

**UPPER ALLEN TOWNSHIP  
BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS II MEETING  
June 4<sup>th</sup>, 2025 - 6:30 P.M.**

**COMMISSIONERS**

Kenneth M. Martin, President  
Richard A. Castranio, Jr., Vice President  
James G. Cochran, Assistant Secretary  
Eric Y. Fairchild, Assistant Secretary  
Phil J. Walsh, Assistant Secretary

**TOWNSHIP OFFICIALS**

Scott Fraser, Township Manager  
Tim Wendling, Asst. Twp Mgr.  
Andrew Parsons, Police Chief  
Tom Shumberger, Fire Chief  
Jen Boyer, Comm. Dev. Dir.  
Josh Bonn, Solicitor  
Stephen Feinour, Solicitor  
Jason Reichard, Engineer  
Alexis Minana, Recording Secretary

**CALL TO ORDER**

President Martin called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. A moment of silence was observed followed by the pledge of allegiance to the flag. Mr. Fraser performed roll call—all Commissioners were present.

**PRESIDENT'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

President Martin announced that immediately prior to the start of this meeting, the Boardroom was officially dedicated to Former Commissioner Virginia “Ginnie” Anderson Kane. Ginnie served from 1982, when she was the first woman elected to the UAT Board of Commissioners, through 2024. Ginnie attended with her family; many friends and neighbors gathered for a lovely event to unveil the plaque. President Martin thanked everyone involved with arranging the event.

President Martin reminded the audience that the meeting was being livestreamed via Zoom and would be made available after the fact on the Township’s website.

**CONSIDERATION OF MINUTES**

The Board considered the minutes of the meeting held on May 7<sup>th</sup>, 2025. Commissioner Walsh made a **MOTION** to approve the minutes as presented. Commissioner Cochran **SECONDED** the motion, which passed unanimously (5-0).

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

Mr. Michael Hitcho, 2473 Cocklin Court, came to complain about noise emanating from the Willows at Ashcombe Mansion. His home is about 80 yards north of the Willows. He talked about their use of amplified bass which he reports causes vibrations in his home. President Martin asked Police Chief Parsons if the police had received any noise complaints related to the

Willows. Chief Parsons reported that they had received 5 complaints during the past year— however, no citations were issued. He did say the owners were respectful and cooperative during those instances. President Martin encouraged Mr. Hitcho to call the police in instances of excessive noise. Mr. Hitcho stated that he doesn't like to call the police for something like this. President Martin asked if the sound had been measured by police to see if it's appropriate based on ordinance. Chief Parsons reported they had not due to limitations with their sound meter; it was suggested that they upgrade their technology so they could accurately measure decibel levels.

Ms. Bernadette Stack, also at 2473 Cocklin Court, echoed Mr. Hitcho's complaints about noise at the Willows. She called the situation "deplorable," and lamented that she could no longer enjoy her backyard. She stated she felt the Willows was being disrespectful and said it is impacting property values. Ms. Stack asked that the Commissioners use the Tavern as leverage to get the Willows to tamp down the noise. The owners of the Willows plan to build a Tavern on the edge of their property; this plan has not yet been received by the BOC.

Mr. Jeff Williams, 334 East Meadow Drive, announced that July is National Parks and Recreation Month. He commented on how popular the UAT park system is and praised parks staff. He thanked the Board for their continued support.

Ms. Janice Lynx, the Executive Director of the West Shore Historical Society, came to offer herself as a resource related to Bishop Bridge, which was on the agenda for later in the meeting. She is involved in the rehabilitation of Sheepford Bridge.

### CONSENT AGENDA

The consent agenda consisted of bills in the amount of \$379,470.64. Commissioner Fairchild asked about a bill in the amount of \$187,717.59 to Edwin L. Heim Company for HVAC work at the Township building. He noted that the work was being divided between Heim and Johnson Controls, Inc. Commissioner Fairchild asked for a review of these contracts and an update on the work. Mr. Fraser provided the following information: Heim is working on the ERV, air handlers, and rooftop units. Their total contract was awarded for \$626,400, of which \$550,555.21 has been paid—88% paid. He reported that the improvements in air quality are already being felt in the police building. JCI is working on the controllers and system balancers; their contract is for \$443,000, of which 94% is paid, or \$416,056.30. EI, who did the design work for the system will come in before final payments on these contracts are made to inspect the work and make sure it is completed satisfactorily. Mr. Fraser predicted all work would be complete by the end of June.

Vice President Castranio made a **MOTION** to approve the bills in the amount of \$379,470.64. Commissioner Walsh **SECONDED** the motion, which passed 5-0.

