

# Civic Engagement Report

## Phase 2

*Spring 2016 – Fall 2017*



*This page left intentionally blank*

# Acknowledgments

## Prepared by

Lancaster County Planning Commission  
Lancaster, Pennsylvania  
December 2017

## Lancaster County Planning Commission

James R. Cowhey, AICP, Executive Director

### **places2040** PROJECT MANAGEMENT

Scott W. Standish, Director for Countywide Planning

### **CIVIC ENGAGEMENT REPORT TEAM**

Emma C. Hamme AICP, Senior Countywide Planner  
Kip Van Blarcom, AICP, Senior Countywide Planner  
Marie R. Quigg, Graphic Arts Specialist

*This page left intentionally blank*

# Table of Contents

Acknowledgments .....	i
<b>Background .....</b>	<b>1</b>
What's in This Report? .....	1
Civic Engagement Strategy .....	2
<b>What We Heard .....</b>	<b>9</b>
Phase 2 Summary .....	9
Community Conversations (Coalition for Smart Growth) .....	14
Comprehensive Online Survey – Phase 2 .....	20
Regional Municipal Meetings – Fall 2016 .....	22
Focus Groups (Partners for Place) .....	25
Functional Element Meetings .....	30
Other Stakeholder Meetings .....	33
Regional Municipal Meetings – Fall 2017 .....	38

# BACK- GROUND



# What's in This Report?

This report summarizes the input gathered during the second phase of the plan between spring 2016 and fall 2017. In phase 1, we asked county residents what matters to them. In phase 2, we identified common themes and priorities from phase 1 and presented them back to the community. We asked stakeholders to confirm these priorities, then started to identify opportunities and solutions for key issues.

## BACKGROUND

### Civic Engagement Strategy

- Explains the three goals of this effort – awareness, education, and engagement – and estimates the number of participants who were involved.

## WHAT WE HEARD

### Phase 2 Summary

- Lists the priorities identified in phase 1, summarizes what people said about these priorities in phase 2, and discusses new input received during phase 2.

### Community Conversations (Coalition for Smart Growth)

- Outlines what participants said at five meetings cosponsored by LCPC and the Coalition for Smart Growth in fall 2016, including the results of a paper survey handed out at these meetings.

### Comprehensive Online Survey – Phase 2

- Summarizes the results from the three exercises in this survey. [Note: A separate, more detailed report about this survey is available.]

### Regional Municipal Meetings – Fall 2016

- Compiles the results of five meetings that LCPC staff held for municipal elected officials and staff in fall 2016.

### Focus Groups (Partners for Place)

- Shares input received at meetings focusing on five of the subject areas included in the Lancaster County: A Changing Place report: Where we live, where we work, etc.

### Functional Element Meetings

- Discusses issues and opportunities raised during a series of meetings focusing on four of the “functional elements” of the existing Lancaster County Comprehensive Plan: plans focusing on water resources, transportation, housing, and green infrastructure.

### Other Stakeholder Meetings

- Includes results from meetings with individual municipalities, as well as a wide-ranging series of meetings with different professionals, associations, cultural groups, etc.

### Regional Municipal Meetings – Fall 2017

- Presents the thoughts and ideas shared at four meetings that LCPC staff held for municipal elected officials and staff in fall 2017.

# Civic Engagement Strategy

Before considering the results of the second round of civic engagement, it's important to understand the guiding principles of the [places2040](#) planning process:

- Emphasize a placemaking approach;
- Involve all segments of community;
- Integrate previous plans into one;
- Focus on countywide issues;
- Provide a framework for regional plans;
- Build on past planning efforts and principles;
- Coordinate with the region, state, and nation; and
- Articulate a 25-year vision.

The process consisted of four steps: planning to plan, taking stock, framing the future, and creating the plan. The first step was largely an internal one, preparing LCPC staff for the work ahead. The second step included an intensive phase 1 civic engagement effort and a report (*Lancaster County: A Changing*

*Place, 2000–2015*) documenting how the county has changed in recent years.

The third step – framing the future – included the phase 2 civic engagement process outlined in this report. Phase 2 was designed to continue the dialogue and refine the priorities that Lancaster County residents identified in phase 1. A growth tracking analysis contained in a separate report called *Lancaster County: Growing & Preserving, 2002–2015* also helped to inform this phase. The fourth and final step was to create the plan, while continuing to analyze data and share ideas with the community.

Civic engagement for [places2040](#) has had three interrelated goals: to build awareness, educate, and engage the public.

## Awareness

The intent of this goal was to inform the public about the planning process. During this phase, LCPC reached out through various media, including newspaper, television, radio, magazines, and websites. We also maintained an online social media presence.

### ADVERTISING

*Fig Lancaster*. Social Media Marketing Package, issue 41, p. 12-13. (Spring 2016). [https://issuu.com/moxiehouse/docs/fl\\_spring\\_2016\\_issuu](https://issuu.com/moxiehouse/docs/fl_spring_2016_issuu)

*Fig Lancaster*. Advertisement, issue 44, p. 78. (Holiday 2016). [http://digital.figlancaster.com/holiday\\_2016/#/78](http://digital.figlancaster.com/holiday_2016/#/78)

Engle Printing and Publishing Co. (Includes *Merchandise*, *Pennysaver*, and *Advertiser* in 13 Lancaster County regions, plus [www.townlively.com](http://www.townlively.com) website). Advertisement. (November 2016).

*La Voz Lancaster*. Advertisement, p. 12. (August 17, 2017).

*La Voz Lancaster*. Advertisement, p. 10. (October 19, 2017).

*Fig Lancaster*. Advertisement, issue 47, p.8. (Fall 2017). [http://digital.figlancaster.com/Fall\\_2017/index.php#/8](http://digital.figlancaster.com/Fall_2017/index.php#/8)

Greater Elizabethtown Area 2017 Community and Visitors Guide. Advertisement provided free of charge by Elizabethtown Chamber of Commerce. Update and reprint of 2016 promotion. (2017). [https://issuu.com/engleprintingandpublishing/docs/ecg\\_2016-17](https://issuu.com/engleprintingandpublishing/docs/ecg_2016-17)

### PRINT AND ONLINE MEDIA COVERAGE

*Framing the Future: Places2040*. TV feature, Blue Ridge Cable (May 23, 2016).

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9u-DYBwLT7U>

*Share your vision for this county that we know and love.*

LNP. (October 16, 2016). [http://lancasteronline.com/opinion/columnists/share-your-vision-for-this-county-that-we-know-and/article\\_802cf54a-917b-11e6-b3fb-73531a688a9b.html](http://lancasteronline.com/opinion/columnists/share-your-vision-for-this-county-that-we-know-and/article_802cf54a-917b-11e6-b3fb-73531a688a9b.html)

*Join the conversation about Lancaster County's future!*

County Connection (Lancaster County employee newsletter). (November 2016).

*Lancaster County farm country endangered by wasteful land use in urban growth areas.* LNP. (November 20, 2016).

[http://lancasteronline.com/insider/lancaster-county-farm-country-endangered-by-wasteful-land-use-in/article\\_558b6780-adce-11e6-9710-9b8c93210d61.html](http://lancasteronline.com/insider/lancaster-county-farm-country-endangered-by-wasteful-land-use-in/article_558b6780-adce-11e6-9710-9b8c93210d61.html)

*Difficult decisions must be made if Lancaster County is to ward off the specter of urban sprawl.* LNP. (November 28, 2016).

