

LANCASTER INTER-MUNICIPAL COMMITTEE
LAND USE ADVISORY BOARD

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR LUAB MONTHLY MEETING

Date and Time: February 2, 2012 – 4:00 PM

Place: Lancaster Township Office

Attendance:

Columbia Borough:	
East Hempfield Township:	Doug Brubaker
East Lampeter Township:	David Sinopoli
East Petersburg Borough:	David Keener
Lancaster City:	Paula Jackson
Lancaster Township:	Tom Daniels
Manheim Township:	Lisa Douglas
Manor Township:	Pam Shellenberger
Millersville Borough:	Ed Saylor, Jack Gardner, Ed Arnold
Mountville Borough:	
West Hempfield Township:	Tony Crocamo, Ron Youtz, Kent Gardner
West Lampeter Township:	
LCPC:	Randall Heilman
Conestoga Valley SD:	
Hempfield SD:	
Manheim Township SD:	
Lampeter-Strasburg SD:	
Penn Manor SD:	
School District of Lancaster:	
Lancaster Area Sewer Auth.:	Scot Fertich
Suburban Lancaster Sewer Auth.:	
Columbia Water Company:	
Municipal Auth. of East Hempfield:	
East Lampeter Sewer Authority:	
Lancaster City-Water:	
Lancaster City-Wastewater Ops.:	
PennDOT:	Brian Walter
Others:	Neal Metzger, LSC Design; Michael LaSala, LIMC; Mark Stanley, HUB

1. **Call to Order:** Vice Chair Crocamo called the meeting to order at 4:03 pm and led the group in the Pledge of Allegiance.
2. **Approval of Minutes:** Mr. Daniels moved, Ms. Jackson seconded the motion, and the minutes of the January 5, 2012 meeting were approved.
3. **Public Comment:** There was no public comment.

4. **Reports and Actions:** It was agreed in principle for future reviews of Implementing Actions and DRIs that the submitting municipality will provide comments first, followed by LCPC comments if applicable, and open for discussion amongst the group last before vote if a motion is provided.

A. Implementing Action for Review: Rezoning Petition for Erin Court Partners

Mr. Youtz, on behalf of West Hempfield Township, indicated a public hearing is scheduled for March 6, 2012 for the requested rezoning. The item was opened to the group for discussion. Primary points discussed or iterated are as follows:

- Petition requests rezoning to Commercial
- Future Land Use Plan indicates the tract of land zoned as industrial
- It was confirmed the county did purchase land south of Hempland Road in the immediate vicinity. The tract of land is north of Hempland Road
- The lot is of an unusual and odd shape, and not conducive for industrial operations
- The petitioner may possibly place a convenience store at this location due to the proximity to Route 30.
- If this tract is rezoned, and considering all changes of rezoning that has occurred since Growing Together was adopted, an effort should be made to update the future land use plan to reflect such changes.
- Land has always been vacant. The tract was part of land that was further sub-divided in 2002 and has been vacant since that time as well.
- It does not appear rezoning from industrial will impact the amount of industrial land or possibly impact industrial growth overall.
- The Future Land Use Policy Framework Map indicates this tract of land in a “District Regeneration Area.”
- Despite the Future Land Use Plan identifying the tract as industrial, it appears the rezoning would be in line with Growing Together overall.

Ms. Jackson moved, Ms. Shellenberger seconded the motion, and LUAB determined unanimously the proposed rezoning from Industrial (I-2) to Commercial (C-2) would be appropriate per the Future Land Use Policy Framework Map and therefore be generally consistent with the Growing Together Regional Comprehensive Plan. The LIMC will forward a letter of determination to West Hempfield Township.

B. Implementing Action for Review: Rezoning application from Lancaster General

Ms. Jackson, on behalf of the City of Lancaster, provided a brief summary including the following primary points:

- Lancaster General is the largest employer in the city
- An HC District will allow LGH to build out the site to the fullest extent possible
- LGH contributes monies to the city in lieu of taxes since it is a tax-exempt entity
- The primary tract was part of the former YMCA complex
- It appears LGH is planning a new office building for administrative operations and would have approximately 600 employees working at this location
- LGH is trying to consolidate operations to the downtown complex
- A parking garage would most likely be built as well for the employees.
- There has been one neighborhood meeting thus far, and it appears the only real concern may be the “shadowing” caused by a new large building. A shadow analysis is currently underway.
- The Future Land Use Plan shows the larger tract zoned as Institutional and the smaller tract zoned as Mixed Use. The parking garage would most likely be located on the tract currently zoned as Mixed Use, and such a zone would allow a parking facility anyway.

The item was opened to the group for discussion. Primary points discussed or iterated are as follows:

- Any new buildings will probably be about seven stories high.

- It appears the consolidation of LGH operations would be in line with other land use and community facility objectives found in Growing Together.
- The city's planning department is not seeing any real downside to the proposed rezoning or potential development.
- LGH will still be required to complete the land development process as well. The action in question is only to rezone the tracts.