Ms. Judy Bailey, 450 E. Lisburn Road, inquired about the HVAC work that was being done. Mr. Fraser explained that the system is 15 years old and the air conditioners have reached the end of their lifespan. Humidity had become a problem in the building. There are also upgrades to the controllers taking place. Commissioner Cochran noted that some of the improvements to the

system were related to Covid and air purification in a bid to protect from the circulation of airborne illnesses.

## PUBLIC SAFETY

### Police

Chief Parsons came to request authorization from the BOC to purchase a used 2024 Ford Edge SE. He explained it would be used as an unmarked vehicle. It will be purchased from Bob Ruth Ford. An existing vehicle in the fleet, a 2010 Ford Taurus SEL, will be traded in as part of the purchase agreement. The total cost of the Ford Edge, with trade in, is \$22,500.00. This expense was budgeted in the 2025 Police Department Budget. Commissioner Walsh made a **MOTION** to approve the purchase of a 2024 Ford Edge SE from Bob Ruth Ford for the cost of \$22,500 for the police department. Vice President Castranio **SECONDED** the motion, which passed unanimously.

### Fire

Chief Shumberger announced that Saturday, June 7<sup>th</sup>, the UATFD will host a chicken barbecue fundraiser at 11am at Country Town and Baptist Church.

## PLANNING AND ZONING

The first item before the Board was consideration/action of P/F Sub/LD Plan for Funtastik, UAT File # PZ2408-07. In a memo to the Board, Ms. Boyer provided the following information:

The Funtastik land development plan proposes the demolition of an existing single-family dwelling at 2324 South Market Street in Upper Allen Township to construct a 6,000-square-foot retail building with 31 parking spaces. The project is located within the Highway Commercial (C-2) zoning district and will share access and stormwater facilities with the adjacent commercial property at 2234 South Market Street, Zimmerman's Auto. The development will be served by public water and sewer, and is expected to generate approximately 50–60 trips per day, not requiring a formal traffic study. On January 8, 2025, the Board of Commissioners approved a waiver to allow natural drainage without internal curbing and granted a deferral for sidewalk installation along South Market Street. While the Planning Commission supports keeping the deferral, Township staff strongly recommend installing sidewalks to advance the completion of a pedestrian corridor in the South Market Street Connector area.

A zoning variance was granted on April 10, 2025, allowing the applicant to avoid duplicating buffer plantings along the southern and eastern property lines due to existing mature buffers already in place, with the condition that a reasonable number of arborvitae be planted on the southern border. Five trees are currently proposed, though ordinance requirements would typically call for nine. The variance applies only to 2324 South Market Street and does not extend to Zimmerman's parcel. Stormwater design elements must still be finalized, with required revisions including runoff volume calculations, access easements, and underdrain details. Additionally, the applicant must secure a PennDOT Highway Occupancy Permit and enter into

various Township agreements, including stormwater O&M, sewer extension, and financial securities. A \$2,400 recreation fee and applicable sewer tapping fees are also required prior to final plan approval and recording. The Board of Commissioners must ultimately decide whether to call in the sidewalk deferral or allow it to remain and determine if the proposed landscaping satisfies the conditions of the zoning variance.

Joe Burget, from Burget & Associates in New Bloomfield, PA, summarized Funtastik's plan. He reported that Zimmermans has agreed to allow Funtastik to utilize the existing entrance as an entry point to their property. He noted their plan to extend curbing along Market Street. He explained this could be an issue with stormwater management and said they were addressing this with a strategic gap in the curb at the end of the property which would allow water to run into a newly built swale. This plan has been submitted to PennDOT for review.

Commissioner Fairchild inquired about proposed landscaping and requested that additional landscaping be installed along the front of the property. Mr. Burget agreed to this. Vice President Castranio asked how kids under driving age were supposed to arrive at Funtastik. Mr. Burget suggested they will have to be driven. Commissioner Cochran said that there was no chance of connecting to an existing trail which originates at Bumblebee Hollow Road near the rear of the property and said he was in favor of sidewalks being installed along the frontage of the property. There was some discussion about the need for sidewalks at various locations along Market Street as well as discussion on the viability of connecting to the existing trail at the rear of the property.

