

MINUTES OF  
SPRING GARDEN TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION  
July 1, 2025

**CALL TO ORDER:** The monthly meeting of the Spring Garden Township Planning Commission was held on July 1, 2025, at 6:01 p.m.

Present:	John DeHaas	Dawn Hansen, Zoning Officer
	Joel Sears	Dave Davidson, C.S. Davidson, Inc.
	Amy Mitten	Robert Sandmeyer

Ms. Mitten asked for a motion to amend to the agenda to correct the date in the first paragraph to July 1, 2025, and to correct the date of the minutes up for approval to June 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting. Mr. Sears made the motion, Mr. DeHaas seconded. All in favor, motion passed.

**PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD:**

- Roberta Boffo, 1080 Grandview Dr. – Asked about recordings of the meetings.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** Mr. Sears made a motion to approve the minutes of the June 3, 2025, meeting. Seconded by Mr. Sandmeyer. All in favor, motion carried.

**ZONING HEARING APPLICATIONS:**

- **Zoning Application 2025-05 – 177 Harrison St., Ryan Hash** – has filed a Special Exception request for §310-35C for the replacement of an existing non-conforming use with another non-conforming use. They would like to improve the property with a mini storage facility which is also a non-conforming use in the R-2 zoning district. *The property is located at 177 Harrison St. and is zoned R-2 (Residential-Urban Zone).*
  - Joe Musso, planning consultant and project manager, along with property owner Ryan Hash, provided a narrative on the request for the Special Exception.
  - Mr. Musso explained Exhibits A – G. Exhibit E provides a rough draft of a possible plan. Exhibit F shows that the property currently does not fit into the neighborhood.
  - The applicant feels the proposed use would be an improvement of the property.
  - Mr. Hash stated that he spoke with neighbors, and they are supportive. He has been working to improve the property since taking over for his father. He feels a storage facility would be a benefit that is not available close by.
  - Mr. DeHaas stated that Exhibit E shows that about 45% coverage and asked if that was accurate.
  - Mr. Musso stated that it is correct, there is a lot of space that is open. This will go through land development for approval as well.
  - Ms. Mitten asked about business hours.
  - Mr. Hash stated that most storage facilities are open 24 hours, everything will be gated with a secure key system. There will be a security system to help keep the property and surrounding properties more secure.
  - Mr. Davidson addressed Mr. Musso stating that 310-68(B) requires that the total of all expansions not exceed an additional 35% of the area of those buildings or structures that are nonconforming uses, and that Mr. Musso noted correctly that on this property there are some small buildings.

