

EAST MANCHESTER TOWNSHIP
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS & PLANNING COMMISSION JOINT MEETING
AGENDA

July 28, 2026, at 6:00 p.m.

(Immediately following the Planning Commission meeting)

1. APPROVE OR AMEND AGENDA
 - 1.1. July 28, 2026
2. PUBLIC COMMENTS
3. PROPOSED ORDINANCE AMENDMENTS FOR THE EAST MANCHESTER TOWNSHIP CODIFIED ORDINANCE
 - 3.1. Chapter 103 – Fire Prevention and Safety
 - 3.2. Chapter 203 – Streets, Sidewalk, and Curbs
 - 3.3. Chapter 208 – Subdivision and Land Development
 - 3.4. Chapter 255 – Zoning Ordinance
 - 3.5. Other amendments raised by the public or during meeting discussions
4. SUPERVISOR’S COMMENTS
5. EXECUTIVE SESSION (As Needed)
6. ADJOURN MEETING

*All interested parties are invited to attend. People with disabilities may contact the Township office at (717)266-4279 at least five (5) business days prior to the public meeting to discuss how to best accommodate your needs.

*** Board of Supervisor Meeting Live Stream**

The East Manchester Township Board of Supervisors is providing viewing access to its meeting via live streaming on youtube.com. Channel Name [@EastManchesterTownship](#). This will allow the public to view the Board of Supervisors meeting live and will store on YouTube for a controlled amount of time. The meeting link will not allow public participation nor the submission of questions or comments. If any citizen would like to provide public comment during a meeting, they are encouraged to attend the meeting in person. The Township cannot guarantee that there will not be interruptions in the link or recording due to technical difficulties or failures. To ensure full access to any meeting, citizens are encouraged to attend in person.

East Manchester Township
Joint meeting between Board of Supervisors and Planning Commission
July 28, 2026

The Board of Supervisors and Planning Commission met at the Township Building. Supervisors present: Chairman David L. Naylor, Vice Chairman Darryl L. Albright, and Supervisor Dean E. Kohr. Planning Commission members present: Mike McCowan, Mike Scarborough, Ed Hewitt, Troy Rentzel, and Herb Nix. Also, present Zoning Officer Kate Snyder, Township Manager Kristie Masemer, Solicitor Andrew Miller, Engineer Laymon Mortorff, and two citizens. Supervisor Chairman Naylor called the meeting to order at 7:07 p.m.

Motion by Vice Chairman Albright, second by Supervisor Kohr, to approve the agenda as presented. All members voted aye; motion carried.

Public Comments

Nothing at this time.

The purpose of this meeting is to review recommendations and have discussions about ordinances that need to be updated or changed in some way. Chairman Naylor dispensed of all formalities and handed the meeting over to Ms. Snyder.

Definitions – Ms. Snyder wondered if it would be good to go through the ordinances to review the accuracy/consistency of the information, particularly with regard to the definitions. Attorney Miller noted that it would be a time-consuming undertaking, but it can be done for sure. That might be a discussion for another time rather than tonight. It would be good to have all definitions in one area in the ordinance. It would be good to have a cost estimate before the budget discussions.

255-21, Accessory Structures – Trouble arose during a request for a permit for a roadside stand. The Zoning Officer needs some direction – language to add to the ordinance for a definition of a temporary structure.

Is a temporary structure something with three sides or fewer? In the ordinance, the definition is included for a permanent structure, but nothing for temporary structures. Discussion was held on structures that include a foundation and those that are just placed on the ground. How about a “temporary display structure” which was the issue that Ms. Snyder had trouble with? No more than three vertical sides and not permanently attached. Attorney Miller proposed a definition that was acceptable to the BOS/PC members.

255-53B(4)(a) and (b) – Square footage of the accessory structure to house non-domestic (farm type animals) animals’ accessory to residential uses. The current ordinance limits those structures to 150 SF for smaller non-domestic animals. The bigger the lot size, the more non-domestic animals are permitted. The structure size doesn’t increase though, and perhaps we need to provide for a larger structure size if the lot size is large enough to hold a

