

MINUTES

LOWER SWATARA TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION

**REGULAR MEETING
MARCH 21, 2024, 7:00 P.M.**

Meeting was called to order by Chauncey Knopp at 7:00 P.M. with the following present:

Chauncey Knopp, Chairman	Jim Diamond, LST Solicitor
James Young, Vice Chairman	Don Fure, Director of Codes, Planning & Zoning
Howard Crawford	Richard Snyder, Planning & Zoning Coordinator
Joseph Formica	Shawn Fabian, HRG
Tonya Condran, Recording Secretary	Alexa Korber, DCPC

Excused: Dale Messick

Others present:

Zachary Micheli, Warehaus	Jeremy Bittinger, Landworks Civil Design
Dan Creep, Warehaus	John Melham, Melham Associates, PC
Bill Meiser, MASD	Marc Kurowski, K&W
Chelton Hunter, MASD	Ryan Woerner, Stewart Properties
Jeff Shyk, K&W	Grace Heiland, CRA
Chris DeHart, LST BOC	Kimberly Vajda, resident
Dave & Patty White, residents	Craig Mellott, TPD

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE & ROLL CALL

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Mr. Knopp asked if there was a motion to approve the February 22, 2024, meeting minutes. The motion was made by Mr. Formica and seconded by Mr. Young. All were in favor. Minutes were approved.

OLD BUSINESS:

a. MASD New K-3 Elementary – Planning Commission File PC#2023-01. The Preliminary/Final Land Development & Lot Consolidation Plan proposes to consolidate three (3) existing parcels into one (1) new parcel, measuring 125.99 acres. Also, said Plan proposes to construct a new K-3 Elementary School, District Administration Office, Operations Building, parking and access drives, associated utilities, and associated stormwater management/PCSM facilities.

Marc Kurowski, K&W Associates, introduced Dr. Hunter and Bill Meiser from MASD, Jeff Shyk from K&W, and Grace Heiland, who is the architect for the project.

Mr. Kurowski said, as they discussed in previous meetings, the only change on the plans, other than the technical comments that have been addressed, is the extension of Greenfield Drive which comes down through the Messick property and the District property to connect to Route 441 at the bend. There were a handful of new comments relative specifically to the Greenfield extension. He feels they can be addressed without a substantive change to the plans. He then asked for any questions/comments relating to the Greenfield extension.

Mr. Fabian said he saw that there were not any major traffic concerns, but he did have some conversation about the traffic flowing out of the park area. He said the awkwardness of coming out of the park kind of ruined the intent of keeping people from traveling north up Greenfield Drive. He said they were trying to look for some resolution or suggestions on how to keep the flow of traffic going out the new drive and not up Greenfield.

Mr. Kurowski stated that the configuration which looks somewhat awkward is what they intentionally came up with to make sure the School District traffic is going to come in from Route 441 by what they are calling the "Greenfield Extension" to come in and go south to the campus and then come back out in the same manor. They are trying very intentionally to keep that all separate [Greenfield Drive (residential) and Greenfield Drive Extension (school traffic)]. They do not want to generate additional traffic at the existing intersection of Route 441 and Greenfield Drive. They have had multiple, and they continue to have meetings with Mr. Messick to discuss how they can manipulate that property to serve the intent of what he may be looking to do in the future while still meeting the same intent here for the School District. He said they want to provide safety as well as access to the park for the Township residents. Because they need to secure an HOP for access onto Route 441, there will be a whole process that needs to go on with PennDOT and they need to finish up the Traffic Impact Study (TIS). He went on to say that they are looking to advance the Land Development Plans even if we have to say that some adjustments may have to be made to this access drive. Right now, he said they are just in the TIS stage. The HOP process takes about 9 to 12 months. If there are changes that would come to the Plan that they presented tonight, he said they would come back and share with the Board any changes that would come as they work with PennDOT and Mr. [Dale] Messick. So, he said the plan in front of them tonight is an appropriate plan

other than the addressing of any technical comments, which they don't feel that any would be cumbersome.

Mr. Young asked where they stand with the Developer's Agreement. Is there an agreement between LST's solicitor and MASD's solicitor?

Mr. Kurowski said he believes their solicitor and our solicitor have been speaking.

Mr. Diamond says they have but they do not have an Agreement yet.

Mr. Kurowski stated that he thinks the last conversation they had was finding a provision for a temporary solution that would allow a level of comfort for the District that says that if the sewer project hasn't been built to a point where they can connect, is there an alternative that the District can pursue to allow their work to be in place and open the school while the Township's sewer catches up.

Mr. Diamond said no. He said he didn't think we had the concern with temporary pumping. He went on to say that the big disconnect that they were trying to be clear about is [there will be] no recourse against the Township or Municipal Authority, this would be "at risk" just like Triple Crown.

Dr. Hunter said it was not their intent as the School District. He feels there is a little bit of disconnect in that their solicitor is acting in the best interest of the School Board and School District without any input from him (Dr. Hunter, Superintendent of the School District). So, he said their concern is about what would happen if, for whatever reason, the sewer did not get put in. What is another option for them?

Mr. Diamond said he was going to re-word it because neither the Township nor the Municipality have the power to make those guarantees. He said we are open to reasonable temporary pumping and hauling concepts, subject to the State objecting. He added that in the Township's view, they have no right to get started until there is a physical connection to the sewer system. He went on to say that they are more open to allowing the School District to build a lot more than we would a private developer because of the School District having taxing power to guarantee funding. But we cannot be the financial guarantor. Our point is that we don't want someone coming back saying that there was a forceable contract.

Dr. Hunter said that was not their intent. He said they are going to do everything they can to keep the timelines. He apologized for the wording in the agreement that stated that if the sewer was not going to be installed in a proper amount of time to meet the School District's deadline, that it would fall back on the Township. He apologized again for not picking up on that and having them take that out of the agreement. He reiterated that their number one intent was to keep the timelines going so they can go out for bid at the end of next month. But, he added, to expect the Township to pay for a multi-million-dollar project is just ridiculous.

Mr. Diamond stated that as long as we (the Township) have that common ground, moving forward with the paperwork.

Dr. Hunter said he would speak with his solicitor tomorrow to have that wording changed and then send it back to LST and Mr. Diamond.

Mr. Young added that last month when Triple Crown and the School District were in front of us, we offered a template of what we were looking for in terms of approval between the Township and a private entity. There is a difference with this being a School District, so he thought we would be in a position with Triple Crown last month where basically there was an agreement that both sides had signed off on. So, he went on, we felt comfortable last month doing that; but he said he is not feeling the same comfort level now on this. But he will defer to the Solicitor's opinion on that.

