



LANCASTER COUNTY
PLANNING

Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

Monday, January 12, 2026, at 2:30 p.m.

Lancaster County Government Center
150 North Queen Street, Lancaster, Pennsylvania
Rooms 102/104

Organizational Meeting

Mr. Clark called the meeting to order at 2:30 p.m.

Planning Commission Members

x Terry Martin, Chair	x Randy Good	x Joseph Rineer
v Ed Fisher, Vice Chair	x Jeb Musser	x John O. Yoder III
x Heather Zink, Secretary	v Gretchen Raad	x Bob Winegardner

x Present **v** Virtual attendee

Department Staff

Will Clark, John D. Hershey, Kip Van Blarcom, Nicole Deeley, Christine Le, Renee Addleman, Gwen Newell, Mike Domin, Mark Huber, Joella Neff, Aim Terranova, Trevor West, Brian Reid, Matt Hoyer, Faith Kelleher, Wren Citarella, Nick Shenk, and Jayline Cabrera Deaza were present.

Other

Gordon Hoover	Salisbury Township
Chris Slaymaker	Leacock Township
Jeff Swinehart	President & CEO, Lancaster Farmland Trust
Kevin Lynn	Lancaster City Resident
Mary Haverstick	Respect Farmland
Brian Youngerman	Mount Joy Borough Resident
Roy Zimmerman	Lancaster County Resident
Peter Martin	Earl/ East Earl Township Resident
Nelson Ginder	Rapho Township Resident
Colleen Bowden	Salisbury Township Resident
Tim Stuhldreher	Strong Towns Lancaster
Chris Reber	LNP
Claudia Shank	McNees Wallace & Nurick LLC
Tom Daniels	East Hempfield Township Resident
Tom Simpson	Lancaster City Resident
Kevin Baer	Lancaster County Ag Preserve
June Mengel	Lancaster County Ag Preserve
Nick Dennis	

Brenda Kauffman	Lancaster County Resident
Phillip A. Michael	Appel Yost LLP
David Eberly	Lancaster County Resident
Michelle Mercure	Millersville Borough Resident
Russell Pugh	West Lampeter Township Resident
Debbie Frantz	Manheim Township Resident
Andrew Miller	Mount Joy Township Resident
Esther Zimmerman	Warwick Township Resident
Ernest Schreiber	Lancaster Township Resident
Debbie Hess	Earl Township Resident
Michael Sensenig	Lancaster Township Resident
Bob Wenger	Terre Hill Borough Resident
Christian Hinojosa	Lancaster City Resident
Pamela Haver	Manheim Township Resident
Jane Clevenstine	Salisbury Township Resident
Alvin J. Stoltz	Salisbury Township Resident

A. Introduction of New LCPC Members

William T. Clark, III, Lancaster County Planning Department

Mr. Clark welcomed Mr. Rineer, representing the Southern Region of the County and Mr. Winegardner as an At-Large representative.

B. LCPC Officer Appointments

William T. Clark, III, Lancaster County Planning Department

Mr. Clark asked Mr. Musser to present the nominees. Mr. Musser stated the committee met in December and nominated Terry Martin as Chair, Ed Fisher as Vice-Chair, and Heather Zink as Secretary.

The Commission made a motion to appoint Terry Martin as Chair, Ed Fisher as Vice-Chair, and Heather Zink as Secretary. Mr. Martin abstained from voting. The motion carried.

Call to Order

Mr. Martin called the LCPC meeting to order.

Call to Audience

Mr. Martin stated he would like to discuss the Elanco Regional Comp Plan Meeting.

Approval of Minutes

The commission reviewed the minutes from its Monday, December 8, 2025, meeting.

Ms. Zink made a motion to approve the minutes as submitted. Mr. Good seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Presentations

A. **Executive Director's Report**

[0:05:37](#)

William T. Clark, III, Lancaster County Planning Department

Mr. Clark provided updates about the following items:

- Memorandum of Understanding – Website Update
- Summary of Subdivision and Land Development Reviews
- Removal of the interactive maps from the LCPC Packet
- Regional Comprehensive Plans
 - Elanco
 - Pequea Valley

New Business

A. **For Action**

[0:08:03](#)

Introduction

John D. Hershey, Lancaster County Planning Department

Mr. Hershey gave an overview of the following action items:

Community Planning & Ordinance Reviews (4)

1. **31-190**, East Lampeter Township – East Lampeter Township proposes a full Comprehensive Plan update.