[http://lancasteronline.com/opinion/editorials/difficult-decisions-must-be-made-if-lancaster-county-is-to/article\\_badeed30-b325-11e6-97be-7bf8e9806db5.html](http://lancasteronline.com/opinion/editorials/difficult-decisions-must-be-made-if-lancaster-county-is-to/article_badeed30-b325-11e6-97be-7bf8e9806db5.html)

*Take the survey, continue the conversation, and stay engaged!*

County Connection, Lancaster County employee newsletter. (December 2016).

*Countians invited to engage in planning for Lancaster's future.*

Engle Printing and Publishing / [townlively.com](http://www.townlively.com) – select publications. (December/January 2017). <http://www.townlively.com/countians-invited-to-engage-in-planning-for-lancasters-future/>

Lancaster County Planning Commission. Smart Talk, WITF radio. (December 2, 2016). <http://www.witf.org/smart-talk/2016/12/smart-talk-lancaster-county-planning-holiday-cocktails.php>

How should Lancaster County grow? Share your opinion in Planning Commission's online survey. LNP. (December 21, 2016). [http://lancasteronline.com/news/local/how-should-lancaster-county-grow-share-your-opinion-in-planning/article\\_bc2690f0-c6dd-11e6-bdca-a326a64d3c4c.html](http://lancasteronline.com/news/local/how-should-lancaster-county-grow-share-your-opinion-in-planning/article_bc2690f0-c6dd-11e6-bdca-a326a64d3c4c.html)

County planners seek input on plan to accommodate growth. LNP. (February 18, 2017). [http://lancasteronline.com/alwayslancaster/county-planners-seek-input-on-plan-to-accommodate-growth/article\\_e94513ce-f39f-11e6-aa87-07dfab5ecef.html](http://lancasteronline.com/alwayslancaster/county-planners-seek-input-on-plan-to-accommodate-growth/article_e94513ce-f39f-11e6-aa87-07dfab5ecef.html)

Public input adds to county comprehensive plan. LNP. (May 14, 2017). [http://lancasteronline.com/insider/lancaster-county-must-up-its-game-to-save-farms-woods/article\\_0114524a-3742-11e7-9740-0b4faf02c628.html](http://lancasteronline.com/insider/lancaster-county-must-up-its-game-to-save-farms-woods/article_0114524a-3742-11e7-9740-0b4faf02c628.html)

We need to be smart about growth in Lancaster County or our county will be unrecognizable in the future. LNP. (May 21, 2017). [http://lancasteronline.com/opinion/editorials/we-need-to-be-smart-about-growth-in-lancaster-county/article\\_6fe4decc-3cd0-11e7-b175-3723f06ebfb4.html](http://lancasteronline.com/opinion/editorials/we-need-to-be-smart-about-growth-in-lancaster-county/article_6fe4decc-3cd0-11e7-b175-3723f06ebfb4.html)

County Planner Promotes Higher Housing Density. The Elizabethtown Advocate. (September 7, 2017).

## How many people did we reach?

Media Outlet	Estimated Audience
LNP and <a href="http://lancasteronline.com">lancasteronline.com</a>	1,000,000 people
Engle Printing and Publishing Co., Inc. (Merchandiser, Pennysaver, and Advertiser in 13 Lancaster County regions) and <a href="http://townlively.com">townlively.com</a>	153,763 households
Blue Ridge Cable	40,000 household subscribers (daily news reaches 5,000–9,000 viewers)
WITF Smart Talk	15,000 listeners
Fig Lancaster	160,000+ print readers 60,400+ online readers
La Voz Lancaster	12,000 readers
County of Lancaster	1,900 employees

## WEBSITE AND SOCIAL MEDIA

The plan website – [places2040.com](http://places2040.com) – was the main public face of the plan. Between March 2016 and September 2017, there were about 2,190 unique visitors to the website.

Social media platforms may have reached a smaller audience than other print and online media, but were a helpful way to keep the public apprised of planning-related updates.

### Social Media Followers (October 2017)

Platform	Followers
<b>All Platforms</b>	<b>823</b>
Facebook	501
Instagram	169
Twitter	153

## Education

In addition to letting residents know about the planning process, LCPC's outreach efforts included an educational component. The goal was to help the public understand the challenges and opportunities we face as county residents, and why we need to plan for the future.

One of the highlights of phase 2 was an event called *Framing Our Future*, which was held at Brick Gables in Warwick Township (Lititz area) in May 2017. At this event, former Maryland Governor Parris Glendening of Smart Growth America spoke about sense of place and urban revitalization, as well as the fiscal impacts of development patterns. LCPC staff then presented key findings and priorities of the civic engagement process, as well as three scenarios (options) for future growth.

Working with videographer Make Films, LCPC created a series of video vignettes featuring staff and board members from LCPC's Partners for Place. In the vignettes, participants reflect on the public input that had been gathered by that point in the process and comment on how the mission of their organization relates to [places2040](#).

Staff also engaged certified Spanish-language translators to translate key [places2040](#) documents. A Spanish-language survey was also created, although the results had not been processed in time to be included in this civic engagement report.

In March 2017, staff released a report called *Lancaster County: Growing & Preserving, 2002–2015*. This report provides data that measures growth (residential and non-residential development) and preservation of agricultural, natural, and park land. This data is then compared with Lancaster County's adopted growth management targets and policies to see how much progress has been made.

### Videos

- *What We've Heard* film featuring Partners for Place (November 2016)
- Vignettes featuring Partners for Place (March 2017)
- Live video recording of the Framing Our Future event with Gov. Parris Glendening (May 10, 2017)

### Reports and Other Documents

- *Lancaster County: Growing & Preserving, 2002 – 2015* (March 2017)
- "Priorities for Lancaster County's Future" brochure (update – May 2017)

### Spanish-Language Materials

- *places2040: Un Plan para el Condado de Lancaster, PA* (May 2017)
- *Prioridades para el Futuro del Condado de Lancaster* (May 2017)

## Engagement

Civic engagement was a cornerstone of the planning process for [places2040](#), because it wouldn't be a meaningful process without giving residents an opportunity to discuss their hopes and concerns for the future. In phase 1, Lancaster County residents were asked to identify their priorities for the future. In phase 2, they were asked which of these priorities they wanted to address first, and what approach they wanted to take in pursuing these priorities.

LCPC and its partners offered many opportunities for residents to provide input both in person and online. LCPC staff held a second series of regional municipal meetings in November 2016, focus group meetings with our Partners for Place in May/June 2016, and a series of meetings focusing on each of the functional elements of the current comprehensive plan in spring 2017. Staff also met individually with several organizations, agencies, and community groups. In addition, the Coalition for Smart Growth hosted a second round of "Community Conversations" in October/November 2016, as well as five targeted key stakeholder meetings in June 2016 and March 2017.

Online during this phase, the public was invited to participate in two surveys: the communities mini-survey and the Comprehensive Online Survey – Phase 2.

### IN-PERSON ENGAGEMENT

Phase 2 meetings and events focused on reporting phase 1 results back to the public and providing an update on the planning process. Informal discussions sometimes followed these presentations. LCPC staff, members of the Coalition for Smart Growth, and professional facilitators also led structured discussions with Partners for Place, the general public, and targeted stakeholders.

