for warehousing and distribution. Online sales are still a small proportion of retail sales and still have a lot of room for growth. The York area also has a strong labor market.

Mr. Pehnke, Traffic Engineer with Langan Engineering and Environmental Services gave a brief overview of the process of the traffic impact study and the efforts that are in pursuit with a project this size. PennDOT has accepted the traffic study and its conclusions along with the York County Planning Commission. The study looks at traffic generation which has multiple parts, one component being the employee traffic generation and another component being the truck operations associated with a warehouse project, along with everyday traffic, all of which goes into the traffic study. Those numbers are projected, and the traffic generated gets assigned to the roadway systems surrounding the project. An analysis is done to determine what is needed to meet the criteria set by PennDOT. The driveway is designed to meet the PennDOT standards to accommodate the types of vehicles that will enter and exit this site. It is designed so that all exiting truck traffic must turn south onto Bull Road and will be restricted to only allow passenger vehicles to make a left to go Northbound on Bull Road and receive trucks to and from the South. The study anticipates that the majority of all heavy vehicle traffic associated with this project will travel down Bull Road to Route 30 or along Canal Road headed to Interstate 83. The intersection at Bull Road and Canal Road has been under review and is being evaluated by PennDOT for improvement. With this project, PennDOT is requiring a



temporary improvement by installing traffic signalization at that intersection and widening the Northeast intersection radius. The intersection at Hilton Avenue and Bull Road, PennDOT is also requiring a traffic signal along with a left turn lane on Bull Road onto Hilton Avenue. The intersection at Susquehanna Trail and Canal Road requires road widening and providing a left turn lane onto Susquehanna Trail from Canal Road and modifying the traffic signal accordingly. With these improvements, the traffic study shows that they meet the standards and requirements set by PennDOT for the level of service, queues and delays and mitigation of this project.

It was noted that the temporary signal light would at Bull Road and Canal Road be designed as temporary in nature, so the road isn't being torn up twice being that the intersection is slated for improvement by PennDOT in the future. The cost savings from that temporary signalization design would then be contributed to the permanent improvement slated in the future.

Out of the nine intersections that were part of the traffic impact study only three required improvements.

- C.S. Davidson's letter dated March 28th, 2024, was reviewed. Waivers being requested:
- 1. §19-306.11 Maximum Depth of Basins
- 2. §19-306.18.A.1 & §22-1003.3 Interior Slopes of Detention Basins
- 3. §22-501.2.A Plan Sheet Size (30x42)
- 4. \$22-602.3 To not require matching the crown of all drainage pipes Removed
- 4. §22-709.7 Maximum Access Driveway Width (65')

Motion by Harlacher, seconded by Bigham to recommend approval to the Board of Supervisors of the following waivers: 1) §19-306.11 – Maximum Depth of Basins, 2) §19-306.18.A.1 & §22-1003.3 – Interior Slopes of Detention Basins, 3) §22-501.2.A – Plan Sheet Size and 4) §22-709.7 – Maximum Access Driveway Width, *Striking* §22-602.3 – To not require matching the crown of all drainage pipes. All members voted aye; motion carried.

Outstanding SALDO items are:1. The following comments are relating to the proposed buffer strips and plantings (§22-1103.11): a) Provide a note on the detail stating "Buffer Planting Strip Level 3 shall provide 100% opaqueness of the adjoining use at a height of 8 feet (measured from the outside edge of the berm) at the time of planting, through the use of dense planting of trees and shrubs or other structural elements. A minimum 3' high earthen berm with a maximum 3:1 slope shall be utilized." b) Show the 3' earthen berm within the detail. c) On the landscaping plans, provide a hatch for the level 3