Ms. Le gave an overview of the Comprehensive Plan update, recommending approval with the following comments:

Future Land Use, Villages, Agricultural Economy, Farmland Preservation

1. Continue inter-municipal, simplified zoning efforts with neighboring municipalities
2. Clarify specific development, redevelopment, and preservation efforts for the Ronks and Witmer villages
3. Ensure Growth Area Map and Future Land Use Map alignment
4. Integrate the Plain Sect community's changing, non-farm business needs in the Township's overall rural economy strategy
5. Coordinate agricultural economy and farmland preservation education and awareness efforts
6. Identify priority preservation areas to supplement already identified Growth Areas

Housing

1. Tie land use policies and housing diversification efforts with economic development opportunities, particularly in mixed-use areas and those with multi-modal transportation opportunities

2. Consider adaptive reuse policies that convert single-family homes into multi-family housing, without significantly altering neighborhood character in the R-2 District

Parks & Recreation

1. Address the Township's 83-acre parkland deficit with the addition of neighborhood and community parks
2. Include parcels for potential acquisition and future parkland development on the Official Map
3. Collaborate with the Conestoga River Club for water-based recreation activity development

Water & Sewer, Stormwater Management

1. Include future infrastructure, regional stormwater management, and flood mitigation projects on the Official Map
2. Collaborate with neighboring municipalities on water resource planning (e.g. Act 167 Plan)

Mr. Yoder made a motion to approve staff's recommendation for approval of CPO # 31-190 with comments. Mr. Good seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

2. **31-191**, East Lampeter Township – E.G. Stoltzfus Land LLC proposes to rezone two adjoining lots containing a total of 6.4 acres from the Agricultural (AG) district to the Village Residential (VR) district for residential development purposes.

Ms. Le gave an overview of the proposed rezoning, recommending approval.

Mr. Good made a motion to approve staff's recommendation for approval of CPO 31-191. Mr. Musser seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

3. **40-39**, Manheim Borough – The petitioner, Lancaster County Vacant Property Reinvestment Board, requests that the Lancaster County Planning Commission certify its determination of blighted conditions for the property located at 44 Crescent Drive in Manheim Borough.

Ms. Addleman gave an overview of the blighted property, recommending approval. Ms. Zink, as a member of the Lancaster County Vacant Property Reinvestment Board, provided additional details.

Mr. Yoder made a motion to approve staff's recommendation of approval of CPO # 40-39. Ms. Zink seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

4. **46-161**, Mount Joy Township – The petitioner, Elizabethtown Crossing Associates, LLC, is proposing amendments to the Mount Joy Township Zoning Ordinance related to Planned Mixed-Use Developments.

Ms. Addleman gave an overview of the proposed amendments, and shared the concerns raised during a Decembert municipal meeting, including woodland loss, additional traffic signalization, and inclusion of necessary buffers . She recommended disapproval with the following comments:

While some proposed amendments, such as allowing for increased dwelling units within planned mixed-use developments, align with places2040, permitting large-scale industrial uses within the MU Zoning District raises concern. Industrial buildings as large as 250,000 square feet are incompatible with this zoning district's intended purpose as a place for 'neighborhood-type character' via the mixing of retail, cultural, service, office, residential and institutional uses. If the Township decides these areas are appropriate for industrial development, uses currently permitted in its Light Industrial Zone (up to 50,000 square feet) could be of a more suitable scale.

As all proposed amendments relate directly to Planned Mixed-Use Developments, it is not recommended that any be implemented independently of the others.

Ms. Shank, representing the petitioner, addressed staff's comments, and provided additional background. She clarified that the industrial use would be required to be located on a property that is at least 40 acres and all of the land within the development must be within 2,500 feet of a Route 283 interchange. In addition, a Special Exception process would be required to ensure Industrial use compatibility.

The commission members discussed the concerns from Mount Joy Township and Mount Joy Borough with Mr. Miller, who works with the developer. They also shared their opinions regarding industrial uses adjacent to residential uses.