### Subject Area Experts

Functional element meetings (4)

### Partners for Place

Partners for Place regular meetings

Focus groups (5)

Lancaster General Health / Penn Medicine

Lancaster County Conservancy

Lancaster County Chamber of Commerce & Industry

Lancaster County Agricultural Council

Boroughs Collaborative (Economic Development Company of

Lancaster County)

### Municipal Officials and Staff

Fall 2016 regional municipal meetings (5)

Fall 2017 regional municipal meetings (4)

Municipal boards and planning commissions

Municipal staff (CSG)

### Other Stakeholder Groups

Planning professionals (CSG)

Builders and developers (CSG)

American Institute of Architects (AIA)

Plain Sect

Latino Community

Lancaster Bar Association

Leadership Lancaster

Lancaster County Agricultural Preserve Board

Harrisburg Area Community College (HACC) staff

Design professionals (CSG)

Education community (CSG)

## General Public

Community Conversations (CSG) (5)  
Framing Our Future event

## ONLINE ENGAGEMENT

Comprehensive Online Survey – Phase 2 (MetroQuest)  
Online Mini-Survey: Communities

## PARTICIPANTS

During phase 1, roughly **4,265** people participated in an event or online survey, while an estimated **2,510** provided some form of feedback.

Phase 2 civic engagement efforts – both in person and online – reached a total of **3,785** people. Of these, about **911** people attended an event in person, and approximately **575** of them provided some form of feedback. About **2,874** people visited an online survey, and about **2,036** of them provided feedback. In total, about **2,611** people provided some form of feedback during phase 2. It's important to note that these numbers do not include several thousand people who likely learned about [places2040](#) through print or social media.

Combining phases 1 and 2, about **8,050** people attended an event or visited online, of which an estimated **5,121** provided some form of feedback.

### Phase 1

	<i>Attended / Visited</i>	<i>Provided Feedback</i>
<b>Total</b>	<b>4,265</b>	<b>2,510</b>

### Phase 2

	<i>Attended / Visited</i>	<i>Provided Feedback</i>
<b>Total</b>	<b>3,785</b>	<b>2,611</b>
In Person	911	575
Online	2,874	2,036

### Phase 1 and 2 Combined

	<i>Attended / Visited</i>	<i>Provided Feedback</i>
<b>Total</b>	<b>8,050</b>	<b>5,121</b>
Phase 1	4,265	2,510
Phase 2	3,785	2,611

# WHAT WE HEARD



# Phase 2 Summary

Public input from phase 2 largely supported and reinforced the key takeaways from phase 1. These findings, which are outlined in a handout called “Priorities for Lancaster County’s Future,” are listed here:

## Priorities for Lancaster County’s Future

### Managing Growth

Create compact, walkable communities. We’ve made progress, but we’re concerned about the type of development we’re seeing.

### Urban Places

Promote reinvestment through rehab and infill. We’re glad to see ongoing reinvestment in urban places – especially the city and a few boroughs – but there’s still some room for improvement.

### Housing Choice

Ensure safe, quality housing options for everyone. We’d like people at every income level to have safe, quality housing options they can afford.

### Employment

Support 21<sup>st</sup> century industries and jobs. We want to strengthen existing industries, invest in emerging ones, and prepare our workforce for the future.

### Transportation

Build a network with more alternatives and connections. We want a more efficient and flexible transportation system with more alternatives and connections.

### Parks, Trails, and Natural Areas

Provide more places to hike, bike, and enjoy nature. We love our parks, trails, and natural areas — but we also care about the quality of our environment.

### Agriculture and Farmland

Protect both the farm and the farmer. We must continue to protect agriculture and farmland, because it’s an essential part of the county’s economy, identity, and sense of place.

### Thinking Beyond Boundaries

Promote cooperation, work together, and share resources. All of us – particularly municipalities – need to look past traditional boundaries. We need to promote cooperation, work together, and share resources.

## Phase 2 Input on These Priorities

Phase 2 of the civic engagement process continued to clarify and refine these eight priorities. Some additional points related to these priorities emerged:

### Managing Growth

- Use different growth/use strategies in different parts of the county.
- Balance residential growth with other types of growth – services, employment, etc. – to ensure people can access what they need near where they live.
- Connectivity is necessary for successful development.

### Housing Choice

- Meet the varied housing needs of the elderly, including multi-generational housing and accessory dwelling units.
- Reduce zoning and regulatory barriers to innovative and affordable housing solutions.

### Transportation

- Provide and maintain shoulders for buggies and bicycles in rural areas.
- Use tools like traffic improvement zones, employer subsidies, or public-private partnerships to fund public transit and transportation improvements.
- Improve connections between neighborhoods, the city and suburbs, boroughs, areas outside of the city, and neighboring counties.
- Orient new development around transportation hubs to maximize use of transit and reduce automobile trips.
- Provide safe transportation options.

### Parks, Trails, and Natural Areas

- Focus on native plants in both natural areas and new development.
- Protect water supply – ensure capacity before developing.
- Create regional and inter-county trail networks.
- Look for regional and innovative solutions to stormwater management requirements.

### Urban Places

- Provide spaces for the community to gather.
- Ensure that places are designed for everyone (accessible design).
- Address health and quality-of-life issues related to truck/traffic congestion in urbanized areas.
- Use common principles but unique design guidelines for each urban place.
- Redevelop communities and key corridors.

### Employment

- Provide shared work spaces to create synergy.
- Focus most employment growth in urban areas, but allow for small farm-based businesses in rural areas.
- Assist the workforce by providing education and connecting people to jobs.

### Agriculture and Farmland

- Accommodate and support different types of farms and related operations (on-farm businesses).
- Consider new tools to protect farmland, in addition to traditional easements – zoning, public/private partnerships, special protection designations, etc.

- Educate people about the importance of farmland and the necessity of diverse types of farms and farm practices.
- Protect farmland from “rural sprawl.”

### **Thinking Beyond Boundaries**

- Strong leadership is needed to bring together different groups, governmental agencies, etc. for common purposes.
- Improve relationships between the public and local government, neighbors, communities, and people of different backgrounds.
- Use public-private partnerships on projects liked building infrastructure, creating new trails, protecting agricultural land, etc.
- Improve communication with minority populations and outreach to them.
- Regionalize services such as fire/police, stormwater/watershed issues, and transportation.

## New Input in Phase 2

In addition to clarifying existing priorities, some additional issues emerged:

### **Concern about population growth.**

Some participants disagreed with the premise that Lancaster County will or should experience population growth and/or economic growth.

### **Rural areas and villages have unique challenges that require unique strategies.**

Developing unique strategies for urban and rural areas was a common theme of discussion.

- There is population pressure on rural areas from a growing Amish population, westward migration from high-tax Chester County, and desire for a rural lifestyle.
- Too much growth in rural areas may impede farming operations and ruin what makes Lancaster County special – but growth in designated VGAs is constrained by infrastructure, water availability, and cost/availability of services.
- There's a fundamental conflict between a way of life that requires land for gardens and animals, etc. and many smart growth principles (small lots, compact development).

### **There's a communication/education gap between the general public, elected officials, and planning and design professionals.**

People are frustrated by the lack of communication and understanding about the issues that are important to them, especially on topics where they might have some expertise.

- In rural areas, people are concerned by lack of understanding about Amish culture, the value of different types of farming, and the impact of development on agricultural operations.
- Design professionals and developers – and many people in urbanized areas – feel that the concept of compact development is misunderstood by the public and elected officials, which has made such development difficult to implement.
- Many people in the Latino community feel that traditional, formal methods of public participation fail to reach their community and thus inhibit their ability to have a seat at the table.

**Consider the impact of resources needed for development.**

Participants pondered the impact of a broad range of infrastructure, technology, and resources on growth and development.

