

**August 6, 2013**

**SPECIAL MEETING**

The East Lampeter Township Board of Supervisors met on Tuesday, August 6, 2013, at 4:00 p.m. at the East Lampeter Township Office, 2250 Old Philadelphia Pike, Lancaster, PA 17602. This special meeting was called to order by Mr. David Buckwalter, Chairman. In addition to Mr. Buckwalter, supervisors present were: Mr. John Shertzer, Mr. Mike Landis, Mr. John Blowers, and Mr. Glenn Eberly. Also present was Mr. Ralph Hutchison, Township Manager and Ms. Tara Hitchens, Director of Planning/Zoning Officer.

The following persons signed in as being present in the audience:

Tom Smithgall, 1853 William Penn Way, Lancaster, PA 17601, representing High Properties  
Mark Stanley, Hartman Underhill & Brubaker, 221 E. Chestnut Street, Lancaster, PA 17602,  
representing High Properties

Glen Lapp, 2020 Pine Drive, Lancaster, PA 17601, representing Good N Plenty  
Auden Block

Austin Nedrow

Jerald L. Smucker, 20 Leven Road, Gordonville, PA 17529, representing Country Acres Campground  
John E. Smucker II, 2727 Old Philadelphia Pike, Bird-in-Hand, PA 17505, representing Bird-in-Hand  
Corporation

Chairman Buckwalter explained that this meeting was to conduct a workshop to discuss policy issues related to the new draft zoning ordinance.

Overall Ordinance

Ms. Hitchens discussed the term “density”. She explained the difference between gross density and net density. The Board members and Mr. Hutchison also made comments about this term. Ms. Hitchens suggested that the Optional Density Incentive should be changed in the new ordinance. Mr. Hutchison suggested it would be easier to change the ordinance to all gross density then to net density.

The next item discussed was parking spaces and the size of the spaces. The existing ordinance and the proposed ordinance require that parking spaces be 180 square feet, which is a 10' x 18' or 9' x 20' space. By allowing for a 9' x 18' space (or 162 sq. ft.) this would reduce the amount of impervious surface of a single parking space by 18 square feet, which helps with considering storm water issues throughout the Township. Mr. Tom Smithgall voiced his opinion about the required size of parking spaces.

Ms. Hitchens mentioned that there is little said about flag lots in the existing ordinance and in the draft ordinance. Flag lots are great in some areas if there are effective and efficient use of land and infrastructure and they allow for higher densities and intensities in areas that should not be provided such. She added that consideration should be given to discontinuing the previous interpretation of flag lots as it does not make sense from a land use efficiency and effectiveness perspective. Ms. Hitchens suggested they be allowed in urban growth areas but discouraged in Agricultural areas by making them special exceptions.

The next item discussed was the riparian buffer overlay district. This is a fairly extensive overlay district within the proposed ordinance. When the Township engineer took a look at the proposed ordinance in comparison to the stormwater management model ordinance, they found a great deal of discrepancies, especially in the riparian buffer overlay district. It is therefore the recommendation of the Township engineer that we utilize what is in the storm water management model ordinance and simply put the uses allowed in the zoning ordinance for this overlay district. Ms. Hitchens further explained what this all meant. Mr. Hutchison made comments on future permit requirements on all building structures. Recommendation is to reduce to 35 feet on either side of a stream from the top of the stream bank. The Board of Supervisors was advised that these should be handled within the storm water management ordinance and not within the zoning ordinance.

Ms. Hitchens discussed the next issue of lot width. The current ordinance requires a lot width measurement at both the street right of way and the front set back. In essence it requires a pie shaped lot in every case. Developers are choosing the largest width and making that the street right of way as well as the front set back. She asked the Board if wedge shaped lots are how lots should be developed in the Township or if a standard for lot width at the street right of way can serve the same purpose. The Board would like to keep the ordinance as is.

