

**MIDDLESEX TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION
WORKSHOP MEETING MINUTES
MONDAY, FEBRUARY 23, 2026**

START TIME: 7:00 p.m.

END TIME: 10:39 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Wes Beard
Robynn Eppley
Jim Gehr
Tracy Gleim
Doug Graham
Larry Claycomb

STAFF PRESENT:

Mark Carpenter, Zoning Officer
Bud Grove, Township Engineer
Zach Zook, Township Manager
Eileen Gault, Secretary/Treasurer

MEMBERS & STAFF ABSENT:

Tom Ryan
Margie Flatley-Carpenter, Secretary

MEETING MINUTES:

Call Meeting to Order

Tracy Gleim called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm.

Review and discussion of Middlesex Township Resolution #2006-7, Adopting Rules of Conduct for Meetings

All members confirmed receipt of the Resolution outlining the Rules of Conduct for the meeting. It was noted that the rules are listed on the agenda and allow residents and taxpayers of Middlesex Township to speak at the meeting.

The public comment process was reviewed:

- An initial public comment period is designated for items not listed on the agenda.
- Before any action is taken on an agenda item, the public must be given an opportunity to comment on that specific item.
- Even if a motion is on the floor, the Planning Commission must allow public comment prior to voting.

Public comments are limited to three minutes per speaker. Individuals must state their name and address before speaking. No questions were raised regarding the resolution.

Discussion and Possible Action on minutes of February 9, 2026

The Board reviewed the minutes of the February 9, 2026, meeting. Robynn Eppley noted a correction needed on page 3, third paragraph from the bottom. Wes Beard made a motion to approve the February 9, 2026, meeting minutes as amended. Robynn Eppley seconded the motion, and it passed by unanimous vote in favor.

Tracy Gleim then opened the floor for public comments.

Jody Shivel, 8 Teaberry Drive, asked questions regarding the proposed fencing associated with the development.

It was noted that fencing is generally installed by contractors to secure work areas and that the property owner may have the right to install perimeter fencing. It was indicated that setback requirements would need to be confirmed. As the fencing topic was scheduled for discussion later, on the agenda, Mrs. Shivel was advised that her questions would likely be addressed during the developer's presentation and that she could raise them again at that time.

TPF 24-2 Discussion and Possible Action on Preliminary/Final Land Development Plan for Saia Trailer Storage Lot (BOS action deadline 05/06/2026)

Brian Clement, representing the applicant, stated that revised plans were submitted following the previous meeting and that the applicant agrees with the Township Engineer's review comments and will revise the plans accordingly.

Bud Grove Township Engineer provided a summary of outstanding items, noting that most prior comments have been addressed. Five waivers were requested, including:

1. Waiver of the requirement to submit a preliminary plan.
2. Waiver from stormwater infiltration requirements to allow use of a DEP-approved Managed Release Concept (MRC) basin.
3. Waiver from showing all existing structures within 100 feet of the property.
4. Waiver from interior landscaping requirements within the trailer parking lot.
5. Waiver from the requirement that landscaping equal 10% of the gross parking area.

The Engineer recommended approval of the waivers and noted the need to:

- Revise the restrictive covenant to prohibit operational access from Harrisburg Pike, allowing emergency access only.
- Submit a written waiver request to permit lighting heights of 25 feet (rather than 20 feet), subject to Board of Supervisors approval.

Discussion included stormwater management design, lighting height and photometric compliance, landscaping, fencing placement, and operational use of the lot. The Engineer noted that the Manage Release Concept (MRC) basin would be lined due to high sinkhole potential and that water quality inlets and an operations and maintenance plan are required.

Public Comment:

- John Manta, Wolfs Bridge Road, asked about undercarriage washing of trailers to prevent potential spread of contaminants and questioned the need for 25-foot lighting heights. The applicant stated no undercarriage wash is proposed. It was confirmed that the lighting plan meets ordinance requirements for light spillage.
- Judy Johnson, Briar Patch Drive, asked whether trailers would be stored long-term; the applicant clarified the lot is primarily for trailer parking and repair staging, not long-term dumping or storage.
- Stan Shivell, Teaberry Drive, quoted the mission statement from the township Comprehensive Plan regarding growth and change and the management of it.

Following discussion by the Planning Commission and public comment, Pursuant to TPF #24-2 Jim Gehr made a motion to recommend approval of the five (5) waivers requested with the following conditions:

- That a written request be submitted to the township for all the requested waivers, with justification for each waiver requested per the Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (SLDO).
- That all requested waivers be listed on the cover sheet of the plan set.

