

**STRASBURG BOROUGH
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES
January 3, 2011**

Members Present: Ken Johnson Bob Marshall Shelby Nauman
Lee Potts Mary Dresser

Others Present:
Lisa M. Boyd, Borough Manager Stephen Smoker
Dennis Gehringer

CALL TO ORDER AND PLEDGE TO THE FLAG: Chairman Ken Johnson called the meeting to order at 7:00 P.M., followed by the pledge to the flag. He announced that the meeting is being audiotaped to assist in the preparation of the minutes.

CITIZEN COMMENTS: None.

REORGANIZATION: Mary Dresser made a motion which was seconded by Lee Potts to nominate Ken Johnson to be reappointed as Chairman. Lee Potts made a motion which was seconded by Bob Marshall to close nominations for Chairman. Having only one nomination for Chairman, all members voted unanimously to reappoint Ken Johnson as the Chairman of the Planning Commission.

Mary Dresser made a motion which was seconded by Lee Potts to nominate Bob Marshall to be reappointed as Vice Chairman. Lee Potts made a motion which was seconded by Mary Dresser to close nominations for Vice Chairman. Having only one nomination for Vice Chairman, all members voted unanimously to reappoint Bob Marshall as the Vice Chairman of the Planning Commission.

MINUTES OF DECEMBER 6, 2010: Bob Marshall made a motion to approve the minutes of December 6, 2010 as printed. Mary Dresser seconded the motion. Motion carried with members Dresser, Johnson, Marshall and Potts casting assenting votes. Member Nauman recused herself from voting because she was not in attendance at the meeting.

CONTINUED DISCUSSION OF GATEWAY NORTH OVERLAY ZONE: Ken Johnson stated that following last months' meeting, Mr. Gehringer prepared a summary page, table of contents and a recompiled document dated December 17, 2010 consisting of 13 pages. Mr. Gehringer stated that he tried to group items together to make it easier to compare. Mr. Gehringer noted that there is an error in section numbers in his memo.

Mary Dresser was concerned that the language in the purpose was modified to imply that construction in the zone is to only look like the surrounding construction rather than referencing that it could also look like the architecture in the neighboring historic district as was in the original Planning Commission document. Following discussion, it was the consensus to change the wording to state, "as exemplified by the buildings..." and to reference the historic district in the purpose.

The exclusion of a convenience store on North Decatur Street was discussed and its exclusion was previously removed by the Planning Commission and Borough Council. After discussion, it was the consensus to follow Dennis Gehringer's recommendation, considering the traffic flow on North Decatur Street, to state that a convenience store use cannot have access onto North Decatur Street.

The setback section was discussed and Mr. Gehringer stated that because the GN Zone includes a portion of North Decatur Street that the wording that was originally included did not make sense for those properties on North Decatur Street. He also stated that because of the shallowness of the lots at the entrance to Historic Drive that the setbacks could not be applied there either. He suggested wording to state "when possible the buildings shall be located..." Mary Dresser expressed her concern about the enforceability of the vague terms such as "when possible" and asked if this question could be asked of the Solicitor. Dennis Gehringer stated that as a planner, including these words makes it a negotiating tool with the developer rather than being mandatory.

The number of gas pumps was discussed and it was the consensus that 12 nozzles was the number that Council was agreeable with.

Mary Dresser stated that for building setbacks she would like to see varied setbacks and was agreed to by the other members.

211.7.2 to get the Solicitor's opinion if the section as amended from the purpose should be restated or omit it here.

Drive-throughs were discussed at length and the need for screening was stressed. Mary Dresser noted that examples are not provided and items such as dense landscaping are not defined.

The group discussed who enforces the architectural details and it was stated that it will be the Zoning Officer.

Bob Marshall asked if it were possible to have the Solicitor attend a 15 or 20 minute meeting with the Planning Commission after he reviewed the document for the Planning Commission to give him their feedback before he renders a decision.