Dr. Hunter said they kick everything to their solicitors, and they work it out, then they come back to them; but he did not see the provision where it states that the School District would hold the Township liable if the sewer project wasn't done. He stated again that the School District would not do that.

Mr. Kurowski said, relative to the Plan, they would be ecstatic to get a recommendation or conditional plan approval understanding that item as a condition. He said that they know that this is still has to go to the Board of Commissioners (BOC); it's not something that is going to result in a change to the Plans from a Planning Commission review standpoint, so they are respectfully requesting that consideration tonight, knowing that the Greenfield Drive work is going to continue for months as they continue to work on the HOP. The reason for the nudge to get the plan approved is that they are getting closer to their bid period.

Mr. Diamond said that the legal piece would not require any changes to the Plan. It is external to this whole process. So as long as any recommendation has that condition added to it. And that is assuming that the Township Staff doesn't have any outstanding comments.

Mr. Snyder added that we have issued them our latest review letter (dated March 13, 2024) and they are in receipt of that. He knows that one of the items of intent tonight was to get a feeling from the Planning Commission, this being Option A, the alignment of the driveways to get in and out of the park. He did hear from one of the BOC about a different option. Option B would be to have one-way into and one-way out of the park, 16' wide in the curve itself. [Mr. Snyder continued using the overhead projection, pointing out where the driveways would be.]

Mr. Young asked if Greenfield Drive Extension would be dedicated to the Township or will it remain private.

Mr. Kurowski answered that the intent would be to dedicate it to the Township to make it all a continuous township road. They are on the agenda for the BOC Workshop meeting to start that dialog with the Commissioners, as well. PennDOT is going to want to see this configuration as well. Although it is not within the right-of-way, they are going to want to make sure that additional traffic is not being directed up to the existing Greenfield Drive entrance. So, this will be a collaborative conversation which will also include Mr. Messick. He said they will be back in front of the Planning Commission as they finish the HOP work. He is confident with the sewer side of the project, that we will get to a resolution.

Mr. Diamond agreed and said it sounds like we can.

Mr. Diamond also added that it is his understanding that the Messick's would have to dedicate land. So, he feels we should have a condition that there is a commitment to dedication, so we are not approving a plan and then run into a dead-end. The other party who is not here tonight has to dedicate part of his land for that to be part of the road.

Mr. Kurowski said he understood that. He stated that essentially this is a subdivision plan that needs to show what land is being swapped between which parties, as that cuts through, and understanding that if they need to go through what is typically done for a road dedication, it may change later, and they would come back with the

revisions. He said they want it to be a clean recordable plan and it would include all those items discussed.

Mr. Snyder added that they had a conference call the other day and the design team from the School District was made aware that the Plan itself will have a Traffic Impact Study (TIS), an HOP plan, that they will have to place a plan note on there indicating that this Plan recognizes the fact that a separate plan will be developed for the HOP work and that note has been placed on the plan in a fashion that would allow the Planning Commission and the BOC to approve the Plan itself. If not, then everything has to be done out of this stage. But if they put that note on the Plan, that will give them time to develop that HOP plan. This is similar to what was done with the Union Knoll project with all their standard plan notes all over the plan set.

Mr. Kurowski said he is totally agreeable with that condition.

Mr. Crawford asked if it was possible to separate this from all the other plans, so we can accept those plans and then once this portion gets more finalized, then they could bring that portion back.

Mr. Diamond responded that there is some risk that PennDOT will never approve and then we'd have to go back.

Mr. Crawford said that they (PennDOT) are eventually going to have to approve something. So, from the Township's standpoint, even if that falls through, will they still have Raider Lane to go in and out. He feels, again from the Township's standpoint, that we would be able to live with that; but they (School District) are going to try to find some kind of resolution. He feels if we could separate the plans, we should let them move forward without this one finalized section because the other parts are good, but this one section is the one with all the questions.

Mr. Diamond said that is really what they are suggesting by putting a note on the plan.

Mr. Fabian added that we have numerous examples of that happening recently, Rosedale Avenue work for the D&H Warehouse, N. Union Street work for UPS, etc. So that is something that is typically done when there are roadway improvements.

Mr. Young asked, going back to the waivers they are requesting, with respect to curbs and sidewalks, if that would just be on Oberlin Road. And if they are looking for a waiver or a deferral.

Mr. Kurowski answered that he believes it was just on Route 441. He asked Jeff Shyk from K&W for confirmation of that.

Mr. Shyk confirmed that it was just on Route 441 but now they are also including the Greenfield Extension and they were requesting a deferral for that.

Mr. Knopp asked if they would be installing the asphalt walkway instead of the sidewalk.

Mr. Shyk showed Mr. Knopp where the asphalt walk would be using the overhead projection of the site map.

Mr. Young asked Mr. Snyder if there were any other outstanding issues that he raised in his March 13th letter.

Mr. Snyder said other than the standard information that we still need from them, the majority of the issues we raised were relative to the new Greenfield Drive Extension. Everything else that was relative to the site itself were either drafting or minor technical issues.

Mr. Knopp asked for clarification. He asked if the Township was ok with everything except the Greenfield Extension.

Mr. Snyder said yes.

Mr. Knopp asked Mr. Fabian for HRG's comments on this.

Mr. Fabian said they are in a similar position with the remaining sanitary sewer comments, outside of the capacity issue that's been discussed, are all relative to Greenfield Drive. He said they'll have additional chances to review the HOP packet through the TIS with the formal HOP submission. So, they will be in the loop for all that with continued reviews.

Mr. Knopp asked Ms. Korber for any DCPC comments.

Ms. Korber said she did have DCPC transportation staff take a look at the submission from last month, and they did not find anything problematic about it.

Mr. Knopp asked Mr. Diamond for any legal comments/concerns.

Mr. Diamond had nothing further to say at this time.

Mr. Knopp asked the Planning Commission members for any comments.

They had no further comments at this time.

Mr. Knopp then asked for any comments/questions from the Public.

Kimberly Vajda of Greenfield Drive stated that it does sound like we are making some headway, and she is very excited about that. She is still a little confused about going back a bit on Greenfield Drive yet. She wanted to be assured that this would all be worked out. (Mr. Knopp assured her that it would be.) She said she does like the one-way-in/one-way-out idea.

Mr. Knopp asked for any other comments from the Public.

Patty White of Greenfield Drive said she was confused. She stated that she likes Plan B. She says that when there are soccer tournaments, it gets really busy on Greenfield Drive. She asked if Plan B allows traffic to come in through Greenfield Drive, but when they exit, do they have to go out the other way.

