

LITITZ BOROUGH PLANNING COMMISSION
Minutes of Meeting Held July 5, 2023

The July 5, 2023 meeting of the Lititz Borough Planning Commission was called to order at 7:00 P.M. by Stauffer with members Smith, Weibel, Dickinson present. Stoudt was in attendance via ZOOM. Members Meyer and Piazza were excused. Attending in person was Mike Huxta of the ELA Group, Jay Weaver of Eagle Building Solutions, Jordan Zimmerman of B+H Architecture, Will and Nicole Rothenberger, and Jordan Garner. Weibel motioned to approve the June 6, 2023, Planning Commission Minutes, seconded by Smith, motion passed unanimously.

Sketch Plan/ Land Development Modification Request
Warwick High School – Small Addition

Mike Huxta of the ELA Group presented the proposed small addition of the Warwick High School building to the Commission. The proposed plan includes adding two small buildings located near the gymnasium on the West side of the building. The two buildings will be an office for the Athletic Director and a storage building for equipment. Huxta discussed that existing sidewalks and steps will need to be removed to accommodate the additions. In addition, two trees will be removed and replaced. The additions will not require an expansion of the parking lot. The parking expansion was completed with the previous Fieldhouse project. The new buildings will have similar brick façade to match the existing buildings. For stormwater management, the roof leaders of the two additions will be connected to the newly installed underground stormwater retention system. The retention system was installed during the Fieldhouse project. Huxta also explained that permits are currently being reviewed by DEP. In total the new impervious surface for the project is 1,475 ft².

Smith asked the question about the tracking of the additional stormwater runoff from the new impervious surfaces. Huxta replied that a record of the new impervious surfaces can be tracked and recorded with the plan. Smith agrees with the Borough Engineer that there should be tracking of additional stormwater runoff.

There were no other comments or questions from the Commission. Smith made the motion, seconded by Weibel, to recommend to Borough Council to waive the Land Development requirement for the additions at Warwick High School as presented. Motion passed unanimously.

Subdivision Land Development Plans
Eagle Building Land Development

Mike Huxta of the ELA Group presented the proposed Eagle Building Land Development plan to the Commission. Huxta explained the current site is 1.6 Acres and is within the Neighborhood Storefront District-1. The current site is vacant with the exception of an existing garage and an access easement to the neighboring property. Huxta noted that the existing easement will remain after the completion of the project. It was also noted that a portion of the property is within the floodplain.

Huxta explained that the proposed project will include two buildings, a parking area, and an underground stormwater detention system. The building along East Main Street will be mixed-use. The bottom floor will be office space, and the second floor will be apartments. The second building along North Oak Street will be an office and shop space for Eagle Building Solutions. Huxta discussed that the parking area will be screened and a 3-4' retaining wall will be used by the floodplain. The underground stormwater facility will be installed and drain into the floodplain. Due to the proximity of the floodplain the Conservation District will review the stormwater management plan.

Dickinson asked Huxta how much of the existing site is usable. Huxta responded that .9 acres of the available 1.6 is usable. The leftover acreage is part of the floodplain that is on the property. Smith also asked Huxta for information about the proposed bus stop. Huxta discussed that a pad, bench, and lighting will be installed. The installed bench will be the standard Borough benches seen around town. Smith discussed that it would be beneficial to have a conversation with Red Rose Transit Authority and asked if any conversations had happened. Huxta responded that no conversations have been had to date. Smith also asked if signage has been reviewed by the Zoning Hearing Board. Huxta discussed that the Zoning Hearing Board has not reviewed the signage. Huxta noted that the signage would be similar to the signage on the Garman Builders building. Weibel asked about the contribution of fee-in-lieu for parkland. Huxta responded that there would be a flat fee of \$1,610.00.

Weibel discussed that there had been an agreement with the Shade Tree Commission regarding plantings behind the sidewalk. Weibel mentioned that there appears to be no plantings in front of the building on East Main Street. Weibel stated there are regulations regarding landscaping and that there should be landscaping in front of the building. Huxta will take a look into the plantings.

Stauffer asked about pulling the stairs, porch and fence out of the Right-of-Way. Huxta responded that the building will be pulled back to satisfy the comment of taking the stairs, porch and fence out of the right-of-way. Stauffer also noted that landscaping is required in the form-based code and thinks that the frontage would be bare without the plantings in front of a mixed used building.

With no other questions or comments, Weibel the made motion, seconded by Smith, to recommend Borough Council to accept the final plan for 601 East Main Street contingent to the Engineer and staff discussions with the applicant. Motion passed unanimously.

Zoning Hearings Rothenberger Garage Variance Request

Will and Nikki Rothenberger were present to discuss a potential garage variance request for the proposed construction of a new house at 214 East Market Street. Mr. Rothenberger asked the Commission for any questions regarding the plan. Smith proceeded to ask for an update on the project and which building plan they would like to proceed with. Smith noted that the issue with the plan is the garage placement and asked where the garage is located on the plan. Mr. Rothenberger responded that the first plan submittal is what they would like to proceed with. Mr. Rothenberger added that a side loading garage was included in a previous submittal. Due to the lot layout the side loading garage would not work. For a side loading garage the driveway would not fit the layout of the existing property. Mrs. Rothenberger added that the current building plan will have a front-loading garage to the right of the house. The existing driveway would connect to the garage.

