M I N U T E S

LOWER SWATARA TOWNSHIP **REGULAR MEETING**
PLANNING COMMISSION **AUGUST 27, 2026, 7:00 P.M.**

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

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

Others present:

Greg Holtzman, BL Companies	Sam Demey Jr., resident
Tony Trost, Melham Associates	Ron Paul, LST BOC
Adam Kahrnani (sp?)	Jim Rowell, resident
Danielle McLaren, resident	Claudia Sisti, resident
Charles Poticher, resident	David Koratich, Warehaus
Bill Meiser, MASD	Chris DeHart, LST BOC
Zachary Border, LST Twp. Mgr.	Adam Whalen, Integrated Developers
Chris Knarr, McNees	Om Koirala, Brook Meadow Farms
Jeff Shyk, K&W Engineers	

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE & ROLL CALL

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Mr. Knopp asked if there was a motion to approve the July 23, 2026, meeting minutes. The motion was made by Mr. Messick and seconded by Mr. Formica. All were in favor. Minutes were approved.

OLD BUSINESS:

a. Greenfield Drive & Blue Raider Lane (Thane Lane Improvements) – Planning Commission File PC#2025-01. The Preliminary / Final Subdivision & Land Development Plan proposes the consolidation and / or the subdivision of lands to realign and extend Greenfield Drive to Oberlin Road (S.R. 0441). The proposed realignment, and extension of Greenfield Drive requires a portion of the existing Greenfield Drive Right-Of-Way to be vacated. Also, said Plan proposes on-site improvements, utility extensions, and stormwater management facilities.

(Mr. Messick recused himself from commenting and voting as a PC Member but retained his right as a resident to speak during the Public Comment section.)

Jeff Shyk, of K&W Engineers, explained that he has been here many times but right now they are focused on the Thane Lane portion of the project. The Blue Raider Lane improvements were completed yesterday and school started today. He said they received comments from Rich Snyder and Don Fure and they do not have any problems with any of those comments. The one that we did want to talk about was a concern that was initially brought up about the one lot would have required variances due to the size of the lot. But the district has now decided to consolidate that with the other parcel across the street from them onto their overall existing large 128-acre tract, which I understand will eliminate the need for the variance. So, beyond that, there's some housekeeping with notes clarifying areas, coverages, things along those lines. We've got to provide some easement plans. And we also received HRG's comment letter, and that was rather straightforward. We provided the cost estimates and the updates that were requested. There's a bunch of administrative things that have to happen, agreements, etc. before the final recording of the plans. But essentially, the revised plans visually will not look tremendously different than what you see on the plans tonight. With that in mind, we would like to request a recommendation for conditional approval to the Board of Commissioners.

Mr. Diamond stated that Mr. Snyder pointed out that there is a sliver coming off of a property across the street. And he mentioned there is something about a quick claim deed.

Mr. Shyk replied that it is an uneconomic remnant of the parcel from across the street that we are working with the District Solicitor on and resolving.

Mr. Diamond added that the question came up, that there are two overall approaches you can take. One is that if it’s just a regular deed, they must be a party to the plan, and you must draw out their remaining parcel because their lot is changing. So, they must be a party to the subdivision. The other is if you are condemning it, then it doesn’t have to go through subdivision because the condemnation under the Condemnation Act supersedes that. That can be done even in a friendly way. He feels the simplistic thing would be to get the people from across the street to be named as a party and add a plan sheet drawing out their remainder.

Bill Meiser, Director of Operations for the MASD, asked Mr. Diamond if he would mind sending their Solicitor those recommendations so they can look at it and the preferred method the Township would like them to take.

[More discussion ensued on how to handle this remnant of a parcel.]

Mr. Knopp asked if there were any questions from the Planning Commission.

There were none at this time.

Mr. Knopp asked for any comments from the Township Staff.

Mr. Snyder stated that as part of that meeting we had the other day amongst our staff, I think we've addressed the proposal to create this non-conforming lot and I just want touch base with our solicitor, make sure that if they attach this to the school, we're okay even though it's separated by the proposed thing.

Mr. Diamond said he is comfortable with it with the thought being that gives us also the safety net not having to put a stub in there, do all kinds of extra things that may be a waste but if it were ever a thought of that's going to get sold and somebody tried to put a house in it would have to come back through here with a subdivision plan and everything could be analyzed at that time.

Mr. Meiser said that was something we could do but come back and I mean the district doesn't want to own property that they're not going to really need or use. We haven't discussed it formally. Those are things we would bring to our board but they would ask me what do you want to do with it? Well, it's more that we have to maintain so that's not something we want to do. And I know Mr. Messick had indicated some others would be interested in expanding their lot so.

[More discussion on that lot continued.]

Mr. Knopp asked for any comments from HRG.

Mr. Wood said there was nothing real major. Most of those major design issues were addressed through the last resubmission. Mostly housekeeping, administrative.

Mr. Knopp asked for any comments from DCPC.

Ms. Korber said the County was not required to do any additional review.

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

He had none.

Mr. Knopp asked the PC for any other questions.

Mr. Young asked if with those outstanding items, they are looking for conditional approval tonight, would it be better to resolve some of those before we would do that?

Mr. Diamond felt it would be better.

Mr. Shyk said he asked for conditional approval because the visuals of the plan would not change and he thought that everything else could be managed internally.

