

MINUTES

LOWER SWATARA TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION

**REGULAR MEETING
AUGUST 23, 2018 7:00 P.M.**

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

Chauncey Knopp, Chairman
Eric Breon, Vice Chairman
Kimber Latsha
Dennis Fausey
James Young
Peter Henninger, LST Solicitor
Alexa Korber, Dauphin County Planning Commission
Andrew Kenworthy, HRG
Ann Hursh, LST Planning & Zoning Coordinator
Tonya Condran, Recording Secretary

Others in attendance:

Ambrose Heinz, Campus Heights/Steven's & Lee
Joanne Artman, resident
Stephen Artman, resident
Nancy Avolesse, resident
Dr. Lori Suski, Middletown Area School District
Mark Stanley, MWN/UPS
Justin Gochenauer, Baker/UPS
Todd Trautz, Baker/UPS
Dave Feidt, CNR/UPS
Eric Revene, Commercial Partners
Chris Behrden, UPS
Thomas R. Healey, UPS
Bill Leonard, resident
John Davidson, resident
Stephany Davidson, resident
Ovidio Irizarry, UPS
G.W. Sloan/Cheryl, M&H Railroad
George Holder, Hershey Creamery
David Wilson, Rettew Associates
Zach Waite, Hershey Ice Cream
Tom LeBlanc, UPS
Chris DeHart, resident/BOC
Charlie Creswell, Webber/Smith Assoc. Inc.
Lawrence A. Dimeler IV, resident
Claudia Sisti, resident
Matt Ryan, Hershey Ice Cream
Francis Zulli, resident
Jane Zulli, resident

Marjie Hartz, resident
Chet Hartz, resident
Paul Wagner, resident
Kane High, resident
Laura Hayes, Press & Journal
(and a number of others that did not sign in)

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Mr. Knopp asked if there was a motion to approve July 26, 2018 meeting minutes. Motion was made by Mr. Fausey to approve the minutes and seconded by Mr. Young. All were in favor. Minutes were approved.

OLD BUSINESS:

a. **File #PC2018-01, Campus Heights Village III, LP** with a timeline deadline of September 19, 2018. Properties generally south of Dauphin Street, west of N. Lawrence Street, and east of the Borough of Middletown line, zoned Commercial Neighborhood. Final Lot Consolidation and Land Development Plan to combine 32 parcels into one new parcel, vacate select existing streets and construct 14 student housing buildings (84 units for a total of 336 bedrooms). Owned by Campus Heights Associates I, LP, submitted by C2C Design Group.

Larry Grybosky of C2C Design Group gave a summary of the project and asked if anyone had any questions or comments. He said they did not have any other questions, they felt all that was left was cleaning up some last minute items. He said the major comments seemed to be regarding Stormwater, which they do not have any problems with.

Andrew Kenworthy from HRG said there really aren't any comments that would be serious in nature, they all can be addressed. He pointed out to make sure legal items of annexation for the parcels, and street vacation, and things like that get done. A number of items are technical in nature under the Stormwater but fairly straightforward; basically a lot of "clean-up" items.

Mr. Knopp asked if anyone had any questions.

Mr. Henninger said that he spoke with counsel for the developer about street vacations. Exhibit One of the plan shows they have a 15' wide unopened alley, Gina Lane that is private, Wood Street which is a public street, an extension of High Street which was never dedicated; so there are some road vacations that need to be done in the private-way and also in the public right-

of-way. They have done this before in Campus Heights I so they know the procedure to follow. These are legal issues that must be taken care of before final approval and plan recording.

Mr. Grybosky said he was involved with that previous project and assured that they would be submitting the appropriate paperwork to do that. He said they wanted to move forward with the plan just so that everything is timed appropriately. That is why those things are still pending.

Mr. Henninger then asked about the annexation of the two pieces to the left of the project.

Mr. Grybosky said the reason for that annexation is because when they relocated the Lawrence Street right-of-way in the last project, it left these two little triangular pieces on the old lot layout from the old Eagle Heights subdivision. Those two little triangular pieces were essentially “orphaned” when Lawrence Street was relocated; so the intent was to make it all a single piece of property and not have these two little slivers. At present he thinks that the plan is to have that northern portion of Lawrence Street be a private street anyway but in order to make everything clean, that is what the lot annexation will do with those two little pieces.

Mr. Henninger said they need that to get setbacks and they are related-entity owned.

Mr. Grybosky said that is correct; it would come from one Campus Heights project to this new Campus Heights project.

Mr. Knopp asked Mrs. Hursh if there was anything from the Township.

Mrs. Hursh said she did not have anything additional from what was said. She did note that the annexation does help them with the setback on the one building that they got the variance for.

Mr. Knopp asked if the Fire Department has reviewed this plan.

Mrs. Hursh said yes they reviewed it previously because this plan has been around for a while.

Mr. Henninger asked if they were comfortable with the routing with that becoming private back in there.

Mrs. Hursh answered yes, they are ok with that.

Mr. Knopp asked if anyone from the Planning Commission has any questions.

Mr. Breon questioned the problems with water coming down Wood Street. He asked if our staff was convinced that their plans were going to solve the problem down there.

Mr. Grybosky assured that they are catching a lot of the run-off that comes off the fields on the north side, so that is being taken care of. A lot of it is being piped into the basin and they are doing rate-control out of that basin into the storm sewer system.

Mr. Breon was more concerned with the water that runs off of the property and onto W. Main Street (Route 230) and then collects to form about a 6" deep pond along the road every time it rains hard.

Mr. Kenworthy stated that HRG's point of view, looking at the requirements to control the new development, they have addressed those requirements but unfortunately we cannot speak about what is further down on Route 230 at this time. Looking at what is proposed now, they have addressed all the requirements associated with that and have collected everything there and are handling the control of it.

Mr. Grybosky said he couldn't speak about the technical part of controlling the water, but there are a few properties that are further south of this, so this doesn't go all the way down to Route 230.

Mr. Breon said they are a fraction of the size of the Campus Heights development.

Mr. Grybosky said absolutely, but they are all downhill from them, so they can control what they can on their own site and coming to the site from above and address the stormwater that comes onto the site and leaves the site. He doesn't think there is much that could be done other than what is already been planned for. He feels their plan will control the majority of that water; so he feels it addresses the problem.

Mr. Henninger asked where the water goes from that basin.

Mr. Grybosky answered that it goes into the storm sewer system.