[Mr. Snyder showed her how the traffic would flow using the overhead projector.]

Mr. Snyder said that instead of having an oddly shaped intersection, they would come in off the apex of the curve (441), enter a 16' wide drive lane to come into the park. Then when they come out, instead of coming back up, the 16' lane would come out and they would either be able to exit down through the school campus, or it would come up to Greenfield but with the traffic island in the middle, they would be forced to go out Greenfield extension, instead of crossing traffic and going back up to Greenfield Drive.

Mrs. White said her concern was when there are soccer weekends, parking can be a problem. She asked how many parking spaces there were in the park. (The response was that there are approximately 100 parking spaces.) She then added that there are a lot more than 100 vehicles, and they usually park the overflow in the Middle School parking lot. She then asked if they would still be able to park over there, because they shouldn't be parking on Greenfield Drive. She apologized for being confused with this plan.

Mr. Diamond reassured her that this plan is a confusing one.

Mr. Knopp asked if there were any further questions/comments from the Public.

There were none at this time.

Mr. Fure brought up the sidewalks on Greenfield Drive. He said historically with the 3 subdivisions of that property, the sidewalks were deferred for any future development of the property around Greenfield. He also asked the Planning Commission to make a recommendation on how they would like to see the layout of Greenfield moving forward.

Mr. Knopp asked for any other questions or comments.

There were none at this time.

Mr. Knopp asked for the waivers to be addressed:

1. Requirement to Provide a 2" Minimum Pipe Drop Within Inlets: The applicant requests a waiver from the requirement of providing a 2" minimum pipe drop within all inlets. The applicant will instead provide a one inch (1") drop across inlets I-402, I-403, I-404, and MH-400 due to limited available cover and issues with the depths to a limiting zone within the MRC Basin (BMP4).
 - Mr. Crawford made the motion to approve this waiver.
 - Mr. Young seconded the motion.
 - All were in favor.
2. Requirement to Submit a Preliminary Plan: The applicant requests a waiver from the requirement of a submission of a separate Preliminary Plan to proceed with a combined Preliminary and Final Plan, due to the project being constructed in one phase.

- Mr. Young made the motion to approve this waiver based on prior precedent.
 - Mr. Crawford seconded the motion.
 - All were in favor.
3. Requirement to Provide Financial Security: The applicant requests a waiver from the requirement of providing financial security for the completion of the proposed project due to the District as the Applicant being a public entity.
- The Township has required financial security for the past few MASD projects, and this is the first time we have seen this request for consideration. Without further demonstration of the need for this waiver and why it is a hardship, HRG is in favor of denial of this request.
 - Mr. Fabian went on to explain that in their response letter, the applicant has withdrawn this waiver request.
4. Requirement for Monuments and Markers: The applicant requests a waiver from the requirement to provide monuments and markers, as there are parts of the campus that are not directly associated with the physical construction that will occur. All the property lines in close proximity to the areas of construction have lot corners already installed.
- Mr. Young, based on the discussion and recommendation made back in November, he made the recommendation to approve this waiver.
 - Mr. Crawford seconded the motion.
 - All were in favor.
5. Requirement for Curbs: The applicant requests a waiver from the requirement to provide curbing, to direct drainage to grass areas for greater infiltration and to reduce costs to the owner.
- The Planning Commission usually requests a deferral of the installation of concrete curbing instead of a waiver.
 - Mr. Young made the motion consistent with our past practice and based upon our discussion tonight, that we recommend approval of a deferral rather than a waiver.
 - Mr. Crawford seconded that motion.
 - All were in favor.
6. Requirement of Sidewalks: The applicant requests a waiver from the requirement to provide sidewalks, noting the owner is improving an existing gravel path that extends to the site from the softball field near the middle school to be a 4' wide asphalt walk. It is not feasible to extend a walk further than the eastern limits due to environmental permitted needed to cross a stream area.

- Based on discussion at the 11/16/23 Planning Commission meeting, and the virtual meeting held on 11/29/23, HRG recommends approval of this as a waiver instead of requesting a deferral since multiple pedestrian improvements are proposed within the plan.
- Mr. Young made the motion to recommend approval.
- Mr. Crawford seconded the motion.
- All were in favor.

Mr. Knopp asked the Planning Commission what they would like to do with the overall plan tonight.

- Mr. Young made a motion to recommend approval of the plan subject to any pressing and outstanding comments conditioned upon any plan notes necessary with respect to the sanitary sewer and other items that we have discussed. Also, to be attached to the plan, an Agreement with respect to the lack of available sewer capacity. And also conditioned upon any other Agreement that would be required in language acceptable to the Township, and with recognition that you are just starting the HOP process. And that there would be a note on the plan about the HOP and conditioned upon a commitment and agreement with the effect that the adjacent property owner, The Messick's, with respect to adjustment of property lines.
- Mr. Diamond acknowledged that there will be a separate second plan covering the Greenfield Extended part of this.
- Mr. Crawford added that they would have to bring that Greenfield piece back so that the Public gets a chance to comment on that also.
- Mr. Crawford then seconded Mr. Young's motion.

All were in favor.

NEW BUSINESS:

a. CVBP Lot 3 & Lot 4 – Planning Commission File PC#2024-01. The 15.59-acre project site lies within the Industrial Park Limited (IP-L) District. The Revised Final Subdivision & Land Development Plan proposes to construct a 64,400-sf warehouse on Lot 3, a 54,880-sf warehouse on Lot 4, and revised grading/stormwater management facilities/utilities, and site improvements.

Dan Creep of Warehaus was here filling in for Dave Koratich (Project Manager) tonight. He introduced the revised Land Development Plan for Capital Valley Business

Park (CVBP) Lot 3 and Lot 4. He said that a very similar plan was approved and recorded in September of 2023 for this particular project. The difference, between the previous plan and this plan before you tonight, is really related to the increase in building size on Lot 4. The new plan increases that building by roughly 10,000 sf and also removes some parking along the north end of the lot. He said they are seeking two waivers: 1. Preliminary Plan submission (§22-404), and 2. Sidewalks (§22-607.C).

Mr. Creep went on to say that they have received NPDES plan approval through the Dauphin County Conservation District. He also said that they have received the Township Engineer's letter, and they have no objections to any comments in that letter.

Mr. Knopp asked for any questions/comments from the Planning Commission.

Mr. Crawford asked what they took out of the previous plan to make the building larger.