screening and provide a callout referencing the Buffer Planting Strip Level 3 detail. 2. The following comments are related to the sanitary sewer line along the shared access drive of the Northern York Country Regional Police Department and the Hamme property. (\$22-501.2.DD): a) Provide a pavement restoration detail for the shared driveway. b) Provide a concrete encasement for the sanitary sewer line crossing the existing culvert at 11+90. c)Provide clarity with plan callouts and supplemental details as to the method of stream crossing for utilities (open trench excavation, boring, etc.). 3. The following comments are related to the proposed sewer connection in E. Canal Rd. (§22-713.4): a) For SANMH-37 to SANMH-39 the plan view shows labeling for the proposed sanitary sewer, however, the profile shows the existing sewer with proposed callouts. Revise the profile to show and label the existing and proposed sewer layouts. b) Sheets 104 and 105 appear to be nearly duplicated with minor differences. Confirm both sheets are needed. c) Approval of the sanitary sewer layout will need to be received from the township public works director. 4. The name, address, seal, signature, and date of the Professional Engineer/Surveyor shall be added to the plan, certifying the accuracy. (§22-501.2.F) 5. The legal and/or equitable Owner's notarized signatures must be added to the plan certifying concurrence with the plan. (\$22-501.2.H) 6. SWM plan approval needs to be obtained from the Township Engineer. (\$22-602.3) 7. Verification shall be provided indicating that the Erosion and Sedimentation control plan was approved by the York County Conservation District. (§22-602.4) 8. The approved HOP of the access drive and off-site improvements shall be provided before final plan approval. (\$22-602.12) 9. All PADEP permit approvals shall be provided before final plan approval. (\$22-602.12) 10. Emergency services shall review the changes to the proposed improvements to the emergency access drive to Fox Run Road and any comments addressed. General Comments: 1. The plans should clearly indicate that the water service from Canal Road to the proposed meter pit shall meet the requirements of the Dover Township Construction and Material Specifications; specifically, Class 52 ductile iron pipe. Add a label on plan sheet 89 referencing note 35. 2. Dover Township Public Works Water Department comments shall be addressed before final plan approval. Modifying-3. The terms of the MOU shall be finalized into a developer's agreement acceptable to the Township before preliminary final plan approval. Adding comment- 4. Engineer review and approval of the modifications of the access drive to Bull Road.

The MOU- (Memorandum of Understanding) covers the coordination of the transportation improvements with PennDOT at Hilton Avenue and Bull Road, along with the coordination of transportation improvements at Bull Road and Canal Road. It also



covers the Sewer and Water extensions and improvements. The MOU would be converted to a Developers Agreement before final plan approval.

A question was raised regarding the sanitary sewer line along the shared access drive between the Northern York Regional Police Department and the Hamm property and what the plan is before they go before the Board of Supervisors since there seems to not be a resolution in sight. It was stated that this is a Preliminary plan, and the plan proposes utility extensions, and they will implement that per the submitted plan. They believe that they can get that implemented and are not opposed to having those conversations with the Hamm's. If not, they will resubmit the plan with alternatives in place.

Motion by Harlacher, seconded by Bigham, to recommend to the Board of Supervisors to look favorably upon PL 23-6- Bull Road Logistics- Preliminary Land Development Plan-200 Acres Lot Consolidation & 3 Warehouses totaling ± 1.9M SF- Industrial District with outstanding items 1-10 from the SALDO being addressed, and General comments 1, 2, along with modification to #3 to read: *The terms of the MOU shall be finalized into a developer's agreement acceptable to the Township before preliminary final plan approval.* And add comment #4 to read: *Engineer review and approval of the modifications of the access drive to Bull Road.*, from C.S. Davidson's letter dated March 28th, 2024, addressed. All members voted aye, motion carried.

III. Public Comment

Pat Pizza, 1735 Temple School Road- Mr. Pizza questioned whether the Township meets to do a Comprehensive Plan, asked when this parcel was zoned Industrial. He requested to hold an emergency meeting with the public on whether this site should remain zoned Industrial and to hear all the resident's concerns regarding this project. It was noted that the Township does hold public meetings regarding the Comprehensive Plan which looks at zoning and growth boundaries every 10 years. This parcel of land has been an Industrial use since before the Township had zoning. Mr. Pizza also questioned if eminent domain would be implemented for this project. It was stated that this project would not. The project to improve the intersection at Bull Road and Canal Road has been in the planning stages with PennDOT for years and will take place whether this project happens or not.

Deb Goodling Kline, 5310 Bull Road- Questioned if the Township imagined a project of this size when the zoning ordinance was written, and that only has three requirements. It was noted that this Board did not create that ordinance and is only following what the ordinance



currently states. Mrs. Kline also asked whether during the construction period, will they be using onsite building materials and using the water they have access to or will they be bringing in the supplies from off-site. Mr. Courtney stated that sometimes it makes sense from a building perspective to do things on-site, but they are not in a construction sequence yet to give a definite answer. She also asked what plans have been made for when the buildings are sitting vacant to be sure they are being maintained and not create adverse effects inside the buildings. It was noted that all buildings in Dover Township have to abide by the same property maintenance code, and buildings can be condemned if they become unsafe structures.

