

Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

June 9, 2020

The regular meeting of the East Lampeter Township Planning Commission was held on Tuesday, June 9, 2020 at the East Lampeter Township Office, 2250 Old Philadelphia Pike, Lancaster, PA 17602. Chairman Keylor called the meeting to order via Zoom at 7:30 pm followed by the Pledge of Allegiance. Other Commissioners present via ZOOM were Mr. Darrel Siesholtz, Mr. Roger Rutt, Mr. Dan Przywara, and Mr. Dan McCuen. Also present in person was Tara A. Hitchens, Director of Planning/Zoning Officer.

Public Present via ZOOM:

Mark Stanley – McNees, Wallace, & Nurick

Chris Venarchick – RGS Associates

Isaac Masery – Wharton Realty Group

Mr. Keylor noted that the meeting was being recorded via ZOOM and that it would be posted on the Township's YouTube channel the following day, links would be available on the homepage of the Township website.

Minutes:

The minutes of the May 12, 2020 meeting were approved as written on a motion by Mr. McCuen and a second by Mr. Przywara with all verbally voting in favor and raising their hands.

Announcement:

Please be reminded it is CENSUS 2020 time, please fill out the forms online.

Old Business:

- a. None at this time.

New Business:

- a. **Commercial Redevelopment Overlay District Proposal** – Mr. Mark Stanley, Esq. of McNees Wallace Nurick and Chris Venarchick of RGS Associates and Isaac Masery of Wharton Realty Group were present to represent the proposal. Mr. Stanley noted that the applicant is the owner of record of approximately 65 acres known as the Shops at Rockvale. The formal submission was presented to the Township April 15, 2020 and now with the devastating effects of COVID-19 to the retail industry there is more urgency to redevelop this property. Since the informal briefing before the Planning Commission earlier this year, the following changes have been made to the proposal: added grocery store use, added a minimum 4 units per acre residential density, increased the vacancy requirement, decreased the impervious surface area from 80% to 70%, added bicycle facilities, added pedestrian facilities, and now require architectural renderings with master plan submittal. This proposal can serve as a test case for the remainder of the C-3 zoning district or Township as a whole for the Township to consider use at other sites within its jurisdiction as noted in the Lancaster County Planning Commission review letter. Mr. Stanley noted that after the informal conversation with the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors an email was submitted to both the Township Manager and the Director of Planning from Mr. Dave Gribble of the Ronks Fire Department indicating support for the changes to the site.

Mr. Siesholtz indicated that overall, this was a good proposal but that the Route 30 Streetscape Plan should be mentioned in the petition itself.

Mr. McCuen questioned where the 35% gross retail vacancy came from and Mr. Stanley responded that East Lampeter Township staff requested that the original 25% be increased. Further, the time limitation of 6 months vacancy shows that there is not simply a desire to redevelop but truly an economic impact.

Mr. Rutt noted that the minimum of 4 units per acre and maximum of 12 units per acre for residential units is a big stretch. If there is an alternative plan for the site then he would like to see higher residential densities.

Mr. Venarchick indicated that research was done to make sense on the property but also to allow for flexibility with the types and styles of residential and non-residential that may be permitted within the site.

Mr. McCuen asked for clarification of the residential component and density. Mr. Stanley stated that no more than 40% of the site may be developed with residential.

Mr. Siesholtz had a few comments: 1. How does the proposal address mixed use buildings with nonresidential and residential within the same building? Mr. Stanley noted that it doesn't specifically address this but doesn't prohibit this either. 2. Do these types of buildings get counted as part of the residential percentage? Mr. Stanley indicated that this is not specifically addressed within the overall context of the ordinance.

Mr. McCuen offered that Manheim Township has a mixed use development and it seems to work there, so hopeful that it will work here too. Would like to see an increase in residential density above nonresidential uses.

Mr. Przywara questioned if the percentage of residential in community if there is another floor, will that increase the total residential. Mr. Venarchick indicated that the site is approximately 63 acres total, so no more than 25 acres can be residential on the property.

Mr. Keylor calculated that there can be no more than 720 residential units on the property as a whole. Mr. Stanley interjected that the applicant doesn't want a full residential development on the property, that the intent is to have mixed uses, and allow for a residential component and should a developer wish to do commercial, they would utilize the underlying zoning ordinance of C-3.

Mr. Rutt questioned if the residential development would include garages? Mr. Venarchick indicated that the site hasn't been fully designed and thus the need for flexibility is at issue. The market demand will assist in guiding the design of the site. Mr. Stanley offered that a master plan process would be back before the Planning Commission and then the land development process for each phase.

Mr. McCuen questioned if 6 units per acre as a minimum should be considered for residential. M. Rutt and Mr. Przywara had no other questions.