The properties included in the zone were discussed and it was the consensus that the bowling alley and the southern border of the Citgo are included but not the industrial property behind the carwash because it doesn't have frontage on North Decatur Street.

Mary Dresser expressed her concern that the architectural details for building walls where they were to have either windows or architectural details every 50 feet was modified to only being required on the entrance wall and only a course of brick would be required on a 49 foot building. Mary Dresser asked if requiring some detailing could be required, and suggested the threshold be every 25 feet. The remaining members read the section as rewritten by Mr. Gehringer and it was their consensus that the section requires two details but that adding a wall recess is only required when the wall exceeds 50 feet.

Stephen Smoker asked if the Planning Commission would consider self storage. Dennis Gehringer clarified that what he is asking would be for a large building where the units would be accessible from inside the building and not a row of garage doors outside. It was the consensus that if they were accessible from the inside that this type of use would appear like a storefront from the outside.

It was the consensus that Mr. Gehringer would compile the list of changes and provide them to the members for their review and then forward to Borough Council to authorize it to be reviewed by the Solicitor. It was the consensus that if the Solicitor has a question regarding the intent that he should ask that question to eliminate any delays.

OTHER BUSINESS: None.

CITIZEN COMMENTS: None.

ADJOURNMENT: Bob Marshall made a motion, seconded by Lee Potts and passed unanimously to adjourn the meeting at 9:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Lisa M. Boyd
Borough Manager

February 7, 2011 - Meeting Cancelled

March 7, 2011 - Meeting Cancelled

**STRASBURG BOROUGH
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES
April 4, 2011**

Members Present: Ken Johnson Bob Marshall Shelby Nauman (left at 8 pm)
Lee Potts Mary Dresser

Others Present:
Lisa M. Boyd, Borough Manager

CALL TO ORDER AND PLEDGE TO THE FLAG: Chairman Ken Johnson called the meeting to order at 7:00 P.M., followed by the pledge to the flag. He announced that the meeting is being audiotaped to assist in the preparation of the minutes.

CITIZEN COMMENTS: None.

MINUTES OF JANUARY 3, 2011: Mary Dresser made a motion, seconded by Shelby Nauman and passed unanimously to approve the minutes of January 3, 2011 as printed.

CONTINUED DISCUSSION OF GATEWAY NORTH OVERLAY ZONE:

The comment letter from Solicitor William Crosswell dated February 28, 2011 and the response letter from Dennis Gehringer dated March 18, 2011 were reviewed with the following consensus:

1. It was noted that the Zoning Officer has reviewed the ordinance and his comments will be discussed next.
2. Reviewed without further comment.
3. Vague references (when feasible, etc): Changes for vague references amended as follows:

211.3.9.4 – Change to: Fueling areas, storage areas, and refuse enclosures shall be oriented away from public street view or screened from public view.

211.7.6 – Change to: Windows shall be vertically proportioned and vertically aligned with the location of windows and doors on the ground level.

211.7.9 – Change to: Roof lines shall have varied ridge heights.

211.7.10 – Change to: Dormers, chimneys and cupolas and/or other architectural elements should be incorporated into the roof design.

211.9.1.2 – Change to: Drive-thru windows shall be located on the side of the building which does not adjoin a public street.

211.9.2 – Change to: Drive-thru windows that are located on the non-public-street side...”