Ms. Judy Zimmerman Walter, of Zimmerman's Automotive, reported that people walk across their lot all the time. She was not opposed to pedestrian traffic from Funtastik on her property. She was opposed to installing a dedicated path and easement on her property: she doesn't want the easement up for resale; and, the original design had it going the length of the property, which would force Zimmerman's to move structures at the rear and the grading is steep. Ms. Zimmerman said she would be forced to install a heavy fence to prevent accidents. The space at the rear of the property is already small for receiving tire deliveries. She was ultimately in favor of a connector trail through the tree line to her parking lot.

Vice President Castranio pointed out that it was the duty of the Board to perform due diligence on determining how pedestrians could get to Funtastik prior to approving their plan. He did not think that a connecting trail to a busy parking lot was the solution. There was more discussion about whether a trail there is viable. Ms. Walter echoed Mr. Burget's assertion that most people going to Funtastik will be driving.

Ms. Boyer showed a map with a proposed sidewalk extension along South Market Street. Vice President Castranio said he would support deferring the sidewalk but said the BOC should move forward with getting the sidewalks built along Market Street—this would impact 4 properties.

Ms. Bailey inquired if the Board had looked into adding a bike lane, but received the response that PennDOT had forbidden it. Commissioner Cochran summed up: if no trail connection is viable, sidewalks will need to be installed. Mr. Burget indicated he understood and went further to say he knew that even if a deferral were granted in this instance, in the future sidewalks may be required. President Martin encouraged him to be more communicative with Township staff in

the future. Mr. Burget agreed to come back to the Board at the second meeting in June to ask for a time extension in order to work with his client and UAT staff toward a resolution.

Vice President Castranio noted that Funtastik's owner is involved in building up the skate spot at Koser Park; he suggested they request a fee waiver as they are contributing financially to the parks system. Per Ms. Boyer, UAT'S SLDO states that developers must dedicate a certain amount of land with each land development. If they don't then they have to pay a fee in lieu of. The fee amount is in our Resolution of Fee Schedule. So, \$2300 per residential unit and then there is a formula for non-residential development. For Funtastik, their fee comes to \$4800. The fee is dedicated to be used only towards park improvements.

The Board was next to consider action on a Certificate of Appropriateness regarding the front door for 303 Gettysburg Pike. Ms. Boyer explained that this agenda item was moot as the applicant withdrew their application, as the door has been fixed.

Next on the agenda was consideration/action for a waiver of review process for Liberty Forge. In a memo to the Board, Ms. Boyer provided the following information: The Liberty Forge development, proposed by EG Stoltzfus Land, LLC, involves the construction of 193 residential units (137 single-family homes and 56 duplexes) along with community amenities such as a clubhouse, walking trails, and a dog park, on a 96.33-acre site located mostly in Lower Allen Township (LAT). Approximately 14.15 acres of the site lie within Upper Allen Township (UAT), but no homes or public access are proposed within that portion. Instead, the UAT section will contain stormwater management facilities and open space amenities. All stormwater discharges from UAT flow into LAT's system.

Given that no construction or road connections occur in UAT, the developer has requested a waiver from Upper Allen Township's full development review process. This includes deferring plan and stormwater reviews to LAT, waiving UAT's signature on final plans, financial security requirements, and stormwater inspections. The request has been supported by staff and discussed at the Public Improvements Committee meeting on May 23, 2025. LAT has agreed to assume all responsibilities for inspections, enforcement, and financial guarantees associated with the stormwater systems and other improvements. The suggested motion for the Board of Commissioners is to approve the waiver as presented, allowing Lower Allen Township to oversee all aspects of the development.

Vice President Castranio expressed concern that the stormwater basins in UAT would fall under the Township's purview related to MS-4 requirements. He wanted Lower Allen to put it into writing that these stormwater basins would be theirs to maintain. Ms. Boyer replied that she has already had this discussion with LAT and they have agreed to it. Once this is put into writing and signed by both municipalities, it will be a recorded document.

Commissioner Fairchild expressed concern about traffic. He reported backups at the four-way stop sign at Lisburn. He said his main concern is traffic rather than stormwater. He spoke against further development of the area and urged the other Commissioners to investigate and question the proposed project by LAT. Vice President Castranio suggested traffic concerns be raised at the PennDOT scoping meeting. Per Ms. Boyer, Traffic Resource Group (TRG), the Township's

traffic engineer, is looking at the situation and giving feedback to PennDOT. Per Ms. Boyer, UAT will have a seat at the table at the scoping meeting, which allows interested parties to review the project. It is the preliminary meeting for any PennDOT project.