Mr. Young explained to Mr. Shyk that the Planning Commission has been trying to send up to the BOC as complete a package as possible with all the I's dotted and T's crossed before it gets to them. But with those legal issues in terms of what you're going to do with that uneconomic remainder and other legal issues that Mr. Diamond raised, I don't know that we are comfortable giving you conditional approval tonight.

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

Dale Messick said he had two comments. [The plan] shows a street sign at the top of the road by the soccer access. But down on Oberlin Road, it shows no street sign down there at all. So, he was just wondering if he didn't see it right.

[The overhead projection of the plan was used to show Mr. Messick where the stop sign was noted. And a sign that reads "School Traffic Keep Right".]

Mr. Messick said he feels that people need to know what the name of the roads are, so if somebody is hunting a road, they know what the roads are.

Mr. Messick's other comment was that the whole Greenfield Drive and addition there (Thane Lane) and the school district property is all curbed. All around the schools is curbing. He asked why they are requesting the curbing to stop right by the soccer field access. Why wouldn't you want to curb that section?

Mr. Meiser said he believes it is a gas line issue, but it also allows the School District to use it for parking. But he thinks it was more of a financial decision that we directed our engineer to just maintain that as no curbing. But if it is needed, they will put it in.

Mr. Meiser said one other thing he wanted to point out was that they (the School District) will not allow buses to go out Thane Lane or in Thane Lane either because we do not have the proper line of sight. We did look at that because that would've been a big win for us, but we would have to cut so much back all the way to Greenfield and on the opposite side of the property. So, it wasn't feasible for us to do that. So, all bus traffic will come in the new Blue Raider Lane high volume driveway.

With no other questions, Mr. Knopp asked the PC what they would like to do on the Greenfield Drive [Thane Lane] Improvement Plan.

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

The plan was tabled.

b. The Pond II (Preliminary) – Planning Commission File PC#2025-10. The Preliminary Subdivision & Land Development Plan proposes to consolidate three (3) existing parcels / properties into one (1) proposed parcel / property, measuring 24.37 acres. Also, said Plan proposes to develop a townhouse development, consisting of 169 dwelling units, private roadways, site improvements, necessary utilities, and stormwater management facilities. Said Plan proposes to maintain the existing non-residential buildings, and associated driveways / parking facilities.

(Mr. Young recused himself from any Planning Commission deliberation being that he is an adjacent property owner, but he did reserve his right as a Township resident to ask questions or make comments.)

David Koratich of Warehaus stated that not much has changed from the way it looked back in June when they were before the Planning Commission. They had some technical comments from HRG that they had to work through that resulted in them removing some of their waiver requests. Mainly, the release rate waiver. They worked through that with HRG. So, they are now down to three waivers [which he read to the PC at this time. The PC would go over these waivers later in the discussion.]. He added that HRG supports all three waivers.

Mr. Koratich said they were here tonight to seek Conditional Approval of the Plan.

Mr. Knopp asked the PC for any questions/comments. There were none.

Mr. Knopp asked for any comments from the Township Staff.

Mr. Snyder had two things regarding the waivers. He talked with Zach Michaely from Warehaus yesterday. We are requesting that they provide a waiver due to some of the tight constraints on the site with existing conditions as well as proposed conditions. There are a few other drainage easements that are going to be less than the required 20 foot. Because of those tight constraints, I don't believe any of them would go less than 15-foot. So we have asked specifically for them to submit a written request for a waiver of those few areas. I think there's three of them and they're not long in terms of length; they're very short length. But to be in compliance, we have asked them to provide that request for a waiver. We also spoke regarding a waiver regarding a comment that HRG made regarding the cutting of trees 6 inches in diameter and greater. We are going to ask the engineer to do a deferral of that right now. And there is no need at this point in time to do a tree inventory. We know that there have been previous disturbances in this area and there are a lot of non-native invasive species there to go through and mark every one of those trees and make an inventory compared to their proposed development. We could catch that with the final plan. So as a preliminary, we've asked them to defer that waiver at this point in time to the final plan review where they could do a little bit more analysis. We attached a copy of the Lack of Capacity Letter from the Authority regarding the existing sewer system. And other than that, those were the few big issues that we have remaining for them to address.

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

Mr. Fure said just to follow back with what Rich said, we got some new meters put in on that line. So, the Authority should get a determination here in the next couple months.

Mr. Knopp asked for any questions/comments from HRG.

Mr. Wood said a lot of their technical comments were revised and amended with this resubmission. The biggest one that we have remaining from a stormwater standpoint is the downstream conveyance for that existing pipe connection at the southeast portion of that property.

Mr. Koratich said they had met with Illuminated Design today to start thinking about how they can integrate that into their bypass swell. So, I think we'll get a little bit more clarification on that before the next submission.

Mr. Wood added that HRG had another comment in there for the existing basin that was located on the property. After talking with the developer and engineer today, they provided us with the justification that was included in the stormwater report. So we're okay with that comment now. Rich mentioned the tree removal modification and aside from that, a bunch of minor technical comments, administrative housekeeping. And as mentioned with the waivers, all three of those essentially hinging on that gas easement down there at the lower left of the property there, we're in favor of those as well.

Mr. Knopp asked for any comment from DCPC.