- In some parts of the county, lack of public water – coupled with aquifer depletion – will limit growth. In general, availability of water and sewer infrastructure are major limiting factors for density and development. Growth management strategies should consider water supply. Stormwater management requirements are a factor that will limit density, as well as the lack of fire equipment to combat fires in multi-story buildings.

The concept of self-driving cars was often discussed as a potential solution – but the effects on growth patterns, parking demand, traffic, etc. are still largely unknown. Fiber optic networks were also discussed – where will they be provided and what impact will they have on communities? Technology could solve a variety of challenges – what are these technologies, and is Lancaster County positioning itself to take advantage of them?

# Community Conversations

## *Coalition for Smart Growth*

Five community conversations were organized by LCPC in partnership with the Coalition for Smart Growth (CSG). A total of approximately 75 people attended these meetings, which were arranged at locations around Lancaster County:

- Manheim Township Library – October 6, 2016
- Quarryville Library – October 13, 2016
- Tellus360 – Lancaster City – October 20, 2016
- West Donegal Township Municipal Building – October 27, 2016
- Caernarvon Fire Company Hall – November 2, 2016

At each meeting, LCPC staff provided a brief overview of the public input during phase 1. A CSG facilitator then engaged attendees in discussion, shared illustrations of key concepts, and provided a paper survey. The discussion and survey were organized around the six priorities the public had identified up to that point:

- Managing growth
- Transportation
- Parks, trails, and natural areas
- Urban places
- Agriculture and farmland
- Thinking beyond boundaries

Just prior to the release of the Comprehensive Online Survey – Phase 2, a couple of new priorities were added: housing and employment. These were added in response to additional public input during phase 1, particularly from LCPC's Partners for Place.

## Frequent Comments

### Managing Growth

- Build up, not out – stop sprawl and auto-oriented development
- Different growth strategies for city, townships, boroughs, and villages depending on character, infrastructure, and services

### Transportation

- Walkability, bikeability
- Traffic congestion, truck traffic
- Connectivity – city to suburbs, neighborhoods, corridor improvements
- Improve public transportation

### Parks, Trails, and Natural Areas

- More trails, parks, and green spaces
- Stormwater management – work regionally, meet requirements on public land

### Urban Places

- Reduce barriers to infill and redevelopment – particularly building codes
- Improve urban areas

### Agriculture and Farmland

- Preserve farmland through zoning, TDRs, and alternative funding
- Protect the farmer – provide regulatory flexibility

### Thinking Beyond Boundaries

- Intermunicipal cooperation
- Education/communication with the public and elected officials

## Meeting Summaries

### MANHEIM TOWNSHIP LIBRARY

October 6, 2016

This meeting centered on thinking beyond boundaries, with participants citing the need for cooperation between adjoining municipalities, the Lancaster Inter-Municipal Committee (LIMC), and Partners for Place – as well as education and engagement with the public. Transportation and connectivity were also central themes in this conversation, such as connecting urban areas with suburbs, improving corridors, improving and subsidizing public transportation, and complaints about the impact of traffic on quality of life, particularly in boroughs.

Growth management strategies like “building up, not out,” infill development, and mixed use also came up – as did strategies linking growth management and agricultural preservation.

These strategies included supporting functional village growth and using agricultural preservation to encourage greater density and taller buildings in urban areas.

### QUARRYVILLE LIBRARY

October 13, 2016

This meeting centered on agricultural and rural issues such as protecting farmland and agricultural operations. Participants were concerned about the potential threats of rural population growth and “rural suburbia” – subdividing large farms into smaller parcels. Intermunicipal coordination and zoning, strong leadership, focusing growth in existing developed areas, and education of residents were cited as potential solutions to these problems.

### TELLUS360 – LANCASTER CITY

October 20, 2016

Participants extensively discussed transportation, including improvements for public transportation, walkability, and bikeability, and connectivity with neighboring counties. Environmental and recreational concerns included adding more parks and green spaces, using native plants, protecting habitats, and groundwater recharge. Economic and social issues were also emphasized. These included workforce development, income and economic growth in urban areas (especially issues affecting children), and ensuring inclusivity in planning processes. Participants suggested containing growth by ending sprawl, building up and not out, transit-oriented development, and farmland preservation.

### WEST DONEGAL TOWNSHIP MUNICIPAL BUILDING

October 27, 2016

Transportation issues were the primary focus of this conversation. Participants expressed a desire to see more connectivity, work more regionally, provide different modes like light rail, walking, and biking; move traffic around the edges of the Lancaster metro area rather than just along the spokes, and address the impact of truck traffic on quality of life.

Urban quality-of-life issues also came up frequently, like the need for community gathering places, the challenge of trying to rehabilitate under the building code, and the need for services in northwestern Lancaster County. Stormwater was also a common topic, with participants requesting help for unfunded

mandates, and flexibility in meeting stormwater regulations – using rain gardens, etc. There was some debate about the usefulness of TDRs and how best to fund ag preservation – but there was a positive consensus about agricultural preservation in general.

## **CAERNARVON FIRE COMPANY HALL**

November 2, 2016

Growth management was a key topic at this meeting. Participants acknowledged the need for different growth and mixed-use strategies in different parts of the county, but wanted to focus growth in boroughs and the center of the county. They spoke about making urban areas safer, offering amenities to attract residents away from rural areas, and programmatic options to improve urban quality of life. The group also discussed the need to protect farming and core agricultural areas through farmland preservation, agricultural advisory committees, public-private partnerships, zoning, and public education. Reducing the regulatory burden related to the building code, stormwater, and farmers and small businesses was also discussed.

## Paper Survey

In total, 48 people completed and submitted the paper survey at the five Community Conversations. The surveys asked respondents to select the best response to each of the six challenges before them.

Topic	Statement	Votes
<b>Managing Growth</b>	Continue directing growth into designated areas to preserve farmland, open space, and natural resources.	18
	Revitalize the city and boroughs, rehabilitate existing buildings, and design new ones that reflect the character of the surrounding community.	11
	Build up, not out (while admitting we don't always support compact development when it's proposed in our own backyard.)	5
	Curb the amount of new automobile-oriented retail and commercial development on major corridors.	4
	Create more walkable mixed-use neighborhoods (although recently constructed examples don't impress us, and some of us prefer to keep housing separate from other uses.)	4
	Other	3
	Provide more multi-family housing options to rent and own - not just single-family homes.	1
<b>Transportation</b>	Create a more integrated transportation network that encourages the use of alternative modes such as walking and bicycling.	12
	Focus on maintaining existing roads and bridges rather than building new ones.	9
	Reduce traffic congestion by investing in new technology, reducing demand, and providing more connections between corridors.	8
	Coordinate plans for transportation, housing, and jobs, because their needs are closely related.	6
	Improve public transit by increasing service and providing more amenities for riders, such as upgraded bus shelters and train stations.	4
	Other	3
<b>Parks, Trails and Natural Areas</b>	Connect communities with parks and trails, and build trails for transportation as well as recreation.	23
	Improve water quality, work together on stormwater management, and invest in renewable energy.	7
	Provide additional places to hike, walk, and bike – and safe places for children to play.	5
	Create opportunities to observe and explore nature.	3
	Other	3

## Paper Survey (cont'd)

Topic	Statement	Votes
<b>Urban Places</b>	Make better use of what we have – make it easier to reuse existing buildings and construct appropriately designed infill.	16
	Other	7
	Promote the amenities these communities offer – restaurants, markets, shopping, arts and entertainment, activities and events.	6
	Celebrate these places for their history, character, and sense of community.	5
	Focus more attention on safety, cleanliness, community character, walkability, and bikeability.	5
	Encourage local businesses and entrepreneurs, rather than chain stores.	2
<b>Agriculture and Farmland</b>	Preserve the farmer as well as the farm, so agricultural remains viable over the long term.	23
	Protect rural landscapes, including the villages that contribute to their character.	8
	Support farm markets that connect us to local food.	6
	Other	4
<b>Thinking Beyond Boundaries</b>	Promote cooperation across municipal boundaries – for instance, in stormwater management and water quality.	17
	Develop more consistent and efficient zoning and permitting processes – and more flexible building codes.	14
	Other	6
	Maintain a high level of government services (but not surprisingly, without higher taxes and fees).	3
	Facilitate investment in 21st-century infrastructure, such as enhanced broadband.	1

## Comprehensive Online Survey – Phase 2

The Comprehensive Online Survey – Phase 2 launched on November 10, 2016 and closed three months later on February 10, 2017. The online site was publicly available and had a total of 2,385 visits, including 1,633 visits in which participants responded to questions and provided data.