The next item for discussion was Bed and Breakfast Use, Boarding House Use and Tourist Home Use. Under the existing ordinance these uses are all covered within the Boarding House definition and require that these uses be owner occupied. The proposed ordinance would allow for a Tourist Home and requires that Boarding Houses and Bed and Breakfast facilities are owner occupied. Ms. Hitchens asked for opinions from the Board. The Board discussed the differences between Hotels and Bed and Breakfasts and Tourist Homes. Bed and Breakfasts are 5 rooms or less with owner occupancy where as Hotels are 5 rooms or more and not owner occupied. Mr. Hutchison discussed the difference between a Bed and Breakfast and Tourist Homes. Tourists Homes is where an individual rents the entire property where as a Bed and Breakfast each room is rented by an individual. The Board suggest Tourist Homes should be defined in the ordinance with a length of stay requirement of thirty (30) days, allow for non-owner occupied for both Tourist Homes and Bed and Breakfasts. Boarding Houses must be owner occupied. Township staff will ensure that specific regulations make sense for Bed and Breakfasts, Tourist Homes and Boarding Houses. Hotels should be made 6 or more rooms.

Campgrounds were the next item discussed. It has been requested the Township allow campgrounds by right in the C-3 versus the Village Commercial rather than a special exception. It has also been requested the Township to look at the requirement of 180 days maximum for a recreational vehicle to remain on site. This would involve campground owned recreational vehicle staying on site year round but only being rented during the camping season. A consideration of 300 feet on the distance to a collector or arterial was also requested. Presently if you have 100 or more camp sites you must be adjacent to a collector or arterial. Ms. Hitchens stated that the existing ordinance has a maximum of 250 square feet of recreational vehicle, which is governed by the state, has been increased to 400 square feet of recreational vehicle. She stated the proposed ordinance does not address the total square footage of a recreational vehicle. Ms. Hitchens said it has been requested that recreational activities and facilities be allowed within 20 feet of a property line if adjacent to a commercial or agricultural use or zone and require fencing of the facilities and to keep the 100 foot setback from street right-of-ways and residential zones and uses. The last request was to ask the Board if it would allow a percentage or number of campsites to be occupied by cabins. The Board and Mr. Smucker discussed the usage of cabins in a campground and commercial setback requirements. The Board discussed that owner's must demonstrate that a unit is owned/licensed to the campground to remain past 180 days. The Board stated they would prefer a certain percentage of total campsites being occupied by cabins or RV's owned by

the campground with Township staff to consider 5%. The Board discussed removal of the collector/arterial road requirement, reducing commercial uses setback for recreational uses on a campground and require fencing or screening of recreational uses from neighboring commercial uses.

The next item discussed were taller buildings. Taller buildings are allowed within the proposed ordinance if the lot is provided with an additional 2 feet of setback for each one foot of height. It reads as an allowance and you have to go to Zoning Hearing Board for a special exception. The Board discussed the options and the recommendation is that the special exception requirement be removed.

The Board and Ms. Hitchens discussed the redundancy in the ordinance which could be pulled out and put in one section. The Board recommended removal of redundancy throughout the document.

### Agricultural District

Ms. Hitchens stated that the allowance for additional lots from farms has reduced from 1 lot per 25 acres to 1 lot per 50 acres. The Board discussed subdivision rights within the Agricultural District. Mr. Hutchison recommended having a maximum lot size permitted in the district. It was recommended to increase to 1 subdivision right per 25 acres.

The next issue is the planting of shrubs and trees within 10 feet and 20 feet of any parcel within the Agricultural district. There are many uses in the Agricultural district we may not want trees or shrubs planted next too. Agricultural Uses are allowed within every district so there are many uses within the other districts that could plant up to the Agricultural Use. The Board is asked to consider changing this from Agricultural District to Agricultural Use.

Mr. Buckwalter recommended that the Board discuss one more item and then adjourn. The Board agreed. Mr. Hutchison suggested allowing comments from the public before adjourning.