Mr. Henninger added that although he realizes it is not going to be 100% perfect nor does it have to be made that way, it's got to be better than it is now because that upper end is going to be controlled into a basin and underground as opposed to just going down the road.

Mr. Breon was concerned about the small home owners downhill that he felt were going to get the run-off from uphill.

Mr. Grybosky assured Mr. Breon that everything on their side they will be capturing and managing the rate control, so it will not leave their site without controlling the rate. So what will be leaving the site will be less and at a slower rate than what is coming off there right now.

Mr. Breon then asked if there were plans to improve Wood Street since there would be an increase of people using the street to get up to the new development.

Mr. Henninger added that they did improvements to the west side of the road as they were required to do with the first phase. The other side of the road, south of the property, would be improved if development would take place there. So the answer is no, they are not doing anything to that part of the road with this development.

Mr. Breon was under the impression that it was discussed at a previous meeting that improving the road would be part of any further development from Campus Heights. He said he wasn't disagreeing with what has been said about it, but the majority of the traffic is not going to be coming from the single family property owners left on Wood Street. The traffic will be mostly from the college students which he feels will be a burden on the Township in the near future because that road is old and will be deteriorating quickly.

Mr. Knopp asked how many properties were below this site.

Mr. Grybosky said there are maybe four or five properties. Those remaining properties are also zoned Neighborhood Commercial now. The likelihood that they are going to remain is probably pretty low. So if there is future development with those properties that is when the improvements would be made.

Mr. Henninger added that if that would ever happen, it would be required to increase the right-of-ways to the current standard and improve that side of the road just like they did with Campus Heights Phase I.

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

Mr. Fausey stated that he agrees with Mr. Breon. He then asked if we knew about how many feet that stretch of Wood Street is.

Everyone agreed that it is probably around 350 feet.

Mr. Fausey suggested that it would be nice if they would consider improving that stretch of road.

Mr. Latsha asked, from an engineering point-of-view, is the run-off problem that Mr. Breon is talking about able to be improved by this significantly or will it be worse. Is what they are doing really solving the problem?

Mr. Kenworthy said it certainly is not making it any worse, but he cannot guarantee that it will make it any better. He feels it is on the side of improvement as opposed to making it worse. He would not say significantly, but as stated they are controlling over-land flow now that will go into the control facilities and piped out.

Mr. Breon again pointed out that he doesn't feel the road, which was probably put in place in the 1940's, is capable of handling the extra traffic that will be added to it with the creation of the new development.

Mr. Grybosky said that he cannot commit on the developer's behalf, but they will definitely explore it and look at the issue.

Mr. Knopp asked for any other questions or comments. There were none.

Mr. Knopp then asked for the two waivers to be addressed.

1. Section 22-404: Preliminary Plans; Procedure - The applicant is looking to combine the Preliminary and Final plan approvals into one approval process. The applicant understands and will provide everything required for both the Preliminary and Final plan requirements as set forth in the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Chapter 22).

- Mr. Breon made motion to approve this waiver.
- Mr. Young seconded the motion.
- All were in favor.

2. Section 22-508.A: Tree Preservation and Planting - All existing trees on the subject site are to be removed as a result of the overall development. New trees are being proposed, as indicated on the Landscaping Plan (Sheet No. LA-1).

- Mr. Fausey made the motion to approve this waiver.
- Mr. Young seconded the motion.
- All were in favor.

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

Mr. Young asked for clarification from the staff. Is everything compliant, that they submitted in connection with this Phase, with all our requirements and necessary approvals?

Mrs. Hursh confirmed that and Mr. Kenworthy added that there are some outstanding comments as stated at the beginning that are fairly minor in nature and are typical clean-up of detailed items.

Mr. Young said, in terms of substantial compliance, is what he was getting at. So basically, they still need to dot some i's and cross some t's.

Mr. Kenworthy said that is correct.

- Mr. Young then made the motion that we recommend to approve this plan with stipulations.
- Mr. Fausey seconded that motion.
- Mr. Breon and Mr. Latsha were opposed until they would hear back from the developer to consider the improvements to Wood Street.
- Mr. Knopp, who would be the tie-breaker, voted in favor to approve the plan.
- Plan approved to be sent onto the Board of Commissioners for recommendation.

b. **File #PC2018-03, Star Barn Duplex Units** with a timeline deadline of December 20, 2018. Located on Nissley Drive, south of I-283, one lot, 3.67 acres, 12 duplex units, zoned Residential Urban. Preliminary/Final Subdivision/Land Development Plan, owned by Star Barn Townhomes LP, submitted by Navarro & Wright Consulting Engineers, Inc.

Tabled.

NEW BUSINESS:

a. **File #PC2018-05, UPS Northeast Regional Hub**, with a timeline deadline of November 21, 2018. Property is 192 acres located east of N. Union Street at the northern Township boundary, zoned Mineral Recovery and Conservation. Preliminary/Final Land Development Plan to propose 775,033sf parcel delivery distribution hub, maintenance garage, truck wash, employee training center and other required site improvements. Owned by SP Middletown Holdings, LP, and submitted by Snyder, Secary & Associates, LLC.

Mark Stanley, of McNees Wallace & Nurick, was here tonight to represent UPS. He introduced everyone who was there with him tonight: Ovidio Irizzary from UPS, Tom Healy from UPS, Chris Bearden from UPS, Ron Secary from Snyder & Secary, and Greg Holtzman from Snyder & Secary.

Mr. Stanley said they were last in front of the LST Planning Commission in the fall of last year where they discussed the proposed text amendment that was adopted by the Board of Commissioners. Since that time, he said they have worked on the Land Development plan, gone through several reviews internally, and submitted that plan initially for modification requests. Based on that, they added an additional modification to the request to be considered by the Township dealing with de-watering time. There are a few changes from the last time they were here when they were going through the concept plan. At that time, the proposed facility was in the neighborhood of about 940,000 square feet. Going through engineering and their review, the final facility that is proposed on the 192 acres is about 775,000 square feet. So there has been a significant reduction in the size of the facility. He said they have received the review letters from HRG, the County, and LST Staff. Many of the review comments are administrative in nature.