- Mr. Musso stated that the use is cars, not buildings. There are a few small buildings that this will exceed.
  - Mr. Davidson suggested that Mr. Musso have an explanation of this when he goes before the Zoning Hearing Board.
  - Mr. Sandmeyer stated that he is concerned about the hours. He would not like to see 24 hours due to the residential neighborhood, as it could get noisy if people are there at 1:00 in the morning.
  - Mr. Sandmeyer asked how garbage would be handled.
  - Mr. Hash explained that there would be a secure, screened dumpster on the property.
  - Mr. Sandmeyer was concerned that renters may leave trash outside the dumpster and that could create an issue.
  - Mr. Musso stated it would be screened in within the gated facility.
  - Ms. Hansen explained that it is required by the Zoning ordinance to be screened.
  - Mr. Sears asked for an explanation of the difference between an R-1 and R-2.
  - Ms. Hansen explained that R-2 allows for higher density and some commercial, whereas R-1 is strictly residential.
  - Mr. Sears asked if the trees along the street on the proposed plan are to be a buffer to the property and if there is privacy fencing in the rear.
  - Mr. Musso explained that the entire property would be fenced.
  - Mr. Sears was concerned that there wouldn't be enough screening.
  - Ms. Hansen pointed out that the entire rear of the property is already covered in thick vegetation as a screening for the existing residential properties.
  - Mr. Sears feels that the current state of the property is a mess and inquired whose responsibility it is to maintain the property.
  - Ms. Hansen stated it is the property owner's responsibility, and that she has been working with the property owners for the last three years to clean up the property.
  - Mr. Sears stated that they did not do very much.
  - Ms. Hansen explained that it looks a lot better than it did. There was a lot to clean up.
  - Mr. Sandmeyer said the condition of the sidewalks, etc. would be addressed under land development.
  - Mr. Sears made a motion to recommend approval of the special exception request for 177 Harrison Street with the consideration to the hours of operation for the business. Seconded by Mr. DeHaas. All in favor, motion passed.
- **Zoning Application 2025-06 – 325 S Belmont St., BHI Properties LLC** - has filed a Special Exception request for §310-8.C(5) and §310-59 for a Hotel/Motel. *The property is located at 325 S. Belmont St. and is zoned A-O (Apartment-Office Zone).*
    - Attorney Stacey MacNeal, representing Mr. Weiss, provided a narrative on the request for the Special Exception for a 50-room boutique hotel on the second and third floor above the 10,000 square foot office flex space.
    - The building and grounds are currently not being fully utilized.
    - There is more than enough parking for the 47 rental dwelling units, the flex space, and hotel use. Mr. Weiss expects there to be three to four employees on the largest shift.
    - Attorney MacNeal explained that the property meets all the criteria for the special exception and will meet all the building codes for this particular use.
    - Attorney MacNeal stated that even with the hotel use, the traffic will still be less than the previous use as a hospital.
    - Mr. Sandmeyer asked about the multiple uses on one parcel.

- Ms. Hansen explained that in the A-O (Apartment Office) Zone you can have any combination of uses deemed compatible with high-density housing.
  - Mr. DeHaas asked if there is a similar development where multifamily, flex office space, and a hotel occupy the same walls, within the same building.
  - Mr. Weiss explained that there is a 3–4-foot wall between the hotel side and the apartments. There were separate buildings built and joined together.
  - Mr. DeHaas asked for an explanation of how the building is divided.
  - Mr. Weiss explained that the south tower is the apartments. The ground floor is not developed, just the first, second, and third floor are developed. The ground level will be the flex space. Above the flex space will be the hotel. This area was a single addition to the building, so it is separated. It only connects in one area.
  - Mr. DeHaas asked again if there are any other properties that they are aware of that have uses that may or may not have synergy.
  - Attorney MacNeal explained that the Yorktowne Hotel has business offices on the first floor with the hotel above. She said that Belmont has a hotel, multifamily, and retail. The difference here is that it was one building, but it is being separated with fire walls. This is a redevelopment project that is working with what we have by creating two separate uses with a party wall between them.
  - Mr. Weiss added that the building code requires a two-hour firewall between the uses.
  - Mr. Davidson posed the question that if he lived in an apartment he would not be able to walk to a hotel room?
  - Attorney MacNeal said you would have to go outside to get to the hotel.
  - Mr. Davidson said this would have to come back as a land development plan and parking could be addressed at that time.
  - Attorney MacNeal said that legally this does not require a land development plan because there is no exterior work. She will address parking with the Zoning Hearing Board as well.
  - Ms. Hansen explained that 97 apartments were proposed, but only 49 are being built, the 10,000 square foot professional office flex, and the 50-room hotel space, there is plenty of parking available on site.
  - Mr. Sandmeyer made a motion to recommend the special exception for approval. Seconded by Mr. Sears.
    - Public Comment:
      - Raeanne Waltersdorf, 1558 Hollywood Parkway – Asked about existing businesses, and availability of apartments
      - Roberta Boffo, 1080 Grandview – asked if apartments could become part of the hotel. She also asked about the definition of a hotel.
      - Mr. Weiss explained that by law he cannot keep a hotel guest longer than 28 days.
  - Motion passed, 3 to 1, with Mr. DeHaas voting nay.
- **Zoning Application 2025-07 – Parcel #48000340083, Spring Garden Township** – has filed a Special Exception request for §310-17(B) to allow two driveways. *This property is located on Indian Rock Dam Road across from York Country Day School and is zoned C (Commercial Zone).*
    - Attorney Jason Sabol representing Spring Garden Township provided a narrative on the request for the Special Exception for two driveways for a proposed new fire station to be located on Indian Rock Dam Road. He described the project's location.
    - The left-hand driveway would be for ingress for fire trucks and ingress/egresses for civilian traffic and employees. The right-hand driveway is for egress for fire trucks only. The trucks will pull

