

Borough of Greencastle
Planning Commission Minutes
April 11, 2022
6:00 P.M.
60 N. Washington Street

Members in Attendance: Ed Wine, Guy Camp, Tony Homer, Jim Thomas, and Joe Degrange. Also present was Borough Manager Emilee Little, Zachary Rice of Salzmann Hughes, and Usman Choudhary of ARRO Consulting.

Representatives in attendance for the proposed Buchanan Flats development included Atty. John Andrews of McNees Wallace & Nurick, Justin Doty of Frederick Seibert and Associates, Inc., Joe Eisenhower of Inch & Company, Craig Mellott and Drake Lenker of Traffic Planning and Design, Inc.

Wine called the meeting to order at 6:06 p.m.

Public Comment Period

No public comments were received during the initial public comment period.

Minutes

On a Camp/Homer motion, the Planning Commission voted unanimously to approve the March 14, 2022 meeting minutes with an amendment to the second to the last paragraph on page 2 to read: *On a Thomas/Homer motion, the Commission unanimously voted to recommend conditional approval to Borough Council subject to reconciliation of all engineering comments.*

Old Business

None.

New Business

Little provided an overview of the Buchanan Flats project to date:

- Plans were submitted February 7, 2022.
- Propose 10 multi-family apartment buildings with 30 units each (300 total).
- Two buildings (60 units) will be located within the Borough.
- There are two proposed access points: Route 16 east of Spring Grove Avenue and the other on Grant Street
- Proposed public road with a cul-de-sac that currently ends prior to Moss Spring Avenue.
- Franklin County commented that they want to see a coordinated review with Antrim Township (the Township), expressed traffic concerns, and suggested another means of ingress and egress.

Rice spoke to the Planning Commission (Commission) about plan review among the Borough and the Township, with each municipality being responsible for ensuring that the developer has demonstrated compliance with that municipality's ordinances and regulations.

John Andrews, introduced the representatives present on behalf of Buchanan Flats. He said that this would be the first of several public meetings with the Township and Borough and that multiple levels of approvals would be needed before construction can begin.

Andrews provided an overview of the proposed Buchanan Flats development. Other statements included:

- About 19.5 acres total with 5 acres in the eastern part of the Borough and 14.5 acres in the Township.
- Area is zoned Residential (R2) in the Borough and Community Commercial (CC) in the Township. Zoning requirements in both municipalities are similar.
- 300 total units, a community center, and pool for residents.
- Access points will be Grant and E. Baltimore streets. They expect the Township will request a through street in the future, not a cul-de-sac.

Wine asked for clarification on the Township acreage and Doty said there are about 25 acres, with about six acres of woodlands being preserved.

Doty presented the Commission with engineering information that included:

- There are five acres of development in the Borough and two buildings. The plans will be modified to address the 160-foot height restriction within the Borough.
- No more than 30 units per building.
- Significant stormwater management designed for run-off.
- Water and sewer will be provided by the GAF CWA and the Antrim Township Municipal Authority. The GAF CWA has not provided comments yet.

Wine noted that Grant Street also provides access to a historic local cemetery and that it's important that access be preserved.

Mellott presented information on the traffic impact study stating that the study evaluates site access requirements and evaluates impacts on adjacent roadways. The PennDOT Highway Occupancy Permit process is still in review and should take a year to obtain a permit. The scoping process was done with the Borough, Township, and Franklin County, and PennDOT is preliminarily looking at improvements to Exit 5.

Homer asked how many vehicles were anticipated entering and exiting at the Route 16 intersection and Mellott said studies indicated that in the a.m. from Moss Spring to Route 16 there were 47 turning left toward I-81 and 21 turning right, and in the p.m. there were 30 turning left and 13 right turns.

Homer asked what hours were considered peak times and Mellott said it was based on camera views of traffic between 6-9 a.m. and 3-6 p.m. He added that times can change depending on the intersection. Mellott said the traffic would be controlled by a stop sign for now.

Homer said he felt the numbers were low and Mellott said the statistics are based on counts done at existing residential developments and averaged.

Wise asked if the numbers are anticipated from the apartment complex and not a connection through Moss Springs and Mellott said they were. He asked Mellott if the request for a connection approval would come from the Township and he said he believed it would.

Homer asked Mellott if he did a traffic count on Route 16 and what those counts were. Mellott stated there were five intersections from Route 11 to John Wayne Drive and explained the analysis involved in getting the traffic numbers.

Jan Shafer, 142 Carowinds Drive, asked speakers to use the microphone.

Homer asked if the traffic going out to Grant Street wasn't up to standards required, what Inch & Company thought would remedy that. Andrews said they will consult with ARRO for what improvements would be required and they are not averse to making those.

Wine asked if Grant Street was to be an ingress and egress and Andrews said it was.