Ron Secary from Snyder, Secary & Associates came to the microphone and explained that they were the civil engineers for the project. He explained the rigorous design process that they have been going through since last fall when they were last here. They have seen some significant changes and betterment to the plan. Things like the size of the building being significantly reduced, and various elements being added to the plan such as an electric substation, CNG (Compressed Natural Gas) fueling stations, a second truck bay, and they even sloped the building. But the general layout is still very reminiscent of what was seen last year. He then described the location and project in more detail and stated that if at any point anyone has any questions to just stop him to talk about it.

Mr. Secary then went over the plan drawing with the Planning Commission team. In the western portion of the property, would be the employee parking. The rest of the site is filled up with the various truck parking that is necessary for the operational needs of this facility. There is now a maintenance building on the north side; there is a truck launch on the east side and one on west side. There will also be a small sewage pump station on the southeast corner. There are two guard shacks and all employees must come through those guard shacks. The entire property other than the employee parking will be totally fenced in. As far as access, coming in off N. Union Street, the northernmost access will be for cars and it will go directly into the employee parking lot. The southernmost access will be for the trucks and they will go through a guard shack. There will be eight lanes; four inbound, four outbound. All the inbound trucks come into what they call the core. From there, there is an extensive internal conveyance system that takes the parcels through the building to the appropriate wings in which they are then distributed for delivery.

Mr. Secary then went into the topic of utilities. This project will be fully handled with every public utility (gas, electric, sewer, and water). Suez Water will be the water provider. The LSTMA will be providing the sewer service. He then said that they will be replacing the current pump station on N. Union Street, giving LST a brand new pump station. As it turns out, they will need to have their own electric substation on site which will be on the southwestern corner of the site property.

Mr. Secary touched a little on the subject of Stormwater Management. There will be several above ground, traditional stormwater basins and those will handle the flow from the retail building and the roadway. About midspan of the access driveway is another basin to collect stormwater from those roadways and treat it before it is discharged. And what cannot be seen are two very large underground basins, which will be large concrete vaults that will take the bulk of the stormwater that is generated by the site proper, treat that and hold it back. He said they are significantly reducing the rate of stormwater discharge with the larger storms from this property to the Swatara Creek.

Mr. Secary then went back to the access roads. They have put a couple of cross-over cuts so that in case of an emergency, traffic can be diverted from one side or the other to get to the in-and-out access. This is just an added safety feature.

Mr. Fausey asked about the underground water collection system. He asked for confirmation that there were going to be concrete bunkers.

Mr. Secary said yes and that was a good analogy. They are going to be very large concrete structures. A property this size will generate a decent volume of runoff because of the impervious surfaces, so they will be putting a lot of inlets and pipes all over the property that will get that water into those basins. And then the outlet structures on those basins are sized to greatly restrict the water from going out before it is discharged into Swatara Creek. At the end of those pipes, when they discharge to Swatara Creek, they not only put energy dissipaters but they actually dropped the water in the manhole before it gets to the outlet. The water is discharged in a very flat run of pipe, then they put an outlet protection structure, a concrete baffle, and after that they put level spreaders, basically a very large curb in which the water would have to get up to a certain elevation then flow over via sheet flow. So the manner of discharge from the pipes is not really going to funneled like a stream into the Swatara Creek, it is going to be slowed down, the velocity taken out of it, and then spread out very wide so it's really more of a sheet flow than a concentrated flow.

Mr. Breon asked about the dog-leg section of the entranceway. He asked if they have the level spreaders out of that detention pond, as well.

Mr. Secary said yes, it does.

Mr. Breon asked where the water would be going from there.

Mr. Secary showed where the water flow was going from there, which was down to the Swatara Creek.

Mr. Breon then asked about the big concrete bunkers.

Mr. Secary say both would also discharge into the Swatara Creek.

Mr. Henninger asked to go back to the road structure. One of the questions that always comes up with our Fire Department is if there are two ways of getting in and out. He said he knows there is a truck lane in and an employee lane in and the cross-overs to get there, but he was questioning if a fire truck can go into the employee parking area and obtain full access to the perimeter of the building.

Mr. Secary assured that it can. There is a straight shot up to the northern end of the property which has a gated fence there at the salt shed; this would feed directly into the site property.

Mr. Henninger asked for confirmation that a fire truck could make that turn.

Mr. Secary said yes, it could. Anywhere on the property would be possible for a fire truck to maneuver.

Mr. Secary then spoke on the environmental aspects. There is currently a wooded buffer along Swatara Creek, they are maintaining all that and are not going to touch any of that, as shown on the plan. He said that, in fact, they have enhanced it with additional forestation to beef up some of the thinner areas. They have put in riparian plant mixes to create meadows in areas that will promote ecosystem enhancements. These are not only out of the DEP's recommendations but also the Manada Conservancy. They have recently met with the Conservancy to review the plan and the meeting went well. He feels they were appreciative of the effort they are making not only to protect resources but also to enhance the resources.

Mr. Secary discussed lighting next. They have provided a plan with the photometric details. All the lights will be directionalized inward so none will be facing out towards anything other than the core of this property. The lights will also be back-shielded to prevent glare from going backwards towards adjacent properties. The photometric analysis shows there is no spill-over onto adjacent properties. It will also be LED lighting so it will be very efficient and softer.

We feel this state-of-the-art lighting will go a long way to help mitigate people's concerns about light pollution.

Mr. Secary went on to say that they did voluntarily placed sound-walls along the southeastern corner of the site to help protect the residents in that direction from the sounds that may be generated from the operations. He said they are in compliance with the Anti-Idling Laws, which basically limits any idling to 5 minutes or less.

Mr. Secary reiterated that UPS would be using CNG stations to fuel portions of their fleet.

Mr. Breon said he saw a high-pressure gas line not like a residential 2 PSI-type line. Is this the high-pressure line that runs all the way back the road back to the CNG station? And is the purpose for this high-pressure line for anything other than the CNG station?

Mr. Secary answered that the line is for the CNG station only.

Mr. Secary then talked about the two truck wash facilities. Every truck that comes off of this site goes through the truck wash so that they are coming off the site as clean trucks and are not tracking any materials onto the adjacent roadways. Also, the water used for the cleaning of the trucks is recirculated and eventually discharged to the sanitary sewer system. No effluent from this property would appear to require pretreatment.

Mr. Secary discussed N. Union Street. He said they are doing a separate roadway construction plan. This plan will illustrate the improvements they anticipate to their frontage along N. Union Street. They are anticipating a left-turn lane to access the northern driveway for the car entrance. They have two dedicated right-turn lanes coming into the southern (truck) access and a continuation of that right-turn lane into the northern (car) access.

