

WINDSOR TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION

February 20, 2025

1. The meeting of the Windsor Township Planning Commission was called to order at 6:03 P.M. by Chairperson Pilachowski.

Present at the meeting were Jerry Pilachowski, Jim Vergos, Todd Kurl, Brita Runkle, Christopher Kraft, P.E. (C.S. Davidson, Inc.), Kipp Allison and Deanna Coble. See the attached list of citizens present.

2. The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.
3. Public Comment – There were no comments.
4. On a motion from Mr. Vergos and seconded by Ms. Runkle, the minutes of the January 16, 2025 meeting were approved. Motion carried. Four votes yes.
5. Plans to be reviewed:

A. KEVIN E. & MELISSA M. SWARTZ – Common Ownership Merger Plan #2024-281 by Shaw Surveying, Inc., along Kormit Drive & Milner Drive in Milner Heights development (02/2025) – Josh Myers of Shaw Surveying was present. He advised that this is a lot consolidation of two lots into one. He stated that they are requesting a waiver of Section 305.2.B of the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance for plan size. On the motion of Mr. Kurl seconded by Mr. Vergos, the Commission approved the waiver request. Motion carried. Four votes yes.

Mr. Kraft and Mr. Allison advised that all comments have been addressed. On the motion of Ms. Runkle seconded by Mr. Kurl, the Commission approved the plan. Motion carried. Four votes yes.

6. Proposed Zoning Ordinance Amendment – Maximum Lot Coverage, Accessory Structure Size – Mr. Allison advised that there has been a request to amend the Zoning Ordinance in relation to the maximum lot coverage and the size for accessory structures. He noted that as part of these changes, the existing Zoning Ordinance would be updated to include all amendments that were done since the last Ordinance update. Mr. Allison advised that he has spoken with other municipalities to determine their regulations.

Mr. Allison advised that the Planning Commission members have received a packet of information from him regarding increases to the maximum lot coverages per zone. This packet was also provided to the citizens present. Mr. Allison advised that he is proposing the changes as follows:

1. Agricultural Zone
 - Single-family detached dwellings – Increase from 20% to 30%
2. R-1 Zone
 - Residential Uses
 - No utilities – Increase from 20% to 30%
 - Public water – Increase from 20% to 30%
 - Public sewer – Increase from 20% to 30%

- Public sewer and water – Increase from 30% to 40%
- Duplex – Increase from 30% per unit to 40% per unit
- Other Permitted Nonresidential Uses – Increase from 30% to 40%
- 3. R-2 Zone
 - Single Family Dwelling – Increase from 30% to 40%
 - Duplex – Increase from 40% to 50%
 - Two Family Dwelling – Increase from 40% to 50%
 - Other Uses – Increase from 30% to 40%
- 4. R-R Zone
 - Residential Lot Averaging Design Option
 - Residential Uses – Increase from 15% to 30%
 - Conventional Lot Development
 - Residential Uses – Increase from 20% to 30%
- 5. Open Space Development
 - Open Space Development Option 2
 - Single Family Dwelling – Increase from 30% to 40%
 - Duplex – Increase from 40% to 50%
- 6. Neighborhood Commercial
 - Increase from 50% to 70%
- 7. General Commercial
 - Increase from 70% to 85%
- 8. Industrial Zone
 - Increase from 70% to 85%

Mr. Allison advised that by increasing the permitted coverage this will be a benefit for both residential and commercial uses. He commented that it will have a significant impact on residential properties with a smaller lot size. It was noted that properties with septic systems should consider the location for a secondary system should there be a failure when proposing additional improvements on the lot.

Dan Hoerr, 20 Patterson Avenue, advised that he is in favor of this increase as it allows residents to add improvements to their property such as a shed to house a lawn mower.

It was the consensus of the Commission to proceed with the changes as proposed.

Mr. Allison advised that a request was brought before the Board of Supervisors to make a change to the size requirements for an accessory structure. He commented that previous Boards had not been open to making changes. However, the current Board was receptive. He explained that the current regulation limits the size of a detached structure to 50% of the footprint of the dwelling.