The purpose of this survey was to further refine the priorities identified in the Comprehensive Online Survey – Phase 1. It also presented various scenarios for future growth and preservation (along with their benefits and impacts), and asked participants how they would allocate limited resources to support their top priorities.

The survey included three exercises, listed on the next page.

## Scenarios Exercise

This screen asked participants to compare three potential land-use scenarios or outcomes for the future. Results showed that the public clearly prefers the Places scenario (Scenario 3). The Balance scenario (Scenario 2) found much less support. The Trend scenario (Scenario 1) ranked lowest among the options, indicating that Lancaster County residents want to see a change in current development patterns. The results of other exercises in survey supported the Places scenario.

As in previous surveys and comprehensive planning processes, ag and farmland once again scored well. This category scored highest in the both the “priority ranking” and “budget allocation” exercises. More specifically, the results for each screen were as follows:

## Priority Ranking Exercise

The top priorities identified in this exercise were ag/farmland; employment; parks/natural areas; and reuse, rehab & infill.

- “Agriculture and farming”, “Employment”, “Parks and natural areas”, and “Reuse, rehab and infill” scored highest. These support the Places scenario either directly, or by using land more efficiently to reduce pressure on agricultural and natural lands.

## Budget Allocation Exercise

The top priorities identified in this exercise were ag/farmland; reuse, rehab & infill; parks/natural areas, and transportation.

- The top four ranked categories were “Agriculture and farmland,” “Reuse, rehab and infill,” “Parks and natural areas,” and “Transportation.” All of these support the concepts put forth in the Places scenario in a number of ways.
- “Compact, walkable places” (sometimes shortened to “urban places”) and “think beyond boundaries” ranked low in this survey, but it’s important to note that these two topics were among the eight that the public had already identified as priorities. LCPC’s Partners for Place noted that the low ranking of these two priorities may simply reflect the public’s lack of knowledge about how these issues affect the community.

A more complete accounting of the results of the Comprehensive Online Survey – Phase 2 are available in a separate, more detailed report.

## Regional Municipal Meetings – Fall 2016

In fall 2016, five regional municipal meetings were organized by LCPC staff. Roughly 80 people attended these meetings, which took place at locations throughout Lancaster County:

- Bart Township Fire Hall – November 15, 2016
- Paradise Township Municipal Building – November 16, 2016
- Lancaster County Government Center – Lancaster City – November 17, 2016
- West Donegal Township Municipal Building – November 17, 2016
- Ephrata Borough Municipal Meeting – November 18, 2016

At each meeting, LCPC staff provided a brief overview of the public input received in phase 1, then asked the group what it would take to implement each priority.

## Frequent Comments

### Managing Growth

- Difficult to apply smart growth in rural areas/need for a different rural strategy – way of life, water/sewer infrastructure, etc.
- Educate municipal officials and the public about land use

### Housing Choice

- Challenge of providing housing in rural areas, where infrastructure/water is not available and residents prefer larger lots
- Affordable/higher density housing is needed, but is often stigmatized and difficult to build

### Transportation

- Accommodate non-motorized modes of travel – need for shoulders in rural areas and sidewalks and bike lanes in urban areas
- Traffic is a challenge
- Improve public transportation – more destinations, more amenities, less stigma
- Better connections – from city to suburbs, borough to borough, intermodal

### Parks, Trails, and Natural Areas

- Need for regional stormwater solutions
- Urban areas want more trails, trail connections; rural areas in the eastern part of the county not as keen on trails
- Urban places
- Improve urban areas
- Need for more rehab and infill – make both easier to do
- Address impacts of truck traffic on urban quality of life

### Employment

- Need workforce education

### Agriculture and Farmland

- Preserve farmland
- Trend toward smaller farms and more on-farm entrepreneurialism is causing more “mixed-use” farming areas
- Thinking beyond boundaries
- Take a regional approach to planning, stormwater, water/sewer, fire/police, and transportation
- Address housing, transportation, and employment together

## Meeting Summaries

### **BART TOWNSHIP FIRE HALL**

November 15, 2016

This discussion centered around agriculture and farmland issues, particularly shifts to smaller farms and increased need for small on-farm businesses to make a viable living. This group had concerns about the applicability of “smart growth” principles to rural and village areas, where lack of infrastructure and funding present barriers. The primary transportation issue articulated was the need for wider shoulders for non-motorized vehicles. The group also wanted to see regional cooperation in areas like planning, fire, and police.

### **PARADISE TOWNSHIP MUNICIPAL BUILDING**

November 16, 2016

This group had many concerns about transportation, including traffic, lack of public transportation in the area, the increasing use of scooters and even bicycles among Plain Sect populations, and GPS units sending drivers along back roads not meant for high-volume traffic. Uber and autonomous (self-driving) vehicles were possible solutions. The group discussed infrastructure-related constraints to higher density development, particularly the expense of water and sewer services and depleted aquifers. Participants also mentioned the potential benefits of regional municipal cooperation on planning, stormwater and watershed issues, and police/fire.

### **LANCASTER COUNTY GOVERNMENT CENTER – LANCASTER CITY**

November 17, 2016

Transportation was the dominant discussion topic, including concerns about traffic/congestion due to higher density and single-occupant vehicles; public transportation concerns such as lack of funding, service, responsiveness, and amenities (benches, shelters); and difficulty of connecting existing

communities with sidewalks, bike lanes, and roads. The group wanted to connect existing trails, connect to other counties, and to “dream big.” As for thinking beyond boundaries, the group believed municipalities need to think regionally (particularly about stormwater and flooding issues) and communicate and work with the public.

### **WEST DONEGAL TOWNSHIP MUNICIPAL BUILDING**

November 17, 2016

Transportation and urban places rose to the top in this discussion. The group discussed improving public transit and connecting it to employment; connecting communities around the city; the impact of through truck traffic on congestion and quality of life; and the need for safe, alternative modes of transportation such as bicycling. The group talked about the need to improve urban areas around the county by adding businesses and employers, adding destinations and places to walk, and rehabilitating existing buildings.

### **EPHRATA BOROUGH MUNICIPAL BUILDING**

November 18, 2016

Housing was a key topic at this meeting. Participants discussed the challenges of developing housing due to different regulations in each municipality. They also identified a need for affordable housing for all incomes, a mix of housing types and multi-family housing, and education to reduce the stigma associated with affordable housing. The group also discussed the importance of solutions that address housing, transportation, and employment together. Signalization, light rail, and public education were suggested as transportation solutions. Agricultural concerns included the high cost of farms, effects of internal growth pressure, and the importance of protecting ag lands using a variety of methods.