Mr. Henninger said that he did notice on the plan that they are proposing a "No Right Turn" on the truck exit.

Mr. Secary said that yes, they brought that up last year, and it is important to them to discourage any movements in that direction (toward Fiddlers Elbow). The intent is that all truck traffic will go southbound and not northbound.

Todd Trautz with Michael Baker, traffic engineer representing UPS, the traffic impact assessments are being completed for the Township's needs and also PennDOT. Regarding the question about restricting the turns, it is currently being proposed as part of their recommendations to prohibit right turns for tractor-trailers. He said they did not want to make it

a blanket regulatory restriction understanding that with other vehicles coming out of the northern (car) driveway, it would make sense for them to turn right. So there will only be a sign restricting right turns coming out of the southern (truck) driveway.

Mr. Breon said there have been previous commitments from Ovidio Irizarry (UPS) and some of the others that through the management of the routing of the trucks, they will keep them off of Route 441, Fulling Mill Road and Fiddler's Elbow Road.

Mr. Stanley said that they made the commitment that trucks leaving the site are required to turn left, except for the brown trucks where they have deliveries on those roads. Otherwise, all trucks leaving the site will make a left and go southbound to 283.

Mr. Breon feels that corporation's memory exists only in contractual language that is signed in documents. Otherwise just talking, like we are right now, gets forgotten after time. He would like this agreement to be formalized in a plan note or something. He said our previous agreement was to direct the trucks onto the ramps onto Route 283.

Mr. Stanley said they are not adverse to that. They can do that by way of a plan note or a developer's agreement that will be entered into by-and-between UPS, as the owner of the site, and the Township.

Mr. Knopp asked if this would keep the trucks off Route 441, Fulling Mill Road, and Fiddlers Elbow.

Mr. Stanley confirmed that with the exception of local deliveries.

Ovidio Irizarry of UPS explained sometimes they also have large deliveries in those areas that must be carried on a tractor-trailer, so with the exception of those vehicles, the trucks will go south on N. Union Street to Route 283.

Mr. Henninger said that he believes they could craft language that would exempt local deliveries.

Mr. Latsha asked what the consequences would be if there is not a compliance with that agreement.

Mr. Henninger said they would be in breach of contract but we haven't gotten to that discussion yet. He saw yesterday the start of a contract with ideas that just needs to get more specific. There would have to be some kind of penalty. Unfortunately, with Fulling Mill Road

and Route 441 being truck roads, PennDOT says that they are designated truck routes, there will be a little difficulty and the Township has been fighting that for many years.

Mr. Latsha asked if there is a problem between a private party and the Township coming up with an agreement like this.

Mr. Henninger said there is not a problem with that.

Mr. Breon asked if the Planning Commission could get a copy of that agreement when it is drawn up.

Mr. Henninger agreed to that.

Mr. Secary said that they have purposely made the geometry difficult for a right turn out of there reinforcing the fact that they are not intending to have truck traffic go northbound from the site.

Mr. Secary then went on to discuss N. Union Street improvements. As promised when they were here last fall, they are going to reconstruct totally N. Union Street from Fulling Mill Road up to the frontage of the site. Currently, N. Union Street is about an average of 22 - 23 feet wide with no curbs, very variable pavement sections. They did core borings and found a mish-mash of combinations of subbase and pavement and in some places no subbase, just asphalt on top of rock. They met with the Township engineer and discussed some options. The Township's ordinances provide for a curbed 34' wide cartway for a collector street and that is what their plan shows, which would be 17' from the center-line to the curb-line. Twelve feet of that would be dedicated to travel lanes and then there would be 5' shoulders/bike lanes on either side of the road. The road will be appropriately signed and striped for the bike lanes. He also went on to say that they were concerned about the structural integrity. The Township has its own paving section that it uses for the collector streets, but they wanted to make sure that the road that they build will have a long life cycle and be appropriate for the kind of traffic that they going to use along with the quarry traffic. They had a geotechnical engineer do an evaluation of a pavement cross-section and it's about an inch and a half thicker than LST's pavement section. So when it is all done, LST will not only get a wider pavement section with curbing and storm sewer inlets, but it will also be thicker than Township built roads. UPS is paying for the entire reconstruction of this from Fulling Mill Road north to the site. Todd Trautz from Michael Baker, the traffic engineers, submitted today to PennDOT and the Township the Traffic Impact Study for the project and there is plan to be a concurrent review between the two parties.

Mr. Secary then said he was willing to answer any questions in regards to the comments from HRG, Dauphin County, and LST staff. He said the comments were relatively minor

comments. He added that there are several waivers that are attached to the plan and explained each one.

1. Preliminary Plats; Procedure. - The project is being submitted as a Preliminary/Final Plan.
2. Monuments and Markers. - The property corners which are not located along the Swatara Creek have been previously marked with steel pins. As such, the developer is also requesting relief of the requirement to mark the property corners along the Creek.
3. Sidewalks. - The developer is seeking relief of the requirement to install sidewalks until that time at which the Township deems necessary.
4. Volume Controls. - The developer is seeking partial relief of this requirement as it pertains to Watershed Area 3. A water quality analysis and riparian buffers will be used as alternate means of meeting the NPDES Permit requirements.
5. De-watering Time. - LST Ordinance requires stormwater basins to de-water within 72 hours. All the surface basins will be compliant; but the large underground basins, because they are so big, cannot quite do that in 72 hours.

Mr. Knopp had a questions about the traffic study. He asked if the lights at Fulling Mill Road and Union Street are part of that traffic study.

Mr. Trautz said yes, they met with PennDOT and other stake-holders and they had a scoping meeting. He said they are now working with Eric Stump of HRG on the preliminary study, before going to PennDOT. So it is in the works. But the intersection down by the ramps all the way up to Fulling Mill and then up to the next intersection are all part of the impact study.

Mr. Knopp asked for questions or comments from the Planning Commission.

Mr. Young asked what a "red-tag parking spot" is.

Mr. Secary explained that those are parking spots for vehicles that need to be worked on at the maintenance facility.

Mr. Young asked how long is it anticipated that vehicles that need repaired will sit there.

Mr. Secary assured him that these vehicles will not be stored onsite.