through the building from the rear of the property instead of stopping on Indian Rock Dam Road and backing into the station.

- The property does meet all the requirements of the special exception.
- Mr. Sandmeyer asked if this would be seen for a land development plan because he questioned the number of parking spaces.
- Ms. Hansen explained that eventually this will be seen, and the extra parking is being provided for some possible future recreation on the property.
- Mr. Sandmeyer asked if the approval was required prior to applying for PennDOT permits.
- Ms. Hansen explained that they have already applied for PennDOT permits but have not yet received a decision.
- Mr. DeHaas made a motion to recommend the special exception to the Zoning Hearing Board based on PennDOT approval. Seconded by Mr. Sears. All in favor, motion passed.

**Subdivision/Land Development Plans: None**

**OTHER BUSINESS:**

- Comprehensive plan
  - Mr. DeHaas commented about his distaste for mixed use zoning. He mentioned that he has not reviewed the latest version of the comprehensive plan due to internet issues. If mixed use is still part of the comprehensive plan, he does not support it. He does not agree with some of the broad-based comments in the plan.
  - Carolyn Yagle, Environmental Planning and Design, provided a summary of the multi-municipal meeting between York Township and Spring Garden Township and some of the discussions that were had.
  - Based on comments from York County Planning and Township engineers some items have been added such as street classifications and sidewalks.
  - The document is ready for the next phase so that both municipalities could authorize the 45-day review period with the School District, the surrounding municipalities, and York County Planning Commission in accordance with the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code.
  - This document, through the course of 2025, has received recommendations that are both multi-municipal and municipal specific.
  - During the 45-day review period there is an opportunity for public comment and public hearings, and for the Planning Commission to make recommendations relating to early implementation efforts such as zoning ordinance updates and other pursuits. It also allows for each elected official bodies to identify during 2026 budgeting discussions resources that would be applicable in 2026.
  - They have addressed the comments from the Township and captured those in a way that balances what is beneficial for both municipalities.
  - The plan that is posted on the website is the most up to date.
  - It is important to get this before the Board of Commissioners for their comments as they are the ones that will authorize it for a 45-day review.
  - Mr. Sears asked if it is the Planning Commission's job to recommend it to the Board for review.
  - If this were to go before the Board next month, it would not be up for review by the Board until October.
  - Mr. DeHaas stated that if it is recommended to the Board of Commissioners, the Planning Commission would be finished with its review unless the Board asks the Planning Commission to review certain things.