# Focus Groups

## *Partners for Place*

Lancaster County Planning Commission (LCPC) engaged coLAB – an organization that specializes in facilitation and promoting collaborate partnerships – to facilitate five focus group discussions. coLAB’s Kate Gallagher, Bree Gillespie, and Deena Minney worked with LCPC staff to frame the conversation, develop discussion guides unique to each focus group subject area, facilitate meetings, and assist with reporting. The focus group subject areas were derived from five of the six topics addressed in *Lancaster County: A Changing Place*:

- Where We Live
- Where We Work
- How We Invest in Our Communities
- How We Move People and Goods
- How We Protect Our Treasured Resources

One topic from the *Changing Place* report – *Who We Are* – was not addressed in a meeting, because that topic deals with demographic change, which is largely outside the scope of land-use planning.

Staff selected key trends identified in the *Changing Place* report and asked participants to:

- Relate these trends to their own professional experience;
- Identify the potential causes of these trends;
- Consider how these trends relate to other subject areas in the *Changing Place* report; and
- Identify trends that might have been missed in the report.

In addition to more specific questions related to the topic of each meeting, all focus group participants were asked:

- How do current trends support or undermine our desired future in this subject area?
- What barriers (institutional or otherwise) could prevent us from encouraging the trends we want to see, and discouraging the trends we don’t want to see?
- What kinds of collaboration would help us achieve our desired future?

Partners for Place and other stakeholders were invited to participate in specific focus groups related to their areas of expertise. Although some participants attended multiple meetings, no two focus groups had the same group of attendees.

## Overarching Themes

Though each focus group had a different theme and different participants, there were some common threads in these discussions:

- Leadership – public, private, and nonprofit sectors
- Connections across different issues and organizations
- Need to break down institutional barriers and typical planning “silos” such as housing, transportation, natural resources, historic resources, etc.
- Keep Partners for Place together after plan is complete and continue to seek their input and help with implementation
- Regionalization, consolidation, cooperation, and partnerships are critical
- Governments need to reach out to more stakeholder groups and include them in the process
- Work together and speak with one voice
- Planning and smart growth
- People are starting to embrace and institutionalize smart growth principles
- Focus on compact and efficient development
- Help the public to visualize best practices in planning – what do they look like?
- Need to give people more options for mobility, housing, etc.
- Flexibility and adaptability will be of primary importance in the future
- Technology will change the way a lot of things are done – traffic monitoring, water usage, etc.
- Important to keep up with changes in technology
- Funding

## Meeting Summaries

### HOW WE PROTECT OUR TREASURED RESOURCES

May 24, 2016

- Community continues to support agricultural preservation and dedicated funding for this effort
- Ag preservation is good, but we need to explore additional ways to preserve land
- Importance of preserving the farmer, not just the land – to keep people farming, farming needs to be profitable
- Strong link between agriculture and water quality
- Preserving farmland also depends on achieving higher density in growth areas
- Natural lands and park lands – conservation and preservation of these lands needs to keep pace with a growing population
- Historic resource inventories – it's important to know what we have
- Need more consistency in inventories and regulations
- Rehabilitation of existing buildings is difficult
- Private sector needs to take a larger role in doing this
- Local leadership is key to improving water quality
- County needs to play a central role
- Need to highlight the link between farmland, natural lands, and water quality
- Air quality is an issue, but not a high priority for most people
- Is air quality better than it was? – it depends on the numbers you're comparing
- Overall air quality may be better, but daily pollutant spikes are becoming a greater problem
- People don't understand what they can do to improve air quality – they think it's just a federal issue

### WHERE WE LIVE

May 26, 2016

- Cost of housing
- Connection between employers, jobs, and wages
- Need for sustainable wages
- Location of jobs – wages, economy of jobs
- Businesses can't find qualified employees
- Location of growth
- Importance of county leadership and municipal cooperation
- Housing quality and maintenance
- Need more coordination among municipalities – ideally, they should adopt and enforce similar codes and maintenance standards
- Buyers don't want fixer-uppers; they want their housing units exactly the way they want them
- Importance of professional management for rental units
- Mixed-use development has social benefits
- But how can we convince people to support more compact development?
- People support reuse and rehabilitation of existing buildings, but it's difficult to do
- Municipalities don't make it easy – infill is a good thing, but there are many obstacles in the way
- Zoning regulations are arduous – long process increases building cost
- Local officials not always on board with higher density and more diversity of housing types
- Need to have consequences for doing the wrong thing – for instance, landlords who don't maintain their properties, and municipalities that don't meet their density goals
- Housing and aging
- 55+ communities tend to be expensive
- Boomers are staying longer in single-family homes, which tightens up the market – not as many single-family homes available to young buyers

## HOW WE MOVE

June 1, 2016

- Smart growth transportation – accommodate all modes and all users
- Pattern of development – we need to build up, not out – but what impact will that have on transportation?
- Provide more choices and options, and show greater flexibility
- Need to explore small-scale solutions to transportation issues
- Congestion is not a significant issue
- Complete Streets and green infrastructure – need to provide funding “carrots” for people to invest in these things
- Connections between transportation, land use, jobs, housing, and transit
- Technology – impact of new tools such as adaptive signals (sensors and cameras that monitor and regulate traffic), the internet, phone apps, and autonomous (self-driving) vehicles
- Need to do a better job of integrating transit into the transportation system as a whole

## HOW WE INVEST

June 2, 2016

- Regionalization and consolidation are important for the provision of community facilities and delivery of services, and there are many different ways to achieve these goals
- Funding issues will likely force emergency and other services to regionalize and consolidate
- A shift is underway from volunteer personnel to paid professionals
- Need to address stormwater now, or the necessary upgrades will become more expensive in the future
- As projects scale up, upgrades become more affordable – it’s cheaper to things when they’re done systematically and across the board
- Rather than charging everyone for a service, charge those who actually use it – spreads the burden and reduces fiscal impact on certain groups
- Consider establishing a countywide stormwater management entity
- County should take the lead on water issues, but must get local government buy-in
- Importance of broadband – in the future, all information will provided this way, and monitoring of traffic, water usage, etc. will be done remotely, so broadband must be universally available
- Broadband will be particularly important in medical services
- Need better communication among different levels of government as well as service providers
- Should take another look at the option of reclassifying Lancaster County from a 3rd-class county to 2nd class, because 2nd-class counties have additional responsibilities for the provision of services – a possible benefit

## WHERE WE WORK

June 3, 2016

- Pattern of development – build up, not out (higher density, not sprawl)
- Education – get different educational institutions to work together
- Connections between education, job market, and housing
- Importance of workforce training and “soft skills”
- Limit regulatory obstacles
- Employers should show more flexibility with the workforce – adopt best practices in human resources, etc.
- Need to address issues on a countywide basis
- In some cases, county government should take the lead; in others, municipal government or elected officials should do so
- Sense of place – make the county more attractive for all types of investment

# Functional Element Meetings

The Lancaster County Comprehensive Plan components include ReVisions, the policy plan; Balance, the growth management element; and six functional elements which focus on specific topics in planning, such as housing and water resources. For this round of meetings, subject matter experts and other key stakeholders were invited to participate in separate discussions about each of the functional elements. The following descriptions summarize the discussion points from each meeting. Meetings for two additional elements (Heritage and Tourism) were planned, but did not take place.