larger quantity of non-domestic animals. How about if the lot size is five acres, a building of a certain size would be permitted? Kind of a sliding scale? Impervious area will always be in play for lot coverage review as well as stormwater management as applicants are still required to follow all of the other applicable ordinances with an application submission. An applicant had 4 acres and wanted a larger building for goats (the ordinance allows 6 goats per acre with a minimum required of three acres = 24 goats permitted in this example), and they were limited to 300 SF for the shelter structure. Ms. Snyder noted that the ordinance may need flexibility to address simple requests of this nature without requiring ZHB review in every instance. But why not require them to apply for a variance, so that neighbors can have the opportunity to voice their opinions on the application? Agricultural operations were discussed and are exempt from this ordinance section and its limitations. An amendment of this nature would help folks who have a large parcel and are allowed per the existing ordinance to have more non-domestic animals so that they wouldn't need to pay a fee and present a case before ZHB just to house the animals in a larger structure. Does R-1 (Low Density Residential) allow multiple uses? No, one principal use and one principal structure, therefore, a single-family dwelling could not have a primary Agricultural Operation on the same lot, but per this non-domestic animal section, they can have these types of animals/structures as "accessory" to the single-family dwelling with the regulations provided therein. This ordinance is currently in place. Could the Agricultural and Conservation districts be exempt from the structure restriction? Is this possible? Yes, that's doable. We could easily set it up as a sliding scale format, too. But if we use the sliding scale, maybe we wouldn't need to exempt any district. Exempt from the max structure size Agricultural and Conservation districts, and all other districts would use the sliding scale. OR exclude Agricultural and Conservation districts, and in the permitted residential districts, leave the section as it is. At a ZHB hearing, a structure size request might be considered a de minimis variance. Ms. Snyder recommends the sliding scale option for all districts except for Conservation and Agricultural as districts would be exempt from the size of the structure. Attorney Miller will come up with a draft for further review/discussion.

SALDO/Zoning – this arose because of a problem at DHL. Ms. Snyder went to the site for an inspection, and she was stuck in the line with both tractor trailers and passenger vehicles, with no way to circumvent the queue for entering and exiting. Can we designate separate areas for cars/other vehicles and the tractor trailers? From Mr. Mortorff, perhaps the long line of trucks is in violation of the recorded plan/requirements in the first place. Ms. Snyder clarified the situation; she had to wait for a security guard to come and let her come onto the property. Perhaps this is an operational issue for the DHL site (or other sites), not a Township issue. The trucks were queuing in the site's driveway, not out into the roadway, so they might not have been in violation of the recorded plan. So add 'queuing' to the language of Section 255-59.

Define bus/truck terminal use and other recommendations on this subject by Attorney Miller – there have been some past issues with a bus company and a trash collection company wanting to utilize existing commercial/industrial lots that have principal buildings on them, but didn't want to occupy the buildings, merely the parking lot areas. Per the ordinance, a lot may have multiple tenants as long as they are all contained within the principal structure. Attorney Miller will check other ordinances and come up with language to add/revise.

Chapter 103-11, Security Gates – add at the discretion of fire chief and zoning officer may require any of the following – security gate, emergency access gates, guard shack, etc. A fire call was made to a commercial location, the fire truck couldn't gain access to the site and needed to wait for the guard in the shack to get to the gate, wasting precious fire-fighting minutes. On this site, there were some issues with the siren-activated gate, and the business thought they were complying with the requirements, even though they weren't. Attorney Miller will add language to ensure that all access points provide either a 24-hour manned guard shack or siren activated gates.

203-21, Obstructions/Hazards – this recommendation refers to basketball hoops in the street. Currently, the Township staff is not permitted to enforce basketball hoops in the street. It was noted that the police department enforces the state law, which covers the roadway, but the police aren't thrilled about doing such enforcement. Attorney Miller will add "street" to the section for basketball hoops. Please note, the Township gets a lot of resident complaints about these in the roadway especially in developments. The common complaint is that the kids don't move out of the way, which is a police issue, but the structure can be a hazard within the right of way.

103.9.D, Fire Lanes – currently the ordinance requires emergency access drives and lanes to be paved when connected to a public road. Recommendation: add interior accesses shall be paved as well.

255-62, Signs – Ms. Snyder would like to see something to require attached permanent signs to the exterior of their occupied space to identify businesses and freestanding signs to identify multiple tenants. Internally illuminated sign requirements are already present in the ordinance for industrial uses. Discussion was held about emergency vehicles locating commercial businesses – it's easier to see the name of the business rather than merely the address. Industrial uses might be exempt from this requirement, what with multiple buildings and all (would the requirement be to put the sign on each building?). It's good that Ms. Snyder requires businesses to put their name/address on the back doors for easy identification from the back of the building or strip mall situation. Ms. Snyder will talk with the fire chief and police chief, then advise Attorney Miller.

255-67, Nonconformities – if the sign ordinance is changed, can enforcement be done on existing businesses? Attorney Miller will check and also determine where to put this in the ordinance.

103-12.B.7 and 8 – Knox Boxes – add “Fire Chief” to the inspection process – add this to conform the language wherever it needs to be added.

Add definition for a **Second Front Yard**

Casino/Gaming Facility – provide for the use – since it’s a “use not provided for,” currently the applicant would need to request a Special Exception. Ms. Snyder recommends that the applicant request this as a Special Exception within one of the districts. Attorney Miller recommends this in the Commercial District. Attorney Miller will draft this for further discussion.

Chapter 144-6, Rental Operating/License – Rental license should be executed by the Zoning Officer, not the Secretary.

No comments from the Planning Commission members or audience members. Thank you from Chairman Naylor to the staff members for all the dedication and work that they put into this list of amendments. Well done.

Motion by Vice Chairman Albright, second by Supervisor Kohr to adjourn. All members voted aye; motion carried. The meeting adjourned at 8:54 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Kristie Masemer, Township Manager
Julie Maher, Recording Secretary