4. Building separation: Agree with Mr. Gehringer's comment that because of the desire for a village pattern of development, building separation is established by the building and fire codes, and that this approach allows the interrelationship of structures, typical to a village, while addressing safety issues.
5. Applicability of Gateway North: Agree with Mr. Gehringer's comment that it is not necessary to obtain conditional use approval.
6. Add to Section 211.2.2 to state that "...and if the Gateway North Zone is chosen to be enacted, in addition to the application, a project narrative, a master plan, a site plan, a conceptual building plan, proposed signs, and architectural and design standards which will be incorporated into the development shall be included."
7. No change necessary, if an applicant chooses to follow the standards required in the Gateway North Overlay zone, the requirements are specific.
8. Some language should be included to address this issue to strengthen Section 211.2.5 which states that an applicant can either choose the underlying zone or the GN Overlay Zone.
9. Change Section 211.2.4 to state that the landowner is "voluntarily accepting and agreeing to comply with the standards of the GN Zone by virtue of making application for approval of development under the provisions of the GN Zone and that because the GN Zone is an optional form of development in addition to other development permitted in the underlying zone, any burdens which may accompany that form of development must be accepted in advance by the landowner" and to include the provision on the application form.
10. Add the following section: "It is hereby declared to be the express intent of Borough Council that the design standards and sign regulations required by the GN Zone are essential to and inseparably connected with the remainder of the GN Zone and that the GN Zone would not have been created without the provisions contained herein relating to design standards and signs" and to amend the severability clause in Section 6 of the Draft Ordinance to cross-reference this new Section.
11. Building setbacks – no change necessary because setback flexibility is desired.
12. Section 211.3.9.6 – add after no more than six (6) dual-sided fuel pump dispensers "serving no more than 12 motor vehicles at a time."
13. Section 211.3.9.1 – this section should be removed based on Bill Crosswell's comment.
14. Should will be changed to shall except in 211.7.10.
15. Photographs should be included. Joe Hunt could be asked if he would be willing to assist the Borough.

16. This statement should be included, since reimbursement of if fees of the Borough Engineer and other professional consultants and attorneys' fee are currently not included in the Borough's fee schedule.

17. It was noted that the Borough engineer will not be reviewing the ordinance.

The comment letter from Barry Wagner dated March 28, 2011 was reviewed and the following was the consensus:

1. No comment.
2. No comment.
3. No change necessary.
4. No change necessary.
5. No change necessary.
6. No change necessary.

It was noted that Barry commented that the ordinance is quite clear and easy to flow, and while he has some concern as to how the approval process will develop, the proposal appears to be quite workable from a zoning officer's perspective.

The "Courtesy Review" comment letter from the LCPC dated April 1, 2011 was reviewed and the following was the consensus:

1. Section 211.3.7 - It was the consensus to keep this section as listed in the draft and not make any changes.
2. Section 211.3.8 - Parking for large recreational facilities was discussed and the need for large amounts of parking but only necessary at certain times. It was the consensus to keep this section as listed in the draft and not make any changes.
4. Section 211.3.9 – It was clarified that all of requirements 1-9 would need to be met in order to have a convenience store with or without fuel service.
5. 211.3.9.1 – Delete
6. 211.7.1.1 – change wording to read "German, Georgian or Federal" and include photographs to show what recent construction within the GN Zone is desired.
7. 211.7.7 – change to "bulk and volume of walls"
8. 211.10.6 – follow the County Planning Commission's model Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance which indicates that a minimum aisle width of 20 feet is sufficient for parking compounds.

9. 211.11.6 and 7 – follow LCPC Model Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance to require that no more than 25% of all trees be one species to ensure tree vegetation remains in the event of a blight or infestation.

10. 211.12 – change to “architectural treatments such as the use of fences...”

The informal comments from the LCPC regarding signs was discussed and it was the consensus that the types of signs that are mentioned in their comment letter are already listed in Section 211.14.1 and that other sign regulations are included in other sections.

REVIEW OF OFFICIAL MAP: It was stated that the printed map is not correct so this item will be tabled and reviewed at a future meeting.

OTHER BUSINESS: None.

CITIZEN COMMENTS: None.