Doug Graham seconded the motion, and it passed by unanimous vote in favor.

Jim Gehr made a motion to recommend approval of Preliminary/Final Land Development Plan (TPF 24-2) to the Board of Supervisors, subject to the conditions outlined in the Township review letters and the additional conditions discussed, including clarification of access restrictions and submission of the lighting waiver request.

Wes Beard seconded the motion, and it passed by unanimous vote in favor.

TPF 25-17 Discussion and Possible Action on Preliminary/Final Land Development Plan for Pennsylvania Digital 1 (PAX-1) Data Center Phase 1-A (BOS action deadline 03/04/2026)

Justin Ross-Livic Civil and Charlie Courtney-McNeece, Wallace & Nurick, were present for discussion of the development plan being presented.

Charlie Courtney introduced the application before the Planning Commission. The plan under consideration is a Preliminary Land Development Plan for Phase 1A, corresponding to Lot 1A of a previously approved subdivision. The original 700-acre site was subdivided into five lots (1A, 1B, 1C, 2, and 3). This evening's review focuses only on Phase 1A, which is an infrastructure plan. It does not include construction of data center buildings. Future meetings will address plans related to specific building development.

Justin Ross presented details of the plan and addressed common public concerns.

- **Submission Timeline:**
The Phase 1A plan was initially submitted in August of last year and has been under Township review for approximately six months. The review process has included multiple rounds of engineering comments and response letters.
- **Plan Documentation:**
 - Approximately 140 engineering plan sheets
 - 850+ page Environmental Impact Statement and Assessment
 - 700+ page Stormwater Management Report (specific to Phase 1A)

Each future phase will include its own stormwater report and environmental documentation.

Phase 1A includes the following infrastructure improvements:

1. PPL Substation and Switchyard

- A large PPL substation and switchyard will be constructed and interconnected with a new 500 kV transmission line.
- Smaller substations will reduce voltage from 500 kV to distribution-level power for future phases.
- This is a primary component of the infrastructure plan.

2. Internal Access Road

- A loop road (shown in dark blue/gray on plans) will provide internal access throughout Phase 1A.
- The road will be built to public road standards.
- At this time, it is not being offered for dedication to the Township; it will remain privately maintained by the development entity.

3. Removal of Previous Improvements

- Infrastructure previously installed for the previous residential development (construction halted after property purchase) will be removed to accommodate the new infrastructure layout.

4. Water Main Relocation

- An existing Township Authority water main currently runs through the property.
- The plan proposes rerouting it:
 - East along Country Club Road
 - North along the eastern property boundary
 - Along the existing transmission line corridor
 - Reconnecting near the river
- The Township Authority engineer designed and approved the relocation.
- Additional valving has been incorporated to prevent service interruptions or boil-water notices during transition.
- The relocation avoids wetlands and the creek corridor, minimizing environmental disturbance.

Stormwater management was discussed in detail:

• **Design Approach**

- The plan includes multiple stormwater basins.
- Basins are designed to fully dewater within approximately 72 hours (2–3 days).
- No permanent standing water is anticipated, reducing risk of stagnant water or mosquito breeding.

• **Treatment System**

- Initial “MRC” cells provide water quality treatment with engineered media.
- Water then flows into larger rate-control basins.
- Basins are designed to meet strict runoff control requirements to ensure:
 - No increase in downstream runoff
 - Protection of the adjacent creek
 - No increase in flood risk
 - Maintenance of water quality standards

• **Vegetation & Maintenance**

- Smaller treatment cells will include wetland vegetation.

- Larger basins will include a specialized meadow/wetland seed mix to promote evapotranspiration.
- An Operations and Maintenance Plan has been submitted.
- Maintenance includes scheduled mowing (annual or biannual) to prevent tree growth and maintain basin functionality.

The Environmental Impact Statement addresses:

- Water quality
- Floodplain impacts
- Wetland considerations
- Ecological sensitivity
- Runoff controls

The engineering team and Township consultants have been reviewing these materials as part of the ongoing process.

Clarifications Provided During Discussion

- The internal access road meets public standards but will remain privately maintained.
- The water main relocation has been engineered and approved by the Authority.
- Stormwater facilities are designed for infiltration, controlled release, and environmental protection.
- This phase does not include data center building construction.
- Additional public meetings will address building-specific development plans.
- It was noted that invasive vegetation within stormwater areas can be controlled through seasonal management practices.
- An operations and maintenance plan includes provisions for periodic mowing and vegetation management to prevent establishment of unwanted species and tree growth.

