

# **LANCASTER TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION**

**1240 Maple Avenue  
Lancaster PA 17603**

## **MEETING AGENDA – February 16, 2010**

The regular meeting of the Lancaster Township Planning Commission was held Tuesday, February 16, 2010 at the Lancaster Township Municipal Building. The meeting was called to order by the Chair, Melissa Kelly at 7:00 p.m. She led the attendees in the Pledge of Allegiance. The following members were in attendance: Edwina Coder, Richard Hendricks, Nick Jabbour, and Gordon Reed. Melanie LeFevre and Bob Desmarias were excused. Also in attendance, Bill Laudien, Township Manager, Lynn Stauffer, Director of Planning & Zoning, and Rebecca French, Planning and Zoning Assistant. Township Supervisor Kathy Wasong was also present.

## **APPROVAL OF MINUTES – January 19, 2010**

The January 19, 2010 LTPC meeting minutes were approved as submitted.

## **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION/COMMENTS**

Lynn Stauffer reported that the Planning and Zoning Department has been working on the Annual Report for the years 2006 through 2009 and will have this report ready for the March LTPC meeting.

**SUBDIVISION/LAND DEVELOPMENT PLAN:** None

**NEW BUSINESS:** None

**OLD BUSINESS:**

### **Hawthorne Ridge Barn Improvements:**

Stephen Ness, a representative from Lennar introduced Joe Caughy of Lennar, and Hunter Johnson, Principal architect for TONO Architects. Mr. Johnson presented a newly designed sketch plan of the new facility with regards to the historic barn on the Hawthorne Ridge property. As stated in the Land Development Plan approval condition No. 31, the new facility serves as a means of mitigating the lack of qualified open space in the development, and the applicant shall develop the existing barn on the property into a community center. Mr. Johnson stated that additional consideration has been given to the integration of salvaged and “historic” materials from the existing barn structure for the proposed new Community Center. He stated that in order to provide a façade that maintains the authenticity of the original barn, and capture its historic appeal, plans are to carefully select, rehabilitate and incorporate salvaged materials from the existing barn. The facility will utilize newer building technologies intended to reduce future maintenance while updating its functionality as a neighborhood amenity. The new facility will have 1300 square feet of community space, a central lobby, kitchen, restrooms, and a fitness center with a changing area. The community center will have approximately 100 person occupancy load. Some of the key points he pointed out were:

- Incorporate the scale and size of the original barn structure
- Materials that would be salvaged, cleaned, and reinstalled from the existing barn

- Limestone field stone from the bearing walls – reinstalled to clad portions of the exterior walls
- Install vertical, batten and board fiber cement siding over the majority of the exterior wall surfaces above the salvaged limestone veneer including the two end elevations (similar to the original structure’s vertical siding)
- Utilize repainted and rehabilitated wood siding in selected areas
- Locate the use the existing salvaged siding within the lobby and front entrance
- Install a “bank barn” door using hemlock or Douglas fir
- Incorporate authentic, structural timber framing as the predominant architectural feature within the community room
- Create the historic imagery of the barn interior, the “Hammer Trusses” and plank deck ceiling
- The design for the new facility will display the craftsmanship of local tradespersons.

Mr. Johnson explained that the condition of the existing wood timbers from the original barn is no longer suitable for structural bearing due to their age and inability to meet modern code requirements. He stated that by limiting the reinstallation of salvaged material to protected exterior or interior areas of the new Center, this will minimize the impact of weatherization and intensive maintenance efforts for the Home Owners Association. He stated that by blending of the historic characteristics of the old with new, this will also conform to sub-paragraph “1” of the Land Development Approval Condition No. 31.

Gordon Reed stated concern about the barn’s original 1799 red river rock ‘date stone.’ He wanted it noted that the ‘date stone’ be incorporated within the design element and displayed in the new facility.

Melissa Kelly wanted to know if there are any photos of the original barn. (Note: a demolition permit would require photos be taken of any structure to be demolished.)

