

**UPPER ALLEN TOWNSHIP  
BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS MEETING  
March 6, 2024 - 6:30 P.M.**

**COMMISSIONERS**

Kenneth M. Martin, President  
Richard A. Castranio, Jr., Vice President  
Virginia M. Anderson, Assistant Secretary  
Eric Y. Fairchild, Assistant Secretary  
Phil J. Walsh, Assistant Secretary

**TOWNSHIP OFFICIALS**

Scott Fraser, Township Manager  
Timothy Wendling, Assist. Town. Manager  
Andy Parsons, Chief of Police  
Jennifer Boyer, Comm Dev Director  
Mike Welt, Zoning and Code Enf. Officer  
Barry Cupp, Sewer Dept. Manager  
J. Stephen Feinour, Solicitor  
Jason Reichard, Engineer  
Ryan Kunkel, Deputy Chief

**CALL TO ORDER**

President Martin called the Board of Commissioners meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. A moment of silence was held, and the Pledge of Allegiance was recited by all. Roll call was taken by Mr. Fraser.

**PRESIDENT'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

President Martin mentioned that Summit Search and Rescue thanked the Township for the donation. He also mentioned that they have assisted the Township several times.

**PRESIDENT'S RECOGNITION OF VISITORS**

There was no recognition of visitors.

**CONSIDERATION/APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF  
BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS MEETINGS**

President Martin asked for any comments or corrections to the Minutes of the February 7, 2024, Commissioners Meeting.

President Martin made a correction to the type of meeting that was held. The meeting was listed as a reorganization meeting, and it was a regular meeting. This will be corrected in the minutes.

Commissioner Fairchild made a **MOTION** to approve the Minutes of the February 7, 2024, Board of Commissioners Meeting, **SECONDED** by Commissioner Anderson. The motion carried unanimously.

**CONSENT AGENDA**

There were no items for action.

**PUBLIC SAFETY COMMITTEE**

**POLICE DEPARTMENT**

Chief Parsons shared that the traffic crashes annual report for 2023 is now listed on the website.

**FIRE DEPARTMENT**

Deputy Chief Kunkel stated that the new air packs came in last week and will be in service by the end of the month. He added that the hazardous foam was removed from the apparatus and is being stored, but the Fire Marshal is now coordinating the removal of the foam.

**PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE**

**Consideration/Action of a P/F Land Development Plan for K Care (Genius Kids) Childcare Center, UAT File #23-08-01**

Ms. Boyer explained that the plan is for an 8,500 square foot commercial daycare center along Old Schoolhouse Lane. The applicant is requesting a few modifications to the site design, and a parking reduction request from the required 40 parking spaces down to 27 spaces. Under the Township's Zoning Ordinance, the Board may authorize a parking reduction if the applicant can justify that the parking provided is adequate. The applicant provided a traffic study showing both intersections are operating at a level of service (LoS) A, therefore there are no proposed improvements where Old Schoolhouse Lane meets Cumberland Parkway at either intersection as it is a horseshoe shaped road.

Mr. Esch McCombie, Esq. with McNeese Wallace & Nurick and Mr. Greg Holtzman, civil engineer with BL Companies, represented the plan. Mr. McCombie stated that the plan was discussed with the Planning Commission in January and the requested waivers, parking reduction, and the plan were recommended for approval. Mr. Holtzman explained that the plan had been presented to the Board of Commissioners in June of last year as a sketch plan and that it has been modified since then. The address for the property is 151 Old Schoolhouse Lane and it is the last vacant lot in Cumberland Business Park. The proposal is to construct a 8,500 square foot daycare building with associated parking, with a 5,000 square foot outdoor play area. Mr. Holtzman noted that an offset for a fence on the property may be able to move in the future with consent from the neighboring property owner. There was a previous comment about access to the dumpster, and after consulting the waste management company, the two spaces in front of the dumpster will be marked as staff only and will be utilized by the owners only.

Mr. Holtzman stated that they are asking for three modifications. The first modification is to Section 220-5.3.B.(5) to allow a portion of the public sidewalk to be outside of the right-of-way, because there is not enough space to provide a five-foot wide sidewalk and a five-foot wide grass area from the existing curb within the right-of-way. The second request is to Section 220-5.4.B.(3)(g) to provide a rounded tangential arc with a minimum radius of 15 feet instead of the required 30 feet. Mr. Holtzman stated that the required 30 feet is usually for large truck traffic; the tighter curve helps to control speed and makes a shorter distance to cross for pedestrians, and the 15 ft tangential arc was deemed serviceable by a firetruck through a truck turning analysis. The

third modification is to Section 220-5.13B(2)(a)[2], concerning landscaping islands. Mr. Holtzman argued that even though the two parking endcaps do not have curbing all the way around, the plan includes the vegetation to meet the criteria and intent of the ordinance, but it does not meet the definition.