Transmission and Distribution Layout

- Overhead transmission lines will extend from the main PPL switchyard (yellow area on plan).
- Transmission poles (shown as dots on the plan) will carry overhead lines that split into multiple overhead feeds.
- From each designated substation area (orange areas), all electrical distribution will transition to underground.
- Everything beyond the immediate substation/switchyard footprint will be underground.

Underground Conduit System

- Underground electrical lines will not be traditional walk-through “line vaults.”
- The system will consist of concrete-encased conduit banks, typically containing approximately 24 conduits.
- Conduits will be encased in concrete and installed in segments within open trench construction.
- Some segments may utilize prefabricated conduit sections assembled on-site.
- The system is similar in concept to line vaults but fabricated in place and not designed for walk-in access.

Landscaping and Buffering

- Landscaping is proposed at multiple levels:
 - Along property boundaries
 - Along the internal access road
 - Along most frontages of the switchyard and substations
- Limitations exist where landscaping cannot interfere with overhead transmission line rights-of-way.
- Species selections were coordinated with PPL to ensure mature heights will not conflict with overhead lines.
- All landscaping will be included in the development agreement.
- A long-term maintenance obligation will apply, similar to stormwater facilities.

Berm and Topography Discussion (Country Club Road Area)

- A 12-foot berm is proposed along certain portions of the Country Club Road frontage.
- Due to significant elevation changes near the eastern portion of the property (elevations dropping from approximately 510 feet downward), a 12-foot berm would not effectively screen views in that area.
- Constructing a berm high enough to provide screening in that location would require 30–40 feet of elevation, creating substantial visual and environmental impact.
- Therefore, landscaping and other buffering methods are proposed instead in areas where topography makes berm construction impractical.

Zoning and 1,000-Foot Façade Requirement

- Under the zoning ordinance, any residential zoning district (or district where residential development is permitted) within 1,000 feet of the property line triggers specific façade requirements for future data center buildings.
- Buildings located within that 1,000-foot buffer must meet:
 - Required glazing percentages.
 - Specific architectural and aesthetic standards
- These requirements will apply to future building phases and are not part of the current infrastructure-only plan.
- The 1,000-foot measurement is taken from the property line.

Laydown Yard and Temporary Improvements

- A previously approved laydown yard (approved in December under a separate plan) is currently constructed.
- The area consists of gravel/stone surface and job trailers.
- Temporary fencing is required around the laydown yard:
 - Intended as a screen.
 - Helps contain debris.
 - Not intended as a permanent perimeter fence
- Landscaping was approved as part of that earlier plan to buffer views of construction equipment.

Temporary Construction Fencing

- Additional temporary fencing may be installed along frontage areas for construction security.
- Fencing will be set back on the property and is not intended to enclose the full 700-acre tract.

- Permanent security fencing in the future will only surround individual data center campuses (approximately eighty acres each).
- Security fencing around substations and switchyards is required for utility infrastructure protection and is included in this plan.

Country Club Road Frontage Improvements

- The developer is required to improve Country Club Road along the frontage of Phase 1A.
- Due to the condition of the road (multiple historical overlays over a weak base), full-depth reconstruction is proposed rather than simple resurfacing.
- Minimum obligation: reconstruction along the Phase 1A frontage, including up to the crest of the hill.
- The developer will bond improvements along the entire stretch of Country Club Road to cover impacts from construction traffic.
- The goal is to avoid reconstructing sections now that would later be damaged by heavy construction equipment.
- The development agreement includes bonding for the remainder of the road.
- Off-site sections may initially involve overlay and base repair bonding, with long-term reconstruction anticipated.
- Timing of full reconstruction may be deferred until substantial construction activity is complete or as mutually agreed with the Township.
- If road damage (e.g., potholes, shoulder deterioration) occurs during construction, the developer is responsible for repairs to Township standards.
- Current lane widths are approximately 10.5 to 12 feet.
- The proposal includes:
 - Two 12-foot travel lanes
 - A 4-foot shoulder along the project frontage
 - An additional 5–6 feet of total roadway width
- The road will undergo full-depth reconstruction along the required frontage.
- A thicker pavement profile and improved base structure will provide long-term durability.
- Instead of curb and sidewalk (which would require storm inlets along the entire frontage), the proposal includes:
 - Grading away from the road
 - A swale/channel between the roadway and berm
 - Directing runoff toward landscaped areas for improved water quality
- A waiver request was noted for this alternative design approach.

Construction Traffic

- Primary truck access is anticipated from Route 11 via Interstate access.
- The developer acknowledged that while it is difficult to strictly control all truck routing:
 - Construction meetings will be held regularly.
 - Contractors will be directed regarding approved routes.
 - Adjustments (signage, coordination with Township) will be made if issues arise.
- Ongoing coordination with the Township during the construction period was emphasized.