ADJOURNMENT: Bob Marshall made a motion, seconded by Lee Potts and passed unanimously to adjourn the meeting at 9:28 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Lisa M. Boyd
Borough Manager

May 2, 2011 - Meeting Cancelled

June 6, 2011 - Meeting Cancelled

**STRASBURG BOROUGH
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES
July 11, 2011**

Members Present: Ken Johnson Bob Marshall
 Lee Potts Mary Dresser

Others Present:

 Lisa M. Boyd, Borough Manager May Gaynor
 Tara Hitchens, LCPC

CALL TO ORDER AND PLEDGE TO THE FLAG: Chairman Ken Johnson called the meeting to order at 7:00 P.M., followed by the pledge to the flag. He announced that the meeting is being audiotaped to assist in the preparation of the minutes.

CITIZEN COMMENTS: None.

MINUTES OF APRIL 4, 2011: Mary Dresser made a motion, seconded by Lee Potts and passed unanimously to approve the minutes of April 4, 2011 as printed.

GATEWAY NORTH OVERLAY ZONE – RECOMMENDATION TO BOROUGH COUNCIL: The Borough Manager reviewed the status of this Ordinance that at the May 2011 Borough Council meeting, Borough Council authorized it to be officially reviewed by the Lancaster County Planning Commission, those comments have been received, and is now back to this Board for their formal recommendation to Borough Council before Borough Council can advertise for a public hearing, which is anticipated to be September 13, 2011.

The County comments were discussed as follows:

Comment #1. The Borough Manager stated that the Planning Commission did recommend removing that reference but the Borough Council felt that because the Gateway Zone is optional that the flexibility should remain.

Comment #2. The Borough Manager noted that the reference in 211.1.3 was changed to “or,” but there are two more references in Sections 211.7.1.1 and 211.7.2 that need to be corrected to “or.” Tara Hitchens explained further that to clarify referencing “recent development,” that specific locations should be listed that are desired. Tara Hitchens added that another concern if referencing addresses is that if that structure is razed and reconstructed. Another suggestion was to simply include the year of pharmacy or post office (such as 2000-2011) construction behind the word recent. The Borough Manager will ask the Solicitor’s opinion if removing/revising this sentence would be construed as a “substantial change” which would require the Ordinance to be re-reviewed.

Comment #3. Tara Hitchens recommended that for tree plantings that language be included that no more than 25% of one species be planted. It was explained that this is recommended in case of blight that not all trees are affected. It was the consensus of the members to not include this,

even though they agree that it makes sense, since there is not similar language in the underlying zone.

Comment #4: The definition for enrollment was discussed and it was the consensus that since the ordinance references state regulations that we believe we are covered, and this should be verified with the Solicitor. It was the consensus that the indoor recreation should also be verified with the Solicitor.

Ken Johnson stated that a comma should be inserted in Section 211.2.5 as follows: ...connected with the remainder of the GN Zone, and that the GN Zone...

Section 211.3.9.1 should read: The use is located East of Historic Drive. However, the Borough Council wanted this removed.

May Gaynor questioned the wording in Section 5 and this will be verified by the Solicitor.

Lee Potts made a motion, seconded by Bob Marshall and passed unanimously to recommend to Borough Council that this Ordinance be advertised for Public Hearing, contingent upon direction from the Borough Solicitor for the few items discussed at this meeting, which will be forwarded to the members by the Borough Manager when received.

REVIEW OF OFFICIAL MAP AS PREPARED BY THE JOINT PLANNING

COMMISSION: Tara Hitchens reviewed the County's comments to the Township's Official Map since they were just received by the members as follows.

The following changes that need to be made were noted:

- Need to include the entire existing Strasburg Pool property as a proposed park
- Correct the line at the Strasburg Elementary School to have the parking lot as "proposed" and not "existing"
- Rename "hazardous intersections" to "intersection improvements" because of liability reasons.
- Add Prospect Rd/Lancaster Ave and N Jackson/W Main intersection. Mary Dresser noted that other intersections were on the map previously and the Jt. Planning Commission was asked to remove them because there was not documented accident data for those intersections.