Commissioner Castranio asked for clarification of the fence being able to be moved. Ms. Boyer stated that the setback can be reduced to 15 feet from 25 feet in the side and rear yard, with consent from the neighboring property owner due to a recent ordinance change.

Mr. Holzman noted that there were not many options for stormwater management due to the size of the lot, but there is 30 feet of greenspace on all sides of the lot. Also, there is a small rain garden that has been enhanced with landscaping, and a subsurface system located under the parking lot that collects water. Finally, in cooperation with the township, the discharge point was modified to be further downstream.

President Martin asked if the parking reduction request is based on the real estate or is it based on the current use, and if it is based on the use, would the parking requirements change if the use changed in the future. Ms. Boyer clarified that the parking requirements are tied to the use, so if the use changes in the future the parking requirements would have to change to meet the ordinance requirements.

Commissioner Fairchild asked if the intent of the parking lot was to have a specific circulation pattern. Mr. Holzman stated that the parking lot is designed to have two-way access, but the assumption is that most traffic will flow in from the far entrance and leave from the near entrance. Angled parking was considered during the design process; however, it was determined that angled parking would have been potentially more dangerous and would have resulted in fewer total parking spaces.

President Martin asked if one-way traffic flow would be better for safety as it would cause less confusion. Mr. Holzman said the parking layout was discussed extensively and ultimately it was determined that allowing for two-way access was the most customer friendly option. Commissioner Anderson also mentioned safety concerns, specifically concerning parents that are running late for drop off times. Mr. McCombie explained that since the COVID-19 outbreak, drop off is much quicker, because parents are no longer walking their children to the classrooms; they are dropping their children off at the door with their teachers.

Mr. McCombie elaborated, stating that the Township's zoning Section 245-17.5A allows for a reduction in parking spaces, and the applicant is asking for a reduction down to 27 spaces. The narrative provided to the Board compared this facility to similar nearby facilities and nearby municipalities. Mr. McCombie provided an overview of the narrative, explaining that parking is tied to the maximum number of employees expected to be on site at one time, which was 16. Also, there are no longer peak drop off and pick up times, which are now spread out over several hours due to changes in work schedules. This was verified by the analysis done by Traffic Planning and Design, Inc. (TPD). TPD did vehicle counts at a Genius Kids facility in Silver Spring Township, which is also owned by K-Care and has same number of employees and students, and they found that the highest one-day demand maximum was 23 vehicles out of 25 parking spaces with second highest being 21 vehicles. Special event parking was also taken into consideration for the parking

calculations. Special events at these locations do not include all the classes at the same time, rather it is usually one class per event. Due to this, the proposed 27 spaces should be sufficient, specifically considering their other facility has only 25 parking spaces and that amount has been sufficient. For this location on Old Schoolhouse Lane, there is also on-street parking available. Mr. McCombie detailed how since 2011 there has been a downward trend in parking requirements in the surrounding municipalities as ordinances are updated, with a high of 48 required spaces in 2011 and a low of 20 in 2023.

Commissioner Castranio asked Chief Parsons if there have been any parking issues on Old Schoolhouse Lane. Chief Parsons stated there have not been any issues.

Commissioner Fairchild mentioned hearing about a potential agreement for joint parking with nearby property owners. Mr. McCombie explained that they have reached out to the neighboring property owners, and both responded stating that they were in the process of working on their lease of the property and were not interested currently.

Commissioner Walsh asked for a description of how the rain garden and stormwater management are designed and would operate. Mr. Holzman explained that the rain garden will collect water and pond slightly, then will infiltrate through. Commissioner Castranio asked if the underground facility would also infiltrate or if it had an impervious liner. Mr. Holzman stated that the underground system should infiltrate. Commissioner Walsh also noted that the area tends to be prone to developing sink holes. Mr. Holzman confirmed that Engineering Consulting Services (ECS) performed geotechnical analysis by conducting either two or four infiltration tests and after those tests the underground basin was moved from under the playground to under the parking lot.

Commissioner Fairchild asked why the decision was made to include the sidewalks instead of deferring the improvement since the adjacent properties do not have them, and if the required five-foot grass strip was maintained between the curb and the sidewalk. Mr. McCombie explained that the ordinance requires a sidewalk, and it was for the safety of children and their parents if they park on the street.