Ms. Stauffer expressed concerns about the old ‘Shenk’ family cemetery on the property stating that it is in bad condition and that someone needs to be responsible for its maintenance. Lennar will contact ‘Grave Concern’ of Lancaster County in order to see what is required in order to transfer that responsibility over to another party. Ms. Stauffer requested that Lennar provide a written agreement stating that the HOA or another party will maintain the cemetery. The LTPC agreed with that request. Mr. Ness stated that agreement to maintain the cemetery will be submitted in writing. He stated that some of the fence around the cemetery is salvageable and that repairs will be made to resemble the original fence.

Ms. Stauffer asked how the new facility and parking area would affect storm water management.

Mr. Ness stated that they may need to tweak the site plan and bring the vertical grade up with control fill, but the new facility is all within the same footprint and should not affect the storm water management plan.

Mr. Hendricks stated that with the 272 homes to be built in Hawthorne Ridge, the 100 person capacity occupancy load doesn’t provide enough space for the new facility. Mr. Hess explained that it should be adequate enough space because past involvement with this type

of facility has been that not all homeowners or everyone living within a development attend the HOA meetings and/or all of the events held in a community center. He stated that there is also adequate open space (weather permitting) around this facility for the purpose of accommodating an over flow people.

Mr. Hendricks asked about utility room area for HVAC, sprinkler systems, electrical panel, etc. Mr. Ness stated that an area has been designated to house the utilities.

Mr. Ness stated that Lennar held a meeting in December 2009 with the current residents of Hawthorne Ridge in order to gather their feedback on the new facility. Lennar has a management company that will provide management of the new facility until it's time for the HOA to take control. Lennar currently has bids out to the local craftsmen in the Lancaster County area and plan to use local contractors when building the new facility. Mr. Ness stated that Lennar has built this type of community facility before for other developments. He stated that they will proceed with the design plan of the new facility upon the LTPC's approval and recommendation to the Board of Supervisors.

**Richard Hendricks recommended a motion to move ahead with the plan and Nick Jabbour seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0.**

Representatives from Lennar will give a presentation on the new facility at Hawthorne Ridge at the next Historical Commission meeting on Monday, February 22, 2010.

A general discussion ensued among the LTPC members.

- Gordon Reed stated that it is important to protect and preserve the Township's natural resources such as large, old growth trees. He expressed concern that another 'historical structure' in the Township failed to be saved.
- The LTPC discussed implementing a revision to the demolition ordinance in order to detain future demolition of historic structures and natural resources
- Preserve and protect historic date stones
- Need preservation guidelines and specific documentation
- The Historical Commission does not have the power to implement the National Registrar's guidelines
- Require precise documentation regarding historical structures; owners, events, etc.
- At the initial sketch plan phase of new development, require all historic structures and/or natural resources be documented
- Document all discussion of historical preservation; discussions, recommendations, and actions made by the LTPC and BOS regarding historical structures and natural resources in future developments
- Maintain documentation of all discussion regarding historical structures and resources
- Require a financial incentive; encourage the BOS to require an indemnity bond (double or triple) to preserve historical structures and natural resources within a new development
- Require developers to submit copies of all sketch plans and submit drawings several weeks prior to the LTPC meeting so that the LTPC has adequate time to review
- Ask BOS for a letter of consistency

## Report from the Zoning Ordinance Review Committee

Bill Laudien provided notes and definitions based on past comments and suggestions on Accessory Dwellings Unit Standards and copies of pages from *'Growing Together: A*

*Comprehensive Plan for Central Lancaster County* on housing strategies. He also provided copies of pages from the *'Accessory Dwelling Units Publication,'* copies of an *'Accessory Dwelling Unit Ordinance'* adopted by Town of Rindge. (Rindge Accessory Dwelling Unit Ordinance Adopted March 14, 2006) and copies from the *'Manor Township Zoning Ordinance'* (Amended through December 1, 2008) for the LTPC to review and provide feedback.