Mr. Musser asked Ms. Addleman for clarification regarding the decision to recommend disapproval. Ms. Addleman stated her concern was a misalignment of the proposed amendments with the purpose of the Mixed-Use zone that was provided by Mount Joy Township. She stated that she was not opposed to the location being utilized for some Industrial purposes, but her attempt to obtain the Township's opinion on these amendments was unsuccessful. Due to this, she found the proposed industrial use incompatible with the Township's Mixed Use Zoning District purpose.

Mr. Yoder stated Mount Joy Township recently rezoned a formerly Industrial zoned parcel in a similar location to Agricultural. He stated he agreed with Ms. Shank's points pertaining to parcel adjacency to Route 283.

The commission continued their discussion, including highlighting the expense involved in having residential uses adjacent to highways due to buffering costs.

Mr. Fisher suggested that the recommendation should limit the type of industrial uses allowed due to the proximity to existing and proposed residential uses.

Attendees, Russell Pugh and Brian Youngerman, expressed their concerns about the proposed amendment. Concerns included proposed service hours and loss of other existing zoning protections.

Mr. Yoder made a motion to table CPO # 46-161 to give the applicant a chance to revise the submission. Mr. Winegardner seconded the motion.

Ms. Shank stated that because these amendments have been scheduled for a public hearing with the Mount Joy Township Planning Commission, she would prefer an LCPC recommendation with comment instead of being tabled for a month.

Mr. Yoder revised the previous motion and made a motion to approve CPO # 46-161 with comment that they address the industrial types of uses and size. Mr. Winegardner seconded the motion.

Mr. Good requested that if the use of an industrial building is changed, they must have Special Exception approved by the Zoning Hearing Board. Mr. Fisher added Special Use.

Mr. Yoder revised the previous motion, and made a motion to approve CPO # 46-161 with following comments

- 1. The applicant addresses the industrial types of uses and size allowed.**
- 2. If the use of an industrial building is changed, they must have either Special Exception or Special Use approved by the Zoning Hearing Board.**

Mr. Winegardner seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Other Items

- 1. Places2040 Amendment**
Kip Van Blarcom, Lancaster County Planning Department

Mr. Van Blarcom gave an overview of the amendment, and a summary of public comments received prior to the meeting.

Mr. Fisher left the meeting at 5:02 p.m.

The following is a summary of public comments made during the meeting:

Gordon Hoover, Salisbury Township

I recommend the board postpone any approval of this plan, because several townships have not had an opportunity to solicit public comments. Salisbury Township came with a recommendation very late in this process, but we always intended to take this to the residents and have a public hearing.

The area we're proposing to include in the growth area is already served by infrastructure. To develop any other part of the township, we have to bring all the infrastructure in, which costs money. Salisbury Township has no real estate tax, so our options are limited.

Chris Slaymaker, Leacock Township

Leacock Township started this conversation almost a year ago at an advertised special meeting with the planning commission, zoning hearing board members, and the supervisors where we discussed our boundaries.

We have a lot of beautiful farmland we care about – but preserved farms are permanent, and we don't want to handcuff future generations. There's no intention to rezone anything in Leacock Township right now. We're really just looking at what's best for long term. So, we had a meeting with Farmland Trust, and with the Ag Preserve Board. We want to work on identifying the areas we'd like to preserve – and it's a lot of the township.

I support what Gordon said. If the board could delay for a while, that might give us some time to listen to our constituents. We have not talked to any of those property owners yet, and we need to. We also want to sit down with the Farmland Trust and pick some areas in the township that we can prioritize for preservation.

Jeff Swinehart, President and CEO, Lancaster Farmland Trust

Everyone at the Lancaster Farmland Trust understands there's a balance between preservation and allowing areas for growth.

This process may have been rushed a bit. There wasn't a lot of public input, so we're suggesting we postpone and allow some of that public process to play out. A lot of these expansions didn't have any data justification. I think it's in everyone's interest to analyze what the need is.

Let's identify priority areas within the municipality that we want to see firmly protected. Having said that, if municipalities are going to develop a farmland preservation plan, they have to fund it, too. I think there's a more mutually beneficial path if we focus on these key areas and how we fund their preservation.