Judy Forry, 981 E. Canal Road- Stated that the residents of Dover no longer will have a bedroom community in a rural suburban setting. Her concern is that if the stormwater basins are shortened, it will cause bigger issues for neighboring properties that already have issues. Another concern for her is lighting and safety, she asked if the property would have security patrolling. Will the neighboring properties be required to pay thousands of dollars to connect to public utilities? It was stated that the plan that has been submitted has an extensive engineered stormwater plan that prevents runoff, and the lights will be seen from a distance but will not be directed toward neighboring properties. The water line for this project being proposed is to be extended from the area at Park Street up to the area just beyond the Northern York Regional Police Department building.

Teri Marlowe, 2975 Solar Drive- Though she is not thrilled with the project being proposed, she does understand that it will bring tax revenue to help with the school district's current deficit. She asked if there were any tax breaks discussed. It was noted that there is a program called LERTA that municipalities will do to attract large commercial or industrial projects but there have been no requests or discussions of any of that. The school district would be the main one to approve that if it was discussed as the bulk of the tax revenue would go to the district.

Heather Miller, 3680 Bull Road (Just for Pets, owner)- She is concerned that her customers will not be able to enter or exit her business as it is already impossible between the hours of 3 pm to 5 pm. She feels at the minimum they would need to make the roadway at least 3 lanes. Mr. Pehnek stated that the first step of remediation efforts is to install a traffic signal which will reduce the delays and queues for the driveways near the intersection that they may face today. This intersection currently is at a level F of service today. Installing a traffic signal will take this to an improved level C, including the increase of traffic from this project. It will improve the traffic flow even with the increase of traffic proposed.



Eileen Pizza, 1735 Temple School Road- Expressed her concern with the timing of the signals with the installation of a traffic light. She feels that at least with the 4-way stop traffic is always moving.

Cheri Saxton, 1591 E. Canal Road- Questioned if there are any plans to improve the intersection at Fox Run Road and East Canal Road. She stated that there are always accidents there now. It was stated that the Township is currently undergoing a road safety plan to evaluate all Township intersections and to see what adequate changes can be made to improve them. That intersection is currently under review with a Traffic Engineer. She also questioned why the traffic study shows 50% of the truck traffic going to Interstate 83 and the other 50% going toward Route 30. The study does not mention trucks that will be traveling through the square of Dover to head towards Route 15. Mr. Pehnke stated that even without having tenants, the position of this property and the way it is oriented, it is expected that the majority of the traffic will go to Interstate 83 and Route 30.

Melvin, Hoover, 1825 Poplar Road- Asked for a show of hands of who wants this project and asked the Planning Commission to support its community.

Dough Ingram, 50 S. Main Street- Stated that he has traveled East and West Canal Roads for 53 years and feels no matter what PennDOT does for improvement, the roads just are not made for truck traffic.

Bob Nicoli, 1517 Farm Cross Way- Questioned if anyone has surveyed how property values will be affected after this project is completed. He also asked what the hourly flow of truck traffic would be along Bull Road. It was stated that at peak hours it would be around 30 to 40 trucks an hour.

Michael Chapman, 950 Butter Road- Stated there is a bill that is being discussed that would establish a referendum procedure for large-scale projects located within smaller communities that would require it to be voted upon. He feels it should be voted on.

Mike Fahs, 2567 Roosevelt Avenue- Requested a traffic light at Poplar Road and Bull Road so he could get his mail. He asked if the traffic and road improvements were done with the comprehensive plan to suit the industrial use of this land. He hopes that with the temporary traffic solutions that are being proposed it won't be years until PennDOT comes in to make



their improvements. He feels that the infrastructure should be built before the large projects are approved.

Kurt Blake, Esquire on behalf of Geroge and Mary Hamm, 1501 E. Canal Road- Stated that there is not currently an agreement to allow Hines to share access to install any of the utilities. The only agreement was from 2002 and that easement agreement was specifically between the Hamm's, Lamparter's, and the Northern York Regional Police Department for them to build their facilities only. Attorney Courtney stated that the plan is proposing an extension of the sewer from that property, and they believe they have the right. The easement that was established between the Police Department and the Hamm's was established from the property from which the Police Department property was subdivided from the Glen Gery property. The Glen Gery property is a beneficiary of the underlying easement that was referenced in that document.

Mary Phipps, 2351 Tower Drive- Expressed her concerns about pollution and the air quality from the trucks and whether the Wastewater Treatment Plant can currently handle the increase and if not, who will be responsible for paying for it. It was stated that those two issues are being reviewed. The first issue would be how to get the sewage to the plant, the second being the capacity at the plant. After the research was completed, it showed there is capacity at the plant. As for getting the sewage to the plant, research showed there is a section of an interceptor that has a conveyance issue. The developers for this project have agreed to work with the Township to get that interceptor upgraded so the conveyance issue would be resolved.