President Martin emphasized that the work was to be done largely in other municipalities and that UAT should not expect to impose its desires on them. Ms. Boyer acknowledged there would be secondary impact on traffic in UAT. Commissioner Cochran argued that secondary traffic from surrounding municipalities is a fact of life in UAT due to its location. He also emphasized that UAT has no jurisdiction over what LAT does on their own land. Ms. Boyer confirmed UAT's jurisdiction was limited to the stormwater basins. Mr. Bonn stated that because the roads are in LAT, it would be up to LAT and PennDot as to the location of the development's entrance. UAT would have no ability to interfere. President Martin suggested that the scoping meeting would be a good setting for UAT to express any concerns to PennDOT and LAT. Per Ms. Boyer, UAT is welcome to make suggestions to LAT—however, it is not in the position to mandate or require anything to happen there. PennDot is the ultimate decision maker.

Commissioner Fairchild made a **MOTION** to disapprove the waiver request. The Developer shall be required to submit a subdivision and land development plan application for consideration by the appropriate Township boards. Commissioner Walsh **SECONDED** the motion. The motion failed 3-2.

Commissioner Cochran made a **MOTION** to approve the waiver request, which was **SECONDED** by Vice President Castranio. Commissioner Fairchild said that with this vote, UAT would be condoning more development. President Martin again made the point that LAT's land in question was not under UAT's jurisdiction. The motion passed 3-2.

The Board next considered scheduling of a public hearing date for a zoning text amendment. The Upper Allen Township Community Development Department has proposed a zoning text amendment to remove “contractor’s offices, shops, and yards” as a permitted use by Special Exception in the Agricultural District, aligning the zoning ordinance more closely with the township’s Comprehensive Plan. This use will remain permitted by right in the Industrial District and would become a Special Exception use in the Highway Commercial (C-2) District.

The amendment consolidates the current definitions into one and introduces new criteria for where and how these facilities can operate, including requirements for enclosed storage in the C-2 District and screened outdoor storage in the Industrial District. The proposal also mandates direct access to arterial or collector roads, prohibits access through residential areas, and requires a traffic study. These changes aim to protect agricultural land, encourage commercial and industrial growth in appropriate areas, and limit negative visual or traffic impacts. The Cumberland County Planning Commission supported the changes with minor revisions, which were incorporated. The Upper Allen Township Planning Commission reviewed the amendment at meetings on April 28 and May 19, 2025, ultimately recommending its approval with a 4–1 vote. No public objections were recorded. The Board of Commissioners is now considering scheduling a public hearing, with possible dates in July or August, as required under the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code. Following the hearing, the Board may vote to adopt or reject the ordinance.

President Martin did not see a reason to change the ordinance. Commissioner Cochran gave an example of what could happen under the current ordinance: one could buy a farm and then turn it into a major equipment distributor, inconsistent with an agricultural district. Commissioner Cochran said he was in favor of “accessory use,” allowing the contractor shops, offices and yards to remain in the agricultural district as an accessory use only instead of a primary use. Basically, a farmer in their home could still have the use but it couldn't be the main use on the property. Ms. Boyer explained that any proposed change to the ordinance would have to go back before the County to review (30 days). President Martin pointed out that most farmers who are successful have side businesses.

Ms. Karen Overly Smith, 855 Oak Oval, said there were some good models for this type of law in Lancaster County that aim to preserve farming and farmland.

Ms. Boyer suggested that the hearing be held July 16<sup>th</sup> or August 6<sup>th</sup>, if it were the will of the Board. Commissioner Walsh made a **MOTION** to authorize the appropriate Township staff to advertise the ordinance and public hearing to be held on July 16<sup>th</sup>, 2025, at 5:00 p.m., to discuss the zoning text amendment requests. The Board shall hear testimony during the public hearing. Following the close of the public hearing, the Board can consider taking action to either approve or disapprove the proposed ordinance at the regular BOC meeting on July 16<sup>th</sup> at 6:30 p.m. Commissioner Cochran **SECONDED** the motion, which passed unanimously.

The next item for the Board’s consideration was the purchase of historical district boundary signage. Per Ms. Boyer, the Historical Architectural Review Board (HARB) unanimously recommended the approval of cast iron entry signs for the Yellow Breeches, Shepherdstown, and Trout Run Historic Districts. They also recommended adjusting the Yellow Breeches sign’s location closer to Lisburn Road to better signal district entry at the McCormick Road intersection. Additionally, the HARB suggested placing an extra Shepherdstown sign on South York Street, noting the need for PennDOT approval. These recommendations received positive support from the Public Improvements Committee on May 23, 2025, which also discussed placing more modest signs along South York Street and Arcona Road. A quote was provided for six painted, cast aluminum plaques at \$3,200 each, with \$500 for freight, totaling \$19,700. The signs are expected to take 4–6 weeks for delivery after approval. Two motions are proposed: one to approve the \$19,700 purchase and installation, and one to approve or disapprove adding signs along South York Street and Arcona Road. Ms. Boyer showed a mock-up of the signs which are brown and unique to each district.