Mr. Creep pointed out on the overhead projection of the site map which parking spaces were removed (which were on the backside of the building) to allow for the increase of the building size.

Mr. Crawford asked if that would bring any truck traffic closer to the houses behind there.

Mr. Creep stated that no, that has not changed from the original plan. [He pointed out the existing slope using the overhead projection]. He added that the past improvements stopped at that slope and the revised improvements stop at that slope as well.

Mr. Knopp asked Mr. Snyder for any questions/comments.

Mr. Snyder said anything they found were just technical errors or minor drafting errors, so the Township Staff is ok with the Plan.

Mr. Knopp asked Mr. Fabian for any comments from HRG.

Mr. Fabian said he had no technical comments, only a couple of administrative items on it. HRG did issue a revised recommendation for Financial Security.

Mr. Knopp asked Ms. Korber for any comments from DCPC.

Ms. Korber asked about parking. She said she did notice that they are over the requirement for parking, but she asked if it is needed to accommodate the employees, trucks, etc.

Mr. Creep explained that with these warehouses, the end tenants aren't always known, so a lot of times they will show more parking than what's needed in case of a particular tenant needing more spaces than what's required by the Ordinance.

Ms. Korber stated that the truck parking would be in the back, and then the vehicle parking in the front. She asked if with Lot 3 is it intended for the trucks to come out from the back and go through the vehicle parking area to exit.

Mr. Creep said no, that is an emergency route that goes through there.

Mr. Knopp asked Mr. Diamond and Mr. Fure for any questions/comments.

There were none at this time.

Mr. Knopp asked for any questions/comments from the Public.

Mrs. Vajda asked if we were about out of land in Lower Swatara Township. She also asked if there was a record of how many vacant warehouses there are in the township.

Mr. Formica told Mrs. Vajda that it was public knowledge, and she could look that up.

Mr. Fure told Mrs. Vajda that he wasn't aware of any vacant warehouses in the township. He said there is a lot of raw land though, but that is all that he is aware of.

Mrs. Vajda said she was just curious. She stated that she has lived here all her life, and she just sees it all [the land] disappearing.

Mr. Knopp asked for any other comments or questions from the Public.

There were none at this time.

Mr. Knopp asked for the waivers to be addressed:

1. Requirement to submit a preliminary plan (§22-404): Applicant requests to submit a combined preliminary/final plan submission rather than individual preliminary and final plans.
 - Mr. Young made the motion to recommend approval of the waiver.
 - Mr. Crawford seconded the motion.
 - All were in favor.
2. Requirement for sidewalks to be within the right-of-way of the street and extend in width from the right-of-way line toward the curb line (§22-607.C): Applicant requests to not show sidewalks along Kreider Drive or adjacent surrounding streets due to the existing street networks in adjacent developments not having sidewalks along the street.
 - Mr. Young made the motion to recommend deferral rather than a waiver.
 - Mr. Crawford seconded the motion.
 - All were in favor.

Mr. Knopp asked the Planning Commission what they would like to do with the Plan overall:

- Mr. Crawford made the motion to recommend approval based on the waiver approvals and any other stipulations.
- Mr. Formica seconded the motion.
- All were in favor.

Plan was approved.

b. Steelton Terminal – Planning Commission File PC#2024-02. The 137.01-acre project site is split among three (3) municipalities: Lower Swatara Township, Steelton Borough, and Swatara Township, and lies within the Industrial (I) District, Industrial District – Light (I-L), and Limited Manufacturing District (M-L) respectively. The Preliminary/Final Land Development Plan proposes to construct three (3) new warehouse/distribution facilities (203,840 sf / 305,760 sf / 605,860 sf), access roads/drives, parking areas, site improvements, utilities, and stormwater/PCSM facilities.

Jeremy Bittinger with Landworks Civil Design further explained the project. As mentioned, the property is in 3 municipalities, Lower Swatara Township being to the east

and north. He showed the property on the overhead projector and pointed out where it was in our municipality. There are three buildings associated with this project, plus employee parking and truck parking. Building One is in the north of the property which is in Lower Swatara; Building Two is Steelton and Swatara with parking on both the left and right sides, and trucks on the north and south sides; and Building Three splits all three municipalities.

Mr. Diamond asked if he knew what percentage of Building Three was in each municipality.

Mr. Bittinger said they are going through a lot of calculations for that for tax implications, as well. But as far as they know at this point, they have been coordinating with Capital Water, and all of their sewer would be going down into Steelton's sewer system. That includes Buildings One, Two, and Three going into Steelton's system. The nearest sewer they have to LST is on Richardson Road, which would require a creek crossing, and they are trying to limit [inaudible].

Mr. Diamond reiterated that all three buildings sewer would be going into Steelton's system, so there is no dedication of any sewer lines that would pass through Lower Swatara.

Mr. Bittinger said no, at this time they believe it will all be a private system.

Mr. Bittinger went on to say that there are three waivers associated with this plan: submission of a preliminary plan, they don't intend for this to be phased, all three buildings will likely go up at the same time; the plan size; and lastly, sidewalks, the only public street associated with LST would be Richardson Road, which they have no connection to, and they do not plan on interrupting the stream or any other environmental features along that road.

Mr. Young asked what Swatara Township did with the request for waiver of sidewalk.

Mr. Bittinger said they met with them earlier in the month, but it was just a briefing item then. For them [Swatara Twp.] as far as the waivers go, there is only about a 200-foot stretch of road and the project's driveway entrance takes up most of that, so they haven't received a comment from HRG on their side of things yet.

Mr. Knopp asked how you get in and out of this complex.

Mr. Bittinger answered by pointing out on the overhead projected plan where the intersection of S. Harrisburg Street and Quarry Road. The site's traffic would turn onto Quarry Road and go directly to Eisenhower Boulevard which then connects to Route 283 and the PA Turnpike.

Mr. Knopp asked if there were no other ways in and out.

Mr. Fabian informed us that there are two emergency accesses that will be gated.

Mr. Bittinger stated that emergency access will be on R Street and one on L Street (which is not a public road) in Steelton Borough. The goal is to get all the industrial traffic, which is trucks, up to Eisenhower and then to the highway system, avoiding any residences in that neighborhood.

Mr. Formica asked if there is a traffic light where it comes out to Eisenhower.

Mr. Bittinger answered yes.

Mr. Formica asked if there was any roadwork that would need to be done because of this.

Mr. Bittinger asked his traffic engineer, Craig Mellott of TPD, to answer that.