Steve Hess, 946 Shadowbrooke Drive- Asked if the Planning Commission can stop this project. It was stated that if they meet all the requirements, it cannot be legally denied. But they must meet all the requirements of the current zoning ordinance & subdivision/land development ordinance.

Sherdian Spangler, 3710 Bull Road- Questioned how he will get in and out of his driveway if they put a traffic light at the intersection of Bull and Canal Road. He feels the traffic light will make traffic back up in front of his house and make it impossible to enter or exit his driveway. It was stated that regardless of this project, the intersection was already slated to be improved by PennDOT and it is unknown what those changes will be at this time.



Rodney Kime, 5310 Bull Road- Questioned if the Comprehensive Plan could be revised and amended before this project is approved. It was stated that this plan had already been filed and it would not change the outcome of this project.

Duane Hull, 2220 Locust Road- Stated that he spent 8 years serving on the Board of Supervisors for Dover Township and found it hard to believe that with all the traffic concerns involving two state roads, a representative from PennDOT was not in attendance for tonight's meeting to answer some of those concerns along with state representative Seth Grove. He feels this plan should be tabled until PennDOT is available to answer the residents' questions.

Kevin Nicholas, 3740 Bull Road- Feels as if residents from Conewago Township should also be involved in the meetings involving this plan. His concerns also involve the traffic that will be generated from this project and the water runoff. He questioned where the traffic would flow if there was an accident and traffic would need to be rerouted.

Danielle Beck, 3760 Bull Road- Questioned how this project could comply with the stormwater ordinance that all other residents must comply with without asking for waivers. She also questioned the note on the plan regarding the installation of sidewalks along the entrance that homeowners are required to install and pay for within six months of plan approval. She also had concerns regarding the airport overlay and whether our emergency services are equipped to handle such an emergency. It was noted that there is a major modification to their stormwater plan that is still being reviewed. The sidewalks being installed are on the property of the warehouses only and do not extend past their property. Adjacent property owners will not be required to install sidewalks at their own cost. This plan meets the regulations for the airport. All plans are reviewed by our emergency services to address any of the concerns they might have as well.

Greg Gerhart, 3871 Colonial Road- Has environmental concerns and asked about the process with the outside agencies. It was stated that the approvals from the York County Conservation District along with DEP and other outside agencies will be conditions of the preliminary plan. They have had multiple pre-application meetings with DEP and the York County Conservation District. These meetings are typically held before you submit an NPDES (National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System) permit. The NPDES permit is a required stormwater permit in Pennsylvania. It regulates peak rate controls and volume reduction requirements along with water quality regulations. They must meet all those regulations in addition to the Township regulations. They plan to submit their NPDES application in late



April. It was noted that the York County Conservation is open to the public for anyone inquiring about the findings of their review. It can also be requested at the Township once it is received.

Jennifer Potts, 4070 Bull Road- Questioned what the distance would be from warehouse number one to her home. She is concerned about the dust and air pollution and what the idling restrictions are. It was noted that the idling restriction is a state law and is best enforced by having an enforcement mechanism installed by the owner. The owner is willing to incorporate language into the lease for the tenants that would enforce the idling restrictions. The distance of warehouse number one would be 350' to 400' from the office side of the building to the edge of her home, there will also be screening that is required.

The meeting was recessed at 10:34 PM. The meeting reconvened at 10:47 PM.

IV. Ordinances

a. 2024 Joint Zoning Ordinance Update

Motion by Harlacher, second by Bigham to table the discussion on the 2024 Joint Zoning Update on tonight's agenda and to hold a Special Meeting later in April to discuss. This meeting will be advertised when a date has been set. All members voted aye, motion carried.

V. Other Business/Public Comment

An update was requested regarding the crosswalk at Davidsburg Road and Tower Drive from last month's meeting. The Township has not received a copy of the issued Highway/Road Occupancy permit for that yet. It was also noted that this crosswalk is an item that is currently listed in the Townships Road Safety Audit and will be looked at.

VI. Correspondence

None

VII. Next Meeting

The next Planning Commission meeting will be held on Wednesday, May 1st, 2024, at 7:00 PM.

VIII. Adjournment



Chairman Hoffman adjourned the Planning Commission meeting at 11:04 PM. **Motion** by Love, seconded by Harlacher. All members voted aye; motion carried.

Respectfully Submitted by,

Tina Wagner Recording Secretary