Mr. Allison showed a property with a dwelling with a footprint of 1,975 square feet. He stated that the maximum size under the current regulations would be 987 square feet. He noted that in this example, there is sufficient lot size for a larger structure. He advised that some lots may be able to accommodate a larger structure but others may not. He stated that for enforcement purposes, he would like the regulation to be the same over all zoning districts. He added that a dwelling is the same use regardless of the zoning of the property. He stated that he is looking for ideas on how the ordinance should be changed. He noted that this is an accessory use and questioned if it should be limited in size such as the same size or smaller than the dwelling

footprint or if there should be no cap in the size at all. He stated that not having a cap may not be a good option in all locations but may work for larger lots.

Christine Emma, 20 Patterson Avenue, advised that they currently have an accessory structure on their lot but they are in need of more space for storage. She noted that under the current ordinance they can have a 1,200 square foot building and she understands that she could have multiple buildings or attach the building to the dwelling but they would like to have one 50' x 60' building. She stated that even if the permitted size was increased to 100% of the dwelling footprint, she would still not be able to have this size building. Mr. Pilachowski questioned if her home is a rancher or a two story. Ms. Emma advised that it is a two story. Mr. Pilachowski commented that often ranchers have a larger footprint.

Andrew Nelson, 3550 East Prospect Road, approached the Board. Mr. Allison advised that Mr. Nelson has an older home that has a small footprint. He noted that his property is in the R-1 zone and although he has 1.3 acres, the footprint of the home is 982 square feet. Mr. Nelson commented that older homes tend to have a more modest footprint. He stated that his property has outbuildings but he would like to have one large building. He commented that he understands that some residents may not want their neighbors to have a large building and suggested a gradual scale based on lot size.

Mr. Allison advised that the average lot size in the R-1 zone is .62 acres so an acre may be a good starting point if a scale were to be used. Mr. Allison stated that not all neighbors get along so maybe setbacks should be increased or height restrictions put in place. Mr. Kurl stated that he would agree that setbacks should be increased based on height. He commented that he believes that a height of 25' would be necessary for the trucks of tractor trailers. Mr. Kurl advised that he needed to leave the meeting but wanted to give his stance. He stated that he is in favor of increasing the size and would be agreeable to going to 100% of the house size and possibly larger. He stated that setbacks should also be increased based on the size of the building. He noted that stormwater requirements could have an impact on the size building someone is willing to build.

It was noted that the current maximum height permitted is 20'. However, in the Agricultural Zone, the building height may increase to a maximum of 25' provided that the setback is equal to the height of the building over 20' high.

Ms. Emma questioned if Homeowner's Associations can regulate the size or placement of a building. Mr. Allison advised that they typically do not have much enforcement power and often have the Township address violations.

Mr. Allison advised that York Township had limited the maximum size of an accessory structure to 900 square feet. In 2018, they changed their ordinance to have no cap on the size. Their Zoning Officer stated that they have not had any issues. Mr. Allison advised that Lower Windsor Township does not have a cap on the size of an accessory structure and their Zoning Officer is not in favor of this.

There was discussion regarding the connection of an accessory building to a septic system or public sewer. Mr. Allison noted that a septic system is based on the number of bedrooms in the home so having a bathroom in an accessory structure would have no impact. He stated that the

location for a secondary septic system location would need to be discussed during the permitting process.

Mr. Kraft advised that under the current ordinance, once the size of the building and/or driveway reaches 2,000 square feet in size, a Stormwater Management Plan is required. Mr. Allison explained this requirement.

Ms. Runkle and Mr. Pilachowski agreed that they would prefer the permitted size be based on lot size using a scale rather than the dwelling footprint.

Mr. Hoerr stated that he has wanted a large building for several years. He commented that he does not understand why you may have a larger building if it is attached to the dwelling but could not have that same size if it were detached. He stated that he would like to see the ordinance changed to not have a cap on an accessory structure. He noted that multiple buildings can be an eyesore and are more expensive to construct. Mr. Allison explained that with an attached building, the setback would be increased.