## Meeting Summaries

### BLUEPRINTS: WATER RESOURCES ELEMENT

March 8, 2017

- Water resources was not listed as one of the eight priority areas from the civic engagement process. This group feels it is a high priority. How will this be addressed in the plan?
- The goal of reducing the number of miles of impaired streams has not been met. It's important to improve water quality and get streams off the impaired list.
- Sustainability of infrastructure systems (their physical condition) is a key challenge. The design life of many systems is coming to an end. How will this be addressed?
- Residents have enjoyed low-cost water and sewer services for a long time, but this could be changing soon. Water seems to be taken for granted.
- We need collaboration between partners to determine where growth will occur, and what services will be available to accommodate this growth. These partners could include the Susquehanna River Basin Commission (SRBC), municipal authorities, LCPC, etc.
- Economies of scale make it difficult to provide sewer and water service to certain rural villages. This will impact the county's existing rural strategy under Balance – targets for number of housing units and density in VGAs.
- Thinking beyond boundaries could help solve many of these issues.

### CONNECTIONS: TRANSPORTATION ELEMENT

April 4, 2017

- Focus improvements on maintaining existing corridors and making them more functional, rather than building new roads.
- Connect the transportation goal to employment –the primary reason for transportation is linking people to jobs.
- Focus more on collaboration – for example, trails have been a stepping stone for municipalities to talk about regional issues.
- Important to address 21st-century needs such as self-driving cars, rideshare services, etc.
- Public transportation needs to attract “choice” riders, not just captive riders. Convenience is key. It works better in densely populated urban areas.
- Keep in mind that utilities are corridors, too – pipelines, etc.

## **CHOICES: HOUSING ELEMENT**

May 4, 2017

- We need to make the jobs-housing-transportation connection. We can't think of housing in isolation – we need to link the places where people live and where they work.
- Build housing consistent with goals in growth management plans. In growth areas, allow for higher densities, greater building height, multi-family dwellings, infill and adaptive reuse.
- Regulatory barriers (local, state, and federal regulations) drive up costs. Make development “by right.”
- Consider innovative housing solutions such as shared living opportunities.
- Change the culture – improve the perception of density and affordable housing among the public and decisionmakers.
- Work, plan, and regulate together. It is inefficient to have 60 separate municipalities with their own staff, plans, and regulations.
- Link county funding to county policy – for example, invest in growth areas, subsidize infill and reuse projects, and provide implementation funds.
- Implement the plan by educating all key stakeholders, outlining specific implementation steps, and requiring buy-in from municipalities through a consistent public process. Strong county and municipal leadership and clear messaging are essential.

## **GREENSCAPES: GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE ELEMENT**

June 13, 2017

- Educate the public more about the need to preserve our remaining open space.
- Need to build up and not out to preserve both farmland and natural lands.
- “Protect, restore, and link fragmented natural lands” is a top priority.
- There is a need for common language in zoning ordinances.
- Preservation of natural lands is a top priority.

# Other Stakeholder Meetings

## MUNICIPAL MEETINGS

### Planning Commissions

Martic Township – June 13, 2016

Marietta Borough – June 21, 2016

Leacock Township – June 28, 2016

Salisbury Township – July 12, 2016

Caernarvon Township – July 21, 2016

### Boards of Supervisors

Manor Township – October 3, 2016

## OTHER MEETINGS

Planning Professionals (CSG) – May 25, 2016

Builders and Developers (CSG) – June 28, 2016

Lancaster County Conservancy

- Land Protection Committee – August 18, 2016
- Board – September 20, 2016

Harrisburg Area Community College (HACC) staff –  
October 7, 2016

Plain Sect – October 9 and 21, 2016

American Institute of Architects – October 20, 2016

Latino Community – October 28, 2016

Lancaster Bar Association – December 7, 2016

Lancaster Agricultural Preserve Board – December 15, 2016

Lancaster Agriculture Council – December 15, 2016

Leadership Lancaster – January 6, 2017

Municipal Staff (CSG) – March 21, 2017

Design Professionals (CSG) – March 29, 2017

Education Community (CSG) – March 30, 2017

Adelante Educational Forum – October 28, 2017

## Meeting Summaries

Summaries of a few meetings are not provided, because at these meetings, LCPC staff made presentations on [places2040](#), but did not lead any discussion or civic engagement exercises related to the plan.

### PLANNING PROFESSIONALS

#### Coalition for Smart Growth

May 25, 2016

Nine planning professionals participated in this facilitated group discussion. Participants were asked the following questions:

#### **What needs to change to make Lancaster County a better place?**

Transportation issues, traffic congestion, and affordable housing options.

#### **What barriers prevent Lancaster County from being a better place?**

Zoning and other regulatory issues are the key barriers – including bulk and lot requirements, parking, building height, and lengthy approval processes. Public perception of development and certain housing types, governmental fragmentation, and traffic on main corridors are also barriers.

#### **What can you, as a professional, do to help us reach our desired future?**

Educate clients and provide visuals and graphics to demonstrate smart growth principles.

### BUILDERS AND DEVELOPERS

#### Coalition for Smart Growth

June 28, 2016

Twelve builders/developers participated in this facilitated group discussion. The most common complaint among developers was regulations – specifically stormwater regulations, inconsistency and interpretation of regulations, and issues related to state roads. Since the 2008 recession, developers believe the county is underbuilt, which may eventually lead to a housing crisis. Low compensation for the workforce coupled with rising construction costs and requirements makes it increasingly difficult to provide housing within an affordable price range.

Suggestions for how to move forward included:

- Stronger leadership to improve regional cooperation, such as mediating disputes with water and sewer authorities;
- Create a regional stormwater authority, or bringing together the Lancaster Inter-Municipal Committee (LIMC) or other regional municipal groups;
- Take a big picture view of infrastructure and sharing the burden of improvements, using tools like traffic improvement zones;
- Adjust/simplify standard Euclidean zoning regulations and allow for greater density – taller buildings, flexible zoning, and infill of underutilized sites;
- Pursue innovative approaches to stormwater management; and
- Stay on top of current trends like bikeability and fiber optics.

## HACC STAFF

October 7, 2016

Approximately 25 staff members from Harrisburg Area Community College – Lancaster Campus participated in this discussion. Suggestions included re-imagining and reinvesting in corridors, building up and not out, protecting historic and cultural resources, supporting small businesses and entrepreneurs, providing more social gathering spaces, and engaging millennials. Related to education, the group suggested communal spaces for learning, an educational collaborative, and new online learning options.

## PLAIN SECT

October 5 and October 19, 2016

Fifteen members of the Plain Sect community participated in these two group discussions, which generally focused on transportation, agriculture and related industries, and housing. Participants focused on issues such as providing additional train stops, improving roadway shoulders or providing buggy lanes, and safety concerns related to traffic congestion, vehicle speed, and rumble strips for horses. Changes in the agricultural market may present zoning challenges. Produce is the main cash crop, and does not require much land – but it may require a roadside stand. Small, farm-based businesses are important to the community, as opposed to businesses located in industrial parks. The population is growing quickly, and prefers multi-generational housing options.

## LATINO COMMUNITY

October 28, 2016

Eight members of the Latino community participated in this discussion, which generally focused on affordable housing, connecting people to opportunity, and inclusivity. Affordable housing and housing near job opportunities were major concerns, as was general access to jobs. Written materials and other documents produced for the plan should address culture and diversity, and planners should reach out to the Latino community in casual settings and through translated materials.