Although Lancaster Farmland Trust does not protect land inside of growth areas, there's nothing legally preventing us from protecting any piece of land that a property owner wants to preserve.

Jeb Musser, Lancaster Farmland Trust and Lancaster County Planning Commission

I support Jeff and Gordon's comments. It's been 30 years since we took a look at growth boundaries, but that should not be a reason to rush into this.

I don't think growth areas should be used as an anti-preservation tool. I think they should be put in place where growth is meant to occur.

I also just want to clarify something that is often misunderstood. When a piece of property is preserved, people think it can't change at all. That's not true. To Kip's point earlier, agriculture is always changing. We intentionally craft our easements to allow for a wide variety of agricultural uses. Yes, we're limiting subdivision rights, but we try to keep it as open-ended as possible.

Terry Martin

All right, LCPC members. Any questions for the speakers?

Jeff Swinehart

I mentioned municipalities being willing to fund farmland preservation plans. That can happen in several ways. The elected body could use general operating dollars, secure a bond, or pass an ordinance for an open space referendum. That way, the voters in that municipality get to vote on whether or not they want to fund farmland preservation.

Terry Martin

Needed to be said, thank you. Anything else from the Commission?

Randy Good

When we do develop properties, we really need to look at smaller lots and higher density. I know that scares people. When you have smaller lots, you have fewer utilities to maintain, fewer streets, and fewer feet of sewer line. So, a municipality will get more revenue per acre. That's important.

I recommend setting a target of July 1, 2027, to be adopting this. Let the department come up with a plan after talking to municipalities about what the schedule should be. I think that gives time for everybody to look at the proposals, provide feedback, and develop a good plan.

Terry Martin

For public comment, I'm going to start with Kevin Lynn from Lancaster City.

Kevin Lynn, Lancaster City resident

I'm the Executive Director of the Institute for Sound Public Policy. I'm also a member of Respect Farmland, a watchdog group for Lancaster County.

Over the past decade, Lancaster County has experienced steady but modest population growth. From 2015 to 2025, our county added 27,000 residents, growing from roughly 540,000 to 566,000. That's an average annual growth rate of just 0.5%, or about 2,700 people per year. To put this in perspective, Lancaster is one of only 23 Pennsylvania counties experiencing any growth at all.

The current push for multi-family development appears particularly disconnected from these demographic realities. We're seeing a concerning trend of overbuilding that exceeds actual demand. This oversupply will inevitably lead to increased vacancies and downward pressure on rents.

The market will self-correct, providing more affordable options without sacrificing our community character. Looking forward, demographic projections suggest

this modest trend will continue. Our growth comes primarily from natural growth, particularly our Amish population. Given these realities, the argument for aggressive development doesn't hold up. Smart, targeted development can accommodate modest growth while preserving what makes Lancaster County special.

Slow growth allows existing infrastructure, roads, schools, water systems, and sewers to serve the population without constant expansion. Municipalities can maintain and improve what they have, rather than scrambling to build new capacity.

This preserves the rural character that makes Lancaster County distinctive and maintains the agricultural economy that's central to the region's identity. Lastly, slow growth means fiscal stability. Communities avoid the growth Ponzi scheme.

With new developments, upfront revenues mask long-term maintenance costs. Slow growth allows for more sustainable budgeting and prevents the fiscal strain of constantly expanding services.

Mary Haverstick, Respect Farmland

I'm here for Respect Farmland, a citizens group. None of us are paid. We are not even a nonprofit group. We don't solicit any money – we just volunteer our time, because we care about the county.

Respect Farmland wants to slow down this process, because citizens have not yet been fully heard. I think we just saw that happen in Earl Township, which made a wise decision to step back. I was at that meeting, and there were 100 people in that room who did not want to see these boundaries expanded. Most of them were from Earl Township, and most of them were farmers.

I do think that we need to get people, the average citizen, to come in here – the person who has lived in Lancaster County all their life and loves the quality of it. The culture we have here is quickly eroding. Anytime the news reports a farm being developed, there are comments in the hundreds, and they're all on the side of slowing this down.

Bob, you took some heat but voted to hold off, and I commend you for that. I think that Leacock, Salisbury Township, and [West?] Earl should also put on the brakes and revisit this issue with proper public comment and proper notification.