Mr. Siesholtz questioned if just want to redevelop the site as commercial then one would just use the C-3 zoning district. Concerned that a developer could offer just 1% or 10% residential and not meet the true intent of the overlay zoning district but still utilize such. Mr. Stanley noted that this particular issue could be modified in the future or for other sites. Mr. Venarchick noted that the minimum number of residential units on the site is 252 units at 4 units per acre. Mr. Keylor stated that if the market doesn't take us to one way or another than the developer needs flexibility within the ordinance. Overall he is enthusiastic and trying to make sure that it's done right.

Mr. Massery offered that as we all try to get it right, time is of the essence.

Mr. Keylor is appreciative of the attempt that is being made for this property to redevelop but wants the best options put forth.

Mr. Keylor had the following comments on the proposal: 1. 21060.A.5 – which comp plan? 2. 21060.D.a what size convenience store? 3. Financial institutions are broken down into service drive through lanes, which is proposed here? 4. Grocery stores can be accessory or principal, what is being asked for here? 5. Multi-family and townhouses should have separation distances (it was noted that the building code would take care of this issue, not the zoning ordinance) 6. Parking compounds are a business, is this what the applicant truly wants? 7. Residential retirement facility, is this part of residential allowance or non residential (given they act in a commercial way, they would not be residential)

Mr. Siesholtz offered the following additional comments: 1. Coverage changed from 80 to 70 percent with the provision that you can go higher with appropriate stormwater management, by whom (Stormwater Management Ordinance of the Township) 2. G is mistyped 1, 2, 2, 3 should be 1, 2, 3, 4 3. Section 4 typo 4. D.2 Route 30 should be SR 5. E.2 typo in

Mr. McCuen questioned if an additional property at the corner of Bowman and Rockvale should be added to the overlay. Ms. Hitchens noted that the property does not have the appropriate C-3 underlying zoning and is actually zoned AG – Agricultural and used as such.

Mr. Keylor read the draft review letter dated June 1, 2020 from LCPC and Mr. Stanley noted that it was approved by LCPC on the day prior.

Mr. McCuen offered that the proposal is good and something that should be supported, although open for tweeking it in the future if need be.

On a motion by Mr. McCuen and a second by Mr. Rutt with all verbally and by hand raise voting in favor the East Lampeter Township Planning Commission recommended forwarding of the Commercial Redevelopment Overlay proposal to the Board of Supervisors for a hearing on July 20, 2020 at 5:00pm.

Mr. Siesholtz indicated that the following is not part of the motion, but that consideration should be given to allowing this overlay or something similar to be used where appropriate throughout the Township in the future after we see how this works out.

Mr. Przywara noted that he is already starting to receive calls at work for a consulting firm that want to use this template either elsewhere in the Township or in Lancaster County.

- b. Zoning Ordinance Amendment Discussion** – Ms. Hitchens went through the memo dated April 22, 2020 regarding potential zoning ordinance amendments for 2020. Tourist home – don't believe this will work with an occupant and having an occupant would be hard to monitor by zoning officials. Kennel size – all in favor of reducing. Kennel buffer – could be sufficient if appropriately constructed for noise, may be a case by case issue. Signage – all nonconforming signage should come into compliance: Mr. Rutt believes that signage should be able to be put back if not destroyed by owner but a force beyond their control. Farmer's Market – no issue with this change. Route 340 changes – agree with all subject to BIH design guidelines and Article 23 requirements. Municipal uses – Mr. McCuen wouldn't want refuse facilities next to dwellings. Schools – agree to separate grade/high from technical/college. Typo 23440 should be 23450.

Briefing Items:

- a. None at this time.

Other Business:

- a. LUAB was cancelled for the month of June.

- b. Mr. McCuen questioned if the Board of Supervisors would consider sending a letter to East Hempfield Township encouraging them to increase density not reduce density based on a recent news article that he had read in the Lancaster Newspapers.

Announcements:

- a. Again, please be reminded to fill out the CENSUS 2020 forms online.
- b. Please take the time to offer input into the Bridgeport and Route 340 study surveys at the bottom of the Township home page.

Adjournment:

On a motion by Mr. Siesholtz and a second by Mr. Przywara with all verbally voting in favor, the meeting was adjourned. The next Planning Commission meeting will be held on Tuesday, July 14, 2020 at 7:30pm in the East Lampeter Township Office, 2250 Old Philadelphia Pike, Lancaster, PA 17602 and view the Township website at www.eastlampetertownship for information to attend via ZOOM.

Respectfully submitted,

Tara A. Hitchens, AICP
Director of Planning/Zoning Officer