Mr. Irizarry added that these vehicles are red-tagged for one or two reasons. One reason being that the parts to repair it had to be ordered and they are just waiting for that part to come in. The other reason is that there is a back-log of work. But typically they only take a couple days, no more than a week.

Mr. Young asked for the status of the DEP approval of the planning module.

Mr. Secary said they had submitted the post card and they are waiting to get that back. They have been talking to Lower Swatara Township Municipal Authority (LSTMA) about this. It ties in with the pump station. It is kind of a 2-part process: Part 1 is the permit for the module; Part 2 is the permit for the construction of the pump station. They have submitted to Lester Lanman of the LSTMA; he went through it and supplied all the information that was necessary; and they now forwarded it on to DEP.

Mr. Young then asked what the status was for the subdivision on the west side of N. Union Street.

Mr. Secary said they will be submitting that for the next meeting.

Mr. Henninger explained that this tract encompasses land that is on the other side of N. Union Street. So rather than trying to do a subdivision/land development plan all in one process, they are doing two parts to get the land development thing and then just subdivide on that piece on the other side to create a new lot. Dauphin County and the Township have taken the position that roads are not natural subdivisions, so they have to go through actual subdivision process to chop that piece off across the road and make it a separate piece.

Mr. Secary added that they will have a 192-acre piece of land on the east side of N. Union Street and the residual on the west side.

Mr. Knopp asked how many acres that would be on the west side.

Mr. Secary replied that he believes it is 80 acres.

Mr. Stanley added that that piece of land is being retained by the seller, UPS is not acquiring it.

Mr. Knopp asked for any other questions from the Planning Commission.

Mr. Latsha asked where the trucks get washed.

Mr. Secary showed where the truck washing facility is located on the plan.

Mr. Latsha asked how many trucks get washed every day.

Mr. Irizarry explained that they used to wash every vehicle every day, but the way they do it now the most they get washed is twice a week to help conserve water. It is on a rotating basis.

Mr. Latsha asked what happens to the run-off from the truck washing.

Mr. Irizarry explained that the water gets reclaimed/recycled so the only run-off is when the vehicle leaves, the water that is dripping off the vehicle gets caught in a basin.

Mr. Henninger added that it will eventually go into the sanitary sewer system after the recycled water cannot be used anymore.

Mr. Knopp asked HRG for any questions/comments.

Mr. Kenworthy said he has nothing else. Everything has already been discussed this evening, and a lot of the other comments are technical in nature.

Mr. Knopp asked County for any questions/comments.

Ms. Korber had a few things she wished to reiterate from the regional perspective. She asked for clarification on their parking area for employees. She asked if they were over requirement.

Mr. Secary stated that they were over the Township's requirements but not over the operational needs.

Ms. Korber then asked if they were considering a partnership with CAT to maybe have a transit stop somewhere on the site.

Mr. Trautz explained that it was discussed in a scoping meeting with PennDOT but he didn't think it was going to be moved forward with.

Ms. Korber went on to discuss the Manada Conservancy. She just wanted to pass on that they were glad at how willing UPS was to sit down with them and do all these considerations. She added that the Swatara Creek is a DCNR water trail, people use it for kayaking and all, and they are doing everything they are required to be doing, but she wanted to know if they would ever consider some pre- and post-construction water testing at that bend of the creek.

Mr. Secary restated that it was not something they are required to do, they feel they are going to meet and/or exceed the pollutant-reduction requirements of the State and typically this

kind of use does not generate stormwater affluent of that nature. Beyond that they have a series of onsite features and BMPs that will cleanse the water before it goes into the Swatara Creek. They have also left a riparian buffer so that nature does its job. They are discharging quite a distance from the creek and allowing the riparian buffer along the creek as a last line of defense.

Ms. Korber stated that the Swatara Creek is one of the last that we have that is not impaired so she just felt the need to mention it.

Mr. Secary said that he would take that suggestion back and they would discuss it.

Ms. Korber asked if their lights would be downward facing.

Mr. Secary said absolutely.

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

Mr. Henninger said that he has had discussion with Mr. Stanley with regards to the developer's agreement and community agreement. As far as the plan goes, he feels it is surprising to see a 75 page plan that is literally that clean. We've seen many lesser plans with many more issues and comments.

Mr. Secary said they have met innumerable times with LST staff and HRG and it has been a very cooperative process that has helped them get to where they are now.

Mr. Stanley added that they have also met with the Fire Chief. They have reviewed the plans and the Fire Chief commented that they were very pleased with the layout of the plan and the circulation on the site.

Mr. Breon brought up the subject of lighting. He said it is a very hot topic with LST.

Mr. Secary said the state-of-the-art in light technology has come a long way. So there will be directionalization, LED lights, the back-shields, just the technology has gotten to the point where you can really focus that light where it needs to be and not get much, if any, spillage from the lights. He also mentioned that these lights are more for security reasons, they are at pretty low light levels.

Mr. Knopp asked Mrs. Hursh for any comments from the township.

Mrs. Hursh said she would like to mention a couple additional things that she knows will come up. Most things have been addressed. There are the five waivers. The Fire Protection was

addressed. The township has added a couple minor things. E&S Plan has to be approved. Building Permits will be required for the sound walls and retaining walls. Buffer yards were required along N. Union Street at the frontage of the property and they are providing it there with the required screening. The rest are just administrative items that every plan has to do.

Mr. Young asked about Site Plan 3.04. He questioned about whether the fences would need a variance being that he saw there was 7' high fence on one of the pages of the plan.

Mr. Secary said their intention is to build a 6' high fence. He thinks maybe what Mr. Young is seeing is a distance of the fence to be 7' off of the curb-line.

Mr. Knopp asked for any other questions from the Planning Commission.

Mr. Latsha asked about the report from the Fire Department. He asked Mr. Secary if all questions from the Fire Department were answered affirmatively, like will there be a pump house, where are the FDC's located, etc.

Mr. Secary answered that the pump house is undetermined. The pump house would be required if the flows and pressures being delivered by the water company are insufficient. That will not be known until they do their design. But at this point it is not being proposed.

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

Mr. John Davidson of Carriage House Rd. came to the microphone at this time. Mr. Davidson asked if the traffic study would have warrants for a signal at N. Union Street and Longview Drive. And what kind of traffic restrictions are there going to be on Longview Drive in terms of tractor-trailers specifically.

Mr. Henninger said that based on previous discussions that it would be part of the Developer's Agreement that the tractor-trailers are not to go up Longview Drive.