Ms. Korber had no additional comments.

Mr. Knopp asked for any comments from the Solicitor.

Mr. Diamond said the only thing I'd say is the additional waiver Rich just mentioned in a few specific spots for going down to 15. I think we just want that very clearly marked on the plan, so these never get misconstrued as a blanket waiver, but it's for whatever spots really matter.

Mr. Koratich said they will identify those areas and submit the formal waiver request and add it to the plan, as well.

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

Mr. Young stated that the residents in the adjoining development always have an issue with traffic. There was an HRG letter of August 20th that referenced it under the Pond II TIA (Traffic Impact Assessment) package that there were a number of missing sections and that the study itself should include all study parameters agreed upon within the approved scoping application.

Mr. Koratich answered that he thinks there's just a little communication gap. The last submission they only submitted was what has changed from the original. So, HRG and the Township have been copied on everything that's been submitted to PennDOT. So, I think the last submission was just what changed from the previous round of PennDOT comments.

Mr. Young said the second one is the neighboring development wants to know whether you are going to build from Karen's Caterer up to Nissley Drive, or are you going to build the other way? Where are you going to start with the construction of the townhouses?

Mr. Koratich said not to hold him to this, but he believes they're going to extend from the cul de sac of The Pond (I) down to Fulling Mill Road. And then the loop that goes out around Karen's Catering and back down around the Fire Hall or adjacent to the Fire Hall and Illuminated Design would be phase two or three, or I'll call it still phase one, but the first order of construction.

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

Mr. Knopp asked for the waivers to be addresses:
1. Street Separation Distance (Chapter 22-502.7.C) - The applicant requests a waiver from the requirements that streets shall be separated by at least 150 feet between centerlines. The applicant is proposing Road A and Road D to be separated by at least 125 feet between centerlines. Due to existing site constraints, all developable area has been utilized to accommodate the require stormwater management facilities. The proposed 125-foot separation between Road D and Fulling Mill Road is necessary because increasing this distance would encroach upon the stormwater management facilities. Relocation of these facilities is not feasible due to the presence of an existing

gas utility right-of-way, which significantly limits the available area for stormwater management.

- HRG recommends approval due to the site constraints with the stormwater facilities and existing gas easement.
- Mr. Crawford made a motion to approve this waiver.
- Mr. Messick seconded the motion.
- All were in favor.

2. Pipe Slopes (Chapter 26-126.3.B) - The applicant requests a waiver from the requirements of providing pipes with no slope less than 0.5%. Slopes less than 0.5% are proposed to provide proper cover and avoid conflicts with existing utilities.

- HRG recommends approval as pipe slopes have been increased where possible. The minimum slope of any proposed pipe is now 0.39%.
- Mr. Crawford made a motion to approve this waiver.
- Mr. Messick seconded the motion.
- All were in favor.

3. Inlet Drops (Chapter 26-126.3.F) - The applicant requests a waiver from the requirements providing a minimum two-inch drop between the lowest inlet pipe invert elevation and outlet pipe invert elevation. The applicant is proposing a minimum 0.1-foot drop across the inlets. The minimum 0.1-foot drop is proposed in lieu of 2-inch drops as the cumulative impact of larger drops across multiple inlets creates conflicts with existing utilities and pipe cover issues.

- HRG recommends approval as 0.1-foot drops across the inlet is adequate.
- Mr. Crawford made a motion to approve this waiver.
- Mr. Messick seconded the motion.
- All were in favor.

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

- Mr. Crawford made a motion to table the plan until we get the other waivers.
- Mr. Messick seconded the motion.
- All were in favor.

Plan was tabled.

c. Middletown Ovoliquid – Planning Commission File PC#2026-07. The Preliminary/Final Subdivision & Land Development Plan proposes to subdivide the existing 250.35-acre lot into two (2) lots; whereby, Residual Lot 1 will measure 215.35 acres and Proposed Lot 2 will measure 35.00 acres. Furthermore, said Plan proposes to install/construct a proposed +/- 122,652 square foot Egg-Cracking Facility, accessory buildings/structures, and associated site improvements/utilities/stormwater management facilities on Proposed Lot 2.

Greg Holtzman, senior project manager at BL Companies, explained that this project is an egg cracking facility. It is located at the intersection of Longview Drive and North Union Street. So, this is the current property of Kreider Farms which owns the 250-some acres. What we're doing as part of this project is proposing first a subdivision. We're looking to take 35 acres of corner off. And then with that subdivision, we're looking to develop the parcel into an egg-cracking facility. To give you an overview of the operation, you're going to have trucks that are as of now entering the left side on this plan which is where the truck wash is. They'll be coming from farms, things of that nature. And they'll be coming around the facility. They will back up and that's where they will unload the eggs from the farms. And then after it goes internally through the process on the right-hand side, you'll see a few trucks sitting there. Those are the ones that leave the facility. Inside this facility it's split. So, you have the raw side, and you have the finished side. So basically, imagine splitting down the building for processing the raw and then finishing the final product. Currently we're showing about 170 spaces. Our client believes right now there's two shifts up to three eventually. The shifts can overlap. And the first shift is the processing and things, and the second shift is sanitation. The hours of operation will be an eight-hour day. So, this is not intended to be 24-hour facility. Then again there are three shifts and they do overlap. So, it's somewhere in the middle. We went through the ordinance again. Some of the concerns are health, safety and welfare. There's the farm next to it. So, the byproduct out of this facility here will be eggshells and the effluent. We're currently working with the township here to make sure that we're providing all the information they need for ph. and things of that nature to show that we're complying with the rules. And, as it gets down to Derry Township, that we're meeting all those requirements. We're still addressing some of those comments and we're actively working through those.