Tara Hitchens stated that the Strasburg Township map showed 125' riparian buffers but they do not have a riparian buffer ordinance. She noted that the Borough, if they want to show riparian buffers on the map, also needs an ordinance, or removed from the map. Ken Johnson suggested that we should coordinate with what Strasburg Township is going to do regarding riparian buffers. Mary Dresser stated that she believes we should include riparian buffers on the map and work on an ordinance because water quality is extremely important. She added that there are grants available for riparian buffer plantings.

Ken Johnson stated that if everyone was in agreement that the PC needed to make a recommendation to Borough Council regarding the creation of a riparian buffer ordinance. It was also the consensus that it is important to coordinate with Strasburg Township. Tara

Hitchens stated that the County does have a riparian buffer ordinance model that has the buffer size based on stream classification.

The Borough Manager stated that this map will be reviewed by Borough Council at their August 9, 2011 meeting.

Mary Dresser noted that the Official Map was the final task of the Joint Planning Commission's current list of duties but reminded that they are an existing board if other tasks arise in the future.

OTHER BUSINESS: Tara Hitchens reported that she will be on maternity leave in January.

CITIZEN COMMENTS: May Gaynor stated that she has expressed her concern to the Borough Manager previously about what appears to be a parking lot expansion for the Creamery. Ken Johnson stated that the property owner is following our ordinance that allows for improvements less than 1000 square feet per property. Ken Johnson added that there are additional improvements planned for the future at that location which will trigger stormwater management.

ADJOURNMENT: Bob Marshall made a motion, seconded by Lee Potts and passed unanimously to adjourn the meeting at 8:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Lisa M. Boyd
Borough Manager

**STRASBURG BOROUGH
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES
August 1, 2011**

Members Present: Ken Johnson Shelby Nauman
 Lee Potts Mary Dresser

Others Present:
 Lisa M. Boyd, Borough Manager May Gaynor
 Tara Hitchens, LCPC

CALL TO ORDER AND PLEDGE TO THE FLAG: Chairman Ken Johnson called the meeting to order at 7:00 P.M., followed by the pledge to the flag. He announced that the meeting is being audiotaped to assist in the preparation of the minutes.

CITIZEN COMMENTS: May Gaynor stated that she wanted to make sure that through the rezoning request process for 23-29 West Main Street that there is due consideration to neighboring properties, and documented in writing, regarding items such as landscaping and landscape buffers.

MINUTES OF JULY 11, 2011: Mary Dresser made a motion, seconded by Lee Potts and passed unanimously to approve the minutes of the July 11, 2011 meeting as printed.

REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATION TO BOROUGH COUNCIL – 23-29 WEST MAIN STREET REZONING REQUEST: Ken Johnson stated for the record that he was disappointed that neither the applicant nor the property owner was in attendance and asked that this displeasure be passed onto the applicant.

Shelby Nauman asked how the proposed zoning would resolve the grandfathered lot coverage nonconformance for the subject property. Ken Johnson stated the current zoning is R-H which provides for maximum lot coverage of 50% and the R-H allows for conversion apartments and apartments and C-1 does not. It was noted that C-1's maximum lot coverage is 90%.

Ken Johnson noted that there was inconsistency between their documents regarding the acreage of the parcel. The Borough Manager stated that the Borough's Solicitor references this lot as being 0.76 acres. Tara Hitchens noted that the LCPC lot size is based off of GIS and may include the right-of-way but there are still inconsistencies in the applicant's petition

Ken Johnson also noted that the request doesn't state what size of lot they eventually intend to subdivide off and if they intend to have the remaining lot meet the lot coverage for C-1 or if they will leave the lot as an "island" lot or proceed with a lot add-on. Tara Hitchens noted that the future subdivided lot would have to be joined to another lot but reminded the members that the Planning Commission has to look at the rezoning of this property on its own merits alone.