Public Comments

Wine began by stating that while 80 percent of the development is in the Township, the interest expressed by the public relates to the scope of the project within the Borough. He said it took almost 50 years to develop 98 units throughout Moss Springs and there will now be 300 units within two years; that gets people's attention.

Steve Miller, 232 Moss Spring Avenue, presented questions to Inch & Company and the Commission. He stated that more than 560 people from the Borough and Township have signed a petition. Miller stated they understand the development is coming; they want to know how to incorporate the development into the community to make it the best they can. His questions (as submitted) were (answers italicized for each):

1. For the benefit of citizens of Grant Street, explain why Madison Street was not selected as an entry/exit point for the development?

Eisenhauer said that he initially met with the Borough and staff didn't express an interest in connecting an additional road into the Borough, and also there is a private property between the end of Madison Street and the development property line that does not grant access.

2. Current drawings show that the Moss Spring Avenue Extension, off Route 16, will end within the Development vicinity with a cul-de-sac. Is this correct and does the Planning Commission support this non-connection ie. No connection to current Moss Spring Avenue.

Steve Miller asked the Planning Commission if they would vote against joining a roadway to the cul-de-sac and Wine stated that would not be answered at the meeting that night.

3. If the current Moss Spring Avenue was to be connected to the extension road, what traffic calming measures would be taken to ensure that speed would be controlled (15-25 MPH) and the road would be safe for current residents?

Eisenhauer said that interests are aligned in that the primary access point is in the Borough and that the road is safe. Wine added that if the Township would connect cul-de-sac, there is only one stop from Baltimore Street to Route 11. Rice said any street connection questions would be addressed by the Borough.

4. Citizens are concerned over the speed on Borough roads that will be accessed to and from this development, what traffic calming measures will be installed for speed reduction? Can the Baltimore Street entry point be designed for local traffic and not for use by tractor trailers?

Rice stated that ultimately the HOP is governed by PennDOT. Eisenhauer stated this is the first public meeting on the project, we are discussing things but that the Township hasn't submitted a comment letter; there is still a lot of work to do; there are measures that can be taken.

5. Updates from PENNDOT provided to the Boro for input or review? It had been indicated that East Madison was proposed by PENNDOT and Boro had declined its use? Have they provided any comments?

Rice said they can invite PENNDOT but the Commission and Borough will stay apprised of any comments.

6. What efforts are being made to safeguard the water supply?

Little and Rice noted that the GAFSCWA has a PADEP source water protection plan that governs prohibitions as well as establishes restrictions and criteria governing how developments are required to be constructed within close proximity to a water source.

Mike Stenger, 216 Moss Spring Avenue, asked if there would be a connection fee for the Borough sewer hook-ups. Rice said there will be tapping fees and EDUs assessed. Stenger then asked who the battle is with regarding the Moss Spring extension and how much persuasion does the Borough have with the Township?

Andrews stated that the developer is seeking approval of the plan as submitted which does not show a connector road to Moss Spring.

Albert Miller, 171 Apple Drive, stated he is Borough Council President and that this project would affect all of our communities. Miller spoke to the need for joint cooperation between the Commission, Council, and Township. He said that it was disingenuous for the developer to show the cul-de-sac at this stage.

Andrews said they (Inch & Company) are between a rock and a hard place having determined that there is value in the project and investing in the community, and that the Borough will be proud of it. Andrews stated the road connection is not considered an inevitability at this point, it was not disingenuous to call the road a cul-de-sac, and because there is a right-of-way on the other side of the property line does not require the developer to purchase additional property to put a road in. If this is an inevitability, they will work to make it aggregable to the Borough. Inch & Company representatives stated they are fully on board to make the road *Local Delivery Only*, working with PennDOT and the Borough to design an access point to discourage truck traffic but allows school bus traffic. Eisenhower is hopeful that through the proposed access to Route 16 he will be eliminating other access points along Route 16 and Auto Zone because his negotiations with Mr. Plessinger that include a curb cut. He was not aware that 560 signatures are against the road.

Albert Miller said that it was the Township and the Borough who need to decide what could go wrong with the road.

Wine asked Andrews if 300 units is a normal complex for Inch & Company, the business model, and how is that determined. Andrews said the number was the result of land area and allowable density and then they used a standard build (30 unit) design that allows six acres for tree cover.

Wine said that the Commission would next work on a timetable and present it to Borough Council noting a possible extension to the 90-day review deadline.

Rice said the Commission could ask for an extension at the May Council meeting. Andrews stated they would ask for an extension in writing.

On a Homer/Camp motion, the Planning Commission voted unanimously to table the Development Plans for Buchanan Flats.

On a Homer/Camp motion, the Planning Commission voted unanimously to recommend to Borough Council the extension requested by Inch & Company to extend the review period 90-days from the expiration of the current 90-days.

The meeting adjourned at 7:34 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Emilee Little
Borough Manager