

**MOUNT JOY BOROUGH ZONING HEARING BOARD  
MINUTES of APRIL 28, 2021**

The Zoning Hearing Board virtually via ZOOM on the above date. The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Bob Marker. Board members present including Ned Sterling, Alecia Hair, Michael Melhorn and Bruce Haigh. Borough officials in attendance included Stacie Gibbs, Zoning Officer. Zoning Hearing Board Solicitor, Joseph Kenneff, Esquire, was present. Michelle Parke, court stenographer was also present.

**MINUTES**

**Meeting minutes of March 24, 2021 were approved as corrected on a Motion by Melhorn and a second by Sterling. Motion carried 5-0.**

**NEW BUSINESS**

Bob Marker read the Standard Board Procedures to all those present. There were no objections to the jurisdiction of the Zoning Hearing Board nor were there any challenges as to the personal or business interest of any member of the Board.

Stacie Gibbs, Zoning Officer is still sworn in from the last case and the record is still open.

**CASE NO. 1**

Continuation of the application for Fred and Shelley Baker, 1043 Washington Street, Reading, PA 19601, requesting Variances of Section 270-47.A maximum building coverage of 30% and maximum lot coverage of 35%, to attach a garage to the existing house and add a driveway extension to accommodate the garage at the property located at 232 S. Market St., Mount Joy, PA.

**EXHIBITS**

**BOARD:**

B-4 Revised Narrative and Site plan.

Brian Cooley, DC Gohn, Fred and Shelly Baker, and Peter Kerekgyarto, Beers Hoffman were previously sworn in are also still under oath. Ron Good was joining the meeting but will not be testifying.

**QUESTIONS AND TESTIMONY**

1. Cooley advised the revisions were based upon the feedback and discussion at the previous Zoning Hearing Board meeting.
2. Cooley advised they made two revisions to the plan as it relates to building and lot coverage.
3. Cooley advised the proposed building coverage was 34.8% on the previous application and has been reduced to 31.3% as part of the revised.
4. The building coverage has been decreased by 3.5%.
5. Cooley advised the lot coverage was 52.8% and has been reduced to 48.7%
6. The lot coverage has been decreased by 4.1%

7. Cooley advised the owner decreased the garage and the overhangs by 711sf. The overall garage was reduced by 323sf, and the roof overhangs were reduced by 388sf.
8. The proposed garage is now 1,960sf which excludes the overhang.
9. Cooley advised if you take the existing building coverage and the overhangs of the existing house those total 4,064sf. If you were to add the proposed garage which is 1,960sf plus the 4,064sf that equals 6,024sf which is exactly 30%. The only increase in building coverage is the 388sf of the roof overhangs.
10. Cooley advised they eliminated the overhang completely on the western side of the garage. The garage was shrunk on the western property line which provides additional separation from the properties in the back.
11. Cooley advised they were able to modify the proposed driveway with a decrease of 10sf. That is part of the overall 48.7% which has been reduced from the 52.8%.
12. Cooley also advised there were 3 proposed garage doors and now there are 2 proposed garage doors.
13. Cooley advised the existing lot coverage for the site is already at 35% without any improvements.
14. Haigh advised the people on the backside on Poplar Street are now going to see what looks like a commercial building because there is no overhand.
15. Haigh advised he would prefer the overhang to be all the way around even it is reduced to 1'.
16. Marker advised there are some evergreens back there.
17. Haigh advised they had proposed a 2' overhang on the original plans and the revised plan proposes no overhand in the rear. Haigh advised he prefers the overhand to be on there to present a mid-century modern look and stays with the character of the house.
18. Haigh advised if they put the overhangs back to a 1' overhang it would be more appealing with a vegetative screening, so it looks like a house and not a commercial property.
19. Kenneff asked if the applicant was willing to put a 1' overhang back on.
20. Cooley advised the only overhang that is proposed to be removed was on the western side. The owners are willing to put the 1' overhang back on this side of the proposed garage along the rear setback line.
21. Sterling asked what the new figures now would be if he puts the 1' overhang on the west.
22. Haigh advised about an additional 33sf.
23. Kenneff advised, after discussions it would be about 40sf.
24. Sterling asked what the percentage change would be if there would actually be a change.
25. Cooley advised with the 40sf western overhang the new building coverage is 31.5%. It is an increase of .2%. The new lot coverage would be 48.9%. It is an increase of .2%.

**Attorney Kenneff opened the meeting up for public questions and public comment.**

**No public had any questions or public comment.**

**On a motion by Marker and second by Sterling the taking of testimony was closed.  
*Motion carried 5-0.***

**The Board went off the record.**

### **ACTIONS BY THE BOARD**

On a motion by Sterling and a second by Haigh approved the application of Fred and Shelley Baker, 1043 Washington Street, Reading, PA 19601, for Variances of Section 270-47. A maximum building coverage of 30% and maximum lot coverage of 35%, to attach a garage to the existing house and add a driveway extension to accommodate the garage at the property located at 232 S. Market St., Mount Joy with the following conditions:

1. The applicant shall at all times be bound by its plans and promises as presented to the Zoning Hearing Board, either in written or oral testimony, as part of the hearing and/or its application.
2. The applicant shall obtain any necessary approvals and permits as may be required by applicable laws and regulations, including but not limited to Borough Zoning/Building Permits and Water/Sewer Permits as per the Mount Joy Borough Authority Rules and Regulations.
3. The western side of the garage shall contain a one-foot overhand.
4. A violation of any of the conditions of this decision shall constitute a violation of the Ordinance.
5. The decision shall bind the applicant, his heirs, successors, grantees and assigns.

***Motion carried 5-0.***

### **ADJOURNMENT**

**On a motion by Marker and a second by Haigh, the meeting was adjourned.**

***Motion carried 5-0.***

Respectfully submitted,

Adopted this \_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2021

Stacie Gibbs, Zoning Officer

Ned Sterling, Secretary