IN THE MATTER OF
THE APPLICATION OF
KEVIN ENGEL
: BEFORE THE LOWER ALLEN TOWNSHIP
: ZONING HEARING BOARD
: CUMBERLAND COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA
: DOCKET NO. 2019-06

DECISION GRANTING A VARIANCE

The Applicant seeks a variance to establish an outdoor pet runway within 200 feet of a lot line. A hearing was held before the Board on June 20, 2019.

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. Notice of the hearing was properly advertised, the subject property was posted, and all property owners required to be notified of the hearing were notified in accordance with the Codified Ordinances.

2. The Applicant is Kevin Engel, whose address is 1854 Lincoln Highway East, Lancaster, PA 17602. The Applicant is the property owner’s architect.

3. The subject property is an improved parcel of land located in an I-3 district, known as 925 Linda Lane.

4. The subject property is owned by Doug Gellatly, and used in a pet boarding business known as Greenlin Pet Resort.
5. The subject property is long and narrow, fronts on Linda Lane, and is bounded on the rear by an abandoned highway interchange.

6. The owner wishes to establish at the rear of the existing building an outdoor pet runway for unleashed pets.

7. The runway will extend from the existing building to a fence on the rear property line.

8. There was no objection to the requested relief.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. Under Sections 220-266 and 220-269(B)(5) and (C) of the Codified Ordinances, the Zoning Hearing Board has jurisdiction to hear and decide a request for a variance.

2. Section 220-167 (B) of the Codified Ordinances requires kennel runs to be located at least 200 feet from all lot lines.

3. The unusual shape of the subject property, and the location of the existing building combine to create an unnecessary hardship.

4. A variance is necessary to enable Greenlin to establish and use an outdoor pet runway in connection with the kennel.
5. The unnecessary hardship has not been created by the Applicant.

6. The requested relief will not alter the essential character of the district in which the subject property is located, nor substantially or permanently impair the appropriate use or development of adjacent property, nor be detrimental to the public welfare.

7. The requested variance represents the minimum variance to afford relief.

8. The requested variance is dimensional in nature.

**DECISION**

Based upon the foregoing findings and conclusions, and in consideration of the testimony and evidence presented to the Board, it is the decision of the Board that the Applicant's request for variance relief be and is hereby granted, subject to the condition
that Applicant maintain strict conformance with the testimony, plans and evidence presented to the Board.
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