The affected farmers didn't get a letter in their mailbox letting them know that the boundary was going to change regarding their property – and that could hurt their financial plans. Some of these people could have been considering preservation for the next generation, or maybe next year or 10 years from now. Those people can't make that decision now.

Kip said we're anti-growth and we care about farmland. I would like to point out that we've given our stamp of approval to the Willow Valley skyscraper, Stehli Silk Mill, St. Joseph's Hospital rehab, and Route 30 where they're redeveloping a dead mall into apartments. These are all growth projects. Not all growth has to take a farm!

Our current growth boundaries are not exhausted. We've done a lot of work on Lancaster County's population numbers. These growth area expansions are based on data from 2018. We came in and said, we think your numbers are too high.

They're saying we have to make room for industry. Farming is an industry – and you are minimizing the area for farming when you do that. Who is having children in Lancaster County? It's the Amish. They want to keep their farms. They don't come to many of these meetings, but we try to give them a voice.

In summation, we need to be thinking about our population. Lancaster County will not be growing at all much beyond 2040. In fact, we could go into negative growth. That is what is happening in Pennsylvania right now.

John Yoder

I do need to correct one thing. The land included in the Mount Joy Township is not farmland.

Brian Youngerman, Mount Joy Borough resident

I'm a councilperson in Mount Joy, but I'm not here to represent Mount Joy Borough Council. I do represent the interests of my constituents who are fed up with buildings and warehouses and housing developments which bring higher school taxes, traffic issues, and destruction of the Lancaster County way of life.

Places2040 was so forward-thinking, so futuristic, so well thought out and planned that it had to be revised after about seven and a half years. I understand the 10-year statewide requirement for review, but I'm a little fuzzy on the timing of your amendment draft.

I don't think there's been enough time for public comment. The claim that you involved all affected communities in the *places2040* amendment is not true. You never involved Mount Joy Borough, which is affected by the increase in developable acreage in Rapho Township. It's probably affected more than Rapho itself. I think you should extend the comment period, because the minimum 45 days is not enough. I suggest 90 or 180 days.

I think the amendment planning process is poisoned by the presence of individuals with a professional conflict of interest. There's a gentleman on the Manheim Township comp plan committee who works for the J.C. Snavely and Son building supply company. Ben Bamford, who was a member of this commission, routinely approved reviews to promote the development of homes and properties in the community.

Terry Martin

We actually have a real estate agent on our commission.

Brian Youngerman

Yes, Gretchen Raad who lists properties in developments like Wynfield at Millersville.

Terry Martin

What does this have to do with this vote today?

Brian Youngerman

I think it says that this is an untrustworthy process.

Terry Martin

Correct me if I'm wrong, Will, but the townships made these decisions to expand growth area boundaries. They brought it to the County Planning Commission for its recommendations. The department actually did ask the municipalities to withdraw some of the numbers they proposed. The county is not going to vote on this until all the municipalities are on board with it.

Heather Zink

Just to clarify. When you said Mount Joy Borough was never involved in the process, every municipality was contacted to participate in the department's regional meetings. If municipalities choose not to attend, that is on the municipality, not on our staff or the Planning Commission.

Brian Youngerman

I think these regional plans are not really driven by the people in the municipality. I have a feeling the process is just driven by the planners.

Gretchen Raad

I want to rebut the comment that was made by Mr. Youngerman. I reject any insinuation that I would have any type of conflict of interest when I vote on something. With any type of development where I had any interest, like the Crossgates community, I've recused myself. The Winfield development was developed by Garman Builders, and I have no affiliation with that, so I want to set the record straight.

Brian Youngerman

I did find other members who were real estate agents who voted on the reviews and then sold properties through them or their firm. But I'm also talking about the larger picture, the regional comp plans which promote and encourage the development of properties throughout Lancaster County.

Roy Zimmerman

I submitted a comment that I'd like my farm to be included in the Warwick UGA, but I saw that the township declined to include it. I appreciate what this board does and the time you put in.