Mr. Mellott said that they have prepared a Traffic Impact Study (TIS) although the Ordinance does not require a TIS. He said they have coordinated with Mr. Fabian and HRG and Dawood Engineering. They got relatively minor comments back from Swatara Township and Dawood, they are waiting for HRG's comments to come back soon. Where Quarry Road comes out to today is an industrial area and it comes out at a signal. It is wide enough for trucks to make turns, so their study did not show a significant impact. That particular intersection is in Swatara Township, so they are waiting to see what they have to say about that intersection. Based on the counts that they (TPD) did at Quarry and Eisenhower, 80% of the truck traffic is headed down towards the Turnpike and 283.

Mr. Fabian said that Eric Stump (HRG's traffic engineer) had finished a review, so he said he would forward that letter to Mr. Mellott.

Mr. Fabian continued that they (HRG) had pretty minor comments; just on the background development for the warehouse space that's off of Highspire Street and some signage in Lower Swatara Township. Also, an agreement on how the traffic flow was going to go.

Mr. Fure asked if the warehouse on the Steelton end could utilize that emergency access road that goes down to the quarry to access Route 230 to alleviate any traffic problem on Eisenhower Blvd.

Mr. Mellott said they looked at that, the hope was to have two permitted entrances, but that access is really steep, and it comes out on Route 230 where there are some challenges with sight-distances. But if there is an emergency where a Police Officer or a Fire Engine has to get in, it is steep, but they'd be able to do it. However, from an everyday use perspective, it doesn't look feasible, so they do not recommend that.

Mr. Fabian added that there are steep slopes on each side so making improvements to widen that access road would be a challenge.

Mr. Mellott agreed that the significant grade on Route 230 is a problem. So, it will have to be for emergency vehicles only, there is no intent to send any trucks or passenger cars that way.

Mr. Fure stated that he spoke with our Fire Chief about the response of LSTFD and how they may work with the three warehouses there. He is going to reach out to Dauphin County Communications and also the surrounding municipalities to see who would get the call for each one of those buildings. With Building 3 going through all three municipalities, what happens if you end up with two tenants in that building? We will have to get that worked out as far as Fire Department and Police responses. He added that the other thing that we have to work out is the Knox Box locations. Typically, a Knox Box is located in that municipality for that Fire Department. Only our Fire Department can use our Knox Box keys when they respond, and the same for each municipality. However, there is something called E-Lock System, where each municipality has an e-lock and that building has an E-Lock System, then any surrounding municipality can respond to that building and gain access for the emergency, whatever it

may be. Our Assistant Fire Chief is going to be working with the surrounding municipalities. So maybe this would be a good time for our Fire and Police Departments to start getting on an E-Lock System. Mr. Fure then asked if they were proposing emergency access gates.

Mr. Bittinger said yes, they are proposing for the emergency access to be gated.

Mr. Fure stressed that you don't want to just limit the gate to a Knox Box key, because then it prohibits the Police from entering since they don't have access to those. His recommendation would be a simple lock, or a passcode might be better.

Mr. Bittinger said absolutely, they will coordinate with them to find a good solution where services from all three municipalities will have access to those gates.

Mr. Snyder said there are a few things that still have to be worked out. Because this project is split between three municipalities, we have items such as Financial Security Agreements, Financial Security Posts, Developer's Agreement, and the biggest one of all to tie this in and define who is responsible for what, and how we are going to handle certain parameters, is the Intermunicipal Agreement. We are still trying to work this out with Steelton Borough and Swatara Township.

Mr. Diamond added that it looks like he will also be representing Steelton in this three-way thing, and then there is an attorney for Swatara Township. He said he talked to Charlie Courtney, who is the Developer's attorney, and they will be having the developer sign extension agreements just to make sure we don't worry about a timeframe. He said he and the other two attorneys are putting their heads together trying to make things efficient, for example how to approach things like Financial Security and is there anyway to do it as one bond instead of three sets of bonds. So, between the municipalities, we will need an Intermunicipal Agreement coordinating who will go out to do inspections and trying to coordinate just the logistics of that, so we don't have three inspectors going out on the same job. Our philosophical starting point is that of the three municipalities, generally it will be designed around whichever one has the most demanding requirement.

Mr. Diamond asked for clarification on who the engineers were for the three municipalities.

Mr. Fabian stated that Dawood is Swatara's general engineer, but HRG is doing their SWM engineering. HRG is the general engineer for both LST and Steelton.

[Discussion ensued using the overhead projector.]

Mr. Fabian pointed out that it is laid out the way it is because there are a lot of obstacles with the quarry and everything else in there that it needs to be designed around so they are trying to make best use out of what available space was there. It may look odd from a 20,000-foot view, but there are a lot of restrictions there between steep slopes that don't show up on this map and environmental features and the surrounding communities.

Mr. Knopp asked Mr. Snyder if he had any more comments.

Mr. Snyder said that it is a work in progress, and they have many administrative items to work through.

Mr. Diamond said the big BMP is in Steelton and LST with most of the outflow going into LST.

Mr. Fabian added that is within our Act 167 District.

Mr. Diamond said that we may uniquely have one big O&M Agreement with two municipalities.

Mr. Knopp asked Mr. Fabian for any further comments from HRG.

Mr. Fabian said this is a first review for them so there are a number of technical items to work through. One that is more of a concern to Mr. Fabian is having the Preliminary and Final come in at the same time, understanding that they are going to be tackling all three warehouses at one time. Some of the concerns are that we don't know who the end-user is, so there will be modifications; the one building being in all three municipalities makes him a little nervous, because if there are modifications, it has to go back in front of everyone (the 3 municipalities) again. He feels this will be a little cumbersome and he recommends phases. But if the intent is truly to build everything at once, then that is a strong argument in favor of that waiver. In reading through Dawood's letter for Swatara's review, it seems like they were comfortable with that Preliminary/Final approach. Most of the other stuff in this letter is similar traffic-type

comments that we have already discussed. He went on to say that there are a number of really steep slopes, so there are some pretty sizeable retaining walls. Usually retaining walls are handled through a detailed review as we get closer to the construction area where HRG's structural team will review through those. There is one that is trying to avoid impact to a wetland area, so they are talking about trying to build a retaining wall closer down to that area. That is a pretty large wall so that makes him a little nervous about making sure that is designed adequately and if there are any additional modifications that could be made there to reduce the height of the wall.

Mr. Knopp asked how high of a retaining wall it is.

Mr. Fabian said it could be 35-40 feet in some locations, so they are very sizeable walls.