Mr. Daniels moved, Mr. J. Gardner seconded, and LUAB determined unanimously, with Ms. Jackson abstaining, the proposed rezoning from a Residential District to a Hospital Complex (HC) District to be generally consistent with the Growing Together Regional Comprehensive Plan. The LIMC will forward a letter of determination to the City of Lancaster.

C. Development of Regional Significance and Impact (DRI): Belmont Planned Commercial Development Conditional Use Application

Manheim Township withdrew the submission, but will resubmit for the March 2012 LUAB meeting. All members should save their packets as the appropriate documents regarding this item are in the February 2012 LUAB meeting packet.

D. Implementing Action for Review: Historic Preservation Overlay District and Zoning Ordinance Update

Mr. Arnold, on behalf of Millersville Borough, provided a brief overview of the proposed changes. Primary points are as follows:

- The borough first addressed historic preservation in ordinance form in 2003.
- Since that time, questions arose whether properties within the inventory were in sync with definitions relative to historic preservation.
- The borough hired a consultant to review the historic preservation portion of the ordinance and identify potential changes
- From a previously held public hearing, the public felt the ordinance was too vague with respect historic preservation. An effort is needed to better define what is historic and what is not historic.
- The borough's Historic Commission felt the best guide would be a "year built" guide.
- There are provisions within the revised ordinance where a person could request to be in the inventory.
- It is felt the revised ordinance is what the community would accept in the borough.

Mr. Heilman, on behalf of the LCPC, indicated he is not personally working on review of the ordinance update. However, other LCPC staff is currently reviewing the ordinance. There are concerns, and the LCPC will make the borough aware of those concerns after the review is completed. The item was opened to the group for discussion. Primary points discussed or iterated are as follows:

- The date of 12/31/1942 was chosen as the "year built" date by the borough from a review of historical activity. It does not appear much building occurred from that time through the end of World War Two.
- Item D(3)(a) within the codified ordinance outlining the requirement for an applicant to provide evidence of demolition of a building in question will not adversely affect the historic significance of neighboring historical buildings, and will remain per the recommendation of the borough's Planning Commission.
- Removal of criteria for streetscape would be detrimental
- The borough should reconsider the revision to item E (4) removing the requirement for the zoning officer to provide a record of administrative approvals to the Historic Commission.
- The borough should reconsider the revision to item E (5) (b) and require an applicant to be present for reviews by the Historic Commission in lieu of the revised encouragement.
- With respect to Historic Resource Protection, Growing Together only indicates a goal of historic resources will be preserved, maintained, and reused to recognize and reinforce the historic character of both urban and rural areas, but does not outline specific guidelines.

Ms. Shellenberger moved, Mr. Daniels seconded the motion, and LUAB determined unanimously (with Mr. J. Gardner abstaining) the ordinance update to be consistent with the Growing Together Regional Comprehensive Plan. However, Millersville Borough should consider the LCPC comments and concerns once provided, revisit and/or reconsider item D (3) (a) in the codified ordinance specifically with respect to streetscapes, reconsider the deletion in item E (4) in the codified ordinance, and reconsider the revision of item E (5) (b) in the codified ordinance with respect to only encouraging an applicant's presence at a Historic Commission review in lieu of requiring the applicant's presence. The LIMC will forward a letter of determination to Millersville Borough.

6. New Business

A. Implementation Option Package (IOP) Procedures

Mr. LaSala provided a brief summary of the draft procedures. Primary points discussed or iterated are as follows:

- The intergovernmental cooperation agreement executed by the LIMC member municipalities call for the complete implementation of Growing Together. However, the agreement only outlines procedures for review of certain land use items including ordinance updates, zoning changes, and developments of regional impact.
- The draft procedure for reviewing IOPs was developed to encompass the balance of the regional plan.
- The Committee-of-the-Whole is required to approve the procedures for LUAB.
- The procedures will be presented to the LIMC at next Wednesday's meeting for approval.
- IOPs will focus on tools, mechanisms, and information called out or inferred from Growing Together.
- The LIMC will be required to approve an IOP, but LUAB will provide the recommendation. Ultimately, acceptance of an IOP is reserved to an individual municipality.

Mr. J. Gardner moved, Ms. Jackson seconded the motion, and LUAB unanimously recommended the approval of the procedures for review of IOPs by the LIMC. LIMC staff will notify the Committee-of-the-Whole of LUAB's determination.

6. Other Business

A. Matter of Record

- a. Next meeting is scheduled for Thursday, March 1, 2012 at 4:00 pm at Lancaster Township.
- b. The "drop dead" date for municipal submissions is Wednesday, February 22, 2012 for the March 2012 LUAB meeting.
- c. Approved representative changes or re-appointments are attached in Attachment G.

7. Adjournment: Vice Chair Crocamo adjourned the meeting at 5:19 PM.