

**WARWICK TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING**  
**FEBRUARY 28, 2024**  
**7:00 P.M.**  
**WARWICK TOWNSHIP MUNICIPAL BUILDING**

Chairman, Tom Zug convened the February 28, 2024 meeting of the Warwick Township Planning Commission to order at 7:00 p.m. In attendance were Commissioners Tom Zug, Bob Kornman, Dan Garrett, Jane Windlebleck, John Gazsi, and Dale Keeney. Also in attendance were Brian Harris, Township Manager; Billy Clauser, Township Planner; Chuck Haley, Township Engineer; David Bitner, Bitner Engineering; Claudia Shank, McNeese; Alex Piehl, RGS Associates; Devin Donmoyer, 135 Northview Drive, Lancaster; Ted Cromleigh, Diehm & Sons; Anthony Petersheim, 938 Log Cabin Road; Doug & Leslie Morrissey, 1220 Seglock Road, Lititz; and Jason Kauffman.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** The January 24, 2024 meeting minutes were approved as submitted.

**CONSIDER THE 938 LOG CABIN ROAD FINAL LOT ADD-ON PLAN, PREPARED BY MACK ENGINEERING, DATED JANUARY 29, 2024:** B. Harris referred to the ELA review letter dated February 22, 2024 regarding this lot line adjustment plan for 938 Log Cabin Road. There are no waivers or modifications being requested as part of the plan. 938 Log Cabin Road is taking less than .25 acre from the adjacent property. Anthony Petersheim is present from Lancaster Design & Build to go over the plan.

Petersheim stated that there are really only minor comments on this plan. He reviewed the comments with Mack Engineering and they will comply. The owner purchased the property approximately 18 months ago and is in the process of some revisions. The house remodel has been through the township and they are in the process of adding a barn on the property as well. This lot annex plan is just a small addition. As the owner was looking at the property he noticed that the existing buildings on the property when he bought it are a little close to the property line on the north side. The owner would like to give himself a little more room between him and the farmer so they mutually agreed to sell him a portion of land up to the right-of-way for the overhead lines.

B. Kornman asked about the property not being owned by the electric company. Petersheim stated that the property owner farms underneath the lines. They just picked that specific line as a line to place on the drawing. B. Harris asked if there was an objection to adding the reserved right-of-way planned for along Log Cabin Road as ELA mentioned. Petersheim asked what the reasoning was behind asking for the right-of-way. Harris responded that it was in case the Township ever wants to do improvements. When shown the location of the right-of-way, Petersheim confirmed that there was no objection to the right-of-way. Harris stated that the Township is not asking for the right-of-way to be dedicated now.

On a motion by D. Keeney and seconded by D. Garrett, the Board unanimously approved the Log Cabin final lot add-on plan.

**CONSIDER THE LITITZ VETERINARY CLINIC SKETCH PLAN, PREPARED BY BITNER ENGINEERING, DATED SEPTEMBER 27, 2023:** B. Harris referred to the letter from Claudia Shank at McNees Wallace & Nurick, LLC regarding Lititz Veterinary Clinic. Claudia Shank and Dave Bitner have met with staff to review some possible options to expand the existing building as well as the parking area. Claudia and Dave were advised to attend tonight's meeting to get some feedback from the Planning Commission.

C. Shank stated that Dave Bitner is the civil engineer for the project. The property is located at 7 Toll Gate Road. The owner of the property operates a veterinary practice there and is looking to do a small expansion to the building which is shown on the plan. The owner is also looking to expand the parking area on the property. The property is .42 acres so there are a number of limiting factors and constraints associated with this project. If the applicant decides to move forward the first step in the process would be a submission to the Zoning Hearing Board because there are a number of variances that would be required, all dimensional in nature. Shank stated that this is a pre-existing non-conforming use on the property of the veterinary practice. There is also some relief that would be needed from the subdivision and land development ordinance if the Zoning Hearing Board relief were granted.

Given the amount of relief that would be necessary to move forward with this project it was decided when they met with staff that it would be a good idea to come in and have a conversation with the Planning Commission about the plan, get any feedback before they make a decision about moving forward with the Zoning Hearing Board Application. Shank stated that this was the subject of a Zoning Hearing Board Application in 1994 and at that point and time there was relief that was received to expand the veterinary practice. As best as they can tell part of that expansion happened and part of it never moved forward. That relief is long lapsed so they would need to go back but at least at one point in time there was relief granted that would have allowed for the enlargement of the practice.