Jim Cochran of 384 Alison Avenue

Mr. Cochran noted that two spaces must be designated as handicap spaces and two are marked as staff only in front of the dumpster. There is also a significant amount of parking on the opposite side of Old Schoolhouse Lane due to the townhouses, who he believes do not have enough parking. Mr. Cochran suggested allowing parking on only one side of Old Schoolhouse Lane to maintain safe sight distances. President Martin agreed that it is important to maintain safe sight distance.

Commissioner Anderson made a **MOTION** to approve the request to modify Section 220-5.3B(5), allowing the Applicant to provide for a five-foot wide sidewalk along their property, a portion of which will be located outside the public right-of-way. The Applicant will provide for a six-foot wide pedestrian access easement around the portion of sidewalk and adjacent property area that is located within private property. The remainder of the sidewalk will be located within the public right-of-way. **SECONDED** by Commissioner Castranio. The motion carried unanimously.

Commissioner Anderson made a **MOTION** to approve the request to modify Section 220-5.4B(3)(g) to provide a rounded tangential arc with a minimum radius of 15 feet instead of the required 30

feet. **SECONDED** by Commissioner Castranio. The motion carried unanimously.

Commissioner Anderson made a **MOTION** to approve the request to modify Section 220-5.13B(2)(a)[2] to provide for landscaping islands at the northeast corner and the west entrance that meet the required landscaping plantings but not the minimum width, length, and/or depth. **SECONDED** by Commissioner Castranio. The motion carried unanimously.

Commissioner Walsh made a **MOTION** to approve the request to reduce the minimum number of off-street parking spaces required for the childcare center from 40 to 27 spaces, in accordance with Section 245-17.5A of the Zoning Ordinance. **SECONDED** by Commissioner Castranio. The motion carried 4-1.

Commissioner Anderson made a **MOTION** to approve the preliminary/final land development for K Care – UA (Genius Kids), UAT File # 23-08-01. with conditions. **SECONDED** by Commissioner Castranio. The motion carried unanimously. The conditions of approval are:

1. Per Section 245-17.2, Table XVII-1 and the latest zoning ordinance amendment adopted October 2023 (Ordinance 828), there is not enough parking being provided to meet the minimum off-street parking standards. The Applicant must either obtain approval of a reduction per Section 245-17.5, enter into a joint parking agreement with neighboring properties per Section 245-17.4, or else meet the minimum standards as identified in Table XVII-1 of Codified Ordinances. If a reduction is granted, a note shall be listed on the Cover Sheet including the date granted, along with any conditions as required by the Board of Commissioners.
2. Final plan submission shall include façade drawings, to include elevations, floor plans, lighting, etc., per Section 220-3.5.C.(2)(ff) of the Codified Ordinances.
3. The pavement section detailed for use within the public right-of-way satisfies the Township’s Construction and Material Specifications; however, it differs from the revised pavement section depths that were included in the financial security estimate issued on January 30, 2024. The detail on Sheet DN-1 shall be revised to match the pavement section issued on the financial security estimate.
4. The limits of saw cut and roadway restoration for utility installations must comply with Chapter 217 for the Township’s Street Opening Ordinance.
5. On Sheet 2 (GN-1), add the following note stating a Knox Box is to be installed and contain keys or a means of access for all structures/suites on site. Note: A Knox Box application can be obtained by the Township Fire Marshal. The Applicant shall work with him to secure the necessary Knox Box.
6. Employee parking is proposed in front of the dumpster. Waste Management provided a letter stating they had no issue servicing the site prior to 7:00 am, but the Township’s ordinances would prevent them from being on-site prior to 6:30 am, which does present a conflict if they cannot accommodate the Applicant within that 30-minute time window.

The Applicant should provide a back-up plan to resolve any potential conflict with trash services.