Peter Martin, Earl/ East Earl Resident

I live at 538 Overlys Grove Road. Our farm is split between Earl and East Earl. My parents decided 25 years ago to preserve their farm. An accounting firm told them there are tax benefits to preserving your farm, but you should wait until your children are over 18 and you don't have dependents. So, they waited 25 years to preserve their farm.

What if they were waiting to preserve their farm for 25 years, and one day, they discovered they're in an Urban Growth Area, and they're not able to preserve

their farm? This process was intentionally deceptive. There were no legal ads in the newspaper. There was nothing in the township's newsletter. On the township website, all I could find was a sentence that the supervisors discussed urban growth boundaries.

I would really urge the board to put on the brakes and let the public know about these plans. Maybe we could have a meeting and share the plans and show people. What's the intended use within these boundaries? Industrial? Residential?

Nelson Ginder, Rapho Township

We're opening up too many acres. It's almost like an invitation for everybody to come in and build warehouses. Rapho has a big triangle for growth, and it's all been used up in a short time. Is there really a need?

Colleen Bowden, Salisbury Township

I work with youth, and I hear what they're doing at their jobs, like serving in local restaurants. They overhear what visitors say, and they come for the farms. I don't understand taking any of that away. With growth comes changes in traffic and roads and the need for more infrastructure.

Families need homes that are affordable in our area. Are we making room for businesses and warehouses or houses to support families to stay here?

Tim Stuhldreher, Strong Towns Lancaster

Strong Towns is in favor of incremental growth, ADUs, missing middle housing, and mixed-use development. We are here in support of Lancaster Farmland Trust and Respect Farmland. We have concerns when large amounts of rural land are planned for growth. A better approach is redevelopment that promotes walking and transit. I was encouraged to hear about the need for smaller lot sizes. I was also happy to hear the two township representatives talk about slowing down and hearing from their residents.

Will Clark

Growth boundaries were not reviewed as part of the *places2040* process. We first started looking at these boundaries in 2023, working with municipalities. We had several meetings in different regions so people could hear what their neighbors were doing.

We revised the *places2040* growth projections from 100,000 new residents countywide down to about 60,000, due to changing projections from the U.S. Census – and that could possibly change again.

I will take the blame for not getting enough public input in this process. Our analysis showed that we have enough buildable land inside growth areas – if we build at the right densities. But maybe not for industrial use, because they need larger lots.

We did not anticipate significant land being added to the growth areas – and most municipalities felt the same way. So, we were caught off guard when a few municipalities proposed larger changes.

My recommendation is to remove the regions currently going through a comprehensive plan process with us – Pequea Valley and Elanco. We would remove these regions from the *places2040* amendment. Then we would redo the 45-day public comment period for the other municipalities.

Several additional municipalities are thinking about new comprehensive plans, as well. Should we wait for them to finish that process? In the future, we probably won't consider making changes in growth areas unless the changes are first made in local or regional comprehensive plans. These changes would also have to go through the zoning process as well, so it's clear whether development is being proposed now or in the future.

Talking about the preservation side, we're already starting to talk to the Farmland Trust and Ag Preserve Board about the possibility of defining "preservation areas," so I think that's a great compromise.

Randy Good

Communication is probably a bigger issue than what's happening with Urban Growth Areas. The requirement that we advertise in the paper has been discussed for years.

I think we need to give this time. Let the Planning Department look into how we're going to communicate so everybody gets the message. We need the support of the people – the supervisors, the commissioners, the borough councilmen that are going to help to make it happen.

Bob Winegardner

I understand the desire for public input. We do the best that we can with the money we have to advertise. But it is also your responsibility to make sure you stay in touch. Make sure you're at our township meetings, and not just when it's raining.

Will Clark

Bob reminded me of one other thing. Ernie Schreiber is on our "Partners for Place" mailing list, so he's been included in all the discussions we've had about growth areas. But I admit we could enhance the process through Facebook, etc.

Terry Martin

So, Will, if we don't move forward with this proposal today, how much time would you need to address the concerns that have been raised?

Will Clark

Most of the public outreach is going to be up to the municipalities. We're having discussions and providing our input, but municipalities are making these boundary decisions.

Chris Reber, LNP

There are now maps on the website that show the proposed changes in each affected township. At last month's meeting, you said they weren't being shared with the public.