Mr. Davidson asked if the Township would post that at either end.

Mr. Henninger said that the Township would have to do a study of that road to see if that road would qualify to put a weight restriction on it but a private agreement is a separate thing.

Mr. Davidson said that tractor-trailers are currently accessing Kreider's Farm but he doesn't think they should be travelling the entire length of Longview Road.

Mr. Henninger explained that in an agreement, we could request them to only use Route 283, but in special circumstances, when Route 283 may be close for a period, they would have to use Route 441 and Fulling Mill Road which are both approved truck routes.

Mr. Davidson then asked Mr. Trautz about the traffic study. He questioned the control of traffic at N. Union Street and Longview Drive.

Mr. Trautz said that when considering a traffic signal, first of all the intersection has to be necessitating that advancement of a traffic control. The future conditions, which are designed conditions of 2024, the intersection is showing to operate fine. So since it is showing to act fine for what standard practice is, we did not look at adding a traffic signal, seeing that its current control would be appropriate.

Mr. Davidson understands that we have to deal with PennDOT regulations, but he feels it is going to be problematic for people travelling east on Longview Drive who are trying to make a turn onto N. Union Street.

Mr. Trautz added that the peak travel times of the site are not the same as the adjacent streets. So when people are going to work in the morning, and when they are coming home is the evening, it is not the same time of the day when the site has its peak traffic. UPS's peak traffic would be 8am-9am for morning and 7pm-8pm for evening. So it is a little off from when you would be experiencing the deep generation of traffic. He said they have to be deliberate as far as the placing of traffic signals.

Mr. Steve Artman of Clearview Court came to the microphone at this time. He asked if anyone spoke with the people of Indian Echo Caverns.

Mr. Secary said the gentleman was here at the last meeting but they have not talked to them directly.

Mr. Artman asked if they would be putting up a sound-barrier for them.

Mr. Secary replied that they have indicated on the plan that they will be putting up sound-walls pretty much directly across from it.

Marjie Hartz of N. Union Street came to the microphone at this time. She asked if there are four sorts per day.

Mr. Irizarry responded that yes, there are four sorts per day.

Mrs. Hartz then asked if there would be four peaks a day instead of just two.

Mr. Irizarry said they were the main peak hours. Not all sorts will be at equal volumes.

Mrs. Hartz asked if there would be a buffer with screenings between the UPS property and the Hartz's property.

Mr. Secary said there are none required.

Mrs. Hartz stated that they are required within the Ordinance. She said the ordinance in Mineral Recovery District and within that district is Residential and there are four homes there and a Residential District requires screenings and a buffer. She asked what they are going to do.

Mrs. Hursh explained that it is not in a Residential District.

Mrs. Hartz exclaimed that they live there.

Mrs. Hursh explained that the zoning adjacent to the homes is Mineral Recovery.

Mrs. Hartz went on to say that their son lives right next to the site and they can all see the site right from their kitchen windows.

Mrs. Hursh explained that there is a separate tract between the homes and the UPS site according to the tax parcel map.

Mr. Stanley informed that UPS offered to construct a buffer along the driveway at UPS's cost with the agreement that they would simply maintain it but the offer was rejected by the Hartz's.

Mrs. Hartz confirmed that they (UPS) did sit at their kitchen table and when they left the berm was to be half on the Hartz's property and half on UPS's property and they (UPS) were going to maintain it. She went on to say that they received a letter that said it will all be on the Hartz's property, UPS will plant it, but after the trees live for one year, the Hartz's would then be responsible forever past that first year. Mrs. Hartz went on to say that they were to sign a paper saying they would not talk at any meetings or disagree with anything. She said they decided not to sign that document because they did not want to give up their right to come to meetings to explain their concerns.

Mr. Breon wanted clarification as to what Mrs. Hartz wanted. He asked if what they wanted was for UPS to put the buffer on their (UPS) property as opposed to the Hartz's or split between the two.

Mrs. Hartz said she does not want it split, she wants a screening on their property.

Mr. Henninger added that the counsel for the Hartz's submitted a letter to the Board of Commissioners back at the end of May requesting that the buffer going back three hundred feet and arguing that the Ordinance required a buffer to be there.

Mrs. Hartz said that she understands it is a gray area, but the system has allowed so much in a Mineral Recovery District that does not belong there. She said she thinks the system needs to look at the residents and give them some protection.

Mrs. Hursh explained that the Ordinance states that a buffer yard of 50 feet shall be required in all cases where the non-residential district boundaries abut a residential use or residential district boundary. The entire subject area on the east side of N. Union Street is Mineral Recovery. Mineral Recovery is not necessarily a residential use, they are permitted a homestead in there and that is what is there. According to the tax parcel map, the parcel directly beside the residential area (she then pointed out on the plan where this is) and this parcel has no homes on it.

Mr. Knopp asked for clarification that there is a separate parcel between the closest home and the project area.

Mrs. Hursh confirmed that.

Mr. Breon asked who owned that parcel.

Mrs. Hartz said that the Hartz family owns it.

Mr. Young asked what that parcel's use is currently.

Mrs. Hursh explained that it is farmed and quarry. There are no homes on it. So because this is a separate parcel and it is zoned Mineral Recovery, it did not require the buffer as it did across from the Residential Agriculture District across the street.

Mr. Young asked if the Solicitor agreed with the Staff's interpretation.

Mr. Henninger said he does agree with the Zoning Officer's interpretation. He feels that the driveway going back to the site does not abut a residential use. Are there homesteads there, yes. But they do not abut this site. They abut farmland.

Mrs. Hartz pleaded for consideration of the buffer. She went on to say that last Wednesday evening, at about 8:00pm, they were going towards Fiddlers Elbow Road towards Hummelstown, and there was a UPS tractor-trailer coming out of Hummelstown. She stressed that these tractor-trailers are not going to just stop travelling that road. They see it every day. She feels strongly that the Township should create a fine to be issued to make it work.

Mr. Breon said that there was talk of remediation or a penalty for that.

Mr. Chet Hartz of N. Union Street came to the microphone at this time. He inquired about the employee parking lot. He said they had discussed concerns when the initial plan was drawn up. Many companies when next to a railroad put security fencing up. And because of the employees parking next to a quarry, he feels a fence should be erected to protect anyone from crossing over the dirt pile and falling into the quarry. He said he did not hear any mention of a security fence along that parking area.