- Ms. Yagle stated that as residents they can also make comments during the 45-day review period.
- Mr. DeHaas hypothesized that if the Planning Commission did not recommend it, the Board can still undertake the review.
- Mr. DeHaas felt that instead of having a special advisory committee the Planning Commission should have had the opportunity to review it just like York Township's Planning Commission.
- Ms. Hansen explained that the Commissioners wanted input from the residents and community stakeholders, and then, Ms. Mitten, being the liaison for the Planning Commission, would bring back the discussions to the Planning Commission for review.
- There was discussion about the process of the review of the Comprehensive plan, and some felt it should have been done differently and was not effective.
- It was discussed that the Planning Commission can always make a recommendation to the Board of Commissioners with suggestions for specific items to review.
- Ms. Yagle pointed out that in each township there have been items that need focus that would come out of this as implementation. The comprehensive plan plants the seed, and the implementation would see it grow.
- Mark Sindich, 1251 Brookway Dr. – Stated that as a member of the advisory committee he saw great value of participating in the process. It was interesting to be able to focus on the task at hand. He doesn't feel that York Township got the same benefit since they used their Planning Commission. He feels it is valuable to collaborate with York Township.
- Ms. Mitten explained that there has been a lot of discussion regarding saving open space.
- Ms. Yagle also brought up the discussion on mixed use zoning uses.
- Ms. Hansen explained that there was a lot of conversation at both York Township and Spring Garden regarding infrastructure, sewer improvements, road repairs, multimodal transportation, and looking forward to the future. These are things that should be incorporated in this plan. It isn't just zoning changes; it is planning for redevelopment and improvements.
- Ms. Mitten asked how they are to have those conversations without breaking sunshine laws.
- Ms. Hansen stated that these meetings are the times for those conversations. There have not been discussions at the Planning Commission meetings as there should have been. The primary focus has been on saving open space. If the Planning Commission feels there are things lacking in the plan, it is because they did not bring up or discuss their concerns.
- Lynne Huddleston, 808 Clearmount, expressed concerns over the involvement of the advisory board, meetings the board had, and the communication with the Planning Commission.
- Ms. Hansen explained that Ms. Yagle is the facilitator and the meetings were with her. The meetings were all open to the public, but not necessarily meetings where the public could comment.
- It was explained that the comprehensive plan is a guide to the future of the Township, not a document telling the Commissioners what they must do. The Comprehensive plan is to be completed every 10 years per the MPC.
- Mr. Sandmeyer feels that the Planning Commission was really left out of the development of the comprehensive plan. He felt that when the Board of Commissioners was looking to develop the property for the municipal complex, they were never involved.
- Lynne Huddleston, 808 Clearmount, stated that at the last meeting in York Township there was a request to add line items in Section 5, Part 5, Respect for the Environment, regarding the Appell Botanical Garden and the Penn State Campus as specific areas of exploration. She requested that 1799 Mount Rose Avenue be added to that line item as well.

- Mr. Sandmeyer said that the comprehensive plan is a recommending book. The focus should be on the zoning ordinance and subdivision land development ordinance. The comprehensive plan is really used to determine arterial and collector streets.
- Ms. Yagle stated that the comprehensive plan and the zoning ordinance are required, by the nature of the MPC, to be generally consistent.
- Roberta Boffo, 1080 Grandview Road, expressed the importance of the Planning Commissioners' input.
- Luther Wike, Township Manager, asked Mr. Sandmeyer to clarify that there is no land development plan for 1799 Mt. Rose Property. Mr. Sandmeyer confirmed there is no land development plan for 1799 Mt. Rose Ave.
- Roberta Boffo, 1080 Grandview Road, is concerned that if the Mount Rose property is not called out in the plan, and zoned open space, it will be developed in the future. She is afraid that Spring Garden and York Township are going to merge into one Township.
- Ms. Hansen explained that the purpose of the intermunicipal comprehensive plan is for shared land use. Both Townships have different needs and that is called out in the plan. We share borders, police departments, we are both First Class Townships, and it is more cost effective to do a joint comprehensive plan than an individual plan. This is a simple guidebook for both Townships.
- Mr. DeHaas asked if the comprehensive plan is to be generally consistent with the Zoning Ordinance then why have some particular parcels been identified as mixed used? The Township must look at its zoning use and determine what makes sense as opposed to identifying zones that are prime candidates for mixed use.
- Ms. Yagle stated that in looking at future land use areas, these are not zoning districts, these are ideas that are illustrated on a map that does not include parcels, it includes general areas within the Township and the relationship between the two. Because, when there is opportunity for a zoning ordinance detailed analysis and update process that would include both text and map, it would be looking at parcel-based zoning district discussions. That general consistency phrase is something that is charged to municipalities across the Commonwealth to identify between the comprehensive plan and the zoning ordinance updates potential recommendations, again, a guide, to, for example, an area in the northeast, or southwest, or wherever it may be, and the relationship between residential, commercial, or industrial or as it may be. This does not present a parcel-by-parcel review and recommendation of zoning ordinance map updates because the charge within the comprehensive plan is to look at what the general land use patterns are and make recommendations to both Townships.
- Mr. DeHaas explained that he doesn't feel either Township could afford to do a parcel-by-parcel zoning analysis.
- Mr. DeHaas asked Ms. Yagle, based on her expertise, where does general consistency and where does the ability of the Township, people on the commission and others, alter the general picture of where certain things are designed to be "logical", this is what this map is designed to do.
- Ms. Yagle confirmed. This document is adopted by resolution, not ordinance, and if years from now there was a desire to have, for example, larger areas of mixed use, then maybe this map would be part of discussions and it would go through effectively updating portions of the comprehensive plan, and maybe this map would be one of those, so that it could set the stage for something further in policy in the ordinance. The nature of this being generalized and having land use areas that are not one-for-one on the zoning nomenclature nor boundaries, gives both communities the opportunity to explore those discussions and recognize that there