Vice President Castranio said he would only support signage for Shepherdstown, which is the only “historic district” he recognizes in the Township. Commissioner Walsh reported that he contacted the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission (PHMC) to discuss a document used to evaluate local historic districts. He stated that the PHMC made clear the National Register of Historic Places is a federal program with no authority or connection to local preservation ordinances, planning, or business regulations in Pennsylvania. Walsh criticized the methodology used in the referenced report, claiming it applied incorrect standards not suited for local evaluations. He emphasized that the report's conclusions were flawed and misleading, particularly in its assessment of the Yellow Breeches Historic District, which was targeted for

removal.

Commissioner Castranio added historical context, stating that when the districts were created in 1976, the PHMC found the supporting documentation insufficient. Walsh then reiterated that despite past concerns, the PHMC has since affirmed the appropriateness of the districts for preservation. He further shared that Frank Grumbine, the PHMC's Community Preservation Coordinator, personally supported Yellow Breeches as a viable historic district—contrary to the report's recommendation to eliminate it.

Commissioner Walsh made a **MOTION** to approve the purchase and installation of the cast metal historic district entry signs for a cost not to exceed \$19,700.00. Commissioner Fairchild **SECONDED** the motion. Commissioner Cochran commented he was surprised they weren't larger for the price, but agreed to vote for them. The motion passed 4-1, with Castranio voting "no."

The Board next discussed the actual boundaries of the historic districts. In a memo to the Board, Ms. Boyer outlined proposed changes to the boundaries of the Township's four municipal historic districts: Rosegarden, Trout Run, Shepherdstown, and Yellow Breeches. The Historical Architectural Review Board (HARB) unanimously recommended dissolving the Rosegarden District due to the loss of its historic mill, leaving only one property in the district. For the Trout Run District, HARB suggested removing the Ashcombe Farms townhomes, which were built in the 1990s and are not historically relevant, while retaining 2450 Cope Circle. In Shepherdstown, the board recommended excluding the home at 333 Scenic Drive due to its newer construction and secluded location, as well as removing the Terraces at Shepherdstown area. No changes were recommended for the Yellow Breeches District. Public feedback on the districts was previously solicited in 2022, and a few residents expressed concerns regarding fairness and awareness of district designations. The memo concludes by requesting that the Board of Commissioners consider the future of the four districts and provide policy direction. Staff will prepare an amended ordinance and map, subject to Board approval, and seek further guidance on whether to notify property owners again.

The Board reviewed maps of each district and debated the merits of certain individual properties as "historic" sites. Commissioner Cochran worried about imposing historic district requirements on homeowners who weren't aware they had purchased in a "historic district."

Ms. Bailey suggested adding a certain property to Shepherdstown. Ms. Boyer explained that the house would have to be "certified" – it has to meet certain criteria to fit into the district.

The Board instructed Ms. Boyer's team to communicate with homeowners who might be impacted by changes in the historic district boundaries. Commissioner Fairchild noted that Commissioner Walsh circulated a petition in 2022 to homeowners in the Yellow Breeches district who all signed to preserve its status as a historic district. Commissioner Cochran suggested that people didn't know what they were signing.

Ms. Stack emphasized that communication was vital and that homeowners should be made aware of what it means to live in a historic district. Commissioner Walsh explained that the designation

of “historic district” has been around since the mid-1970s. He said the crux of the problem lies with people purchasing property in historic districts without realizing it. He was in favor of continued education; Community Development had previously sent out post cards to those in historic districts. Commissioner Fairchild pointed out that historic district regulations only apply to what is visible from the road. Ms. Boyer clarified that the ordinance applied to “anything that could be seen from a public right-of-way within the district.” Ms. Overly Smith asserted that realtors should disclose at the time of sale, but lamented that it was not necessarily in their own self-interest to do so. Commissioner Fairchild wondered if the Township could mandate disclosure by putting it in the deeds of the properties. Mr. Feinour said he had dealt with this in Philadelphia, where there was not a requirement for sellers to disclose historic district status. However, he called disclosure “good practice.”