### Public Comments

Mr. Stanley asked to discuss some Commercial Districts issues pertaining to Commercial/Industrial height and story requirement and about the Commercial lot minimum lot size. He asked about making the regulations less as opposed to more. Ms. Hitchens commented that in the C-3 that is a requirement that shopping centers are 8 acres and every non-residential use must be 5 acres. Mr. Hutchison said this location along Route 30 where it is described as the Regional Commercial Zone. The Board discussed what the vision of the C-3 District is to consist of local, small business or big box Commercial usage. Ms. Hitchens stated it is more regional but also contains other types of Uses. It was recommended that there should be a minimum lot size less than 5 acres; the Township staff is to consider a 2 acre minimum.

Ms. Hitchens addressed Mr. Stanley's comment about the requirement of going to multiple stories after you reach a certain square footage of either Commercial or Industrial space. The discussions included issues with definition of stories and why the Township requires it. It was recommended that this requirement be removed.

Mr. Smithgall commented about the Historic Overlay and questioned the use of the words "place" and "site". He commented that someone could consider a "view" a Historic place. The Board discussed this issue. The Board discussed the importance of saving the right structures and the right areas and the concern with using the expanded definition. The existing definition of a historic property is any site

with improvements, including buildings or other structures, which have been listed on, or are eligible for listing on “The National Register of Historic Places” and demolition of a historic property, can occur with a demolition permit. The proposed definition is expanded to include: The term historic resource or historic site shall include a place, building, structure or site, whereas because of its’ local, state or national significance is considered as a historical site or resource. The historic resources or sites should be older than eighty (80) years in age, or listed on one of the federal or state lists or if it’s identified in the Comprehensive Plan. The proposed zoning ordinance would require a person wishing to demolish or relocate a historic structure to get conditional use approval and zoning permits. Mr. Hutchison said the main purpose of the Historic Overlay was to identify properties that have historic value and allow the property owners a wider range of uses for those properties providing that they preserve the historic value of them.

Adjournment:

Mr. Hutchison asked that an announcement be made to continue the meeting with a date and time. The next scheduled meeting is to be held on Tuesday, August 20, 2013 beginning at 4:00 pm.

**August 20, 2013**

**SPECIAL MEETING**  
*(Continuation from August 6, 2013)*

The East Lampeter Township Board of Supervisors met on Tuesday, August 20, 2013, at 4:00 p.m. at the East Lampeter Township Office, 2250 Old Philadelphia Pike, Lancaster, PA 17602. This special meeting was continued from August 6, 2013 and was called to order by Mr. David Buckwalter, Chairman. In addition to Mr. Buckwalter, supervisors present were: Mr. John Shertzer, Mr. Mike Landis, and Mr. John Blowers. Mr. Glenn Eberly was absent. Also present was Mr. Ralph Hutchison, Township Manager and Ms. Tara Hitchens, Director of Planning/Zoning Officer.

The following persons signed in as being present in the audience:

Tom Smithgall, 1853 William Penn Way, Lancaster, PA 17601, representing High Properties  
Mark Stanley, Hartman Underhill & Brubaker, 221 E. Chestnut Street, Lancaster, PA 17602,  
representing High Properties  
Sandy Kime, ELA Group, 743 S. Broad Street, Lititz, PA 17543, representing Bird-in-Hand  
Corporation  
Rick Jackson, ELA Group, 743 S. Broad Street, Lititz, PA 17543, representing Bird-in-Hand  
Corporation

Chairman Buckwalter explained that this meeting was a continuation of August 6, 2013 workshop to discuss policy issues related to the new draft zoning ordinance.