Mr. Holtzman continued that in terms of some waivers, that's one of the items I'd like to discuss tonight. So, we have the first two, which is preliminary/final and then there's a small patch of vegetation, some trees that were volunteer growth that we're

looking to remove. There's a tree preservation requirement, the ordinance for an egg facility. Birds are not our friends, so we're hoping that one gets granted. And then one of the discussion topics here is road improvements. So, along Longview Drive, what you're seeing here is the frontage of 35 acres, but the entire stretch is roughly 4,500 linear feet. Along North Union Street, that is curved and again that stretch there is about 1800 square feet. One of the requirements of the ordinance is when you do subdivision, it's going to be road widening, curbs and sidewalks. And that's something I'd like to talk to you tonight about to see if there's some give and take here. What we'd like to do is from the intersection of North Union Street, we'd be coming along Longview Drive and as the plan now shows, it proposes curb and road widening to our second entrance. In discussions with our client, they're not opposed to taking that to the entrance to the Kreider Farm which is another like 500-some feet. After that, the remaining 2,675 feet, we'd be looking to stop the improvements at that second driveway and leave that road as it is now. So that's one thing that we're wanting to approach you with and get your thoughts on. The second one is with sidewalks. Starting with North Union Street, we would be looking probably for a waiver for sidewalks along that street. And then after discussion here maybe a combination deferral or waiver for Longview depending on if this board and the Township foresees future people walking here, we'd be more than happy to defer that. And then lastly for curb and sidewalks, North Union Street already has curbs and again we're looking to just go to our entrance. So, the remaining 4,467ft of our property, we're not proposing any curbs, sidewalks or road widening. Last little ask there is with the road widening. We have an unusual circumstance here. We in this graphic here you'll see the sort of the white text. The road for Longview Drive to the right of that is the PPNL high-tension lines and underneath those are the local distribution lines. So, we have a lot of encumbrances on our property and with road widening that would have a significant impact on those, meaning that we have to relocate that smaller distribution line and that has a heavy cost. What we'd like to do again still looking to put the curbs and road widening is in is to push it to the top of the site. So, we'll give the whole width, it's just offset still within the overall 60 foot right of way. But the five-foot shoulder is combined with the other shoulder at the top of the page. So those are the three things we'd like to discuss tonight with you and get your feedback.

Mr. Formica asked if with the road improvements, do they plan on putting a stop sign on Longview Drive like on Strites Road and Powderhorn Road, making it a 4-way stop because right now it is just a 2-way stop.

Mr. Wood responded that the is a Traffic Impact Study being reviewed separately right now. Those comments are forthcoming.

Mr. Formica asked how many employees there would be, roughly, at any given shift.

Mr. Holtzman said they are showing 170 employees, but he thinks that at startup, there will be about 60 over two shifts.

Mr. Messick asked if they were proposing to shift the road widening off of the center. He asked for clarification if instead of going down the center of the right of way, you want to push it overload because of the PPL overhead line, transmission line. Is that any kind of issue with the Township or anything? That if the road is not centered on the right of way, is that any kind of issue from the Township's point of view.

Mr. Snyder replied that he had been out a couple weeks ago and drove the frontage out there for the distribution poles, not the high intensity poles. But the distribution poles are only about five to six feet off the current macadam. They are very tight to begin with. And where they sit there's not a whole lot of linear distance, horizontal distance at the top of those distribution poles before you get underneath the wires or the high intensity poles. So, moving poles is not going to be an option on their side of the project.

Mr. Young asked about the parking. With the overlap of the shifts, are they okay under the new regulations or is this grandfathered in under the old parking [regulations]?

Mr. Snyder said we did a full parking analysis with them and the amount of parking they have demonstrated that they meet the ordinance and actually exceed the ordinance at this point.

Mr. Messick asked for clarification on the installation of curbing. As part of this improvement with the egg cracking, are they saying they will put curbs in and run them up to the existing farm/barn where the chickens are?

Mr. Holtzman said yes that is correct.

Mr. Knopp asked for any other questions/comments from the PC. There were none.

Mr. Knopp asked for any questions/comments from the Township Staff.

Mr. Snyder said we had about eight remaining comments from Subdivision/Land Development and Zoning, all of which are primarily typographical or drafting errors. But the only question would be how is solid waste from the egg cracking process going to be handled?

Mr. Holtzman said the shells are crushed just like powder or something of that nature. They basically take it in a truck; they're going to haul it off so it's not going to be flushed down the system.

Mr. Knopp asked Mr. Fure for any comments.

Mr. Fure said that a lot of it is sort of Authority driven here. They got some work cut out in front of them. There potentially could be some upgrades to the pump station. And just for consideration, if we decide about the curbing at some point, there's no inlets, storm inlets out on Longview. So, we would have to discuss that.

Mr. Knopp asked if they would be expanding on the two other waivers.