Kip Van Blarcom

At that time, we were still discussing these changes with municipalities, so we weren't sure they were ready to share it yet. As planners, we've found that there are drawbacks no matter how the process unfolds. Either we share information as soon as we have it, or we wait until it's ready. Either way opens us up to criticism.

Chris Reber

So, what changed? Why are the maps now available? When were they posted, and why were they made available?

Kip Van Blarcom

With any process we manage, we need to have some private discussions with stakeholders about what is feasible and what might work. There's a fair and right time to share that information with everyone. As Will said, we didn't anticipate a lot of changes in growth area boundaries. Most municipalities aren't changing much at all. As the process progressed, however, some of them took a closer look at the maps and decided to take a different approach.

Will Clark

I think the answer, Chris, is that we added the maps to the website because of the comments we heard at the December meeting. But you're right, we did not push out another press release saying the maps were available.

Terry Martin

How does the commission feel?

Bob Winegardner

What are our choices?

Mr. Good

I move that Lancaster County Planning staff come back to us within 60 days with a long-term plan to get this accomplished with the municipalities.

Heather Zink

I'll second it.

Terry Martin

Motion has been properly made by Randy, seconded by Heather. Any additional discussion?

Bob Winegardner

Are you saying that we're going to have to redo our plan in 60 days?

Randy Good

Planning staff needs to come back and lay out a timeline to complete its work on the growth area boundaries.

It's going to be more difficult for some of the areas that are adding more land.

Will Clark

We could go with a more piecemeal approach or continue with the countywide approach. Should we wait until Pequea Valley and Elanco adopt their comp plans?

Randy Good

Different municipalities amend and adopt their zoning ordinances at different times, so I'm not sure why we'd expect everybody to adopt this amendment at the same time. Adamstown has no changes, so it's simple. But it's more involved for West Donegal.

Bob Winegardner

Earl has already spent 2 years on this and that effort was shut down. I'm not sure what we can ask people to do in 60 days.

Terry Martin

It's a reboot. We're going from January to March to make sure this process is communicated to everybody in the county.

Will Clark

I'm going to bring back a proposal to the March meeting to say this is the path forward.

Heather Zink

I want to thank the Lancaster County Planning Department staff for all of the work they've done to this point. I have personally attended just about every regional meeting for my region, and it would have been nice to see more municipalities participate – especially the ones that are now saying we weren't involved in these regional meetings.

Jeb Musser

I don't represent a specific municipality. There are a handful of us on this commission who are at-large members representing certain countywide interests, whether it be real estate, etc. The County Commissioners made it a priority to have someone from agriculture and farmland preservation appointed to this commission, so we're definitely thinking about farmland and the rural side of things.

Terry Martin

I'm from Caernarvon Township, and I don't think you could challenge Caernarvon's commitment to preservation – literally because we're a landfill community, and we have the resources. But people need to put themselves in our position as municipal officials.

We rezoned some land because of pressure from people who live across from the landfill. If you check the deeds, who owns these properties? Stoltzfus, King,

Lapp, Martin, Zimmerman, Riehl – Amish farmers coming to us and saying, if you don't give us a place where we can employ our kids, they're going to move out of the county.

So, keep that in mind when you hear criticisms of us trying to create an environment where we can still keep the Amish and Mennonites in this community. There are a lot of local farm businesses that have outrun the farms. These are some of the pressures we face in the east end of the county.

Terry Martin

Motion was properly made by Randy, seconded by Heather. All those in favor of holding our breath for 60 days while we get a recommendation from Lancaster County Planning Department staff, please say aye. Those opposed? Motion passed.

Mr. Good moved that Lancaster County Planning staff come back to us within 60 days with a long-term plan to get this accomplished with the municipalities. Ms. Zink seconded the motion. The motion carried.