Brian Raybin, Jr, 175 Meadow Road, advised that his property is approximately 6 acres but the footprint of his home is small. He stated that he is in favor of no cap to the building size for lots preferably over 1 acre.

Mr. Allison advised that with enforcing an ordinance, it is important to be able to tie the regulation to a specific item. He stated that the Township could determine the size of a dwelling so it was able to be regulated. He commented that the same could be done for lot size. He added that the intent of the Township staff is to try to help the residents.

Mr. Herring stated that he is in favor of no cap for accessory structures. He noted that he also has a home in Delaware and there is no cap to a building size in that area.

Calvin Nelson, 3540 East Prospect Road, advised that he is favor of no cap for an accessory structure. He stated that he is in the R-1 zone so he would want the rule to apply to all zones. He suggested as another option that for lots under one acre, the maximum size could be 100% of the dwelling footprint and lots over one acre in size could go up to 200%.

There was discussion on the different options. The Planning Commission agreed that they were agreeable to eliminating the cap on accessory structures provided there is a larger setback.

Lonnie Dettinger, 324 Pleasant Corner Court, agreed that the building size should be based on the lots size. He stated that he would like to have an accessory building to have an enclosed pool. He stated his lot is approximately 4 acres.

Mr. Allison advised that he will look into the option of no cap with an increased setback and also the 100%/200% maximum size that Mr. Nelson suggested. He stated that he will have information for the next meeting.

Andrew Nelson thanked the Commission for letting the residents speak this evening. He felt that they presented their information professionally and the meeting was a non-hostile environment.

Mr. Pilachowski stated that the Commission is always open to listening to the residents as they are civil servants. He stated that the members are all Township residents. It was noted that that all of the Planning Commission meetings are open to the public. Mr. Pilachowski reminded that the Commission is only an advisory board.

7. Plans to be tabled:

- A. MEADOW CREEK TOWNHOMES – Preliminary Subdivision & Land Development Plan #378.14 by Site Design Concept, Inc., along Cape Horn Road, Ruppert Road and Kendale Road. (10/1/07)
- B. BROOKFIELD CROSSING – Preliminary Subdivision Plan #2003-16A by Johnston & Assoc., Inc., 71 lots along Smith Road. (2/1/07)
- C. HOWARD/SNOOK PROPERTIES WEST – Preliminary Subdivision Plan #120817 by James R. Holley & Assoc., Inc., 292 lots along East Prospect Road, Stonewood Road & Freysville Road (12/1/12)
- D. HOWARD/SNOOK PROPERTIES EAST – Preliminary Subdivision Plan #120817 by James R. Holley & Assoc., Inc., 61 lots along Freysville Road (12/1/12)
- E. BROOKFIELD CROSSING (Resubmission) – Preliminary Subdivision and Land Development Plan #2006-16A by Johnston & Assoc., Inc., 98 lots along Smith Road (11/7/17)
- F. WINDSOR PLAZA Preliminary/Final Land Development Plan #2020E89-003 by RGS Associates, Along Cape Horn Rd. (6/17/24)

On the motion of Chairperson Pilachowski seconded by Mr. Vergos, plans 7A, 7B, 7C, 7D, 7E & 7F were tabled. Motion Carried. Five votes yes.

7. Planning Commission Comments – There was none.

8. The meeting of the Windsor Township Planning Commission adjourned at 7:40 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,



Kipp D. Allison
Secretary

CITIZENS PRESENT

February 20, 2025

Andrew Nelson
Paula Nelson
Dan Hoerr
Christine Emma
Mike Herring
Calvin Nelson
Brian Raybin, Jr.
Josh Myers
Zachary Ingram
Lonnie Dettinger

3550 E. Prospect Road York PA
3550 E. Prospect Road York PA
20 Patterson Avenue Windsor PA
20 Patterson Avenue Windsor PA
White Oak Road
3540 E. Prospect Road York PA
175 Meadow Road York PA
Shaw Surveying
Shaw Surveying
324 Pleasant Corner Court Red Lion PA