Mr. Fabian went on to say that there is an existing conservation area with the stream along Richardson Road but if you look at the actual topography between the building and the mobile home residences on the other side of Richardson Rd., most of the trees are actually down in the valley area, so there is not a lot of visual screening for everyone that sits on a high point of that mobile home park. Something to consider is that there is an existing buffer, but it is not really in view shed of those residences there. There might be some additional screening for Building One to consider just because there are two high points directly across from each other. So aside from that, Mr. Fabian said he had no major concerns, it is a pretty straightforward plan set.

Mr. Knopp asked for any comments from DCPC.

Ms. Korber said she wanted to make mention of the single entrance off of S. Harrisburg Street with cars and trucks going in. She asked if there was any chance of a second separate entrance for vehicles.

Mr. Bittinger said they don't own enough land in that area to make two access drives.

Ms. Korber said when she looked at that intersection on Google maps, she did see stop signs so she didn't know what that might do for the back-up.

Mr. Mellott said it is a three-way stop today with the exception of a right-turn onto S. Harrisburg Street. But this will make it into a 4-way intersection with an all-way stop.

Ms. Korber asked for clarification on whose regulations we would use for what with the buildings being in three municipalities.

Mr. Bittinger explained that it would be based on the most restrictive for each building. So LST's standards would be used for Buildings One and Three; and Building Two would be Swatara's standard. Steelton does not have an ordinance for warehouse parking.

Ms. Korber asked if LST collects a stormwater fee.

The answer was yes, LST does collect a stormwater fee.

Ms. Korber pointed out that Swatara also collects that fee, so that will be something else that will need to be worked out between everyone.

Mr. Diamond agreed that will be something that needs to be worked out between the municipalities.

Ms. Korber asked if there would be a lighting plan.

Mr. Bittinger said yes, there will be a lighting plan with the next submission and an E&S Plan as well. He said that they have already submitted to the Dauphin County Conservation District, so they will be including that in the next submission. He believes the Landscaping Plan will be included, as well.

Mr. Knopp asked Mr. Diamond for any further comments.

Mr. Diamond did not have any other legal comments. But he did want to commend Mr. Fabian for bringing up the topography there. We are used to looking at the paper plans which only show us the two-dimensional layout. And it does seem like there may be a screening concern in that area because of the topography, that would be hard to pick up on just looking at the paper plans.

Mr. Bittinger said they are currently working with Steelton, who don't require a buffer, but they are voluntarily installing one for the residents. So, they will be sure to work with LST on the buffer.

Mr. Young had a follow-up question to the comments from the Township regarding the front yard setback to be 55 feet. Our requirement is 80 feet. So, first of all, is that comment correct? Secondly, is that due to the natural occurring topography there?

Mr. Bittinger asked if this was pertaining to Richardson Road.

Mr. Snyder said it was Richardson Road.

Mr. Bittinger assured him that they were plenty of feet away from that, so if needed, they could change that number on the plan without affecting anything at all. He thinks they are about 150 to 200 feet away from the property line.

Mr. Snyder went on to explain that in LST's Zoning Ordinance, the definition of "front yard" of any facility is the side that has frontage along the road. In this case, they have frontage along Richardson Road. But they have no access to Richardson Road so the other point where they have access is off Quarry Road, so we want to make sure that we know what to differentiate between front yard, side yard, and rear yard.

[Discussion ensued using the overhead projector.]

Mr. Snyder said we just want to be a little more clarifying as to what we call this yard and display on the plan what this setback is off Richardson Road. Regardless, they can meet the 80' setbacks off of Richardson and Quarry Roads. It is a technical issue and not a physical issue.

Mr. Fabian added that most of the measurements he is taking are just roughly around 120 feet or more.

Mr. Snyder said the confusing part was the property lines and the need for clarification and he will work with Mr. Bittinger's office to get that all cleared up in a manner that is acceptable to both municipalities.

Mr. Young said his concern was that it says 50 feet, but it is an 80-foot requirement, so we would be looking at a variance, so he just wanted clarity on what the issue was before we proceed further. Was it a calculation error or an interpretation error?

Mr. Snyder said that physical distance-wise, they can meet the building setback line off of both Richardson and Quarry Roads. It's just a matter of where we set that line and whose Ordinance do we use to differentiate that versus having two building setback lines.

Mr. Knopp asked for any other comments or questions.

Mr. Fure just wanted to emphasize what Mr. Fabian touched on with the elevation change and landscape buffers.

Mr. Knopp asked for any questions from the Public.

There were none at this time.

Mr. Knopp asked the Planning Commission what they would like to do with this plan.

- Mr. Crawford made a motion to table this plan.
- Mr. Young seconded the motion.
- All were in favor.

Plan was tabled.

c. Brook Meadow Farms – Planning Commission File PC#2024-03. The 115.01-acre project site lies within the Residential Agricultural (R-A) District. The Proposed Consolidation Subdivision & Land Development Plan proposes to consolidate two (2) existing tracts with two (2) new lots: one (1) for agricultural use(s), three (3) for residential use(s), one (1) for potential solar use(s), and one (1) for a combination of uses. Lastly, said Plan proposes the installation/construction of both an irrigation pond and a sanitary sewer force main.

John Melham, of Melham Associates, was here tonight on behalf of Mr. & Mrs. Koirala, to explain the plan. This is a conceptual plan being presented tonight for the Planning Commission's consideration and feedback. He explained that he had one correction: the tract to the south of the road, will be cut in half [he then pointed out on the overhead projection of the map where it would be]. So, it is a combination of a consolidation plan, re-subdivision plan, and draft of a land development plan.

[More presentation followed using the overhead projector.]

He explained that the new 10,000 sf building will be for both processing and packaging. It would be immediately west of the existing structure. The rest of the compound has an existing farmhouse, an existing storage building, and on the plan they are showing future potential uses for the rest of the existing structures. He went on to point out where the low-pressure sewer system would be.

Mr. Knopp asked for any questions/comments from the Planning Commission.

Mr. Formica asked if they were just looking at re-zoning for the slaughterhouse area and if the rest would stay the same (residential).

Mr. Melham said he was not sure they were looking at re-zoning that, but if they have to, they will.

Mr. Fure pointed out that they do have the right to do what they are proposing to do under the “Right To Farm Act” for the slaughtering/processing of animals that are raised on site.

Mr. Diamond asked Mr. Melham if they would be slaughtering there and not bringing in things from elsewhere.