7. A certified, engineered design and details of all retaining walls shall be submitted and approved by the Township prior to the issuance of any permits. The final design must be reviewed and approved prior to recording the land development plan.
8. The Applicant must obtain approval of the Erosion and Sediment Control Plan from the Cumberland County Conservation District and furnish to the Township a copy of the required NPDES permit in accordance with the requirements of Section 220-3.5.C(4)(h), Section 220-5.14., and Section 214-19.C of the Codified Ordinances.
9. The Applicant shall obtain approval of the planning module for new land development or approval of an exemption from the planning requirements from the Township and PA DEP in accordance with the requirements of Section 220-5.7.A of the Codified Ordinances of Upper Allen Township and pay all applicable application and tapping fees in accordance with the requirements of Chapter 200 of the Codified Ordinances.
10. The Applicant must enter into a Reservation of Capacity (ROC) Agreement with the Township and pay the appropriate ROC fees or pay tapping fees for the number of approved EDUs.
11. The Applicant must enter into a Sewer Extension Agreement with the Township and furnish the required \$1,000.00 escrow for plan and legal review costs, provide plats and legal descriptions for sanitary sewers to be located outside of the public rights-of-way, furnish the required escrow amount for inspection and related costs, and provide appropriate installation financial security for the sanitary sewers.
12. The Applicant must provide evidence that the final plan has been reviewed and approved by the Township Engineer, in accordance with Chapters 214 and 220 of the Codified Ordinances.
13. The Applicant shall enter into a Stormwater Best Management Practices Maintenance Operation and Maintenance Agreement with the Township and pay all applicable fees, in accordance with Section 214-33. of the Codified Ordinances.
14. The Applicant must contribute to the Township Recreation Land Acquisition and Improvement Fund in the amount of \$3,400.00. This contribution to the Fund shall be paid at the time of approval of the subdivision or land development plan in accordance with the requirements of Section 220-5.15.D.(4) of the Codified Ordinances.
15. The Applicant must sign the plan and have the signatures notarized according to Section 220-3.5.C(2)(dd) and 220-3.6.B(1)(a) of the Codified Ordinances.
16. The Applicant must have the final plan, including any profiles or drawings required under the provisions of Chapter 220, signed and sealed by a licensed surveyor and licensed engineer certifying to the accuracy of the survey and plan and that they are in conforming

with the township code and other applicable state regulations, in accordance with Sections 220-3.5.C(2)(e), 220-3.6.B(1)(b), and 220-5.2.N(3) of the Codified Ordinances.

17. The Applicant must provide financial security in a form acceptable to the Township and in an amount to be estimated by the applicant and approved by the Township Engineer to ensure construction of the improvements and/or concrete monuments shown on the plan, and the applicant must enter into an agreement with the Township providing for construction and installation of all improvements, including sanitary sewer work, shown on the plan according to Section 220-4.2. of the Codified Ordinances. The financial security shall contain the provision that the Township shall be informed in writing thirty (30) days before the expiration date of any letter of credit or bond provided as a condition of approval.
18. The Applicant must also furnish financial security to the Township in an amount equal to the required percentage of the total financial security provided to cover the cost of construction inspection, administrative, and other related costs according to Section 220-7.3.B of the Codified Ordinances.
19. The Applicant shall also comply with all fees, taxes, utility rentals, building, police or fire codes, ordinances, resolutions, and regulations as may be in effect from time to time concerning the proposed development.
20. The Applicant shall obtain final water main design approval from Veolia Water Company and furnish to the Township an updated design plan.
21. The Applicant shall pay such fees as are charged from time to time by Upper Allen Township for other further reviews or permits as may be required concerning the proposed development.
22. The Applicant must satisfy all conditions on the approval of the plan and the plan must be recorded within 180 days from the date of written conditional approval by the Board of Commissioners or the plan will be considered disapproved.
23. Upon approval of the final plan and prior to obtaining township and county signatures for final plan recording, the Applicant shall provide a CD, a flash drive, or an electronic file submission that includes a .dwg AutoCAD file that includes one drawing of all the lots on the plan, in accordance with Section 220-3.6.A.(14) of the Codified Ordinances of Upper Allen Township. The data shall include all tract and parcel boundaries, lot lines of all lots on the plan, building footprints, street rights-of-way (public and private), curbs, sidewalks, storm sewer infrastructure, sanitary sewer infrastructure, edge of pavement, hydrants, all utility or other easements (public and private), declaration of planned communities/condominium documents (including amendments), and any other data as required by the township and the county. The file shall be with a spatial projection of PA State Plan projections, PA South Zone (3702), NAD83 horizontal datum, NAVD88 vertical datum. Units shall be in US survey foot. A digital copy of the final plan in PDF shall also be submitted. The county Planning Department will not sign final plans until this file has been provided to them.

Since there are conditions on the approval of this plan, the plan will be rejected unless the owner/applicant agrees, in writing, within thirty (30) days, to comply with and abide by the specific conditions of approval.

### **Consideration/Action to Schedule a Public Hearing for a Sign Ordinance, Amending Chapter 245, Article XVIII**

Ms. Boyer explained that the sign ordinance has been in discussion for the past several years and was most recently before the Commissioners in September 2023. Since then, staff have addressed the comments received, finalized the language, and had the Township Solicitor review the latest draft. The final draft is presented tonight. Ms. Boyer said there were a few questions that needed to be addressed to the Board before they acted tonight to schedule a public hearing date. Ms. Boyer noted that while the county's Planning Commission (CCPC) reviewed the latest draft, if any changes were made, then those changes would need to be reviewed by the CCPC. The CCPC must be afforded at least 30 days to review before the public hearing date.