Commissioner Cochran made a **MOTION** to authorize staff to prepare an amended map of the Township’s municipal historic districts and ordinance for further consideration and to dissolve the Rosegarden District. Vice President Castranio **SECONDED** the motion. Commissioner Walsh inquired if approval to dissolve would have to come through the PHMC. Ms. Boyer replied that the PHMC is only involved in the certification of new districts. Commissioner Cochran’s motion passed unanimously to dissolve Rosegarden.

Commissioner Cochran made a **MOTION** to authorize staff to prepare an amended map of the Township’s municipal historic districts and ordinance for further consideration and to amend the Trout Run district to exclude the homes in the Ashcombe Farm neighborhood, with the exception of 2450 Cope Circle. Commissioner Fairchild **SECONDED** the motion, which passed 4-1, with Castranio dissenting.

Commissioner Walsh made a **MOTION** to prepare an amended map of the Township’s Municipal Historic Districts, and accompanying ordinance for further consideration and to amend the Shepherdstown District to exclude the property at 333 Scenic Drive and to exclude the Terraces at Shepherdstown property, as presented. Vice President Castranio **SECONDED** the motion. The motion carried 4-1, with Commissioner Cochran dissenting.

The Yellow Breeches district was to remain the same and so required no action by the Board.

Ms. Boyer announced that there will be HARB meeting on June 17<sup>th</sup> at 6:30 p.m. They will review certificates of appropriateness at both 240 Gettysburg Road and 1943 S. York Street.

Commissioner Walsh took a moment to thank Mr. Fraser for spearheading the effort to get historical signage installed in the Township.

President Martin called a 5-minute recess at 9:05 p.m.

### **PUBLIC IMPROVEMENTS**

The Board was to take the final vote on taking ownership of Bishop Bridge from Cumberland County. Commissioner Fairchild announced that the Board had received a revised proposal from Wrought Iron Bridge Works offering to rehabilitate the bridge for vehicular use for \$1.05M. That

is up from \$850K for pedestrian use and emergency access only. Commissioner Fairchild stated that Cumberland County has indicated they would contribute \$275,000 to rehab the bridge (that \$275,000 requires the bridge to be opened for vehicular traffic.) Commissioner Fairchild argued that County funding and grant funding could largely offset the cost of rehabbing the bridge. He argued it was suited for the national registry of historic sites. He pointed out that the West Shore Historical Society was on hand this evening. He commented that the Sheepford Road Bridge had just been bid—for \$1.7M. Commissioner Fairchild highlighted how different taking down each bridge would be and argued that the process for Bishop Bridge would inevitably be cheaper than Sheepford. He lamented the loss of bridges like Bishop Bridge as well as the skillset of maintenance and construction of such structures.

Vice President Castranio stated that the bridge has been out of commission for years and that the Board had not received one complaint. He said the bridge was no longer needed and that committing to rebuilding the bridge put taxpayers at risk.

Commissioner Cochran read prepared remarks, as follows:

“Tonight, we face a crucial vote on the future of Bishop Bridge, a decision that’s been nearly 11 years in the making. It’s vital that we document this journey thoroughly. The conversation around Bishop Bridge’s fate began in November 2014, when a joint report by the Cumberland and York County Planning Commissions suggested a \$62,700 investment in repairs. This was projected to extend the bridge’s life by 5 to 10 years, after which it would be closed without further repairs, maintaining a 10-ton weight restriction. By October 2017, a Preservation Assessment by Gannett Fleming, shared with Township residents, estimated an \$800K cost to rehabilitate the bridge for a 15-ton limit, or \$2M for replacement. Discussion also included closing the bridge and creating a new gated emergency road through Messiah College. This emergency access road gained traction, and on January 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2018, the Cumberland County Finance Meeting approved spending \$360,000 on its construction, with York County reimbursing 50%. It was understood that no further funds would be allocated to Bishop Bridge repairs.

In April 2021, Herbert, Rowland, and Grubic provided an updated rehabilitation estimate for Bishop Bridge. Repairing only steel and stone issues would cost \$900K, while a full rehabilitation, including contingency and engineering, would reach \$2.2M. Traffic counts at the time showed Bishop Bridge with 217 daily trips, significantly lower than Green Lane Farms Bridge (2808 trips) and Slate Hill Bridge (1581 trips). Sheepford Road Bridge, with 201 daily trips, was also noted. It was recommended that both Bishop and Sheepford Road bridges be closed. Following an inspection in July 2021, Bishop Bridge was indeed closed. The estimated cost for ‘substantial repairs’ to safely reopen it with a load posting for an extended period was \$2M. Concurrently, the Township engineer C.S. Davidson assessed the bridge, estimating minimum necessary repairs at \$1M and replacement at \$1.5M. By August 2021, Cumberland County initiated the process to remove Bishop Bridge. At the September 1, 2021, BOC meeting, UAT commissioners began discussing whether the Township should take possession of the bridge. Now, nearly three years and 9 months later, Cumberland County awaits our decision.