Mr. Melham said that is correct. It is called “custom slaughtering”, and it is just low volume. There have been submissions to the Township in the past, so the new facility will be on a larger scale with all the latest equipment to do both the processing and packaging. Some of the product will be trucked out and they do show on their plan that there is a single loading dock for straight trucks. Mr. Koirala says he will not need tractor-trailers, only straight trucks. [He then pointed out where the trucks would be coming in and out on the overhead projected map.] He went on to say that with what they are doing here, there is no clear-cut parking requirement. The owner said he would need about 50 parking spaces, so Mr. Melham’s firm has provided a little over that on this plan. He said he cannot give figures on projected truck traffic, but the owner said he would only need one loading dock, so there shouldn’t be much generated truck traffic at all. The traffic coming in there is mostly single-family cars. But he will have straight trucks for his sales to local markets, but how much, he does not know at this point.

Mr. Diamond asked if they would be raising the goats on the property.

Mr. Melham said yes.

Mr. Knopp asked if they would only be slaughtering goats.

Mr. Melham said there may be some chickens that they would also slaughter, but there are very few; he doesn't have chicken coops. But his business would either be predominantly or solely goats.

Mr. Young asked to go back to Zoning. This is in the Residential Agricultural District (R-A) so he's not sure a solar operation would be a permitted use.

Mr. Melham said maybe not, but they put it in their plan because the owner has talked to someone about the potential of renting that space, but that is all Mr. Melham knows about it. So obviously, if that comes to fruition and it requires some kind of zoning appeal, they will have to do it.

Mr. Knopp asked where they plan on putting the solar panels.

Mr. Melham informed them that it was not the owner who came up with this idea. He was approached by a company. [He pointed out on the overhead projected map where it may potentially be.]

Mr. Crawford asked if the owner was going to break up Tract 1, will he be using the new tract for a different purpose?

Mr. Melham said no, it is still intended for his agriculture. He raises some crops for sale, such as peppers and other vegetables, but there is no immediate intended use for that piece of land. At this point, there is no interest in further subdivision or residential development, it is purely agriculture. As their business expands, new ideas may come forward, but right now it is just remaining agriculture.

Mr. Formica asked if the public could go in and buy something.

Mr. Melham said the public can come in. He is dealing with the PA Department of Agriculture and USDA, and they regulate a lot of this. His customers now are private customers. He does do some wholesale trade. So, some local markets come in and purchase his product and take it out. That pattern is intended to continue, both private and low volume customers. It is the same as deer processing places. Same product, different animal.

Mr. Diamond wanted to clarify that here we are talking about Subdivision and Land Development. The general concept that the owner is alluding to is that there is State preemption of local zoning for a pretty broad swath of normal agricultural activities. On the other hand, someone running this could start doing something that steps out of those lines, so if the preemption doesn't apply, our zoning limits may apply, so the Township has restrictions on where solar can be when it is a primary use that's generated for offsite accessory, we are looking at all those things. So, someone coming in for solar could trigger another subdivision because you would be allocating land. It's very different from someone just wanting to put solar panels on their house.

Mr. Crawford asked if the State is then regulating his processing here. Who is regulating this processing activity, the Township or the State?

Mr. Diamond explained that there are a number of nuance things that it depends on. If you are putting in an agricultural building to do normal agricultural activities related to that farm, the buildings are either going to meet our SALDO requirements or the zoning stuff will potentially become un-preempted around the edges. There does get to be a lot of confusion on certain kinds of agricultural storage buildings that get to become exempt from building codes. But if they are going by very specific definitions, that could change things.

Mr. Crawford said he is still not sure who would be responsible for checking those types of things.

Mr. Diamond said both. The State is looking at it more from the food-safety aspect, while most of the rest is the Township. However, the Attorney General's Office does step in if they feel we are overstepping the preemption. They would normally just send a somewhat friendly letter to the Township saying they don't feel we are allowed to push this regulation in this actual scenario. There are a whole bunch of laws: the Right To Farm Act, ACRE Act (The ACRE Act protects ranchers, farmers, and livestock markets

from burdensome federal overregulation), and a few more. So there always is a somewhat complex analysis to try to understand the facts as represented by the Applicant. Sometimes you may get a complaint, or you visually can see that something else is happening, but sometimes these cases change based on the circumstances.

Mr. Melham stated that again this is just a conceptual plan and he told Mr. Koirala to give us an idea of everything you plan to do with your property at this point. That is when Mr. Koirala told him that he was approached by a company that wants to do a solar farm, but he was not sure he wanted to do that. But Mr. Melham included it in the plan just in case. So, everything else, with that exception of the solar farm, was Mr. Koirala's idea. The solar farm was just included to show what was suggested.

Mr. Diamond added that with all that being said, we have to inform the owner that the solar farm is not permitted in that zoning district. And that is if it isn't, we really don't know at this time because we never researched it.

Mr. Melham said neither did they, but they did want to include it on the plan because it was brought up as a potential use.

Mr. Snyder said that primary solar energy system in the R-A District is a "Use Not Provided For". There are four districts in LST that permit solar energy facilities, but R-A is not one of them.

Mr. Diamond said his position is if it is a "Use Not Provided For" doesn't mean you can jam it in any district.

Mr. Snyder added that it is not expressively permitted but it is also not expressively prohibited either.

Mr. Diamond added that we have opposed, as a township, someone trying to put one in where it is not permitted, and it was denied by the Zoning Hearing Board.

Mr. Melham asked about the food operations. Who governs that and who controls that? He said next time they come here, they will be better equipped and maybe their client will be there because he can cite the various agencies he is working with.

Mr. Fure replied that they are the USDA, IFC, Dept. of Agriculture, and Dept. of Sanitation.

Mr. Melham added that they will be able to answer questions about who controls all of this. But he said they are just trying to be fully open with the Township.

Mr. Young asked about their well and if they will be connecting to public water.

Mr. Melham said they have a private well that is solely for irrigation. The reason he needs a pond is because there is not sufficient water for a normal growing season. So, there is no intent to run from his well to all the proposed residential units, they would all have their own individual well. The reason they are putting the whole thing on a low-pressure system is that even though the septic systems have all passed, you need to look at the expense of each of these mounds and the time involvement. So, that is why they are proposing this alternative.

Mr. Diamond wanted to make sure they were not proposing any of that to be dedicated.

Mr. Melham said it would be private. Obviously, they will be paying the Authority to process that waste.

Mr. Diamond said they would need an intensive grease trap.

Mr. Melham agreed that there will be that. But there is no animal processing waste going into the sewer. That is handled separately in a holding tank that will be taken care of privately.

Mr. Diamond advised that just hosing down the floors going into floor drains can result in heavy intensive waste, so we will be very analytical about what is flowing where and what the strength of that waste is.

Mr. Melham said that all the impertinences inside that facility, all the sinks, all the washdowns, all the grease-traps....