Ms. Boyer went on to say there were seven questions that needed to be addressed by the Board. The first question concerned home-based businesses. The current ordinance allows for one wall or projecting sign of no more than two square feet, and the proposed ordinance would allow for any wall, window, and projecting signs totaling 8 square feet. This would allow for the potential of having multiple signs if the total did not exceed 8 square feet. It was noted that different districts, specifically the Agricultural district, may have different uses which could allow for potentially larger signs as opposed to signs in a residential district. A list of home-based businesses/occupations that are allowed in these districts, with definitions, was provided to the Board to assist in the decision-making process.

Commissioner Fairchild stated that this is a very complicated ordinance and that he is sympathetic to the requests of some of the property owners within the Highway Commercial (C-2) District, those who border the PA Turnpike or Route 15, or places in the Agricultural District or Messiah University as they all have reasonable requests. However, Commissioner Fairchild would like to address those concerns as simply as possible without a major rewrite of the entire ordinance. He argues that the Board could spend hours discussing these categories, but he questioned whether anything would be gained by doing so. He also noted that he has researched other sign ordinances in Pennsylvania Townships and found Manheim Township to be a comparable location. He argued that the Upper Allen sign ordinance should mimic their ordinance as they are an attractive township; however, he did note that their ordinance has not been updated since 2016 and could be considered outdated. Ms. Boyer confirmed that the Manheim Township sign ordinance has not been updated to reflect decisions of more recent court cases, and therefore it could be unconstitutional. President Martin argued that the point of the sign ordinance update is to prevent inappropriate signage in the township. Commissioner Fairchild clarified that he would like to end up with something simple and streamlined. President Martin agreed that the end goal is to have something simple and streamlined, but he feels as though what is being presented is an adequate response to the Board's request for an updated sign ordinance and he would like to focus on the draft that is being presented.

Ms. Boyer stated that the township needs to amend the sign ordinance because of deficiencies in



the current ordinance, such as not adequately addressing signage in the Agricultural and Residential Districts for non-residential uses. Additionally, through discussions with the Boards and the public over the last several years, it was indicated that the current sign ordinance is too restrictive, lacking variation and flexibility. This draft is designed to meet those expectations and these final questions are all that is left to complete the draft before it goes to a public hearing. If the Board decides to change positions, then the process would need to start from the beginning again. Regardless of what direction the Board would like to go, amendments to the current ordinance are needed.

President Martin asked the Board to address the current question of whether they believe it is advisable to increase sign size for home-based businesses from 2 square feet to not to exceed 8 square feet. He also noted that he believes that 8 square feet for the Agricultural District is acceptable, but he has more of an issue with allowing larger signs in the Residential Districts. Commissioner Castranio agreed with President Martin and would like to add the free-standing monument sign, with up to 12 square feet, to the Agricultural District. President Martin asked Commissioner Walsh for his opinion since Commissioner Walsh lives on property similar to lands found within an Agricultural District. Commissioner Walsh stated that when he first moved to the township 25 years ago, his property was zoned agricultural and at that time he would not have been allowed to have signage for a home-based business. He argued that while allowing for signage in the Agricultural District isn't an issue, he does not want to see a proliferation of competing signs. He also notes that signs in the Agricultural District will likely be placed close to the road, with Ms. Boyer confirming a setback of 10 feet from the right-of-way is required.

Ms. Boyer continued with the second question, explaining the current ordinance does not allow any sign to exceed 25 feet in height. The proposed ordinance limits free-standing ground pole signs to no more than 25 feet in height but would allow wall signs to go to the top of the building, just below the start of the roofline. This language could allow a wall sign to be as high as 85 feet above the ground, depending on the use and the district, if allowed height adjustments are utilized to exceed the base height of 35 feet. Ms. Boyer asked the Board if they wanted to regulate the height of wall signs. President Martin stated he would not be opposed to a height of 35 feet, while Commissioner Fairchild argued it should follow the allowed height of the building and Commissioner Castranio stated he found the 25-foot maximum to be acceptable but would also agree to 35 feet. President Martin confirmed with Ms. Boyer that the Board would accept limiting the wall sign height to 35 feet.

