

Lancaster Inter-Municipal Committee

**LAND USE ADVISORY BOARD**

**MINUTES**

Date and Time: November 5, 2009 – 4:00 p.m.

Place: Lancaster Township Office

Attendance:

Representatives (R), Alternates (A), and Others from Participating Municipalities and LCPC:

East Hempfield Township – Doug Brubaker (R)  
East Lampeter Township – None  
East Petersburg Borough – David Keener (R)  
Lancaster City – Tim Roschel (R), Paula Jackson (A)  
Lancaster Township – Lynn M. Stauffer (R), Bob Desmarais (A)  
Manheim Township – Carol Simpson (R)  
Manor Township – None  
Millersville Borough – Ed Saylor (A)  
Mountville Borough – None  
West Hempfield Township – Kent Gardner (R)  
West Lampeter Township – Dave Martin (A)  
Lancaster County Planning Commission – Brad L. Stewart

Other Representatives:

Hempfield School District – Dan Forry  
School District of Lancaster – Greg Collins  
Lancaster Area Sewer Authority – Scot Fertich

Others:

John R. Ahlfeld, LIMC Executive Director

Call to Order –Chairman Desmarais called the meeting to order at 4:04 p.m.

Introductions – Chairman Desmarais welcomed Ms. Jackson to LUAB.

Public Participation – There was no public participation.

Minutes of October 1, 2009, Meeting – There being no comments or questions on the minutes of the October 1, 2009, meeting, Chairman Desmarais declared that they would stand approved as written.

Implementing Actions – Chairman Desmarais said that the only implementing action to be discussed was the proposed rezoning from Agricultural Holding and Suburban Residential to Local Commercial and Community Commercial in East Hempfield Township that was discussed at the previous meeting. Mr. Ahlfeld noted that the handouts included a map showing the

location of the rezoning, 58± acres between Route 30 and Marietta Pike west of Running Pump Road (Attachment A), and the memorandum from the Lancaster County Planning Commission (LCPC) commenting on the proposal, including whether or not it is consistent with *Growing Together* (Attachment B). Discussion about the proposal included the following comments: East Hempfield Township did approve the rezoning of the nearby Lime Springs Farm that was discussed at the previous LUAB meeting. There is a question as to whether action on the current proposal should be delayed until the Township's work on revising its zoning ordinance is completed. The proposal would provide for mixed use. Based on a previous design proposal for the site, the Township Supervisors have a concern about the intensity of development on the site considering the limited opportunities for access to it. The potential developer has offered to do a detailed traffic study. The proposal would allow for some residential. The site is sloped from Marietta Avenue down to Route 30; the previous design proposal included buildings with shops on the south side at ground level and residential uses above them opening at ground level to the north. Stormwater from the site eventually goes to the Little Conestoga Creek. A new design plan is being considered, but it has not been submitted yet. LUAB discussed the access issue at its last meeting. PADOT is looking at the possibility of a limited access interchange with Route 30 at Running Pump Road. It's questionable whether the site could support retail uses with so few dwelling units; a study of a 300-dwelling unit proposal for the Sunnyside peninsula in Lancaster City concluded that it could not support commercial.

Concluding comments included the following: The proposal is generally consistent with *Growing Together* in that it provides for mixed uses in a Growth Opportunity Area, but there is a need to look at concerns re roads and access, i.e. traffic concerns. There are questions about how water and sewer service will be provided. Perhaps the site should be developed in the future, but not now, which would support the position in the LCPC's letter. As East Hempfield Township works on its new zoning ordinance it should be careful how it treats this area. Residential use should be stressed. *Growing Together* addresses lots of issues, not just land use patterns. Considering that, Mr. Gardner moved, Mr. Roschel seconded, and it was voted unanimously, with Mr. Brubaker abstaining, to write to East Hempfield Township saying that the proposal is inconsistent with *Growing Together*, noting that the site is within a Growth Opportunity Area, but that there are many other issues that need to be addressed.

Mr. Ahlfeld and Chairman Desmarais welcomed Mr. Forry, the new representative from the Hempfield School District.

Process for Future Reviews of Implementing Actions – Chairman Desmarais reported that Mr. Ahlfeld and he met to discuss review procedures for implementing actions. As a result, the handouts included a new, November 5, 2009, version of the text and flow chart titled “Procedure for Review of Implementing Actions” (Attachment C). Mr. Ahlfeld explained that the new language was underlined and that the main difference from the “Procedure” approved in October 2008 was that there is a new optional step in which there can be an informal review period beginning any time after the sponsoring municipality receives or develops the proposal, rather than waiting until it is also submitted to the LCPC for review. He reported that Pam Shellenberger, who could not be present, sent an email with her opinion that LUAB and the LCPC should review the same version of a proposal, but that it would be acceptable for a municipal representative to present something at an earlier meeting to get some interim feedback.

Chairman Desmarais asked everyone if the review of implementing actions to date has been useful. Mr. Brubaker said it's too early to tell. Mr. Gardner said that some projects in West Hempfield Township have stopped, so the procedure has not been used much; however, he said, it is good to have other eyes look at proposals. Mr. Martin agreed that it's good for a second set of eyes, from outside the municipality, to look at proposals. Mr. Collins said the procedure alerts school districts to what they might have to deal with in the future.

Mr. Martin asked about the role of the developer in the process. It was noted that it's the municipality that submits the proposal for LUAB review. The developer can attend the meeting – which is open to the public – if he wishes, but it's up to LUAB to decide if the developer may speak.

Following discussion, Mr. Gardner moved, Mr. Roschel seconded, and it was voted unanimously to accept the revised procedure for review of implementing actions as circulated at the meeting.

Major Work Projects – There was nothing new to report on major work projects.

Next LUAB Meeting - Chairman Desmarais noted that the next LUAB meeting would be on December 3, 2009.

Adjournment – Chairman Desmarais adjourned the meeting at 4:59 p.m.