Agricultural District

The first item for discussion is the Farm Support Use. Ms. Hitchens stated there are two types of Farm Support Uses: Farm Support Limited Impact Business Operation and Farm Support Business Operation. The Limited Impact Business Operation includes all of the types of Farm Support Uses which are spelled out including any accessory use to an agricultural operation that could include arts

and crafts, trades, and small scale agricultural compatible occupations. This does not allow much to be in the actual Business Operation Farm Support and puts it all into the Limited Impact which falls under a special exception. It is requested that to eliminate one; allow for the Uses as a by right use; if they are they can only consume 1 acre of an entire property that's in an Agricultural District, and there are certain specification within the ordinance already that must be met in order to fall within this use. This seemed to leave no businesses that could be considered the other not Limited Impact. A question about how exactly the Township would measure a large scale versus a small scale agricultural operation. It is suggested that the Board eliminate one of them and only provide for the one as a by right accessory use. The Board discussed the options of eliminating one category and allowing by right in the Agricultural zone. The Board discussed stream lining the permitting process which may limit the special exception hearings.

The next item up for discussion is the Agricultural Roadside stands. The proposed ordinance has a stipulation that at least 50% of goods must be produced by the farmer or the farmer's family from the property where the stand is located. They are not allowed as an accessory use, they are required to go through special exception and there are limits on setbacks, parking, traffic and signage use. As it is currently proposed they would be a special exception in residential, agricultural and the BP districts. The Board is asked to consider allowing roadside stands as a permitted accessory use in the Agricultural District and allow them as a special exception in the residential district and remove the allowable use within the BP zone. The Board discussed the requirements and safety issues of roadside stands.

### Residential District

The Board discussed the current and proposed R-2 District, known as Medium Density, and R-3 District, known as High Density. Ms. Hitchens stated these were in line with both the Comprehensive Plan and the County's Comprehensive Plan.

The next item the Board discussed in the proposed ordinance was allowing multi-family within the R-3 District only. The adoption of the Business Park Ordinance allows a certain number of R-3 units to be developed in this district. The Board is asked to consider allowing multi-family units within other districts such as the Mix Use District which currently only allows single family detached or in any of the Village Districts which allows single family detached and attached but does not allow for multi-family. Ms. Hitchens stated that in the R-2 and R-3 districts as proposed townhouses are allowed; multi-family would be apartments in this district, townhomes are not allowed currently in the Mixed Use, Village Commercial, Village Residential or Village General. The Board asked Mr. Hutchison his opinion on the Mixed Use Zone and he stated he felt that limiting that zone to single family detached homes is a mistake and feels there should be other residential options in that zone. The Board discussed allowing the Multi-Family and Townhouses in the Mixed Use zone allowing it by right, allowing Multi-Family and Townhouses in Village Commercial, Village Residential, and Village General as special exceptions with criteria. Multi-family within other zones versus the Business Park Zone needs to be distinguished by definition.

The setback regulation for accessory structures is the next item the Board discussed. The proposed ordinance has three different limitations. One for accessory structures under 120 square feet, one for accessory structures over 120 square feet and one for accessory structures over 14 feet long. The recommendation for residential accessory structures under 120 square feet at setbacks of 4 feet for side yard and 4 feet for rear yard. The recommendation for residential structures over 120 square feet would be 6 feet for the required side yard and rear yard.

## Commercial District

Ms. Hitchens stated the C-2 area along Route 30 east should include the portion of the Steamboat Inn that utilizes their storm water facilities and portions of their drive lanes and parking. It is recommended that the C-2 area be brought out to the edge of the Steamboat property line. The Board was in agreement with this recommendation.

Ms. Hitchens stated that Numbers 2 and Numbers 3 on the list had been addressed at the August 6<sup>th</sup> meeting.

## Industrial District

The first item to be discussed is the allowance of public and private schools by right in the I-2 zone. Ms. Hitchens noted that the I-2 zone contains the area where HACC currently is located. The Board discussed the I-2 zone. Ms. Hitchens felt that colleges should be allowed but recommends not having elementary, middle, or high schools located there.

The second item on the list was discussed at the August 6<sup>th</sup> meeting.