Ms. Boyer continued with the third question, explaining the proposed ordinance would allow for one additional wall sign of up to 150 square feet on properties which abut Route 15 or the PA Turnpike. However, the Planning Commission recommended increasing the size to 300 square feet. There were also comments given to consider other options, such as: (1) allowing additional types of signs, such as free-standing ground pole and/or monument signs, along with the wall sign so businesses have options; (2) limiting the additional signs already discussed for only properties within the C-2 District, and possibly the IND District. President Martin stated does not have an issue with additional signage along Route 15 and the PA Turnpike, but he would like to limit the signs to only be on-premises signs, which are signs that only advertise for the business that occupies the property which the sign is on. Commissioner Fairchild asked if it would be possible to allow the applicant to decide which type of sign they can have. Ms. Boyer stated that if the Board would like, they can limit the ordinance to allowing one additional sign and then the

applicant can choose what type of sign they add. Commissioner Castranio argued that he would like to see these signs in the C-2 and IND zones and increase the maximum size to 300 square-foot sign.

Ms. Boyer moved to the fourth question regarding the limit of one EMC sign (aka digital sign) for each property or lot. Additionally, the language also suggests limiting to one EMC on the property/lot, including any billboard located on the same lot. If the Board has no issues with the limitation of total EMC signs on a property/lot, but would like to limit the number of EMC billboards possible on a property, staff can amend the language to the “number of EMC billboards on any property/lot” in § 245-18.17.B(11). President Martin and Commissioner Castranio agreed that they would both be fine with limiting the number of EMCs to two per property. Commissioner Fairchild asked what the current ordinance allows. Ms. Boyer stated that the current ordinance does not restrict the number of digital signs but does limit where digital signs can be located.

Ms. Boyer moved to the fifth question concerning the master sign plan. Ms. Boyer stated that the master sign plan process would follow a conditional use process, requiring advertisement of the application request and a public hearing process. The proposed ordinance would allow the master sign plan to be used within the C-1, C-2, PO, INS, and IND Districts. Ms. Boyer stated the current language for the master sign plan could stay as is, but other options were provided for the Board’s consideration. First, the Planning Commission recommended Messiah University be exempt and signs internal to campus not be regulated. If this is to be considered, then other schools and institutional uses within the Institutional District should be considered for exemption, and such uses should be removed from the master sign plan. Second, eliminate the master sign plan, requiring all business owners to comply with whatever sign regulations are in place. This is the current practice, and any deviation would require the owner to seek a variance. Third, limit the applicability of the master sign plan to uses within the C-2 and INS Districts only, possibly including the IND District. If this option is considered, then also to be considered are adding the use “large commercial establishment” back into the language, adding continuing care retirement community, and removing places of worship. Finally, if the Board limits the applicable districts, there are split-zoned properties to consider. Section 245-18.13.E. on Page 26 states that for any building, lot, or use located in more than one zoning district, the most restrictive regulation applies. Ms. Boyer said staff could amend the language to account for split-zoned properties but suggested any deviation of standards be permitted only in the C-2 District (if the districts are limited).

President Martin stated that he would like to see either the master sign plan or see limitations on outward facing signs on Messiah University, but to not limit internal signs. Ms. Boyer asked for clarification on what President Martin meant by internal signs. President Martin said wayfinding, building names, departmental uses, or other similar signs for internal navigation and navigation. Ms. Boyer asked what if they are visible from the roadway and extrapolated, explaining that this issue has come up in discussions previously with concerns that a sign that would normally be prohibited, such as a very large or tall sign, could be placed internally on campus and be exempt even though it could be seen from outside the campus. Also, this discussion led to who decides what is visible from the roadway, as a taller person might be able to see something that others can’t, during part of the year a sign may be blocked by foliage, or structures may move at some point and change visibility. Ms. Boyer also noted that the master sign plan is optional and even if it is allowed within a district not every business in that district would be required to utilize it. They could just comply with the standard ordinance requirements. Commissioner Fairchild stated that

as he understood it, Messiah University considered the master sign plan as a potential hinderance to them as they would need to update it every time they added a new sign. Ms. Boyer clarified that as she understood it, Messiah was concerned about having to provide a new site plan for every new sign; however, staff will work with Messiah to ensure that minor sign changes, such as moving a sign across a street, or adding signage to a new building, would likely not need to come before the board. Commissioner Castranio stated that he would like to see the master sign plan stay while adding the large commercial establishment back in and limiting the plan applicability to the C-2 and INS Districts.

