

**Borough of Greencastle**  
**Planning Commission Minutes**  
**August 29, 2022**  
**6:00 P.M.**  
**60 N. Washington Street**

Members in Attendance: Ed Wine, Guy Camp, Jim Thomas, and Joe Degrange. Also present were Borough Manager, Emilee Little; Borough Engineering Representative, Nate Merkel; and Borough Solicitor Zachary Rice. Commission member Tony Homer was absent.

Wine called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

**Public Comment Period**

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

**Minutes**

On a Thomas/Camp motion, the Planning Commission voted unanimously to approve the July 11, 2022 meeting minutes.

**New Business**

The Commission reviewed a subdivision plan as submitted by CES Engineering, LLC on behalf of JAG Management Group, LLC for the subdivision of parcel 08-2A00.-089.-000000 lots 9A and 9B in Chadwick Estates.

Little reviewed the subdivision plan noting that the majority of other parcels in this residential area have already been subdivided.

Merkel stated ARRO had completed the review and had no outstanding comments.

On a Thomas/Camp motion, the Planning Commission voted unanimously to recommend to Borough Council approval of the subdivision plan as submitted by CES Engineering, LLC on behalf of JAG Management Group, LLC for the subdivision of parcel 08-2A00.-089.-000000 lots 9A and 9B in Chadwick Estates.

**Old Business**

The Commission reviewed the preliminary land development plan as submitted by Frederick, Seibert & Associates, Inc. on behalf of Inch & Co for the proposed Buchanan Flats development.

Little provided a timeline of the Buchanan Flats development to date and the below noted updates:

- Sewer – Engineering has reviewed the current submission and a revised plan must be submitted showing the Borough will treat the sewer from buildings located in the Borough.
- Water – GAFSCWA is still reviewing with regard to source water protection requirements and capacity
- ARRO has reviewed the plans and several comment letter have been submitted to Inch & Company. Ten comments remain outstanding and need to be addressed prior to resubmittal.
- The Planning Commission and Borough Council can only review, comment, and control buildings and management practices which are in the Borough.

Merkel noted that ARRO had reviewed the plan in its entirety, resulting in 51 comments relating to the Borough's ordinances.

Wine re-emphasized that approximately 20% of the development would be in the Borough and the remaining area is in Antrim Township but unfortunately the Borough will have the majority of the burden. Wine noted the Borough has no legal authority over the property within the Township.

Wine asked anyone wishing to provide comment to come to the podium and state their name and address.

Mayor Ben Thomas, 302 S. Washington Street, said he submitted a three-page review regarding Buchanan Flats. He said the project weighs heavily on the Commission and PennDOT, going far beyond what Borough Council can do while creating a significant impact on the community. Thomas noted the 1965 Comprehensive Plan has no bearing currently. Thomas stated the connector road would have a financial impact on the Borough beyond what the Borough can maintain.

Wine asked that the Mayors comments be part of the public record and Little said yes they would be.

Nancy Dunn, 339 Moss Spring Avenue, spoke to concerns about traffic going through Moss Spring Avenue and asked for signage to prohibit construction traffic, as well as other traffic calming measures per PennDOT guidelines.

Heather Gouker, 63 N. Linden Avenue, asked about the connector road and who has authority over it. She also asked about safety impacts on streets such as Madison Avenue, Linden Avenue and Grant Street.

Little said the current plan has no connection on Madison Avenue and a one-way connection on Grant Street. Little stated the Moss Spring connection is in the Township and the Borough has no authority, but Route 16 would be regulated as much as PennDOT allows.

Merle Ritchey, 412 Moss Spring Avenue, said she is concerned about traffic and water pressure.

Little said that the Water Authority engineer is still reviewing the Inch & Co. plans. She said the Moss Spring development's low pressure is the result of the developer never connecting to the high service line as proposed. She explained that Inch & Co. would have to connect the water main bringing most of Moss Spring onto the high pressure system with a portion still remaining on the lower water pressure fed by the Water Treatment Plant.

Rice explained that Inch & Co. owns land up to N. Linden Avenue. A discussion followed on whether or not accommodations, easements, or possible right-of-way agreements, could be made for property not owned by the Borough.

Carter Davidson, 504 Brookview Drive, asked for the Borough's position on the connector road at Route 16 and said that he feels it isn't the right thing for Greencastle. He asked if there is any means to stop this connection and force the Township to own the development. Davidson said everything has changed since the 1965 Comprehensive Plan and that all access should come from the Township. He state that questions asked of Borough Council were met with threats of litigation.

Wine said that if the project is not in the Borough, there is little legal action that can be taken. Discussions can be held on the connection at Baltimore Street and Grant Street extended, but otherwise there are limitations. Wine asked Borough Council President Albert W. Miller, who was in attendance, if he would like to respond to Davidson.

Council President Albert W. Miller addressed Davidson's comments saying that the Borough has tried to meet with the Township and PennDOT and that it will come to the point that a stand will have to be taken regarding the connector road. Miller said Council minutes reflect residents saying their children play in the streets. He added that sidewalks would benefit everyone and they would be at the cost of the residents. Miller stated Inch & Co. is agreeable to installing a traffic light at the Rt. 16 intersection and the associated costs.

Carter Davidson, 504 Brookview Drive, said the people in the neighborhood traverse the street as pedestrians and don't play there, because there are no sidewalks.

Wine asked Council President Albert W. Miller or Little to comment on some of the proposed options regarding the connector road. Little said that when they met with the Township they presented options such as emergency access only, mountable curbing, and building the road but not opening it, and everything was rejected based on the 1965 Comprehensive Plan as provided by the Township.

Carter Davidson, 504 Brookview Drive, asked if it is feasible to tell the Township ‘no’ for the portion of the road in the Borough.