Mr. Secary said there is none proposed. He said there is an embankment that would have to be traversed in order to get to that point, so a fence is not required.

Mr. Hartz said that was a concern of Pennsy along with the Hartz family. He said he was surprised with the amount of money going into a project this size, that a fence wasn't looked at and taken seriously because all it takes is one accident, someone walking off the edge into the quarry, especially a child. He wanted to know if someone gets killed, who will be responsible.

Mr. Breon asked for clarification. He thought the quarry on the other side of the UPS property was higher than the UPS site.

Mr. Hartz said it goes down significantly.

Mr. Secary said it goes down after you get on top of the embankment.

Mr. Knopp asked how high the embankment was.

Mr. Secary said most of the embankment was about 10 feet high from their parking lot to the top of the slope. Also, it is not very traversable.

Mr. Hartz offered anyone who wanted to go back and take a look at it, he would be glad to take them back and show it to them.

Mr. Hartz then discussed the buffer issue. He said a buffer is being put in along N. Union Street, he doesn't think putting a little buffer in along his property is asking for too much.

Mr. Breon asked if the concern they had with the buffer that UPS proposed was that the responsibility of upkeep would fall on the Hartz family.

Mr. Hartz confirmed that. He said that at the kitchen table meeting, they had discussed splitting that buffer on each property and it would be maintained by UPS. But when the Hartz's got the agreement to sign, that was not the way it was written in that agreement.

Mr. Breon asked if we were just talking about vegetation such as trees and bushes and such.

Mr. Hartz replied that it was supposed to be a built up buffer like Pennsy has just a little bit back the lane further. It is about 10 feet high and then slopes down.

Mr. Stanley says he respectfully disagrees about what was said and what was committed to. He said they were talking about a berm and landscaping on top of the berm that would be constructed at UPS's cost.

Mr. Knopp asked if there is a reason why it would be on their property and not UPS's or at least half and half.

Mr. Stanley said it is not required to be on their (UPS) property. And since it was their (Hartz) request, for purposes of buffering their use, what they (UPS) determined is that they would construct it at UPS's cost. But when they were talking about that, they were talking about a berm which has significant width at the base to get to a point where you have a level top for purposes of landscaping, so it does take some ground for consideration. UPS was not averse to constructing it nor were they averse to landscaping it, but it was somewhat deceptive for Mrs. Hartz to say that we will plant it but if it dies, it dies. What UPS was saying was that they will take it through the one planting season but they cannot guarantee landscaping will live and at that point of time, if there was anything that would need replaced, UPS would replace it but after a certain period of time, it would become their responsibility.

Mr. Latsha asked how much that landscaping would cost that we are talking about.

Mr. Stanley said that once the offer was rejected, UPS did not advance it any further.

Mr. Latsha asked why they wouldn't price it out before they made the offer.

Mr. Stanley replied that it would be added as a cost to the project and they were willing to assume that cost. When the offer was rejected, they did not take it to the next step.

Mr. Knopp asked for confirmation that the subject area was about 300 feet.

Mr. Secary said it was more than that.

Mr. Stanley said they were suggesting to do it longer than 300 feet to take it back to where the quarry operation began.

Mr. Latsha said he didn't need an exact number, he was just trying to get an idea of what kind of cost we were looking at. He just wanted a reasonable educated guess.

Mr. Stanley said, "We offered. They said no. We stopped. Period."

Mr. Secary echoed what Mr. Stanley was saying. They offered and it was rejected so they stopped. The cost was not what the issue was because UPS was more than willing to take on the entire cost of it. But an educated guess would be probably in the tens of thousands of dollars with the dirt, the labor involved, the landscaping, etc. but he doesn't have an exact figure.

Mr. Latsha said he appreciated him trying to answer the question.

Mr. Knopp asked how long the employee parking lot was.

Mr. Secary said it was over 1000 feet easily.

Mr. Young asked what the cost of a fence is approximately.

Mr. Secary said probably about \$10 per running foot for chain-link fence.

Mr. Young said that we are talking about \$20-25,000 to be a good neighbor and appease the adjoining property owner. He said he knows they are not required to do it but there was a poet who once said "Good fences make good neighbors" and if that is all they are asking for UPS to do, he feels it behoove UPS to resolve that with them. Mr. Young feels it is miniscule in terms of the whole project but goes a long way in satisfying concerns of abutting property owners.

Mr. Breon asked for the approximate length of that lot again.

Mr. Secary said it was somewhere over 1000 feet.

Mr. Irizarry said they would look into the fence.

Mr. Paul Wagner of Longview Drive came to the microphone at this time. He asked if the perimeter fencing was going to be maintained after it was put it.

Mr. Secary said yes, absolutely it would be maintained.

Mr. Wagner asked if the fencing out front along N. Union Street would also be maintained.

Mr. Secary said there would be no fencing along N. Union Street. It would just be a berm.

Mr. Wagner added that he also farms the ground back there with the Hartz's and the weeds are quite prolific right now. He asked if they would have a problem if he mowed them down right now. These noxious weeds produce 100,000 seeds per plant.

Mr. Irizarry said that it is legally not UPS property yet.

Mr. Kane High of Powderhorn Rd. came to the microphone at this time. He said he had a stormwater management question. He asked the civil engineer what the maximum flow coming out of the site would be.

Mr. Secary explained that they are asked to design from the 1 year through the 100 year storm, so there is quite a difference between the lower storms and the upper storms but they are more than reducing it by 50% from what is coming off that property right now. He said he couldn't give exact numbers because he did not have the report here with him tonight but he could tell him that the expected outflows from there will be significantly less than what is coming off there as an undeveloped lot right now.

Mr. High stated that the flow of the Swatara Creek right now is about 1500 cubic feet per second. He asked how that will change with the development of that lot.

Mr. Secary responded that obviously they are dwarfed by the flow of the Swatara Creek.

Mr. Knopp asked for any further questions or comments.

There were no more questions or comments at this time.