are different relationships that are going to happen over time and work with the generally consistent uses. That also means that the zoning ordinance map does not need to be or intended that it would be a one-for-one, that this map goes directly on top of a zoning map, it is not an overlay.

- Roberta Boffo, 1080 Grandview, asked about including Mill Creek to the plan to get credits towards riparian buffers and be called out in the section on page 81 for urban growth because it was farmland.
- Raeanne Waltersdorf, 1558 Hollywood Parkway – Stated that the Zoning Officer mentioned that their group are the only ones that show up, but they did have 560 signatures of people that do want this land to be kept and not sold. Also, she wanted to make everyone aware of this study or quote that was done for March 13<sup>th</sup>, 2024 before the comprehensive plan started. It's the highest and best land use according to taxable value. It's all about the property at 1799 Mt. Rose Avenue and there's a lot of different ideas on it. Apartments and stores and she just wanted the commissioners to keep in mind that the public thinks that that's kind of odd timing that this was done before the comprehensive plan was started and it makes a lot of them feel that this is the plan in the background. This is a best land use report that Spring Garden Township paid for to develop the Mount Rose property.
- Ms. Hansen explained that at the time that study was done, the commissioners were trying to determine what they wanted to do with the property, so they had C. S. Davidson do a study to see what the best use for the property could be based on the value of the property. It was not a land development plan; it was a suggestion to see what possible uses for the property could be. It was a feasibility study.
- Ms. Mitten explained that the Board of Commissioners have consistently connected the Mount Rose property with the comprehensive plan. It was determined that nothing would be done with the property until the comprehensive plan could be completed. She felt that what Mrs. Waltersdorf was trying to explain is that the commissioners were trying to develop the property into mixed use until the residents said they didn't want that. The comprehensive plan was a backdoor plan to change the property to a mixed-use zone. The implementation of the comprehensive plan is what is concerning to the residents.
- Ms. Yagle stated that it is not a difference in any implementation points in being able just to use that natural resource type of discussion as an example just as was had last week when there was discussion about projects being incorporated into the plan.
- Ms. Mitten stated that the Planning Commission needs to take into consideration the needs of all the residents of the Township, not just the 560 people who signed a petition. The Planning Commission cannot say that they are going to make that property open conservation or open space.
- Mr. Sears said he thinks the property should be put in the plan as a point of reference just as the Codorus Creek was mentioned as a point of reference. With no suggestion of usage other than to say this is a point of reference this is a geographic feature in the in the Township as Ms. Yagle suggested. That it would be a geographic point of reference that could be included in the comprehensive plan with no discussion of future use plans, just this is what it is.
- Lynne Huddleston, 808 Clearmount - Clarified what she was requesting; that just as the Appell Botanical Gardens and Penn State York were put in as line items as areas that needed to be considered specifically in this comprehensive plan, she was asking that 1799 Mount Rose be put in as a line item; no determination, no specifics, but that enough people have spoken in this Township that they want something done with this that it should be in there and noted along with those other items.