### Topics of Discussion: - Accessory Buildings in Zoning Districts – R1, R2, C1

**Unit size** for accessory buildings per lot requirements: Most ordinances set the limit by square foot, by size percentage of the primary residence, or a combination of both. (Minimum size tends to be around 200 sq. ft; maximum size tends to be around 800-900 sq ft; percentage of maximum lot coverage range is around 40% - 50%)

Mr. Laudien asked the LTPC for input regarding these standards.

- Previously discussed eliminating the R-S district
- Did not include R-3 district
- Should the C-1 district be included along the east side corridor where there are mixed business/residential lots are large enough to have accessory buildings
- Some parcels already have accessory buildings and garages

Mr. Reed stated that R3 should be included to meet requirements of residential density factors. He asked about structures that have complete bath rooms within the attached garage? Could this be considered a dwelling, accessory building, or a garage?

Mr. Hendricks stated that under the definition of accessory buildings, it is a permitted use; the application is already covered in the existing ordinance in terms of accessory buildings

- In R1 and RS districts construed as a garage, carriage house, guest cottage, living quarters for household staff and maintenance personnel
  - Doesn't necessarily have to be limited to that
- Wording is different in R-2; doesn't state anything about living accommodations
- Living accommodation phraseology only exists in R-S and R-1

Mr. Laudien stated that he has a different interpretation; that the secondary residence with an accessory structure is not permitted except where otherwise permitted in R-S and R-1 where conditions apply to living quarters for household staff maintenance personal

The other application for an accessory structure; **secondary accessory structure as a residence:**

- In what districts can these accessory buildings occur?
- Carriage house; main use is not consistent with RS and R1
- Secondary structure as a residence is not permitted RS & R1

Mr. Laudien stated that he didn't include R3 in his recommendation because his concern is with the smaller lot size. He stated that there needs to be some control mechanism where the residential density of the property exceeds what is reasonable.

- Need to have sufficient lot size and sufficient codes
- R1, R2 and currently R-S have sufficient space to meet all of the requirements

Ms. Kelly asked what about in 'Professional' neighborhoods that include 'granny flats' in the back of the residence?

- Are these type neighborhoods found more with an R3 application?
- Still need to meet requirements; parking, lot coverage

### **Lot coverage**

Most ordinances with smaller lots that have existing accessory structures need to meet standard requirements. Need to consider the following:

- Parking
- Public water and sewer
- Garage
- Driveway

### **Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU)**

- Requirements: Parking, lot coverage and all other regulations
- Most of smaller lots with accessory buildings are non-conforming use
- Driveway
- Decide what the requirements should be in R3 for off street parking;
- Assess on case by case basis

**Most ordinances try to limit the size of the units based on a percentage of the primary residence;** some on total square foot, and some ordinances are based on a combination of both.

**Some ordinances also limit the number of bedrooms to 1 or 2.**

- One bedroom per unit

**Unit Limit** – One accessory dwelling unit (ADU) per lot is typical

- Per residence

**Setbacks, lot coverage,** and other general zoning requirements – The ADU combined with the primary residence should comply with the standards of single family residences with each zoning district. Key: zoning were for SF; when evaluating this - accessory structure

- Accessory to single family home

**Should total number of non-related persons apply?**

- Most ordinances stated no more than 3 non-related persons living in a dwelling
- Applied to accessory dwelling

**Parking requirements** – 1 or 2 parking spaces per unit

- One parking space per bedroom
- On site or off street parking

**Utilities – Separate utilities or are combined utilities allowable?**

- Consider total number of residents for septic, sewer or water.
- Ordinances varied – consistent with sewer and septic
- Must provide adequate sewer
- Compel owners to have more than one utility meter when renting out accessory space
  - Electric and/or gas meter
- Multiple units?
- How can it be enforced?

