

# **MINUTES OF THE NEW SALEM BOROUGH PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING**

September 23, 2025 at 80 N. Water Street, York New Salem, PA

The New Salem Borough Planning Commission met on Tuesday, September 23, 2025. The meeting was called to order at 7:00 PM by Mr. Partridge who led those in attendance with the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag. Mr. Partridge then explained the process for the evening and introduced the members of the Planning Commission.

## **COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT**

Peter Partridge- Chairman  
Carl Barley – Vice Chairman  
Bob Boulden  
Kim Martin

## **OTHERS PRESENT**

Dave Lipinski, Engineer  
Judy Albright, Secretary  
Jon Holmes, representing J.A. Myers  
Doug Lillich, representing J.A. Myers  
Ryan Yohe, Resident

## **COMMISSION MEMBER ABSENT**

Vicki Rohrbaugh

**RESIDENTS IN ATTENDANCE** - Emily Smith, Marty Arno, Cecilia Harvey, Deb Bailey, Bruce & Martha Hanley, Ryan Yohe and Ed Mundorf.

**APPROVAL OF JUNE 24, 2025 MINUTES** – on a motion by Mr. Boulden, seconded by Mr. Barley and unanimously carried the minutes were approved as presented.

## **CONTINUE REVIEW STATUS OF NOTTINGHAM VILLAGE DEVELOPMENT** –

Review and comments have been received from York County Planning and David Lipinski, Borough Engineer and have been provided to all present. The developer just received comments from York County Conservation on September 22 and has not yet reviewed them.

Mr. Lillich indicated they should be breaking ground in the summer of 2026 to begin Phase I and begin constructing homes by spring of 2027. Phase II will come later.

Eng. Lipinski presented his September 15 outstanding comments.

1. The comments provided by the York County Planning Commission shall be addressed to the satisfaction of the Borough.
2. Payment of all fees to New Salem Borough. It was recommended that the Borough bill the developer upon receipt of the engineer's time.
3. A 180-day time extension has been granted by the developer which would extend the approval time till 4/18/26 to be discussed later.
4. Comments provided by the Zoning Officer and Borough Solicitor shall be addressed, none submitted at this time.
5. Comments provided by the Fire Chief shall be addressed; no written comments received, verbal indications are they have no issues with the plan.

6. DEP Sewage Planning is required for this plan. A DEP Sewage Planning Module has been submitted to the Borough. Prior to the Borough signing the Module, two items must be addressed. (1) only a portion of the required 52 EDU's have been reserved by the previous developer. The additional EDU's required must be obtained by the developer, and all necessary fees paid for their acquisition. (2) a letter from the WWTP must be obtained indicating capacity for these 52 lots. The developer has paid for the reserve EDU's and North Codorus Township has advised they see no problems with the additional sewers.
7. A DEP permit is required for the proposed street crossing of wetlands and a watercourse.
8. An NPDES Permit for construction activities is required.
9. The Solicitor shall review the proposed HOA documents and report back to Engineer and Planning Commission.
10. The Borough should confirm that the AM peak hours and the PM peak hours for the two intersections agree with their knowledge of the existing traffic patterns. An internal traffic study of the Sherwood Forest Development is included in the report and includes existing and proposed stop signs and a 25 mph speed limit throughout. Much discussion ensued regarding the backup of traffic on Main and George Streets as a result of the traffic light. Mr. Partridge indicated Borough officials held a zoom meeting with PennDOT officials and they will be presenting a plan to change the light cycles which should alleviate some of the congestion.
11. A PennDOT HOP is required for the proposed driveway along North Main Street. Mr. Holmes indicated since there is a driveway there, a new permit may not be required.
12. Sheet 7 indicates the overhead electric to be demolished. A letter from the utility owner acknowledging the demolition is required. What is meant by "See Sheets 7-10 and 23-27 in your response letter? Mr. Holmes indicated they do have a letter from Met Ed indicating their proposed plan and subsequent underground electric.
13. The developer shall confirm with PennDOT that the emergency access does not require a PennDOT HOP.
14. The developer is proposing parking on both sides of the street.
15. Sheet 43, proposed sidewalk detail, the welded wire fabric (WWF) reinforcement is for the concrete, not the 2RC stone. Mr. Holmes indicated they would clarify this on a revised drawing.
16. The sanitary sewer trench and storm sewer trench details shall indicate that the backfill shall be compacted in maximum 12-inch lifts.
17. Sheet 44, connection to existing manholes shall be cored and utilize watertight manhole boots and include the creation of the manhole flow channel – developer will adjust details.
18. The Borough Solicitor shall review the operation and maintenance (O&M) agreement for the stormwater management facilities. There are specific O&M criteria in the PCSM report that must be incorporated into the O&M agreement – Solicitor will need to prepare the agreement.
19. Why was the channel flow not included in the Tc path for the predevelopment condition?
20. Note 16 on sheet 23 shall be revised. All sanitary sewer mains and laterals to the cleanouts located at the street right-of-way or easement boundary will be owned and maintained by the Borough. Storm sewer located outside of the street right-of-way will be owned and maintained by the Homeowners Association.
21. In addition to the relatively deep storm sewer previously indicated in our the Stormwater Management review letter for the Borough's information. The plan and O&M agreement

shall clearly indicate that the proposed culvert at the existing stream crossing shall be owned and maintained by the Homeowners Association.

22. Proposed retaining walls shall be designed by a structural engineer and have adequate safety protection for vehicles and pedestrians.

Developer will address the issues and submit a revised plan.

**PUBLIC COMMENT** - Questions arose from members of the Commission and residents pertaining to the cut-de-sac length not being according to the ordinance, notification to local schools of development, what roads would be used for ingress and egress to the development, would there be an inspection of sewer and drain pipes prior to backfill, street lights for the development and their placement toward existing homes, could there be uniform mailboxes, placement of white fence along N. Main St., and correction of adjacent property owner names.

### **CONSIDER RECOMMENDATIONS TO COUNCIL-**

**Regarding Extension** - On a motion by Mrs. Martin, seconded by Mr. Boulden, and unanimously carried, the Planning Commission recommends that Borough Council approve the 180 day extension till April 18, 2026.

**Regarding Approval** – All Commission members felt the plan is not ready to move forward to Borough Council. On a motion by Mr. Barley, seconded by Mr. Boulden and unanimously carried, the plan is tabled until the next Planning Commission meeting.

Discussion then on when the next Planning Commission meeting would be held either October 28 or November 25. Commission members are to check their calendars and Mr. Partridge is to notify the developer of their determination.

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:25, respectfully submitted by Judy Albright, Secretary.