Mr. Holtzman said yes, they are asking to be tabled tonight. They just wanted to get the PC's thoughts on those additional waivers and get some guidance on what might be advisable.

Mr. Knopp asked Mr. Wood for his comments.

Mr. Wood said, as mentioned, the Traffic Impact Study is one of our two major comments. The other one being the sight distance at North Union Street. A little more detail there, but most of our remaining technical comments were carryovers from the original submission, but it's substantially advanced from that original.

Mr. Knopp asked Ms. Korber for her comments.

Ms. Korber said her big question was going to be whether there was going to be a traffic study, which I believe you answered for me without me asking it. So, seeing as that's all in PennDOT's hands now, I'll just make the general statement that area of North Union Street is well served at the moment.

Mr. Knopp asked for any comments from Mr. Diamond. He had none at this time.

Mr. Knopp asked for any questions/comments from the Public. There were none.

Mr. Knopp then asked the PC what they would like to do with this plan tonight.

- Mr. Young made a motion to table it tonight to have time to resolve the Municipal Authority's outstanding issues.
- Mr. Crawford seconded the motion.
- All were in favor.

Plan was tabled.

NEW BUSINESS:

a. RR1, LLC (Zoning Map Amendment) – Planning Commission File PC#2026-08. The Applicant, RR1, LLC, requests a Zoning Map Amendment to the Lower Swatara Township Zoning Ordinance. The subject property is a 3.50-acre parcel, located along the northeast side of Eisenhower Boulevard. Currently, said parcel lies in the Industrial (I) District; and the Applicant proposes to rezone the current Zoning District to Commercial Highway (C-H) District.

Christopher Knarr, of McNees, Wallace, and Nurick, LLC, and Adam Whalen of Integrated Consulting stated they were here on behalf of our client, RR1 LLC. Like you said, the owner of a 3.5-acre tract of land near the intersection of S. Eisenhower Blvd. and Route 283, right off the interchange of Interstate 283. The property was formally developed until 2010s with the hotel and restaurant. And around that time the buildings were demolished. And what currently is there now if you've been by, is a fenced parking area that was remnant from the leftover parking. The site is fully serviced with public water, sewer, electric and gas. And right now, as you mentioned, it's zoned Industrial and we're looking to have it rezoned to the CH district. If I recall, and I wasn't a party to it in the past, but the LST Planning Commission, and Dauphin County Planning Commission have already reviewed this and recommended approval on it. I'll just give you a couple highlights if I may. Like I said, they're looking to change the zoning, extend the zoning from east and the south and the west, the CH (Commercial Highway) District to include that entire property. So it wouldn't be a rezoning, it would just be an extension of existing zoning. It wouldn't create any new use or any new district. It would just merely be a little

map change. The owner is looking to do restaurant/retail on that site. And we provided a conceptual plan that Integrated had developed on behalf of the client. Adam can speak on any specific issues relating to that and just kind of give you an overview and then you can turn it back over to me and I'll wrap it up, if that's okay.

Adam Whalen with Integrated Consulting came to the floor. He stated that the client's looking to propose a 20,000 square foot mixed use commercial building with drive through restaurants on either end. One's more of a pickup window type restaurant. Drive through goes the whole way around the building to the other side and then there will be a second floor that would be about 4,000 square foot office that would be included with that 20,000 square foot. Around there, we have some travel lanes for the drive through, for the pickup windows, for the restaurants, an exit or escape lane going around the building as well, one way traffic. Then we have just a patio for people to sit and enjoy their meals or whatever. As far as parking is concerned, we have enough parking for the retail, the restaurants based on the number of seats and then also the office based on employees or I think it's agents or something like that, the way the ordinance reads. Included with that, at the south end there you can see there's a drive-thru restaurant, a QSR, that we're also proposing. Right now, there are no specific tenants, but our client is moving forward with architects. We don't have anything with us or anything at this time, but they are serious about this, and we think it's a great site and everything for it. On top of what you see, traffic has started. We've contacted PennDOT about access to this property. We have a meeting next Wednesday to discuss access into what that might look like and what a traffic study would look like for this property. We've done preliminary investigations into infiltration testing for stormwater management as well. So, we're starting preliminary investigations performed so that we know it's a viable project with everything at this time, it does seem that way. So, the two accesses that we show are one right in and then a full movement access and this seems like a great opportunity.

Mr. Knarr added that recognizing that the prior use was hospitality and things like that, that's not consistent with the current zoning. So, we're looking to have that rezoned from the Industrial to the CH district. And I did mention before about it being before this board and that the County Planning Commission recommended approval of that back in October of 2025. Regarding the Comprehensive Plan, we looked at that and we provided a narrative providing support for justification. I can go into any detail with that, but it's generally consistent with your Comprehensive Plan which shows that property was to be used in the future as commercial office retail in an area of the township where there are

services and utilities. Similarly, the growth management plan, the county comprehensive plan suggests redevelopment and infill in areas where there is existing development rather than sprawling in the green field in rural areas. And then just from a standpoint of community impact, recognizing that the uses that are permitted in the industrial district typically would see heavier truck traffic. Generally, the bulk storage, warehousing, distribution and commercial development on this site would have less Truck traffic, less impact. And recognizing the school district was here tonight, I know that there were a couple developments proposed for residential. This wouldn't impact the schools from a student standpoint. It wouldn't impact housing and things like that. It would just provide additional opportunities for the township to recognize and the county as well, to have tax revenue and employment opportunities in a place that makes sense. So, we're just requesting that this board would make a recommendation to the Board of Commissioners approving the rezoning from Industrial to Commercial Highway.