Dave Bitner oriented those in attendance to the property. They are proposing a 487 square foot expansion. If you are familiar with the site, the parking right now goes across almost the entire frontage from the building line forward. Cars will sometimes stack up to park. As part of the improvements parking would get cleaned up with parking along the front of the building and adding parking along the edge of the building. With it being such a compact site there is a handful of zoning variances that would be needed in order to implement the proposed layout. The first variances are parking setback requirements. In the front yard there is a 20 foot requirement. They are going to have the edge of the drive aisle of the parking lot approximately 13.5 feet but 15 feet is required on the side. There is approximately 5 feet at the turn around area from the edge of the turn around area down to the rear property line. That is actually a 25 foot setback requirement for parking in the rear. Landscaping around the perimeter of the site has a 15 foot required buffer around the whole entire site for landscaping. There is 13.5 feet on the eastern side, essentially zero along the front, and then 5 feet at the widest part of the existing parking area. Bitner stated that they are okay on internal landscaping requirements. If you are under 20 feet those requirements do not apply so they do not have any internal landscaping requirements to meet. Access drive requires a 100 foot separation distance, but the applicant only has approximately 56 feet from pavement to pavement. The access drive is being shifted to the left a little bit to be able to get the parking. B. Harris asked about the lot coverage and Bitner stated that they are right on the 65% allowable coverage based off of GIS. They are just over that with this plan however once they get the survey there are some areas where they can remove some pavement to get under the 65% requirement. There are approximately 12 spaces along the frontage and the parking requirement is 6 spaces per veterinarian and they are anticipating 3 veterinarians so that is 18 spaces and their plan is showing 19 spaces on the plan. T. Zug asked if there was any landscaping in the side yards at this point. Bitner did not recall any landscaping in the side yards but he did mention a fenced area and a line of trees along the rear of the property. C. Shank stated that the area is mostly commercial with businesses on either side of the applicant and there is a grocery store to the south of the property so there is not a lot of landscaping and not a lot of room to do more landscaping. B. Kornman stated the he did not have any problems with the overall development but he had a few questions. He asked if they are planning on curbing the new paving. Bitner stated they were going to request a waiver for the curbing. If you look at the surrounding businesses, none of the uses are currently curbed. Kornman suggested curbing so that the cars don't start infringing further into the setback area, either that or wheel stops. Kornman also mentioned having a dense landscaping screen around the parking would be a good idea and the curb radii on Toll Gate coming in to the parking lot is listed at 5 feet but Kornman thinks it should be

more like 15 or 20 feet. Bitner stated that one of the challenges there is to try to get the parking that they need and to make that 15 feet they are pushing things down or getting rid of parking spaces in order to reach that. Kornman asked how far it is from the property line to the edge of paving of Toll Gate Road. Bitner stated it is approximately 10 feet. Kornman mentioned that if they could push 15 feet out of it and make the radii going into the parking stall approximately 3 feet. Kornman also asked about stormwater plans for the site also. T. Zug asked if the applicant would be opposed to filling what is left of the grass strips on the sides of the parking lot with even low screening materials.

Bitner mentioned distance between the access points on to Toll Gate Road on opposite side of the street. The plan is to shift things a little so those access points will be slightly offset. Both B. Kornman and T. Zug did not see a problem with this modification because it is a low volume use. The applicant is proposing to use wheel stops instead of a curb. Bitner stated that the ordinance requires curbs to be provided on all new streets and subdivisions along all existing streets abutting a subdivision or land development. The applicant would ask for a modification to curb the property because there are no curbs there presently. Bitner reviewed the parking setback modifications. There is a 10 foot requirement for parking which goes along the same as the zoning ordinance so they would be seeking a modification of that requirements. Bitner also mentioned the width of the access drive in the parking lot with 25 feet required and they are proposing just under 24 feet. If they look at shrinking the radii that might shrink that measurement down a little bit more.