During this period, significant historical preservation efforts have taken place across Cumberland County, offering potential models for community involvement:

- The Friends of Peace Church, a non-profit, successfully secured ownership of the historic Peace Church in Hampden Township from the PA Historical and Museum Commission in 2024, after managing it for 50 years.
- The Mount Tabor Preservation Project, a 501(c)(3) established in 2019, convinced Mount Holly Springs Borough to assume ownership of the Mount Tabor AME Zion Church in 2020 and lease it back to the Project. All ongoing work is funded through grants and donations.

These examples highlight the role of dedicated community groups in preserving historic structures. This brings us to metal truss bridges, and specifically, the Historic Metal Truss Bridge Management Plan. Completed in 2017 by PennDOT, in conjunction with the Federal Highway Administration and the PA State Historic Preservation Office, this plan inventoried and assessed all metal truss bridges in Pennsylvania. Of the 208 bridges identified, each was assigned a priority of ‘Exceptional,’ ‘High,’ or ‘Moderate’ based on design, rarity, context, unique features, and overall condition. In PennDOT District 8, our district, 23 bridges were listed: 9 exceptional, 5 high, and 9 moderate. This prioritization is crucial because the Historic Metal Truss Bridge Capital Rehabilitation Program, founded in 2021, focuses on bridges in the ‘Exceptional’ or ‘High’ categories. Sheepford Road Bridge is listed as ‘Exceptional’ while Bishop Bridge is listed as ‘Moderate.’ Additional criteria for funding include public visibility and strong local support. Sheepford Road has the ‘Friends of the Sheepford Road Bridge,’ a dedicated community group. In contrast, while Upper Allen has various community initiatives, there isn’t a ‘Friends of Bishop Bridge.’ Given these requirements and the limited funding available, it’s highly unlikely that Bishop Bridge would ever receive money from this program. Notably, Sheepford Road Bridge was awarded \$2M, with Kinsley Construction winning the bid at \$1.731M, bringing the total cost with engineering to approximately \$2M for a pedestrian bridge with a 3-ton weight limit.

While Bishop and Sheepford bridges differ in design, length, and deterioration, it is difficult to reconcile some of the numbers presented in the Wrought Iron Bridge Works proposal. Our time is up. We need to make a decision tonight. I have not seen any written communication from PennDOT indicating their approval of the process WIBW is promoting. Furthermore, my request for WIBW to provide a bond for the full amount of the contract, should the project not receive PennDOT approval, has gone unanswered.

Therefore, I will be voting no on taking ownership of Bishop Bridge. Instead, I suggest it is time for someone to create a community group to save Glen Allen Bridge, as it is the next to be abandoned by the County.”

Commissioner Walsh agreed that community support was important for taking on this type of project. He said he felt he had not been active enough in garnering public support to save the bridge, but did point to an online petition that was circulated which got 261 in favor of taking possession of the bridge. Only 16 people signed a petition in opposition. Commissioner Walsh pointed out that the Township is celebrating its 175<sup>th</sup> anniversary. He called Bishop Bridge a unique structure worthy of preservation.

Vice President Castranio asked if there was an upper limit to how much Commissioner Walsh would propose spending on the bridge. Commissioner Walsh said \$1.3M would be his upper limit. There was some discussion between Commissioners Cochran and Fairchild over the merits of WIBW's proposal and cost estimate. Commissioner Cochran argued it didn't address certain permitting and building requirements. He pointed out that WIBW has not actually visited Bishop Bridge. Commissioner Fairchild contended that they had enough information to put together a valid proposal.

President Martin said that he would support saving the bridge if it were majority grant funded. He said he could only support the project if the bridge was built for vehicular traffic. President Martin characterized it as a pedestrian bridge to nowhere. President Martin went on to say he felt the contractor had not demonstrated competence or an ability to communicate proactively and effectively. He didn't feel WIBW was willing or capable of doing the work. President Martin contended that he didn't think UAT would ever receive approval from PennDOT for vehicular use of the bridge. He finally said he didn't feel that saving the bridge was a priority for Upper Allen residents.

Ms. Lynx stated that Sheepford Road required archeological digs due to the use of cranes; she reminded the Board that Bishop Bridge is proposed to be rehabbed without use of cranes so would not require a dig. She delineated the differences between the bridges. She did not know if WIBW had included environmental clearances in their cost estimate.