**Residence of owner** – Many ordinances require that the owner live in either the primary residence or the ADU. Some ordinances do permit conditions where the owner may temporarily leave the residence for defined periods of time.

- By 'exception' and renewed annually
- Homeowners are more likely to maintain the property if they also live there

**Should mobile homes and recreational vehicles to be excluded?**

- Temporary mobile homes are permitted in some districts
- By special exception for temporary housing
- What about in disaster conditions?
- BOS would approve use in an emergency situation

**Should there be an aesthetic component**

- Consider architectural component of neighborhood
- Without building codes in place, difficult to regulate accessory structures under 1000 ft
- Need to provide adequate egress, fire alarm and extinguishers
- Enforce inspections

**Approval process** – Special exception or conditional use would come with a cost but give added control.

- Should new accessory dwelling be a conditional use or special exception?
- Ms. Kelly stated that if it were 'special exception' there would be more control
- Require all new accessory dwellings to be special exception
- Would require a Zoning Hearing Board hearing to make a decision

What about allowing all in existence at the time of the ordinance to continue, but must be registered?

- Consider accessory structure that already exists
- Need to include 'existing conditions'
- Existing condition be 'grandfathered' and keep track of those residences
- Evaluate and renew applications

All new accessory buildings would require conditional use or special exception or allow by right? Considerations:

- Concerns about 'by right' except in existing conditions
- Track existing accessory building
- Unit size
- Number of bedrooms
- Parking

**Discussion about Lot coverage**

- In commercial zone
- R-1 and R-2 for non residential usage 20%
- East Hempfield R-1 30% maximum coverage (with public sewer & water)
- R-1 for all other uses 35%
- Same as single family detached
- Combine for all dwellings on property

## **Discussion about height issues for accessory building**

- R-1 increase from 35% to 40%
- Allow height of accessory building to be same height as dwelling
- Height should be all the same in R-1, R-2 and R-3 districts
  - Except for multi-family dwelling – apartment complex is 75'
- How to measure?
  - From center, lowest point, medium point
- Actual allowable height

## **The LTPC recommended that accessory building can be the same height as the primary dwelling**

### **Discussion – Churches**

Ms. Stauffer reported that the last LUAB meeting discussed churches

- Churches have become so complex (church and related uses)
- East Lampeter is still working out details
- Lynn Stauffer is researching East Lampeter's ordinance
- May have legal ramifications
- Ms. Stauffer will email LTPC

### **Discussion Alternative Energy:**

Utilize criteria and definitions for alternative energy sources

#### **Wind Energy**

- Agricultural by conditional use
- What locations could wind energy be applicable in Lancaster Township?
- Safety of wind mills
- Ordinance per height regulations
- Lot size and set backs

#### **Solar energy**

What should Regulations be?

- Manheim Twp – allowable by right
- Ms. Stauffer will provide more information on solar regulations at the next LTPC meeting

### **Discussion on Convenience store and dispensing of gasoline**

- C-2 district; convenience store as a special exception; does not permit dispensing of gas
- C-3 district; convenience store and dispensing of gas through 'permitted use'

Suggestions:

- Mr. Hendricks agrees with changing wording; should apply in both commercial categories
- Mr. Hendricks will email his comments and Mr. Laudien will forward copies

### **Report from Gordon Reed, LTPC Liaison, Lancaster Township Historical Commission**

Lennar will have a presentation on the historical barn at Hawthorne Ridge at the next Historical Commission meeting, Monday, February 22, 2010.

Mr. Reed raised a question concerning County Planning Commission assessment of the urban growth. Mr. Laudien stated that in the general assessment, Lancaster Township is consistent with the initiatives.

Next month's LTPC meeting there will be a presentation on the City of Lancaster School District's choices and location for the firehouse.

**ADJOURNMENT:** 8:57PM

The next regularly scheduled Lancaster Township Planning Commission meeting will be held on March 16, 2010 at 7 PM.

Respected submitted,

Rebecca French  
Pro Tem