T. Zug mentioned that the applicant is doing the best they can and he was in favor of the plan. D. Garrett and J. Windlebleck agreed with T. Zug.

**CONSIDER THE LC STORAGE PROJECT PRELIMINARY/FINAL LAND DEVELOPMENT PLAN, PREPARED BY RGS ASSOCIATES, DATED FEBRUARY 7, 2024:** Alex Piehl with RGS introduced Devin Donmoyer who is the applicant and the developer of the LC Storage project. Piehl oriented those in attendance to the site and surrounding businesses and roadways. This project did initially go through a special exception to allow a mini warehouse which is what storage units are defined as by the Township. They did receive special exception approval for the use as well as a variance to not require an on-site manager for the facility. The proposed design would utilize the existing access drive off of West Woods Drive. There is actually a stub that exists now to the west which would be the access drive in to the property. There would be a rising gate that would have a key fob with it. There is room for a vehicle to be parked and not block the entrance which was part of the analysis that was done for both the design as well as the volume of traffic anticipated for the project. Coming in to the west side is Building 1 which will be interior storage units so there is a public door on the northeast corner and there is a door on southeast corner for emergency egress only. C. Haley suggested a sign at that entrance. There are the required number of parking spaces which is the required number for the facility. The rest of the buildings would all have front garage door entrances into them. They did provide the required separation between the buildings as well as a turnaround area and fencing. They are proposing a total of 64 storage units. There would be a maintenance unit/utility room as part of the development. For storm water management Orrstown Bank has an underground storm water facility with an existing pipe and spilling basin. The applicant is proposing underground storm water facilities and then connecting into the existing spilling basin for the discharge. There would be the extension of the sidewalk along the frontage as well as the required landscaping buffer around the perimeter of the property. There are bollards noted on the corners of the buildings. They are proposing pole lights in 2 or 3 locations as well as lights on the buildings to provide adequate lighting for areas accessing the unites. D. Donmoyer stated the hours of operation would be 6 a.m. to 10 p.m. Piehl mentioned the ELA review letter and they do not have any concerns addressing any of the items mentioned in that letter. Piehl also mentioned some waivers, one for preliminary plan waiver because this is a preliminary/final plan. They do have one waiver to modify an existing storm easement. There is an existing storm pipe system and one of the corners of the building just clips inside that easement so they are looking to reduce that. D. Donmoyer has already talked to the property owner about this. If the township is agreeable to it, he will get documentation that Orrstown Bank property owner is accepting of the modification of the easement. The other is the runoff draining to pervious areas. All of the stormwater is being collected as noted in the center of the drive so they do not have the opportunity to discharge that to the grass areas. That will all be collected and then managed and discharged to the existing discharge area. D. Garrett mentioned that the applicant is adding a lot of impervious surface and he asked if the underground system will be able to handle it. Piehl stated that they did look at that closely and made

sure there was adequate storage. Piehl explained the Arch system. It is an open half pipe system laid on stone rather than just a stone pit to get the additional volume from the void space within the arches.

B. Kornman asked about signing the two turnaround areas down at the west end to eliminate some storing a boat or camper in that area. Piehl stated they will add no parking signs and that is going to be monitored as part of the facility because it will be needed by the fire department in case of fire, but also those using the facility that are going to use it for turnaround of vehicles. J. Windlebleck asked how often someone comes to check the property. D. Donmoyer stated that the owner/owners all live in the Manheim Township and Lititz area and will frequent it as needed to check on it and clean up. There is no exact requirement but it will be regularly monitored. A. Piehl stated that included in the last resubmission was information from the Condominium Association so they would be in agreement together as far as the maintenance of the common area which would be the access drive as well as the storm facilities. B. Kornman suggested more landscaping between building 1 and West Woods Drive. A. Piehl stated they did provide a couple of street trees along there. One challenge that they do have for anything larger is they do have an existing stormwater pipe that comes through an easement but they would look at the landscaping further to soften the view. The grade on the site is steep at 3:1 or less and it is maintainable. B. Kornman asked about the sign placement on the site. The sign for the facility has not been determined yet. A. Piehl mentioned another waiver from the stormwater ordinance related to drainage to pervious area which is he noted is draining to the center to the stormwater facility.