## Mixed Use District

The item concerning single-family detached dwellings had been address under the Residential District Uses.

## Village Districts

The first item discussed was the minimum lot size of 15,000 square feet with both public water and sewer. Ms. Hitchens stated that using this lot size would create a lot of non-conforming lots. She stated that the ELA Group did an analysis of what is currently there and what could be proposed. The recommendation is to reduce the lot size to 7,500 square feet with both public water and sewer. Mr. Hutchison stated that the public water supply goes as far as Route 896 and Route 340 serving Smoketown but the other Villages only have sewer service. The Board discussed whether there would be the potential for water service in the other Villages in the future. The Board considered a minimum lot area with public services 7,500 square feet and 12,000 square feet with public sewer. The Board also discussed the proposed lot width of the Village districts of 65 feet at the right of way and 100 feet at the front setback and how would it affect the character of the developed areas. Ms. Hitchens stated that the existing development that has occurred within these areas is 50 feet in lot width or less, consideration should be given to reducing this requirement.

The second item discussed was the number of uses within the proposed zoning ordinance that are provided a maximum lot area of 3 acres and how it will impact the businesses in the Village Districts. This will affect several businesses including Smoketown Vet and Rohrer's Seeds. Ms. Hitchens stated that a maximum lot size will create non-conforming uses. Rohrer's Seeds is non-conforming that was grandfathered under a special exception use. She suggests that the Board look at reducing the impact on the Village Districts. Mr. Buckwalter asked if this applies to all Village Districts. Ms. Hitchens stated it primarily affects the Village General and Village Commercial. Ms. Hitchens suggested further investigation on this issue.

## Business Park District

The Board discussed whether the surrounding land originally in the draft ordinance should be rezoned and included within the adopted Business Park Zone. They discussed the how future growth will affect the area. Ms. Hitchens pointed out that laboratories are not allowed in the Industrial Zone which affects the McNeil Pharmaceuticals site. The Board discussed the differences between I-1 and I-2. Mr. Hutchison stated they currently have only one Industrial Zone in the current Ordinance. The Board discussed keeping the Business Park District as adopted by the Board of Supervisors in June with the addition of the McNeil Pharmaceuticals site and keeping the remainder of the Business Park as I-1.

## Public Comments

During the Business Park discussion the Board was asked by Mr. John Smucker to discuss some comments and suggestions about the Village Commercial Zone. Chairman Buckwalter stated that the Board and staff have not had time to review the comments and suggestions supplied to them. He suggested postponing this discussion to a meeting on Monday, August 26, 2013 at 4:00pm.

## Business Park District

The Board discussed the roadway classifications within the Business Park Zone. Mr. Hutchison stated that he believed the classifications came from the Comprehensive Planning effort during the CV Comp Plan. Mr. Hutchison asked if the classifications trigger anything. Ms. Hitchens stated that the classifications affect the different setback requirements along the various zones on the roadways. There was a discussion on whether it affects design criteria. The Board stated the roadway classifications within the document will be checked and corrected.

## Historic Overlay

Ms. Hitchens stated that there was a brief discussion at the end of the August 6, 2013 meeting on this subject and was continued so that Mr. Smithgall could review that particular Overlay District.

Mr. Smithgall stated that the inclusion of the words “site” and “place” in the definition creates a potential problem due to the wording further in the definition of “being older than eighty (80) years in age”. Mr. Hutchison asked the Board if they would like to add to the definition. Chairman Buckwalter asked how staff feels about interpreting definitions as written numbers. Mr. Hutchison suggested placing a year requirement such as eighty (80) years old or fifty (50) years old to the definition of historic property. Ms. Hitchens stated that age is only one part to the definition; it also asks if it’s a contributing structure. Mr. Hutchison stated he is not aware of any municipality that promotes adaptive reuses. The Board discussed the definition of Historic Places and removing the terms “site” and “place” and changing the language and uses in the proposed definition.