Lowell Gates of 1140 Gettysburg Pike

Mr. Gates stated that the buildings at the Mills at Shepherdstown Crossing will be approximately 50 feet in height and he was considering putting something tasteful on the back of the building to identify the building so it can be seen from Route 15 which might be as high as 55 feet. Secondly, in the Rossmoyne Business Center, the owner's association rewrote the sign ordinance for the association to make them less restrictive to help promote the businesses, and he believes the businesses would like to have more signage. Also, the association would like to place large digital signs at either end of the business park to help promote the businesses within the park. Finally, Mr. Gates is wary of conditional use applications for the master sign plan.

President Martin asked for the rationale behind the conditional use requirement for the master sign plans. Mr. Feinour stated the conditional use process allows the Board to have control over what signage is allowed. Mr. Gates stated that he believes it makes the process more cumbersome.

Jerry High of PaulB at 121 Gettysburg Pike

Mr. High wanted to greet the new Commissioners and thank township staff and the Board for their efforts and progress with the sign ordinance.

Jim Cochran of 384 Alison Avenue

Mr. Cochran expressed concern about the wording of the agenda for this item, stating it said consideration and action to schedule a public hearing, but said nothing about discussing the items within the document. He believed it was a violation of a recently passed ruling and having materials placed in front of the Board that are not publicly available was also a violation. President Martin stated that he thought Mr. Cochran's points were valid; however, he believed the discussion was related to the public hearing because before a public hearing can be scheduled a final draft must be in place. Mr. Cochran agreed but also stated that the agenda does not reflect that, and the public should have an opportunity to hear this discussion.

Erik Weenink of 309 E. Meadow Drive

Mr. Weenink stated that he appreciated the discussions about an issue he believed was overdue; however, he was concerned about the increase in the size of signs within the Residential Districts from two to eight or 12 square feet. He did not want to have too many signs that are very large, and 150 square feet sounded like a lot. He asked about the size of billboards. Ms. Boyer said billboards can be up to 725 square feet.

Ms. Boyer asked if the Board wanted an updated final draft with the changes from this evening before scheduling a public hearing. President Martin confirmed with the Board, and they all agreed they would like to see a final draft before proceeding. No further action was taken.

**ZHB: Continuation of Case 24-01 and New Variance Request for 1874 Waltana Court**

Ms. Boyer stated that the January case, #24-01, was continued and a new case for 1874 Waltana Court had been submitted. The homeowner requested a variance to install a fence on their property within the 50-foot PRD development setback. The Board had no comments.

**Consideration/Action of Preliminary Final Subdivision Plan for 2401 Arcona Road UAT  
File #23-12-01**

Ms. Boyer stated the owner has given the township a 90-day time extension, with a new end date of June 15<sup>th</sup>. The owner needs additional time to address outstanding comments. Commissioner Castranio made a **MOTION** to accept the time extension for 2401 Arcona Road, UAT File #23-12-01. **SECONDED** by Commissioner Andeson. The motion carried unanimously.

**HARB: No HARB meeting in March.**

**PUBLIC IMPROVEMENTS COMMITTEE**

Mr. Fraser stated that the next meeting has been moved from March 19<sup>th</sup> to March 18<sup>th</sup> at the same time. He added that the HVAC building improvements and the 2024 road improvements will be on the agenda.

**SANITARY SEWER SYSTEM**

**Slide Presentation on Wastewater Treatment Plant Improvements**

Mr. Cupp gave a presentation on the wastewater treatment plant improvements. See attached.

**ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE**

There was no report.

**PARK AND RECREATION COMMITTEE**

**DCNR Grant Resolution**

Mr. Wendling stated that a resolution is required to be submitted with the DCNR grant that the Township is applying for. He added that the grant has a due date of April 4, 2024. The Township is requesting a \$250,000 matching grant from DCNR for improvements to Grantham Park and Pond. Mr. Wendling stated that the approximate cost of the project is \$750,000 and the project as described in the grant application includes dredging the pond to a depth of eight to twelve feet, replacing a six-inch intake pipe with an eight-inch pipe, relining the bottom of the pond, and bank stabilization and restoration. The project will also include the creation of a 2,625 feet stone walking trail around the pond and an ADA compliant accessibility path from the parking lot to the

pond/trails. He added that benches, a gazebo, and a picnic area will be added throughout the perimeter of the pond. Native plantings will promote biodiversity and ecological balance, while a fishing pier with a shading canopy allows for additional recreational opportunities. Mr. Wendling stated the grant approval is expected in fall 2024 with funds being released in early 2025. He added that he is looking for the final plans to come soon but would like to have the resolution to apply for the grant.

Commissioner Fairchild asked why the numbers are much larger than what was mentioned before for the pond. Mr. Fraser stated that the cost previously mentioned was just to fix the pond, but this amount includes improvements to the park including the pathways, increased accessibility, and the fishing pier.