Mr. Paul Brenaman, 2020 Stumpstown Road, argued that there is no need to save Bishop Bridge. He said he felt a lot of the bridge's supporters come from outside of UAT.

Mr. Williams was opposed to spending money on Bishop Bridge; he said the impact would be minimal on residents in UAT.

Mr. Paul Rigney, 605 Lavina Drive, characterized saving Bishop Bridge as a "vanity project." He said that while he supports historical preservation in general, Bishop Bridge is not functional. He reminded the Board that they are the stewards of their constituents' monies. He expressed disappointment that the Board had taken so long to come to the conclusion that Bishop Bridge would be a waste of money.

Commissioner Fairchild acknowledged that people would be concerned about cost, but asked people to stop inflating the predicted cost. He talked about the malleability of the budget. He pointed out that UAT budgeted \$1.5M for sewer work in Webercroft in 2025 which was ultimately reduced to \$600K. Commissioner Fairchild gave President Martin credit for "saving" \$1M. He did say he wasn't sure that project was even worth \$600K. He talked about stormwater repairs done by Mr. Rehab in Meadowview last year for \$625K. Commissioner Fairchild contended that this was money the Township would never recoup. He echoed his former comments that grant money would offset any expense to save the bridge.

Ms. Bailey said she felt the bridge was a positive investment for the Township. She noted that she has experience with obtaining grants and volunteered to help research funding for Bishop Bridge. Vice President Castranio asked if she would be willing to spend taxpayer money on the

bridge; Ms. Bailey reiterated that she would look for grants but did not say whether she supported spending taxpayer dollars on it. She said she would need further information before commenting. President Martin replied that UAT staff was more than capable of finding grant money and pointed to its track record. However, he said he felt public sentiment to save the bridge was lacking.

Commissioner Fairchild expressed concern that President Martin had instructed staff to pause grant research until a decision was made on the bridge; he felt that all grant opportunities should have been explored as part of reaching such a decision. He pointed to LSA grants specifically.

Commissioner Cochran said Commissioner Fairchild was inappropriately comparing the costs of state mandated stormwater and public sewer infrastructure with the cost of the bridge that is not essential. He said he asked PA State Representative Kutz if he thought Bishop Bridge would be eligible for an LSA grant and received a negative response; LSA grants need high visibility, solid community support, and the ability to impact a large segment of the population.

Commissioner Fairchild made a **MOTION** to take possession of Bishop Bridge from Cumberland County. Commissioner Walsh **SECONDED** the motion, which failed 3-2.

### ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE

The following is context provided to the Board in a memo from Mr. Feinour. Upper Allen Township is seeking to renew its exemption from Pennsylvania's Act 67 noise standards, which allow liquor-licensed businesses to play amplified music up to 75 decibels off-premises during designated hours. The Township's own ordinance—Ordinance No. 831, enacted in January 2024—restricts such noise between 10:00 PM and 6:00 AM, aiming to preserve residential quiet hours.

The current exemption, approved by the LCB and effective since August 21, 2024, will expire in August 2025. The Township is therefore preparing to reapply for a new three-year exemption. This process includes adopting a formal resolution and submitting a petition to the LCB. Upon submission, a public hearing will be scheduled at the Township Municipal Building, with public notice issued in *The Sentinel*.

No noise complaints have been reported during the current exemption period. Mr. Feinour reported that noise complaints about the Willows at Ashcombe Mansion were not found to be valid. The Township asserts its continued commitment to enforcing its ordinance locally through its Code Enforcement Department. The supporting resolution authorizes the petition, affirms local control over noise enforcement, and reiterates the Township's intention to uphold quiet standards for the benefit of its residents.

Ms. Sharon Hower, 2479 Glime Drive, thanked the Board for making the appeal last year and asked them to do again this year. As an impacted homeowner, she said she appreciates the stricter standards of the Township (versus the LCB). She did say that the Willows of Ashcombe can get very loud during events. The discussion turned again to the difference between bass vibration

and sound decibels. Chief Parsons reported that they had yet to take accurate sound meter measurements at the Willows.

Vice President Castranio **MOVED** to adopt Resolution 1109 authorizing the submission of a petition to the Pennsylvania Liquor Control Board for consideration of an exemption to the statute regarding amplified music being heard off the premises of licensed establishments. Commissioner Walsh **SECONDED** the motion, which passed unanimously.

At 10:06 p.m., President Martin called for an Executive Session to discuss matters protected by attorney-client privilege.