Mr. Stanley stated that the ordinance defines historic structures as on “The National Register of Historic Places” or as eligible to be on “The National Register of Historic Places”. This leaves the decisions in the hands of the property owner. Demolition or relocation of a historic property would require the property owner to go to the Historic Preservation Trust of Lancaster County for approval. This takes the options from the property owner and puts in into a public setting. Mr. Stanley expressed concern about the wording of the current draft ordinance. Mr. Stanley explained the process involved in obtaining demolition/relocation of a Historic Place from the Historic Preservation Trust of Lancaster

County. The Board discussed demolition and relocation of a Historic Place. The Board preferred removing demolition as a conditional use.

Other issues:

Chairman Buckwalter asked if there were any issues that could be gone over quickly before adjourning.

Ms. Hitchens stated consideration should be given to how animals are defined. She suggests using the following terms: Farms Animals – typical animals associated with farms; Domestic Animals – all animals that are not classified as exotic or wild by the State of Pennsylvania; Exotic or Wild Animals – all animals classified as such by the State of Pennsylvania. The proposed ordinance does not allow Farm Animals on Residential Zones but allows barns for horses that are used for transportation. The Board should consider altering the language to allow for a minimal number of Farm Animals within Residential Zones in the proposed ordinance and not allowing Wild or Exotic Animals. The Board decided to do as suggested by the Township staff.

Ms. Hitchens stated that the issue of Changeable Signs involves an upcoming Zoning Hearing Board Case involving Kegerreis Outdoor Advertising. They want to put up a changeable sign that changes every eight (8) seconds. The existing and proposed ordinance does not allow changeable signs. She stated that the existing changeable signs are non-conforming, pre-existing uses and change once a day. Mr. Hutchison stated that most businesses comply with the existing ordinance. The Board discussed keeping the language of the existing and proposed ordinance as “No animated, sequential, intermittent, flashing, rotating or oscillating signs shall be permitted except for time and temperature signs.” Mr. Blowers discussed his concerns about the appearance of billboards along Route 30 and Route 462. Ms. Hitchens suggested continuing this discussion at the next meeting.

Adjournment:

Chairman Buckwalter asked that an announcement be made to continue the meeting with a date and time. The next scheduled meeting is to be held on Monday, August 26, 2013 beginning at 4:00 pm.

**August 26, 2013**

**SPECIAL MEETING**  
*(Continuation from August 20, 2013)*

The East Lampeter Township Board of Supervisors met on Monday, August 26, 2013, at 4:00 p.m. at the East Lampeter Township Office, 2250 Old Philadelphia Pike, Lancaster, PA 17602. This special meeting was continued from August 20, 2013 and was called to order by Mr. David Buckwalter, Chairman. In addition to Mr. Buckwalter, supervisors present were: Mr. John Shertzer, Mr. Mike Landis, Mr. John Blowers, and Mr. Glenn Eberly. Also present was Mr. Ralph Hutchison, Township Manager and Ms. Tara Hitchens, Director of Planning/Zoning Officer.

The following persons signed in as being present in the audience:

Tom Smithgall, 1853 William Penn Way, Lancaster, PA 17601, representing High Properties  
Mark Stanley, Hartman Underhill & Brubaker, 221 E. Chestnut Street, Lancaster, PA 17602,  
representing High Properties

Sandy Kime, ELA Group, 743 S. Broad Street, Lititz, PA 17543, representing Bird-in-Hand Corporation

John E. Smucker II, 2727 Old Philadelphia Pike, Bird-in-Hand, PA 17505, representing Bird-in-Hand Corporation

Chairman Buckwalter explained that this meeting was a continuation of the August 6, 2013 and August 20, 2013 workshop to discuss policy issues related to the new draft zoning ordinance.

### Signage

Billboard/Changeable signs were discussed at the last meeting and the discussion was continued. Ms. Hitchens stated that the Board suggests making it as difficult as possible to have Billboard/Changeable Signs on sites.