Wine said, speaking for himself, he is not in favor of the entrance road especially if there is not a traffic light put in, knowing that the decision is outside the Borough’s control.

Rice said all the options are a question of jurisdiction and the Borough’s options are, at most, limited. The Borough has the authority to regulate Grant Street Extended because it adjoins Borough property. If the developer has acquired the right-of-way for the connection on Route 16, they have their own access with PennDOT jurisdiction.

Merkel recommended the Borough perform a separate traffic impact study regarding the signalization of the Rt. 16 entrance. Merkel said the developer’s study was conducted over 10 days monitoring 15 minute intervals and was done April 8, 2022 and revised June 29, 2022.

Mayor Thomas said a traffic study has the potential to be out-of-date within a few years. He said the developer would pay for the light but the Borough would be responsible for all maintenance without an agreement. He recommended the Township have all responsibility for the light.

Eddie Baxter, 117 Carowinds Drive, said the upper portion of Moss Springs has no police coverage and the regulations are only as good as what is enforceable. He said the Township portion of the development would put a lot of pressure on Borough police.

Little said the Greencastle Police Department would only cover the two buildings in the Borough.

Rice said that neither the Borough nor the Township can force the developer to be responsible for problems that may already exist but may be exasperated by the development and suggested an agreement be pursued.

Baxter asked if Moss Spring Avenue could be made a dead end. Wine said it was explored and Rice said any attempt to prohibit access would create a legal issue.

Davidson asked if the roadway could be relinquished through a lawsuit. Rice said the Borough would have to vacate the street which would cause chaos; residents in the Township have a legal right to traverse those streets. Further, a gated community would not have public streets.

Twain Glaser, 279 Moss Spring Avenue, asked how construction equipment is going to access the site. Little said there are five construction entrances in the plans: two at Route 16, two at the northern end, and one in the Borough.

Jennifer Robertson, 495 Brookview Drive, said she objected to The Villas being developed and was concerned about the properties that do not have sidewalks. She asked how long it would take to also need improvements to the traffic light at Walter Avenue and Route 11.

Harold Duffey, 54 Homestead Drive, asked for clarification on the proposed traffic pattern coming off Interstate 81 and what is being done on Grant Street.

Wine asked Merkel if there were width issues on Grant Street, Merkel replied that Inch & Co. have not answered this yet.

Duffey said the problem is the bypass and what was created by allowing ingress and egress across the neighborhood and it can’t be regulated.

Mayor Thomas said additional meetings may be needed due to ongoing questions. He referenced the 2012 Comprehensive Plan which includes the Borough’s position on the access road.

Wine referenced the 1965 Comprehensive Plan which lists proposed loop roads to alleviate congestion at Routes 11 and 16 including Walter Avenue, Nova Avenue, and Moss Spring Avenue. He said that since 1965, there has been residential development along these roadways which creates an obvious issue. Wine noted that while the Borough objected to the connector road in 2012, since the majority of it is in the Township, the Borough has limited control.

Harold Duffey, 54 Homestead Drive, stated another concern regarding the egress on Route 16 at the cemetery. He said the right-of-way for a street like that is not wide enough because of housing there. He said the Borough bent over backwards for Corning Glass in the sixties and now municipalities need to work together. He asked what will happen at Williamson or Walter Avenue when that thoroughfare goes through.

Chelsey Sleighter, 492 Brookview Drive, said she's a medical worker, trained to be preventative and not reactive. She asked what the speed limit will be for Moss Springs and expressed her concerns about impacts to her neighborhood.

Kelsey Marshall, 20 Starlight Drive, asked if the Borough can be assured the developer is following the Uniform Construction Code. She asked about issues such as an Environmental Impact Statement, noise, pollution, water impacts, and air pollution. She said this development harms Greencastle and asked if plans could be obtained through Freedom of Information.

Wine said there will be building inspectors looking at the plans and inspecting the building progress. He said there is no requirement for an Environmental Impact Statement, however the Borough is assessing water, sewer, stormwater, and erosion and sedimentation controls. Wine said he doesn't know anything about Federal Highway Administration requirements, but there will be a buffer between eight buildings in the township and Interstate 81. He suggested Marshall come to the Borough to review the plans. Marshall said she wants to ensure the plans at both municipalities are the same.

Wine asked where Grant Street, being one way, is listed on the plans and if the stormwater calculations were checked by ARRO. He asked Merkel if 100-year storm standards were being modified by industry planners in light of recent changes in weather trends and Merkel said they were not. Wine asked for follow-up on the water bond. He asked Rice if the Commission needed to do anything on the Grant Street boundaries and Rice said the lines could be problematic. Merkel added that this matter had been discussed with the developer and that it could be private access going into the development. Merkel suggested Wine compile his list of concerns for him to take to the developer.

Wine said he would like a separate entrance to the Moss Spring Cemetery and a right of way agreement. He asked about blasting protocols and Merkel said that is a GAFSCWA matter. Rice said he would suggest this be included in any Contractor Agreements to include source water protections and prohibitions. Little said the developer would need to get Authority approval before any blasting and that there have been discussions on bonding for that issue.

Wine asked if screening was required between the borough portion and the properties on Madison Street and lighting.

Little recommended the issue be tabled until more comments can be addressed. Wine asked Rice how to extend the review period, Rice noted Inch & Co. would have to initiate that request.

On a Camp/Degrange motion, the Commissioners voted to table the discussion on Buchanan Flats until the October 11, 2022 meeting or until the resubmission of the plans.

### **Correspondence**

S. Miller – request for information and comment

### **Adjournment**

On a Camp/Degrange motion, the meeting adjourned at 8:28 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Emilee Little  
Borough Manager