Mr. Knopp asked for any questions from the PC.

Mr. Young wanted to point out that they need to add the word “Lower” before “Swatara” on page two or section two of the plan.

Mr. Knopp asked for any questions/comments from Township Staff.

Mr. Snyder said there were no changes in what we had proposed form October of last year. But just as an FYI, we have a TIS scoping meeting with PennDOT scheduled for September 2nd, and I believe this will be on the agenda for the County Planning Commission for their upcoming meeting on September 14th.

Mr. Fure added that just for the Public, he wanted to point out where it's zoned here. [He showed it on the map on the wall.] So that would now all be Commercial Highway, the southern portion. So, it does blend in okay.

Mr. Knopp asked Mr. Wood for any comments. He had none at this time.

Mr. Knopp asked Ms. Korber for any comments.

Ms. Korber said that when it comes through the DCPC meeting, they'll be official. Just speaking as myself, and this is what I say all the time, I just like to remind people that once the zoning change is made, technically any of the permitted uses are fair game.

So, it's often better to look at the spirit of things rather than any given proposed development. But again, that's a general comment. I say all the time.

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

Mr. Diamond said that he echoes Ms. Korber's statement. There are no legal issues, no spot selling or anything like that. Seems like that's really the appropriate zoning designation there. And to Ms. Korber's point, anything's going to have to fit in with all the rules, but that's the kind of use that ought to be there.

Mr. Knopp asked for any questions/comments from the Public. There were none.

Mr. Knopp asked the PC what they would like to do on this item.

- Mr. Young made a motion to recommend approval to the Board of Commissioners.
- Mr. Crawford seconded the motion.
- All were in favor.

Approved.

b. Brook Meadow Farms, LLC – Planning Commission File PC#2026-10. The Preliminary/Final Subdivision and Land Development Plan proposes to subdivide and/or consolidate four (4) existing parcels of land, measuring a total of 113.69 acres, into eight (8) proposed lots. Proposed Lot 1 will retain the existing Uses and/or structures and proposes to add a custom slaughtering facility. Three (3) proposed lots will be for Residential Use(s); and four (4) proposed lots will be for Agricultural Use(s). Furthermore, said Plan proposes to install /construct on-lot sewage disposal systems and associated stormwater management facilities.

Tony Trost, a Project Manager with Melham Associates, stated that they have received comments at this point from the County, from the Engineer, from the Township Staff and from the Township SEO. We're here tonight basically to request the plan be tabled to give us a month to address all of the comments. But I'd be happy to answer any questions you may have tonight.

Mr. Knopp asked the PC for any questions.

Mr. Crawford said he was just questioning why you are splitting the agricultural into four different lots. Are you planning to try to sell those or what?

[Mr. Trost had Om Koirala, the property owner, come to the floor to explain.]

Mr. Koirala stated that it was just because of the road separation that they would like to separate. We haven't made any plan for selling anytime soon but to have the agriculture in a different way and then the house and then if we get some kind of like in the future some of the people are asking for tree plantation. Leasing for tree plantation. So, in order to separate those things, we would like to have the subdivision.

Mr. Trost clarified that the one lot is separated physically by a road, by Longview Drive. So that one's kind of a no brainer. The other three lots are all located south of Longview Drive. The one lot is basically where he has his vegetable operation and the other two lots, there's a barn on the one lot and the other lot. But he's planning for different uses for each parcel in the future. Not necessarily to sell them.

Mr. Knopp said but there's a possibility he could sell.

Mr. Trost said there is always a possibility. But these are being created as agricultural lots. That being a DEP term. It basically means they're not approved right now for any sewage producing facility.

Mr. Knopp asked for any questions/comments from Township Staff.

Mr. Snyder said that they are proposing to dedicate right away along all frontages on Longview as well as Cockley. They are proposing some roadway improvements at the hard curve adjacent to Lot 8. This had originally been proposed with the withdrawn plan from a year or two ago to have sanitary sewer through a grinder pump situation. Low pressure pump situation that's now gone away and they are going with all onlot septic. Like I said, it's just several typographical drafting errors that need to be cleaned up. Need to see a little bit more information regarding the proposed slaughter facility and some of the zoning requirements related to that. Parking, access, lighting, items like that. Otherwise, we're looking for some better description on the existing proposed uses. These have all been put into our comment letter and have been issued to the plan.

Mr. Knopp asked Mr. Snyder if this plan has anything to do with the Kitchen Castle [their proposed slaughtering facility] up there?

Mr. Snyder said no, it does not. This is separate.

Mr. Knopp asked if there were going to be two slaughtering facilities.

Mr. Snyder explained that the one at the "Kitchen Castle" is intended to be the USDA mandated and approved slaughtering facility. This one would be custom. So, I would look to the plan designer or the property owner to describe more if you're looking for a further description, ask them to describe what they're going to be.

Mr. Trost added that there are different regulations for the commercial operation which is being moved off site. The custom operation is for a customer that comes in and says I want that goat. He's going to purchase the entire goat. And the rules are slightly different for that. This is a much smaller operation than the commercial operation.