The next item discussed was signage for non-conforming commercial and industrial uses in other zoning districts and their regulations. Ms. Hitchens stated currently the ordinance falls back to the district in which the business is located. She used Lapp Toy's on Horseshoe Road as an example. They are limited to 2 square feet of signage based on their zoning district of R-2; however they applied to the Zoning Hearing Board and received a variance for approximately 12 square feet. She stated that the draft ordinance allows for 32 square feet per road frontage and per building. She proposes changing the draft ordinance from 32 square feet to 20 square feet which covers majority of the uses. This would allow existing non-conforming commercial and industrial uses to have one freestanding sign and one building sign.

Mr. Smithgall stated that the existing ordinance for freestanding signs requires that all architectural features and support for signage be included. He provided various examples to the Board. He commented that signs presently aren't changed due to the complications of the present ordinance. He suggested a more standard process or make aesthetics part of the ordinance. Chairman Buckwalter commented that there is an effort to look at the Route 30 corridor in regards to signage. Mr. Hutchison stated that if the Streetscape Plan gets completed and they have the design elements incorporated then it could be incorporated into the ordinance for that corridor. The Board asked how the Townships ordinance compares with the county. Ms. Hitchens stated that signage wasn't specifically dealt with in the Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Hutchison stated that the current signage regulations came out of an effort through the LIMC in the '90s and most municipalities in the LIMC adopted those regulations but they are not completely uniform.

The Board discussed providing language in the ordinance for shopping centers to have approval of signage through the conditional use process rather than having to go through the conditional use and the Zoning Hearing Board such as East Hempfield Township has for their zoning ordinance for the village district. Discussions were held on the size of signage in the various districts, the aesthetics of signs and whether to allow a percentage of the allowable sign area to be architectural in nature. Ms. Hitchens stated the Township could end up with 100 square feet signs in the Mixed Use, Village Commercial, Village General, C-1 districts. She also stated that it would significantly affect the C-2, C-3, BP, I-1 and I-2 districts. Staff is to determine if there are existing design guidelines that are utilized by other municipalities to assist with the development of language for this section.

Ms. Hitchens stated that Mr. David Sinopoli, Assistant Zoning Officer, has an issue with the enforcement of the "Open" signs. His suggestion is to either allow none or to allow one open flag near the entrance of a retail facility of a certain size.

The discussion turned back to billboards and flashing, animated signs. Ms. Hitchens stated that billboards are regulated in the draft ordinance. The Board asked how the Township can prevent billboards being installed in the wrong areas. She stated that in the draft ordinance billboards would only be allowed in the Industrial Zones and in the Business Park Zone. The Board asked if there were any regulations on the flashing billboards. Mr. Hutchison stated that he thought there were some DOT regulations in respect to highway signs.

The next issued the Board discussed was Banners. Banners are currently allowed as long as there is no advertising on them. The Board discussed allowing banners on light posts within a center to identify the center, but not advertising a particular retailer and they will not be allowed along the road frontage with a maximum size of 6 square feet. Mr. Smithgall asked about Tanger's banners. Mr. Hutchison stated that Tanger had to apply for a variance. Mr. Smithgall stated that the Township has a stiff ordinance that even a sign in a window is included in the square footage for the building sign.

### Public Comments

Mr. Smithgall commented that the current ordinance is setup to permit use by rights with special exceptions. He stated there are a lot of area requirement controls in regards to frontage, access, collector vs. arterial, square footage of lots vs. square footage of overall use. He is asking if staff can look at paring down some of the requirements. The Board discussed whether to have the Township staff go through specific requirements to determine what is essential and what is not.