## LEADERSHIP LANCASTER

January 6, 2017

About 50 people participated in this meeting, where they discussed the following questions:

### What is the biggest barrier that prevents us from thinking beyond boundaries?

<i>Topic</i>	<i>Responses</i>
Old thinking/small thinking; not wanting to change	17
Self-interest; selfishness; desire to control	14
Lack of cooperation; lack of collaboration with other people and municipalities	6
Fear of change and growth	4
Lack of education	4
Fragmentation; too many municipalities; trying to balance too many needs; complexity	4

### What is the biggest opportunity that could help us look past these boundaries?

<i>Topic</i>	<i>Responses</i>
To overcome misconceptions, educate people about the issues	8
Increase collaboration and teamwork; identify common ground and win-win situations	7
Open communication; listen to different ideas; bring diverse groups together	7
Involve others; allow people to be able to step-up and get involved; new leaders	7
Financial savings; efficiencies gained; resources combined	7

## MUNICIPAL STAFF

### Coalition For Smart Growth

March 21, 2017

About twelve municipal staff people representing boroughs and townships participated in this group discussion. They agreed that revitalization and reinvestment in built areas were key tools, but that cost, building code, and floodplain and storm-water issues are major deterrents. They suggested looking at incentives for redevelopment, strategies for protecting historic buildings, and Transit Oriented Development. They agreed that we need to think beyond boundaries, but observed that previous attempts at regional planning have faltered and that municipalities in general have trouble coordinating. County leadership was cited as an essential tool – there should be more county-municipality communication.

## DESIGN PROFESSIONALS

### Coalition For Smart Growth

March 29, 2017

About twenty design professionals including architects, landscape architects, planners, and engineers participated in this discussion. They discussed the need to change land use regulations to implement smart growth principles and allow higher buildings, provide for redevelopment of underutilized sites, include design guidelines, and generally allow and incentivize the type of development we want – and make it “by right.” Regulations should be context sensitive to different county regions. They emphasized the need to communicate with the public about good design, placemaking (just as important as density), housing market demand, community character, and other planning principles. It’s important to use visuals such as time-lapse aerials to get the public on board with the notion that high density and urban redevelopment is the best farmland preservation program. County leadership on these issues is essential.

## EDUCATION COMMUNITY

### Coalition For Smart Growth

March 30, 2017

About eleven education community stakeholders representing school districts and universities participated in this discussion. Participants were interested in proposed development and population growth, but felt that they are often excluded from the planning process. They also felt that local zoning and state regulations for school development and redevelopment impose a substantial burden on school districts. The ability of students to access housing, services, and transportation were key concerns. Connections between jobs, housing, and transportation must be considered. Cooperation and communication are critical to addressing these issues, particularly among school districts, municipalities, community leaders, the county, realtors, RRTA, and the Pennsylvania Department of Education.

## ADELANTE EDUCATIONAL FORUM

October 28, 2017

Five people attended this presentation and participated in the discussion, which focused primarily on education, cultural awareness, and workforce development. LCPC staff made a presentation about [places2040](#), and Wes Furlong of the Workforce Development Board discussed changes in the Latino population and the upcoming update of the *Latinos in Lancaster County* study. Detailed discussion topics included:

- Providing internships/apprenticeships for students where they can earn money, gain experience in a profession, and learn about different educational options and career paths;
- Educating children in their first language, and educating adults about speaking to children in native languages; and
- Providing a cultural center to help people understand and appreciate other cultures (particularly in the context of Spanish-speaking cultures).

## Regional Municipal Meetings – Fall 2017

Four regional municipal meetings were organized by LCPC staff. A total of about 70 people attended these meetings, which were held at municipal offices around Lancaster County:

- Mount Joy Township Municipal Building –  
November 9, 2017
- Providence Township Municipal Building –  
November 15, 2017
- Ephrata Borough Municipal Building–  
November 16, 2017
- East Lampeter Township Municipal Building –  
November 17, 2017

## Meeting Summaries

### MOUNT JOY TOWNSHIP MUNICIPAL BUILDING

November 9, 2017

Approximately 20 municipal officials and staff attended this meeting. Participants were asked, “What opportunities do you see for more regional place-based planning?” Responses and other comments included:

- Municipalities would like to see an implementation guide for places2040. LCPC staff noted that they will be creating a guide like this.
- K–12 education is missing from planning process.
- School districts get blamed for tax increases.
- A quality work force begins with K–12 education.
- School districts are included in the PA 283/230 corridor planning process.
- How do we make education part of this plan? School districts have to be included. It has been difficult getting school districts involved in planning in the past.
- Issues with rising school taxes.
- What can we do to encourage kids to stay in the county after graduation?
- Schools have been casualties of growth. For example, Lititz has large business and manufacturing base to sustain the school district. Elizabethtown and Columbia don’t have that.
- Concern that higher densities means higher population. LCPC staff noted that this isn’t true – school districts plan for projected population growth. How that growth is accommodated has nothing to do with how many new residents are expected.
- The county will need to provide the “fertilizer” to make this plan happen.
- Concern about some municipalities preserving land in the wrong places. Example – East Hempfield Township.

### PROVIDENCE TOWNSHIP MUNICIPAL BUILDING

November 15, 2017

Approximately 15 municipal officials and staff attended this meeting. Participants were asked, “What opportunities do you see for more regional place-based planning?” Responses and other comments included:

- If we zone for 7.5 dwellings per acre, what if a developer wants to do less? LCPC staff noted that higher density can be required and lower density can be prohibited.
- Southern End not suitable for a density of 7.5 dwellings per acre. Staff noted this is intended to be an average across all UGAs – and the only UGA in the Southern End is Quarryville. Rural areas aren’t expected to achieve 7.5.
- There was a question about what types of uses municipalities need to accommodate.
- Don’t show growth areas in the Southern End. Not appropriate. There is no public transportation in the Southern End. Staff said that other than Quarryville, which is a UGA, the only growth areas in this region are VGAs, and lack of infrastructure will prevent most of them from growing significantly.

## EPHRATA BOROUGH MUNICIPAL BUILDING

November 16, 2017

Approximately 23 municipal officials and staff attended this meeting. Participants were asked, “What opportunities do you see for more regional place-based planning?” Responses and other comments included:

- How can we get K–12 students involved in the plan? Students could provide input on the plan draft. Don’t leave out elementary school kids – prioritize them. Forge relationships between school districts and municipalities.
- Use overlays for specific issues and places (like corridors). Example: in Ephrata Borough and Ephrata Township, development overlaps. They could collaborate on projects. Both municipalities need to be looking at solutions for traffic that passes through the borough. Municipalities along the PA 272 corridor (Brownstown to Ephrata) should also work together.

## EAST LAMPETER TOWNSHIP MUNICIPAL BUILDING

November 17, 2017

Approximately 12 municipal officials and staff attended this meeting. Participants were asked, “What opportunities do you see for more regional place-based planning?” Responses and other comments included:

- Will an implementation guide for municipalities be included in the plan? This is necessary for local implementation. Staff noted that they will prepare a guide like this.
- Municipal cooperation is still an issue. There’s skepticism about getting municipalities to work together to implement the goals of this plan. How should we address Plain Sect communities?
- There are major differences from one part of the county to the other. Will density targets take this into consideration?

*This page left intentionally blank*



thinking beyond boundaries



[places2040.com](http://places2040.com)

**stay involved!**

@places2040



**Lancaster County Planning Commission**  
150 North Queen Street • Suite 320 • Lancaster, PA 17603  
717-299-8333 • F 717-295-3659

[www.lancastercountyplanning.org](http://www.lancastercountyplanning.org)

DECEMBER 2017