On a motion by J. Windlebleck and seconded by D. Garrett, the Board unanimously approved recommending conditional approval of the two waivers.

On a motion by D. Garrett and seconded by J. Windlebleck, the Board unanimously approved recommending conditional approval of the third waiver request.

On a motion by D. Garrett and seconded by D. Keeney, the Board unanimously approved recommending conditional approval of the land development plan.

**CONSIDER THE JOHN L. & REBECCA S. KING FINAL SUBDIVISION PLAN, PREPARED BY DIEHM & SONS, DATED FEBRUARY 15, 2024:** B. Harris noted ELA's reviewed letter in the packets dated February 22, 2024. Ted Cromleigh is present along with John King regarding this parcel that is off of Water Edge Road. The applicant is proposing to annex off 24 acres on the west side of Water Edge Road and the resultant parent tract would be approximately 91 acres. Harris also noted that Water Edge Road divides the farm which is approximately 115 acres. There is no structure on the west side of Water Edge Road. The applicant is not proposing a home on the lot at this point and should they do decide to add a home they will have to go in front of the Supervisors for a conditional use since it is in the Ag zone. They are showing a reserved right-of-way should the Township ever need it along Water Edge Road. The right-of-way along Woodcrest Avenue has a small piece that abuts Woodcrest in the R1 zone. That right-of-way is already dedicated.

T. Cromleigh stated that John King is the owner of the farm and the subdivision that he is proposing is a center line separation plan. They have done DEP sewage planning for the new lot even though there is no dwelling proposed at this time. They are asking for a deferment of the requirements to construct a well. Because it is 25 acres and they do not know where they are going to build, they cannot go through the expense at this point and time drilling a well on the lot. Cromleigh also noted that Mr. King owns two adjacent farms in the area. Cromleigh stated that this is a non-building proposal. The majority of the farm is all zoned agricultural with the exception of a small area that is residential. This portion of the farm is all in farming agriculture. There are two existing houses on the farm and the second house that was built in the early 1900's was a smaller tract based on the tracts and the deed that was merged in with the farm when it was bought. It is currently a tenant house. As part of the sewage planning the applicant provided replacement sewage areas for the farmhouse, the tenant house, and they have done primary replacement sewage testing for the new lot that is being created. The farm is a working dairy farm and Mr. King's grandson runs the farm. Cromleigh stated that they are basically done with the plan and they have a couple of waivers/modifications to present to the Board. Cromleigh stated

that the plan is pretty basic and as B. Harris mentioned if anyone ever goes to build on the lot you will see the plan again. They will have to submit stormwater and land development and before that would be a conditional use hearing in front of the Board of Supervisors.

The modifications that are being requested include Section 285-27.J.3 – Improvements to the existing streets and intersections. The applicant is asking for a deferment of that requirement. If there would ever be something that occurred on the property in the future, they may have to improve the streets. They are asking for modification of Section 285-28.B.1.d. – Sidewalks and Section 285-28.C(1) – Curbs that would apply to the section of farm that is along Woodcrest Avenue. Right now that is agricultural and they are not proposing any driveways or anything that would increase any traffic from that intersection. There are no curbs or sidewalks in that area. They are asking for a waiver of Section 285-11.A.1 – Plan Scale. They are asking for the waiver to provide the farm and its entirety on a single plan view at 200 scale. There is nothing being proposed and all the details are highly legible. The last modification request is for Section 285-35.B(5) – Water Supply: Construction of Well/Well Water Supply Study. A well is the source on the farm and the study that the township ordinance has within it that requires a hydro-geologic study be performed on it to ensure that there is sufficient quantity and quality of the well. They are asking for a deferment of that and that would be provided when a future plan comes to the township. In support of that they did submit data from two newer wells that are on the parent tract and the neighboring farm also owned by Mr. King. Mr. King stated that he has to test every 6 months in order to ship milk.

On a motion by D. Keeney and seconded by J. Windlebleck, the Board unanimously recommends approval of the plan and waivers.

**NEXT MEETING:** Wednesday, March 27, 2024 at 7:00 p.m.

**ADJOURNMENT:** On a motion by B. Kornman and seconded by D. Keeney the meeting was adjourned at 7:51 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Brian Harris  
Township Manager