

September 11, 2025

The East Hopewell Township Planning Commission held its regular meeting at the Municipal Building at 7:30 p.m. Members present were Rob Davis, Jerry McLaughlin, Mike Kosmicki, Sam Georgieff, and Scott Garvey. Also attending the meeting were solicitor Mike Craley, Sam Craley, Laura Vasold, Todd Warner, John Gray, Jack Cogle, and Terri Mallory.

Laura Vasold, the Township Secretary, announced that the meeting would be recorded and that residents must state their name and address when they speak to the Planning Commission.

Rob Davis opened the meeting with the Pledge of Allegiance.

Sam Georgieff made a motion to approve the agenda. Scott Garvey seconded the motion, which was unanimously carried.

Mike Kosmicki made a motion to approve the minutes of August 14, 2025, as read. Jerry McLaughlin seconded the motion. Rob Davis and Sam Georgieff refrained from voting due to their absence at the August 14, 2025, meeting. The motion was carried.

Gateway Logistics Center proposal: The Planning Commission then discussed the Gateway Logistics Center proposal, flagged as a development of regional significance. Members reviewed the concept plan and traffic impact study, noting concerns about limited access points, emergency service routes, and potential traffic increases. While the plan included proposed intersections and loading docks, it was emphasized that the development was still in its conceptual phase. Members expressed skepticism about the adequacy of emergency access and the potential burden on local infrastructure. Ultimately, the Commission agreed to make no formal comment but acknowledged the importance of monitoring the project as it progresses.

Alternative Energy Ordinance: Next, the Commission received an update on the Alternative Energy Ordinance. The ordinance had been submitted to the York County Planning Commission and was scheduled for review at their September 16, 2025 meeting. It was anticipated that the Board of Supervisors would authorize enactment in November, barring any substantial feedback. The Commission agreed to remove the item from future agendas unless significant revisions are required.

Winery Ordinance Discussion: Discussion then turned to the Winery Ordinance. Members reviewed printed materials and agreed that no immediate action was necessary. The ordinance would be refined concurrently with the Special Events Ordinance, with definitions and zoning sections to be updated accordingly. Members agreed to revisit the draft after revising it into the legal format.

Special Events Ordinance: The Board held an in-depth discussion on the development of a Special Events Ordinance, drawing upon the Pine Ridge zoning hearing board decision as a guiding precedent. Key regulatory considerations included traffic circulation, parking adequacy, hours of operation, noise mitigation, and limitations on guest capacity. Members underscored the importance of preserving agricultural land and minimizing impervious surface coverage in event planning and site design. Consensus was reached to draft a new ordinance section specifically addressing permanent special events venues, which would be distinct from temporary outdoor events currently governed under Section 742.

.

As part of this effort, the Board conducted a focused review of the existing definition of “Temporary Outdoor Amusement or Event,” which presently encompasses “any outdoor theatrical, musical or dramatic performance or concert, festival or carnival, or any other outdoor exhibition, show, entertainment, amusement or event of any nature or kind.” Members expressed a need to refine this definition to clearly differentiate temporary events from permanent operations, particularly in light of the proposed ordinance framework. It was agreed that temporary events should be defined as non-permanent and non-recurring in nature, even if held annually, and that this temporal distinction should be explicitly stated within the ordinance language.


The Board reviewed existing exclusions, which exempt church functions, fire company activities, school functions, and events conducted solely for charitable purposes by qualifying organizations. Discussion followed regarding the potential incorporation of Section 742, subsection K’s limitations—restricting events to no more than four consecutive days and no more than six events annually—directly into the definition to enhance clarity and enforceability. Members raised concerns about verifying charitable intent and the disposition of proceeds, noting the need for practical enforcement mechanisms.

Signage requirements and property owner responsibilities were also addressed, with consensus to require permanent signage for Special Event Venues and to stipulate that event permits be obtained by the property owner rather than the event organizer. The Board emphasized the importance of clarity, consistency, and legal robustness throughout the ordinance to ensure effective regulation of outdoor events.

Public Comments: Public comments were provided by Jack Cogle, who raised concerns about data centers and solar farms. The Commission explained the zoning and land development processes, including public hearing requirements and environmental considerations. Members discussed the township’s infrastructure limitations and affirmed that any solar development would be subject to decommissioning requirements and environmental screening standards. The conversation also touched on broader concerns about public awareness, advertising practices, and the long-term impacts of solar installations.

Adjournment: At 8:45 PM, Mike Kosmicki made a motion to adjourn the meeting, which Jerry McLaughlin seconded. The motion was unanimously carried.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Laura A. Vasold".

Laura A. Vasold
Secretary