Weibel discussed that at the June Planning Commission meeting there was discussion of having access to the garage from the rear alley. Weibel asked the Rothenbergers why they elected to not pursue the rear access. Mr. Rothenberger discussed that if they were to pursue rear access, they would have to depend on the alley for access. If the garage was not dependent on the rear alley for access, there would need to be a turn-a-round behind the new house. An additional 30'-35' of asphalt would be needed in the backyard of the property. A majority of the backyard would be used for the turn-a-round and would increase the total impervious surfaces on the property. Smith added that the alley is a private easement and is unpaved and unmaintained. Smith noted that access may not be desirable due to the condition of the alley. Weibel also added that an agreement for access would be needed with the other neighboring properties that also have access to the alley way.

Smith asked the Rothenbergers if the frontage of the garage and house is connected or if there is a setback. If there is a setback Smith requested to know what the proposed setback would be. Mr. Rothenberger replied that he had spoken with Landmark Builders regarding the garage and house. Currently the garage is 3' in front of the porch. Mr. Rothenberger asked the builder if the porch could be extended 3' to create a connected view of

the house. The extension of the porch would increase the cost. Smith noted that if the porch was not included on the house, the house would be set back, and the garage would be pushed forward. The porch fills the space and fills in the façade. Stauffer asked if the garage portion could be set back without completing a custom design for the house. Stauffer asked what the upcharge would be for a custom design. Mrs. Rothenberger responded that they are unsure they could push the garage back because there is living space behind the back wall of the garage. The kitchen and small pantry are behind the garage. Mr. Rothenberger reviewed the floor plan with the Commission and explained that if the garage is pushed back, living space would be reduced. In addition to reducing living space the design of the house would become a custom model and would increase the cost of the project. Rothenberger discussed that extending the porch to be flush with the garage is more economical than other designs. Smith noted that from the June Borough Council meeting, David Brubaker commented about being careful about not turning Lititz into million-dollar homes. Smith noted that if the Rothenbergers built a home to comply with regulations, the cost would increase dramatically. Smith feels comfortable that the current plan is a reasonable solution to fit into the lot.

Stauffer discussed in an ideal situation access from the rear alley would more favorable. Weibel added that the configuration of the lot is what is causing the problems for the design. Mr. Rothenberger discussed that their preference would be to not have a street-facing garage. Due to the lot configuration a front-loading garage was the best solution. Weibel also added that the proposed plan is not out of context with the rest of the block. Regarding the rear access, Weibel noted that there would be additional challenges having access from the rear alley.

Smith discussed that there is a variety of home designs along East Market Street. Smith discussed that he does not object to the Rothenbergers proposed plan. Smith noted that the Rothenbergers have worked with multiple Lititz Borough Boards and Commissions to try and comply with Lititz Borough regulations. Smith believes the proposed concept will work and fit into the scheme of the neighborhood and street.

Dickinson asked about the existing driveway access. The Rothenbergers responded that the current driveway connects from Market Street to the rear alley. The Rothenbergers were unsure if the driveway would connect to the rear of the property. The Rothenbergers would like to preserve as much of the backyard as possible. Mr. Rothenberger would like to use as minimal amount of asphalt as possible and potentially remove the rear asphalt to have a larger backyard.

With no further questions the Commission stated that the Rothenbergers have worked with Borough staff, and other Boards and Commissions to create a plan that fits into the scheme of the neighborhood. Stauffer stated that the Commission is in favor of the plan as presented.

Commissioners Forum

Dickinson discussed with the Commission that there was a merchant meeting to request a change to the Zoning Ordinance to allow A-Frame signage. Merchants in the downtown would be in favor of this change. Weibel discussed with Dickinson that the Planning Commission would need to approve the change to Borough Council. Smith asked if there is a signage overlay district similar to the downtown overlay. Weibel mentioned that the A-Frame type signs can cause issues due to the depth of the sidewalks along the Downtown District. Weibel also noted that there may be legal issues with adding a signage overlay to the downtown. Weibel also discussed that the A-Frame signs have been discussed in other meetings in the past.

Smith asked Dickinson if there had been any discussions with the merchants about parking downtown. Dickinson responded that there have not been any discussions with the merchants. Smith then discussed the

inefficiency of some of the parking areas downtown. Smith believes that some of the lots could allow for much more parking. Smith noted that if the downtown lots were looked at holistically rather than on an individual basis, parking could potentially be increased by at least 25%. Weibel asked the Commission to review the Walker Parking Plan. The Commission agreed that they do not want to reach a point where parking becomes more problematic resulting in the potential need for parking permits.

ADJOURNEMENT

There being no further business Smith made the motion, seconded Stauffer to adjourn the meeting at 7:51 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Jordan Garner
Acting Secretary