Mr. Diamond interjected that he was not talking about little grease traps under the sink, he was talking about the ones that are tens of thousands of dollars that are commercial strength.

Mr. Melham assured him that they would install whatever is required.

Mr. Snyder advised Mr. Melham that in our Township Staff comments letter, number 15 does indicate how will manure and slaughtering/butchering waste be managed. And that you should contact the Dauphin County Conservation District for any assistance with that. So, we are looking at the number of animals and manure and then any of the entrails and waste from the butchering/slaughtering process and how that will all be handled.

Mr. Diamond said all these things are proper agricultural items that are requirements, we just have to be careful with some of the components like what the waste is going into.

Mr. Melham assured that nothing will be going in your waste that the Authority will not accept. He said he was just not prepared tonight to get into all the specifics.

Mr. Diamond added that there is a whole other layer to that too because we (LST) do not have a wastewater treatment plant. We have a system you have to go through but then you would also have to deal with Highspire. There are some complexities with the sewer system.

Mr. Fabian said that we have discussed most of his comments, but one he had is some property line discrepancies between the online database or the County parcels and what is on the Plan. Sometimes the GIS database is not up to date with the research that was done on the Deed so just make sure you can clarify and agree with the property lines.

Mr. Melham said that they concur, this was a difficult survey. He said that they surveyed every square inch of these properties, and they feel very comfortable now with this.

Mr. Diamond asked if any of those implicating any potential disputes with neighbors.

Mr. Melham said he has not heard of any disputes with neighbors over property lines. He said they have marked everything, and normally when you put up markers, that is when you start receiving phone calls, but that have not received any calls. So, he is not aware of any disputes and is comfortable with the surveyor seal on the plan.

Mr. Fabian added that another comment he had was on road geometry between tract 1 and tract 2. There is a really sharp curve, so we are looking at doing lot line readjustment there.

Mr. Melham said that right now nothing is proposed for that. But he is comfortable saying that his clients would not have a problem making some kind of adjustment there on behalf of the Township.

Mr. Fabian said we would like to open up that dialog at some point to see what addition right-of-way could be gained there to help alleviate that geometry there.

[More discussion ensued on the road geometry out there.]

Mr. Knopp asked Mr. Fure for any further comments.

Mr. Fure said looking at the existing house, there are two driveways that lead back to the storage building. He asked if one can be dedicated for just business and then upgrading that driveway.

Mr. Melham responded that if there is a demonstrated or seriously perceived concern, they will address it.

[More discussion using overhead projector.]

Mr. Fure went on to say that as far as permitting and when a permit is required, the PA Uniform Construction Code (UCC) is pretty specific as in animal storage, hay storage, storage of equipment, etc. The building they are using now is still defined for future use as the slaughterhouse. He asked what the future of this existing building will be.

Mr. Melham said he thinks the existing building will continue to be used in the same way. But that is a question that he cannot fully answer at this time.

Mr. Fure said he just wants to be as upfront as he has been with the owner over the past several years. Those buildings were exempt from building permits because they were for horse storage. As you begin to do other things, they will need to be permitted. So, as they move along, they will need to get an engineer in there to evaluate the buildings and bring them up to code.

Mr. Melham stated that their architect is an expert in code.

Mr. Fure added that the code allows for up to 25% of the property to be covered by agricultural hoop buildings.

[More discussion ensued using the overhead projection of the overall site plan.]

Mr. Knopp asked for any further questions or comments from the Staff or the Public.

Mrs. Vajda asked if this was going to be retail.

It was not.

Because this was a Sketch Plan, no action was needed tonight.

OTHER BUSINESS:

a. Fulling Mills – Planning Commission File PC#2024-04.

Mr. Snyder explained that the Applicant desires to develop the property in a manner that is more similar to the surrounding land uses and consistent with the goals and desires of the LST Comprehensive Plan. To effectuate these goals, the Applicant desires to have the property rezoned from Residential Agriculture (R-A) and Residential Suburban (R-S) to Residential Suburban(R-S) and Residential Urban (R-U).

Mr. Snyder clarified that this is an application for a Zoning Map Amendment only, not a Zoning Text Amendment.

Mr. Knopp asked what the difference was between a Zoning Map Amendment (ZMA) and a Zoning Text Amendment (ZTA).

Mr. Diamond explained that if you are changing the map colors that is a ZMA. But when you start changing the wording of the Zoning Ordinance, that is a ZTA. Most of the requirements are the same, but when there is a map change, there are extra notice requirements.

Mr. Snyder went on to say that the typical procedure is that the Applicant was before the BOC at their Workshop Meeting and presented their case and their application, and it was open to some discussion. The first step in the process of the PA Municipalities Planning Code (MPC) is that the BOC officially refers the application to the Planning Commission for their formal recommendation on the request for map amendment (which was done). So, the next step in this process is to bring to the PC's attention that the referral was made, and the application will be appearing at the next PC Meeting (in April) for consideration and a vote on a recommendation. From there, the process continues to move forward to go in front of the BOC after it has been advertised appropriately and gone in front of the Zoning Hearing Board....so there is a whole process that is involved. The next step would be to have it formally read, reviewed, and potentially recommended at our next meeting.

Mr. Snyder added that we have a proposed timeline that we work out with Mr. Diamond (our solicitor) and Dauphin County Planning Commission. Knowing that it is coming in towards the end of the month, DCPC has their meeting the first Monday of every month, so they may not have the opportunity to put that on their Agenda, since they will have comments of their own that will need to be addressed. So right now, we are planning on acting upon this at our May PC Meeting.

Mr. Diamond said that in terms of timing, this is a legislative discretionary thing. So, there is no deemed approval concept. So, the only real times are that the Commissioners have to give the Planning Commission at least 30 days to review, but they could give way longer than that, or they could decide we are not interested in doing this.

Ms. Korber added that she could possibly get it on the DCPC agenda for the April meeting.

Mr. Snyder added that the way the timeline is working for us, we could entertain a recommendation at the April PC Meeting. We built it into our timeline not exactly knowing what the DCPC timeline would be.

[More discussion ensued on the timeline of this.]

April 25th Meeting - The next Planning Commission Meeting will be scheduled for Thursday, April 25, 2024, at 7:00 P.M.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

There were no more comments from the Public.

GOOD & WELFARE

ADJOURN:

A motion was made by Mr. Crawford and seconded by Mr. Formica to adjourn the meeting. All were in favor.

Meeting adjourned at 9:28 P.M.

Respectfully Submitted,

Donald A. Fure, Director of Codes/Planning & Zoning