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

Mr. Fure asked if that was going to be open to the public.

Mr. Trost said he didn't know the answer to that yet.

Mr. Fure told Mr. Trost that they will have to address this with the Zoning to make sure that is permitted, being open to the public. And you are going to have to make paved parking lot and driveway. It also must be accessible, for commercial operations.

Mr. Trost said they are proposing additional parking by code and will provide that information too. But there's going to be five parking spaces. This is a small facility, and we are going to widen the access road to be 22ft wide so it's wide enough for two-way traffic.

Mr. Fure asked if it was going to be attached or detached from the existing building.

Mr. Trost said he believed it is attached. But there won't necessarily be connection, it'll just be attached to this structure.

Mr. Fure said that if you are going to use that old building for anything other than storage of animals, it will need to be evaluated.

Mr. Trost said that is why they are proposing a new building.

Mr. Fure added that he noticed they didn't have any septic detail for the slaughterhouse on there.

Mr. Trost said that is part of the comments that we will have to address as a septic and stormwater management.

Mr. Fure asked, with the spreading of manure, there is a certain amount you can put on a lot of certain acreage. If you start selling off lots here, is that going to limit what you can do for the spreading?

Mr. Trost answered that all will have to be part of the nutrient management plan and they will certainly need to monitor that. And, he said if we need the ground, we won't be able to sell it off.

Mr. Fure said that they are showing some road improvements there at the bend to straighten out the roadway.

Mr. Trost said yes, their initial thought was to remove those improvements because those improvements were put in because of the large vehicles that were going to the slaughtering facility. Now that's gone. So, they were thinking that those improvements would not be required with this subdivision plan. If they're going to be required, we will certainly add them back. But we're talking about box trucks and things like that making deliveries to site, not tractor trailers anymore.

Mr. Fure said he would refer them to our Solicitor. It would be some type of note on a plan or legal enforcement that if you can limit that or not. But I know that was a concern before and still is with the larger trucks.

Mr. Knopp asked for comments from HRG.

Mr. Wood said that from a stormwater standpoint, the custom slaughtering facility was mentioned. We'd like to see some more detail to the stormwater design, the hydrologic

calculations, [inaudible] analyses, some drainage mapping and runoff calculations saw a couple inconsistencies with those that would like to see cleaned up. Some limited disturbance comments, saw some utility construction and grading outside of the proposed LoD on the plans and then some basin and channel design stormwater comments. And lastly, just some verification for easement and specifically the stormwater facility easement, those boundaries and what the long-term ownership and access will be.

Mr. Knopp asked for comments from DCPC.

Ms. Korber seconded the easement and access thing. I did notice that there is a path that connects those hoop buildings to the barn. Well now there's going to be a brand-new lot in between. So, if that connection is going to stay there is probably going to be some kind of access easement there. This one I might defer to. Jim, I did see the note about the existing nonconformities on the cover sheet of the plan with the buildings being in the front set back line. Does there have to be a reference there to like any administrative action that has occurred in the past or is it enough just to note that?

Mr. Diamond said that he didn't know the factual background that is it a non-conformity. We have to confirm what the non-conformity is. And then also with non-conformities it always gets funny when you start doing a subdivision whether you potentially blow some of the non-conformities, sometimes as someone's a clean slate. Obviously if there's a building built within a setback, it is what it is. But there are facets of non-conformity you really have to step back and analyze. It hasn't gelled enough in my mind yet to get down to the granular stuff.

Ms. Korber asked that if saying it's non-conforming would be enough there if we had to have some information to back that up.

[More discussion on setback requirements and non-conformities ensued.]

Mr. Snyder added that they are required out there to have a 50-foot setback. There are three existing structures which would be the existing farmhouse, this barn and this utility shed that are all within that 50-foot front yard set.

Mr. Knopp asked for any more questions from the PC. There were none.

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

Jim Rowell of Cockley Road came to the mic. He said: If it's getting tabled tonight, I can send you all probably the list of questions and everything because there's tons of them regarding from the residential piece to then the slaughterhouse piece. There are two separate things going on. So, if that's the plan, I'll save you all the time tonight. If you want, I can email Zach and he can give those to you.

Some of the major concerns though is just a trustworthy issue to all this. The barn, the road's condemned but they use it every day. People are in and out of it all the time. They say no tractor trailers. 7 Days ago, Picture of a tractor trailer driving in and out. Tractor trailers in there all the time. So, it's really difficult to believe anything that's being said. They're going to take care of the place: The place is overgrown. They've not done anything to take care of that. So, the question becomes: when you start parceling out this land, what does that set up for the future? We start to see housing development; we start to hear things like HOA then because they're going to have their own septic and water system and all that and then they're going to create this. So, there's a lot of residential things. Where's the stormwater management? Where's that going? Where's all that water from these properties going? When you go down the bottom of Cockley Hill and Willow Farm Lane, it floods there a lot already. It just creates those issues till you think of water usage, electrical usage for all this stuff. You've already got issues now putting a whole public sewer in. Are they not going to be mandated to participate in that? Or when others are going to be forced to do it, they're going to build this. Then maybe three years later, are they going to have to undo all of that? So, a lot of questions like that are generated for me to even the notion of the multi-use, multi-house types of stuff and what are they doing with those things? And I just don't have a lot of faith that when we say we're not going to do something, I have zero confidence that's going to hold true at all.