Commissioner Walsh made a **MOTION** to adopt resolution 1095 and give authorization to the appropriate township official to sign the DCNR Grant Application, **SECONDED** by Vice president Castranio. The motion carried unanimously.

President Martin mentioned having a park like that and be handicap accessible is amazing.

Vice President Castranio stated that one item discussed at the meeting was the Mechanicsburg Pool Agreement and he felt it was a little premature as they have not yet asked for a contribution.

Mr. Fraser mentioned that the Township is receiving an excellence award from the Pennsylvania Recreation and Park Society. Mr. Krebs and Mr. Mera-Aguilar will be attending the event to accept the award.

Vice President Castranio mentioned that the annual dog park meeting will be held on March 13<sup>th</sup> at the township building and he will not be able to attend.

## **MISCELLANEOUS**

### **Solicitor Update**

There was no report.

### **Tax Collection Committee (TCC) Update**

There was no report.

### **Capital Region COG Update**

There was no report.

### **Municipal Advisory Board (MAB) Update**

There was no report.

### **Pennsylvania State Association of Township Commissioners (PSATC) Update**

Commissioner Anderson mentioned the meeting is the first week in April and she will be attending.

### **PUBLIC COMMENT**

Sharon Hower, 2479 Kline Drive

Ms. Hower said she attended the December 20<sup>th</sup> meeting regarding the noise ordinance and is asking for a follow-up. Mr. Feinour stated it is under review with legal counsel. He added that he is in communication with the attorney of the PLCB and the process is beginning. Ms. Hower asked how she can be updated in the process and President Martin stated that it would be listed as an agenda item for the meeting when the next discussion will occur.

Commissioner Fairchild, Bishop Bridge

Commissioner Fairchild said both he and Commissioner Walsh have concerns about the 1898 Bishop Bridge near Grantham. He stated that they met with Mr. Kirk Stoner of Cumberland Country Planning and Mr. Ryan Hostetter of HRG Engineers earlier this week to discuss the fate of the bridge. Commissioner Fairchild added that according to Mr. Stoner, there is only about a thirty-day window left to consider options for the bridge before Cumberland and York Counties proceed with plans for its demolition and removal. He stated that Bishop Bridge is a 134' long, pin connected, iron truss bridge built in 1898 and is eligible for placement on the National Historic Register under Criterion C for technological significance per a 2017 Preservation Assessment by Gannett Fleming and TranSystems. Commissioner Fairchild stated that the bridge is also identified for protection on page 3.4 of the 2013 Upper Allen comprehensive Plan. He mentioned that according to a December 7, 1898, article in the Carlisle Sentinel, Bishop Bridge originally cost nearly \$5,000 and the Cumberland and York County Commissioners partook of a grand dinner set before them by the Bishop brothers upon inspecting the new bridge.

Commissioner Fairchild said both he and Commissioner Walsh believe the best option at this point is for the Township assume ownership of the bridge and seek grants for its rehabilitation as either a low weight limit vehicular bridge or as a pedestrian bridge. He thought potential grant funding could come from various federal and state agencies, along with private contributions. Mr. Fairchild stated that rehabilitation as a vehicular bridge would avoid having to construct turnarounds and may allow the county and state to contribute toward the cost using highway aid funds; however, he thought rehabilitation as a pedestrian bridge may provide more grant funding opportunities due to the bridge's historic significance. Pedestrian bridges need to be designed to a higher standard than one might expect because of engineering assumptions that many people could be standing on the bridge at the same time. Commissioner Fairchild stated that a May 2023 cost estimate by HRG totaled \$2,700,000 for vehicular traffic rehabilitation, which included \$250,000 for unforeseen repairs, \$510,000 for construction contingency, and \$210,000 for construction inspections. He added that no one really knows how accurate these estimates are until it is put out for bid. Commissioner Fairchild referenced the Sheepford Road bridge in Lower Allen, which is to be rehabilitated as a pedestrian bridge at the cost of about \$2 million. He added that the cost of that bridge is fully funded by grants, and the West Shore Historical Society will assume ownership upon completion. Commissioner Fairchild mentioned that Bishop Bridge has possible walking trail connections to Simpson Park to the east and Messiah University to the west. He added that people continue to value walking trails and connectivity in considering the overall attractiveness

of a community. Commissioner Fairchild asked to have further discussion of the bridge at the March 20<sup>th</sup> Board of Commissioners' meeting. President Martin stated that staff will look into options and so far that has prevented the demolition to this point.

Meeting dismissed at 9:11 pm for an executive session.