- Ms. Yagle stated that it could be placed in the area talking about natural resources and amenities, it can have whatever options are in this 2024 detailed feasibility recommendations and can continue to evolve at that specific location.
- Mr. DeHaas stated that the view of a certain percentage may be a plurality of the populace is that our comprehensive plan becomes a means to the end that they've already predetermined. Which is the recommendation for the development of it at its highest value 1799 Mount Rose, that means our comprehensive plan becomes a means to an end. And he thinks that is justifiable, based on the timing, to infer that.
- Albert Miller, 300 Old Orchard Lane wanted to express that his number one concern about the comprehensive plan is that it's been discussed here directly and indirectly and he knows there's a "housing crisis" in York County. The term workforce housing gets thrown around a lot. It's in the comprehensive plan and in part 8 they specifically talk about Spring Garden Township being the only place where the mixed-use zoning is going to occur when you look at the future use land map in the comprehensive plan that's the only place you see the mixed-use zoning. He understood it's not zoning it's just a recommendation. He stated that what goes into this comprehensive plan does set the stage for someone who may want to come along and build in a mixed-use area. Specifically, he gave an example of the Baker farm being designated as mixed-use and there's a house on the Bakers farm that one of the two founders of York owned. That house is not mentioned anywhere in the comprehensive plan but it's an historic asset. This plan is being used to solve a problem that York Township doesn't want to deal with. Their Planning Commission stated it's hard to build low-income housing, so they are putting that on Spring Garden Township. He feels this mixed-use zoning, workforce housing is a manifestation of that, obviously the Mount Rose Avenue property is designated as mixed-use as is the Baker farm.
- Ms. Yagle stated that on the future land use plan graphics, which is what they were discussing, there are two areas on the map identified as mixed-use. One is mixed-use and one is commercial and mixed use, and that is because of the way that York Township is looking at some of those areas in conjunction with one another. Both York Township and Spring Garden, on this future land use plan, have areas of mixed-use called out. This graphic does not represent the zoning map. It looks at the nature of land uses that are possible and general categories of it. Because that's introducing a new thing to the municipality, calling that out as a new item, there is existing mixed-use in York Township today.
- Ms. Hansen explained that there is mixed use in Spring Garden already. Regents Glen which is apartment-office zoning can have both offices, apartments, and retail. There are other areas in the Township designated as mixed use. This is not a new zone, it is a new use. They are separate items.
- There was discussion about calling out the property at Mount Rose for recreation and being protected.
- Mr. DeHaas stated that the opportunity exists to indicate that the conservation of current open spaces would be a priority for the Township that does not call out specific parcels.
- Ms. Yagle stated that this would be better approached in an updated Recreation Plan. The 2026 budget could reflect the need to update that 2016 Recreation Comprehensive plan.
- Mr. Sandmeyer made a motion to table to next month's meeting. Mr. DeHaas seconded.
- Mr. Sears felt they had enough information, and it should be recommended to the Board of Commissioners to initiate the 45-day review process with the two substantial additions that were discussed. It's concrete, it's actionable, and it still leaves a review period for people to make additional comments. One comment was Mill Creek be added as a geographic barrier in the same sense as the Codorus reference. The second was to list 1799 Mount Rose Ave and the Barker Farm, along with the Appell property and Penn State York. This moves it along to



the Commissioners and if they are that interested in looking at the specifics, there is a month and a half to do it as individuals.

- Mr. Sandmeyer agrees with Mr. Sears' comments. Mr. Sandmeyer withdrew his motion, seconded by Mr. DeHaas.
- Mr. Sandmeyer made a motion to recommend the plan to the Board of Commissioners for the 45-day review with the two additions. Seconded by Mr. Sears. All in favor, motion passed.
- Motion to adjourn by Mr. Sandmeyer, seconded by Mr. DeHaas. All in favor. Meeting adjourned at 8:57 pm.

Approved