Then you get to the slaughterhouse. I thought we'd resolve that by putting it out on Oberlin Road. Now you can put it right across from our houses. The lighting is already all night. That one hoop barn glows all night. The fans run constantly. So, we're already dealing with that. Now you're going to add this to it.

They talk about traffic. That road is not designed for that at all. And they say there'll be no tractor trailers. Well, they're in there all the time. So, I don't know how you can keep saying they're not when they are. I mean we got pictures of it, so I don't know what else. I don't know when you all got to stop saying that, all right? It's not true, so stop saying it. Right? Say what's real and true because we know it, we're not stupid and do the right thing and be honest about it. That's what you're using it for.

And then where is all that waste going to? We resolved that with the other slaughterhouse. Well now we're opening up a whole other thing. Where's all that waste going to go now? So now you were going to take the waste from the original slaughterhouse on an Oberlin,

you're going to put that on the property. You're removing, I don't know, was it 20-some acres of property because you're parceling that off. Now you're adding additional waste from an additional slaughterhouse. At what point in time does that become problematic? Where do you keep putting all this stuff? Right. So, if you're tabling it tonight, I'll just leave those as public comments. I'll send you all an email with all the other questions.

Mr. Knopp thanked him and asked for any other Public comments.

Sam Demey Jr. came to the mic. He said: This was my grandfather's farm and my father's farm. And I'd like to read from the deed. And this is from 1963. It says the farm shall at no time be sold off in lots for development purposes. And that's defined as water flows, as grass grows. And this was supposed to be carried over to any further deeds. Now I was not involved in settling my father's estate, so I don't know if that was true or not. Rich evidently researched this at one time and maybe he has further comment. This is signed by all of the Demey family, all seven members. And when my sisters and I decided to sell the farm, we decided to sell it at a reasonable price because we knew it had to stay in a farming type use and not be developed. So, I see farmland disappearing at a rapid rate in the township and I would ask that you consider denying this proposal. My dad used to farm Shopes Gardens when there were six or seven houses there. We farmed on both sides of Rosedale Avenue and Lumber Street on the hill. That's all developed. We farmed the Mary Hoffer farm on Fulling Mill Road, that's all industrial and the farm below our house which is now commercial. So, I see the farmland disappearing. So, I would like for you to deny this, and I do not know if this is in their deed or not. That would have to be researched.

Mr. Knopp asked Mr. Snyder if he had researched this.

Mr. Snyder said yes, some time ago. I want to say there's nothing in the current deed that has that restriction in it. But I'd have to go back and look because it's been well over a year or two years since I looked at it. But I'm pretty certain that the current deed does not have any restrictions like that in it.

Mr. Diamond added that what's being raised here is a possible private restrictive covenant and it's not a basis we can look at. Normally a restrictive covenant if it's really enforceable and still would be around kind of two versions of it you'd expect when it's "This is the only use". One version is that the family that deeded it out under those restrictions has in what's called a reverter provision that says if this is never, you know, this ceases to be used as a farm, (I'm talking hypothetically), the property reverts back to

the heirs. If that's the case, that's an issue for somewhere in the chain of titles. The other one that's pretty common is out of a parent track this is put on and the people in the parent track that are later in the chain may have a right to enforce that. If it's not a reverter clause and someone owns the entire parent track, they can make it go away. We would not get into analyzing the title because it's not an issue for us. If somebody has a right to run in and get an injunction or a declaratory judgment that they're entitled to property back or any of that kind of stuff. That's just not our jurisdiction. Our jurisdiction is "do you meet the requirements of the subdivision land development ordinance". And are you consistent with other zoning laws. It's not like Rich should go do a forensic detail so we should hire a title searcher. But if a private person has an interest in that, they certainly may want to pursue that on their own.

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

Mr. Knopp asked what the PC would like to do with this proposal tonight.

- Mr. Young said at the applicant's request, he makes a motion to table it.
- Mr. Messick seconded the motion.
- All were in favor.

Tabled.

OTHER BUSINESS:

a. Data Center Ordinance Discussion.

Mr. Diamond gave discussion on the draft of the new Data Center Ordinance for Lower Swatara Township. He went over the importance of doing this now. The reality is that it's very aggressive out there, and you have to have one or you're really going to get attacked. That's happening everywhere right now. So, I know it's going to be a very tough subject for everybody, but we really have to try to have rules in place with appropriate restrictions. A couple of things have changed just in the last six, eight months.

Some of the many things discussed were:

- Electric demand
- Sound protection
- Zoning regulations
- Generators

- Fuel Usage
- Intrusiveness
- Opposition
- Heavy water usage
- Tax revenue
- Economy benefits

It was determined that after the PC members individually review this draft ordinance, they should direct any questions/comments to Don Fure before the next meeting.

b. The next Planning Commission meeting will be held on Thursday, September 24, 2026, at 7:00 P.M.

PUBLIC COMMENT: Mr. Knopp asked for any other comments from the Public. There were none.

GOOD & WELFARE

ADJOURN: A motion was made by Mr. Messick and seconded by Mr. Crawford to adjourn the meeting. All were in favor. Meeting adjourned at 9:31 P.M.

Respectfully Submitted,

_____

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