Mr. John Smucker commented on his and Mr. Desmond's vision of the development of the village of Bird In Hand. He stated the current zoning of C-1 and C-2 is not village friendly. He expressed his appreciation to the Board for recognizing that the Village zoning should be treated differently. He discussed the plans for signage, parking, sidewalks, pedestrian pathways and public safety for the village. He advised the Board that Leacock Township is working on developing Route 340 from the East Lampeter Township line to Salisbury Township as C-5. He commented on the status of stormwater issues and replacing streetlight fixtures. He expressed concern about the differences in the character of the village of Soudersburg compared to Bird In Hand. He stated that Mr. Sandy Kime has worked on a detailed analysis of the Village. He asked that the Board consider changing what has been drafted for the Village. He expressed disappoint in the Township creating a 600 page Zoning Ordinance. Chairman Buckwalter commented that it is difficult to draw up these ordinances and address all concerns.

Mr. Sandy Kime stated that Bird In Hand is a Mixed Use village and it seems the ordinance covers the Village Commercial aspect but there is no mention of the Residential, Tourist or Mixed Use aspect all of which were highlighted in the Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Kime pointed out some issues with the current draft ordinance and its effects on the Village of Bird In Hand. One of the issues was the restriction of uses on various lot sizes. He stated there are only two undeveloped tracts of land remaining in the village and both are over 5 acres. He discussed the restrictions on apartments in the village and the minimum lot size requirement of 12,000 square feet in the village making non-conforming lots. He made comments about the required 15 foot wide landscape strip and the use of screening which is inconsistent with village development. Ms. Hitchens commented this is for the Agricultural District. Chairman Buckwalter asked Mr. Kime if he felt the 15 foot wide strip along non-residential lot lines in an industrial/commercial use should not be required as screening. Mr. Kime responded no. He feels it changes the character of a village.

Mr. Kime next discussed cluster uses within a single lot and stated that clustering is typical of small villages and the provision in the ordinance would eliminate that ability. He then discussed clear sight triangles and the need to reduce the size for village development. He discussed the fact that 24 foot wide access drives are difficult to achieve in village areas and that separate access to loading and parking are difficult due to small parking lots typical in a village. He went on to discuss the requirements of the parking space sizes and ratios of parking spaces.

Mr. Kime went on to discuss the uses in the Village District and stated that the ordinance does not address and reduces any future development of Maple Avenue. He expressed concerns about bed and breakfast minimum lot area requirements, stating that this would eliminate most of the single-family dwellings in the village. He discussed the 40,000 square foot maximum gross floor size of farmers markets and the minimum lot area of 10 acres for commercial greenhouses. He pointed out that the minimum of 1 acre of open space exceeds the 10% minimum open space requirement for small development and that there are no lots in the village of Bird In Hand that large. He feels the ordinance has a lot of redundancy and is more in line of a suburban area than for a village.

Chairman Buckwalter stated that staff is looking at the ordinance and hopes to provide reasonable solutions. Mr. Smucker asks that the Board consider making Bird In Hand Village its own zone. Mr. Buckwalter thanked Mr. Smucker and Mr. Kime for their input. Mr. Shertzer expressed the urgency of completing the zoning ordinance and addressing key issues brought up in the meetings.

Chairman Buckwalter asked Mr. Smucker if all his issues had been addressed. Mr. Smucker stated that signage in the village has not been addressed.

Mr. Landis commented that he felt the 2 key points were streamlining and condensing the ordinance and to dedicate time to the Bird In Hand issues.

Chairman Buckwalter asked if there was a need for more workshops to address anymore issues in draft ordinance. Ms. Hitchens stated that the Board offered general and specific guidance on the topics discussed and does not feel anymore meetings are needed. She said the issues could be handled through the consultant or changes could be made on the staff level but will not be done by the end of the year. Mr. Hutchison stated that there is a minimum of 45 days to present the Ordinance to the various commissions. He stated the Township may need to get the consultant involved but will work aggressively to complete the draft ordinance.

#### Adjournment:

A motion was made to adjourn the meeting. It was seconded and passed unanimous voice vote.