Ken Johnson stated that years ago, Wesley Methodist Church purchased 39 West Main Street with the intent of putting in a parking lot behind it because their parking lot was owned by the fire company. He stated that the church also had an agreement to purchase the house to the East

(apartments) and to have one driveway an entrance and one an exit and have a parking lot behind. He stated that it is his understanding that the parking lot had Borough support. Then the previous owner of the Creamery wanted to pave the entire back area to be a parking lot at which time the whole project died. He noted that there is new ownership at the Creamery and he has done good things with the appearance and upkeep of the properties as well as designate bus parking. However, Ken Johnson did note that there is a significant stormwater runoff problem in the area and that if the area is developed as mentioned to be a stormwater basin for a parking lot that will be a good complement to the area.

Mary Dresser made a motion, seconded by Lee Potts and passed unanimously to recommend approval of the rezoning petition for 23-29 West Main Street to from R-H Residential to C-1 Commercial, subject to verification from the applicant regarding the size of the property and noted that this recommendation is consistent with the Strasburg Region Joint Comprehensive Plan.

OTHER BUSINESS: Ken Johnson asked if a reply was received from the Solicitor regarding changes to the Gateway North Zone Ordinance. The Borough Manager reported that he stated that any change, including a date, would require the Ordinance review process to be redone.

CITIZEN COMMENTS: May Gaynor stated that some of tonight's discussion was about property owners not maintaining rental properties. The Borough Manager stated that the Borough's Property Maintenance/Housing Ordinance is outdated but is in the Capital Improvements Plan to be upgraded.

ADJOURNMENT: Lee Potts made a motion, seconded by Shelby Nauman and passed unanimously to adjourn the meeting at 8:01 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Lisa M. Boyd
Borough Manager

September 12, 2011 - Meeting Cancelled

October 3, 2011 - Meeting Cancelled

November 7, 2011 - Meeting Cancelled

**STRASBURG BOROUGH
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES
December 5, 2011**

Members Present: Ken Johnson Shelby Nauman
 Lee Potts Mary Dresser
 Bob Marshall

Others Present:

 Lisa M. Boyd, Borough Manager Bruce Ryder
 Tara Hitchens, LCPC Dan Lake
 Bob Hallinger Nick Whiteford

CALL TO ORDER AND PLEDGE TO THE FLAG: Chairman Ken Johnson called the meeting to order at 7:00 P.M., followed by the pledge to the flag. He announced that the meeting is being audiotaped to assist in the preparation of the minutes.

CITIZEN COMMENTS: None.

MINUTES OF AUGUST 1, 2011: Lee Potts made a motion to approve the minutes of the August 1, 2011 meeting as printed. Mary Dresser seconded the motion and motion carried with members Johnson, Nauman, Potts and Dresser casting assenting votes. Member Marshall abstained from voting because he was not in attendance at the meeting.

REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATION TO BOROUGH COUNCIL – 23-29 WEST MAIN STREET REZONING REQUEST: Attorney Bob Hallinger, Nick Whiteford and surveyor/engineer Dan Lake were in attendance for this application. He stated that Mr. Whiteford has an option to purchase the rear portion of 23-29 West Main Street and he wishes to expand the parking for his other properties at the Square. Mr. Hallinger reminded the members that a similar request was previously heard at the August 1, 2011 meeting in that a request to rezone the entire property to C-1 was reviewed and the Planning Commission recommended approval. Mr. Hallinger added that when the request was heard by Borough Council, they and others were concerned with rezoning the entire property to Commercial when the purpose was actually a more limited purpose and Council suggested the applicant reapply with a more limited request. Mr. Hallinger explained that the application being considered tonight is to rezone only the rear portion of the lot to commercial and leave the remaining apartment buildings residentially zoned. He provided a map showing the area proposed to be rezoned.

Mr. Lake reviewed the future plans for the area proposed to be rezoned in that they plan to extend the parking lot and install a pervious parking lot which will contain 16 additional parking spaces. He added that because they are proposing the pervious bituminous parking lot similar to that installed at the Bachman Funeral Home parking lot and that this will control stormwater that is currently running off of the property and help reduce stormwater runoff problems in the area. Mr. Hallinger stated that, if approved, these plans will still have to go through land planning and stormwater management reviews as well and will serve as additional parking for the Creamery complex.