Mr. Knopp asked the Planning Commission to address the waivers:

1. Preliminary Plats; Procedure. - The project is being submitted as a Preliminary/Final Plan.
 - Motion to approve made by Mr. Young
 - Seconded by Mr. Breon
 - All in favor
2. Monuments and Markers. - The property corners which are not located along the Swatara Creek have been previously marked with steel pins. As such, the developer is also requesting relief of the requirement to mark the property corners along the Creek.
 - Motion to approve made by Mr. Breon
 - Seconded by Mr. Young
 - All in favor
3. Sidewalks. - The developer is seeking relief of the requirement to install sidewalks until that time at which the Township deems necessary.
 - Motion to approve made by Mr. Breon
 - Seconded by Mr. Fausey
 - All were in favor
4. Volume Controls. - The developer is seeking partial relief of this requirement as it pertains to Watershed Area 3. A water quality analysis and riparian buffers will be used as alternate means of meeting the NPDES Permit requirements.
 - Motion to approve made by Mr. Young
 - Seconded by Mr. Fausey
 - All were in favor
5. De-watering Time. - LST Ordinance requires stormwater basins to de-water within 72 hours. All the surface basins will be compliant; but the large underground basins, because they are so big, cannot quite do that in 72 hours. But depending on the storm, it could be as much as 20 additional hours, but nothing more than that.
 - Motion to approve made by Mr. Young
 - Seconded by Mr. Fausey
 - All were in favor
 - Mrs. Hursh wanted to include the Section number for that waiver.
It is Section 26-126.2.H

Mr. Knopp asked the Planning Commission what their recommendation was for the UPS plan itself.

Mr. Henninger stated that we would need to see the subdivision plan first.

Mr. Stanley assured that the subdivision plan is coming, but they would like for the Planning Commission to act on this tonight.

Mr. Henninger said that we should add the receiving of the subdivision plan as a condition before voting on this tonight.

Mr. Young would like the condition added that due consideration be given to the requests of the adjoining property owner (Hartz's).

So Mr. Young recommended that the plan be approved subject to all conditions and that they do give due consideration to the Hartz's requests (the fence as well as the buffer).

Mr. Latsha seconded that motion.

All were in favor and plan will be sent on to the Board of Commissioners for recommendation to approve.

b. File #PC2018-06, Hershey Creamery. Property is located at 1200 AIP Drive, zoned Industrial Park, Industrial Park Limited, and Residential Agriculture, 106.27 acres. Preliminary/Final Land Development Plan to propose 183,302 sf of building expansion involving a sanitary sewer pretreatment plant and associated site improvements. Owned by Hershey Creamery Corporation submitted by Rettew Associates, Inc.

Dave Wilson with Rettew Associates came to the microphone at this time and introduced his team. He explained that the project involves a 124 [sic] sf building expansion and a wastewater pretreatment plant. The limit of disturbance for the property is approximately 16 acres. For the wastewater treatment plant, they will be submitting the planning module to DEP and the Township mid-September. They did receive the review letters from HRG, the Township staff and Dauphin County. He then asked if anyone had any comments about the project.

Mr. Kenworthy asked if traffic impact has been assessed for this address.

Mr. Wilson said yes, they did do a traffic impact study. They will be submitting that with the 2025 build-out, it was shown that there is adequate service for the traffic. It was done on AIP Drive down to the intersection of Fulling Mill Road.

Mr. Kenworthy stated that the major items of HRG comments are stormwater related and he feels they can be addressed with standard engineering approach. HRG did not have any other major or particular concerns on the land development.

Mr. Knopp asked for any comments Dauphin County Planning Commission.

Ms. Korber asked if any new employees would be added with this building expansion.

Mr. Wilson responded that yes, they will be adding new employees.

Mr. Breon asked approximately how many.

Mr. Wilson said about 50 new employees.

Mr. Young said it appears that they are adding 197 new parking spaces with 6 new ADA spaces.

Mr. Wilson said their specific need for parking is only 100 but Township requirements are more than that. But they do not feel they will need that many.

Mrs. Hursh said unfortunately parking is in the Zoning Ordinance so for them to go less than that, they would have to get a Variance. When they had the pre-application meeting, they discussed how much parking the Ordinance would require and that being way over what they needed, so Mrs. Hursh had them take out all of their storage areas and areas that weren't going to be used for public use so the required amount of parking could be lowered.

Mr. Knopp asked Mr. Henninger for any comments.

Mr. Henninger asked if they were working with the Township, Authority engineers, and DTMA (Derry Township Municipal Authority) with the pre-treatment facility.

Mr. Wilson said yes, they are.

Mr. Henninger asked if the right-of-way was addressed out on N. Union Street since this property goes all the way out to N. Union Street. Mr. Henninger said that it is still 33 feet out there where they are at, but it may need to be upgraded. The Ordinance will require additional right-of-way.

Mr. Wilson said they would look into that.

Mr. Henninger said from the sewer standpoint, he saw that the maximum number of employees is 100. With the sanitary sewer, any additional flow for DTMA would be based off of the number employees and floor space.

Mr. Knopp asked Mrs. Hursh for her questions or comments.

Mrs. Hursh spoke about their access drive around the back of the building. It is shown as just gravel but LST Ordinance states that it should be asphalt.

Mr. Wilson said the plan is to widen it. Right now it is gravel, and it works for them.

Mrs. Hursh spoke about fire protection. The plan has not been delivered to the Fire Chief yet but Don Fure, LST's Building Code Official, looked at it has made some general comments like adding another fire hydrant in the corner because it was more than 400 feet.

Mrs. Hursh said the only other big thing was that a buffer is required along the residential areas. There is adequate space but there needs to be a buffer or screening in there.

Mr. Wilson said they will add that.

Mr. Knopp asked if there were any other questions from the Planning Commission. There were none.

Mr. Knopp asked for the two waivers to be addressed.

1. Combine Preliminary and Final Land Development
 - Mr. Latsha made the motion to approve.
 - Mr. Young seconded
 - All were in favor
2. To eliminate curbs
 - Mr. Latsha made the motion to approve
 - Mr. Fausey seconded
 - All were in favor

Mr. Knopp asked how the Planning Commission would like to address the plan for Hershey Creamery.

- Mr. Breon made the motion to approve with stipulations and approval from Fire Dept.
- Mr. Young seconded the motion.
- All were in favor.

Plan was approved for recommendation to the Board of Commissioners with stipulations.

OTHER BUSINESS:

The next Planning Commission Meeting will be held on Thursday, September 27, 2018 at 7:00 P.M.

ADJOURN:

A motion was made by Mr. Latsha and seconded by Mr. Fausey to adjourn the meeting. Motion unanimously approved.

Meeting adjourned at 9:03 P.M.

Respectfully Submitted,

Ann M. Hursh
Planning and Zoning Coordinator