B. For Information

3:05:20

Community Planning & Ordinance Reviews (5)

1. **1-57**, Adamstown Borough – The petitioner, Adamstown Borough, proposes to amend its Zoning Ordinance to revise or insert definitions, to provide regulations governing short-term rentals and to revise regulations governing signs.
2. **19-82**, Earl Township – The petitioner, Earl Township, proposes to amend the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (SALDO) to include the execution of a required Developer's Agreement as a condition of the Township's review and approval of preliminary and final plans.
3. **26-54**, Ephrata Borough – The petitioner, Ephrata Borough, is proposing to amend its Zoning Ordinance to define and regulate Smoke Shops and Tobacco Shops, and to revise regulations pertaining to Medical Marijuana Dispensaries and Short-Term Rentals.
4. **27-129**, Ephrata Township – The petitioner, Ephrata Township, proposes to amend its Zoning Ordinance to provide regulations for data centers and data center accessory uses, and to revise existing regulations for animals and animal shelters.
39-288, Manheim Township – The petitioner, Manheim Township, proposes to create a codified code that reflects the updates of four land use ordinances: 1) the Zoning Ordinance, 2) the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (SALDO), 3) the Floodplain Ordinance, and 4) the Stormwater Management Ordinance.
5. **1-57**, Adamstown Borough – The petitioner, Adamstown Borough, proposes to amend its Zoning Ordinance to revise or insert definitions, to provide regulations governing short-term rentals and to revise regulations governing signs.

Subdivision & Land Development Items (25)

1. **71-94-5**, Weber Tracts, Ephrata Township
2. **73-88-1**, Steve M. Ebersol, Salisbury Township
3. **75-366-3**, 236 Cut Road, Salisbury Township
4. **76-370-2**, 550 Sandmine Road, Salisbury Township
5. **78-22-6**, Level Edge Lot 3, Eden Township & Quarryville Borough
6. **78-415-3**, Clark Associates – Storage Building, East Lampeter Township
7. **79-452-2B**, Pennsylvania Classics AC, Penn Township
8. **83-106-4**, Overlook Estates, Ephrata Borough & Ephrata Township
9. **83-159-7E**, Willow Valley Communities Southpointe at Lakes Expansion, West Lampeter Township
10. **84-146-4**, Mt. Joy Poultry Remodel for Noah W. Kreider & Sons, LLP., Rapho Township
11. **85-171-2**, Cassel Signs, Penn Township
12. **90-217-1R**, Susan R. Friedman and Helen K. & Stephen J. Najarian, Manheim Township
13. **92-323-1**, Robert M. Homan, III, Brecknock Township
14. **94-107-2**, Enos S. Lapp, Jr., Little Britain Township
15. **96-166-1**, LASA – Blue Rock Water Resource Recovery Facility, Manor Township
16. **12-54-1H**, Ebenezer Holdings, LP, East Earl Township
17. **19-42-2A**, Revised Final LD & Add-On Plan for Penn Station Townhomes, Penn Township
18. **22-51-1**, Joy Christian Fellowship, West Cocalico Township
19. **25-60**, Proposed Convenience Store with Fuel Dispensing Facilities, Quarryville Borough
20. **25-61**, 175 River Hill Road, Conestoga Township
21. **25-62**, 913 Wheatland Avenue, Lancaster City
22. **25-63**, 588 Owl Bridge Road, Manor Township
23. **25-64**, Paul D. Weaver Dairy Expansion, West Cocalico Township
24. **25-65**, EKR Properties, LLC (Stable Hollow Construction), Rapho Township
25. **25-66**, 538 S. Shirk Road, Upper Leacock Township

Other Business

[3:06:15](#)

- A. Mr. Martin commented on the low public participation for the Elanco plan and refuted comments about the lack of advertising. The meeting was advertised
- B. **LCPC Appointments to Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) and Transportation Technical Advisory Committee (TTAC)**
Terry Martin

Mr. Martin appointed the members to serve on the MPO and TTAC as follows:

MPO
Ed Fisher
Jeb Musser
Gretchen Raad

TTAC
Terry Martin
Randy Good
Heather Zink

Joseph Rineer
Bob Winegardner
John Yoder

John Yoder - Alternate

Public Comment

No one from the audience provided any additional comments.

Adjournment

Ms. Zink made a motion to adjourn. Mr. Musser seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously, and the meeting adjourned at 5:40 p.m.

Link to recorded meeting: <https://vimeo.com/1153962042?fl=tl&fe=ec>

Please note: This meeting was recorded to capture the full discussion of the items above. For brevity, minutes have been simplified to focus on action items and key points in the discussion.