Ken Johnson stated that he is concerned with what happens to what is left of the Esch residential property because if the subdivision goes through, the remaining parcel will be almost all impervious surfaces. Mary Dresser noted that the R-H Zone permits lot coverage of 50% and asked how this would be addressed and if the stormwater controls would address any water runoff from the remaining apartment unit property at 23-29 West Main Street. Mr. Hallinger stated that he was not sure at this point in time how those issues could or could not be addressed because if the project continues as planned, the apartment units would be on a separate lot.

Bob Marshall asked if they anticipated any additional egress problems onto Main Street because of them proposing to add 16 more parking spaces considering Main Street has pedestrian and already crowded vehicular traffic. Mr. Whiteford stated that he believed it would actually lessen problems on Main Street because vehicles would now have a place to park instead of trying to find a place to park. Mr. Marshall stated that he understood Mr. Whiteford's comment but he believed it would make it worse on Main Street and that vehicles will want to turn East from the driveway and traffic is normally backed up from the light. Ken Johnson stated that it will be better for vehicles to turn East from this driveway as opposed to the existing Creamery parking lot and suggested possibly making the existing Creamery parking lot enter only in the future.

Tara Hitchens stated that this has been reviewed twice by the Lancaster County Planning Commission and they recommended approval for this plan at their November 8, 2011 meeting.

Ken Johnson asked what kind of paving they are planning to use for the project to which Mr. Lake stated he stated they were going to try to use pervious paving. Mr. Whiteford stated that depending on the calculations, where there is a bend in the driveway they may want to use impervious paving.

Bruce Ryder stated that his concerns have already been expressed but include 1) the most likely future use is for it to be completely paved over and 2) after it is subdivided, it leaves the apartment property with no open space for the tenants, no way to provide better or more parking for its tenants and essentially no options for improving the property because all of the extra land has been sold off. He stated that he was not in favor of the prior application to rezone the entire property and added then if you look at google maps that if this area gets paved, the entire area from the apartment building to the Square will be almost entirely paved over. He stated that even though it is not an ideal solution, it may be the solution we are stuck with.

Lee Potts stated that he thought we were trying to develop more businesses in the Borough which will be a problem if we don't provide parking.

Mary Dresser noted that the LCPC comments note that this application is in agreement with our Comprehensive Plan to expand the village center but added that she was concerned that this will make the remaining apartment complex parcel almost all impervious when only 50% coverage is allowed by Zoning. It was noted, however, that off-site improvements cannot be required.

Ken Johnson noted that the existing property at 23-29 West Main Street is already non-conforming in many ways. Mary Dresser noted that the project will still have to go through Stormwater Management and Land Development reviews.

Mary Dresser made a motion, seconded by Bob Marshall and passed unanimously to recommend approval of the rezoning petition for the rear portion of 23-29 West Main Street from R-H Residential to C-1 Commercial, noting that this recommendation is consistent with the Strasburg Region Joint Comprehensive Plan, the Lancaster County Comprehensive Plan, the improvements to parking and this corner of Strasburg in the commercial center.

The Borough Manager stated that this recommendation will be considered by Borough Council at their meeting on December 13, 2011.

OTHER BUSINESS: Tara Hitchens stated that with the staff cutbacks at the County, the Lancaster County Planning Commission lost 6 positions and another community planner is leaving which leaves 5 community planners for the entire County. She added that during her upcoming maternity leave that Dean Severson will be our contact at the LCPC.

CITIZEN COMMENTS: None.

ADJOURNMENT: Bob Marshall made a motion, seconded by Lee Potts and passed unanimously to adjourn the meeting at 8:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Lisa M. Boyd
Borough Manager