Lighting

- Ordinance permits 25-foot light poles with Supervisors' approval.
- A modification request is included.

- Lighting is required around access drives for safety.
- A photometric plan demonstrates no light spill onto neighboring properties.
- Berms and mature landscaping will further reduce visible light.
- Taller poles allow fewer fixtures overall, reducing total light intensity.
- Lighting will comply with Township requirements.

Soil Testing

- Over 450 excavation pits and borings were performed as part of a required pre-development site characterization.
- Approximately 60% of the site exhibits little to no infiltration capacity.
- Water typically moves laterally toward the creek and floodplain due to restrictive soil layers.
- This condition likely explains the existing floodplain boundaries.

Stormwater Management

- No uncontrolled discharge to the creek.
- Overall runoff will be reduced compared to existing conditions.
- Wetlands and streams will continue receiving necessary hydrologic input.
- Monitoring equipment is currently installed to measure baseline water conditions.

Managed Release Concept (MRC)

- Because infiltration is limited, a managed release stormwater system is proposed.
- MRC basins function as follows:
 1. Water enters heavily planted cells with engineered media.
 2. Water filters through soil media.
 3. It drains into a secondary detention basin.
 4. Water is slowly released through a controlled outlet.
- Maximum ponding depth is expected to be less than one foot.
- Basins fully dewater within 2–3 days.
- Unlike prior plans reviewed by the Commission, these basins are not lined.
- Where soil allows, infiltration can still occur.

Regional Context

- Pennsylvania currently exports electricity within the PJM regional grid.
- PPL territory has significant generation capacity, largely from natural gas.
- Interconnection approval is scheduled for summer 2027.
- The interconnection requires a coordinated transmission shutdown window approved by the regional grid operator (PJM).
- PPL, as a public utility, is generally exempt from certain local zoning requirements but has elected to work cooperatively with the Township.

Noise Comparisons

- A noise study specific to Phase 1A (substations only) was submitted.
- Additional cumulative studies will be prepared for future data center campuses.

- The Township property line noise limit is seventy dBA.
- 30 dBA: Whisper-level sound
- 45 dBA: Typical refrigerator
- Normal conversation in meeting room measured approximately 50–60 dBA.
- Noise scale is logarithmic (not linear), meaning increases in decibel levels represent exponential increases in sound intensity.
- Discussion included comparison to truck stop noise heard at night.
- It was noted that louder ambient sounds dominate perception; quieter sounds do not meaningfully add to them.
- Additional studies will address generator operation and full campus buildout.
- The applicant anticipates final operational noise levels will remain well below the seventy dBA limit, potentially 10–30 decibels below the maximum allowed threshold.
- The submitted noise study applies only to Phase 1A substations. Generator noise will be addressed in future campus phases and is not part of the current approval.

Review of HRG Engineering Letter

The applicant distributed a color-coded copy of the latest HRG review letter to guide discussion. The request before the Commission is action on the Preliminary Plan, including review of:

- Modification requests
- Waiver requests
- Deferral items
- Conditions of approval
- Third-party agency approvals

It was clarified that:

- **Deferral items** are typically conditions to be satisfied prior to Final Plan approval.
- **Waivers/Modifications** require formal Board action.
- Some items may function procedurally as conditions even if referenced as deferrals.

Waivers & Modifications Discussed

1. Easement Metes and Bounds (Items 1–2)

- Request to defer final metes and bounds descriptions of easements until Final Plan.
- Easement locations are shown graphically.
- Treated as a condition of Preliminary approval.

2. Plan Scale (Waiver Items 1–2)

- Request to exceed standard plan scale requirements (1"=50').
- Justification: Improved readability and legibility.
- Township engineer indicated no objection; plans are clear at proposed scale.

3. Title Documentation

- Final title references will be updated upon recording of the subdivision plan.
- Procedural/administrative item.

4. Fire Hydrants

- Hydrant placement coordination ongoing with the Authority and Fire Department.
- Condition of approval.

5. Sewage Planning Module

- Non-building waiver submitted as part of subdivision.
- DEP review pending; considered a third-party approval condition.

6. Curb at Substation Entrances (Waiver #5)

- Request to waive depressed curb requirement at internal substation/campus entrances.
- Justification: Heavy truck and equipment traffic would damage curbing.
- Considered an engineering and safety-based request.

7. Grading Within Right-of-Way (Waiver #6 & #7)

- Ordinance requires grading up from right-of-way at 2%.
- Applicant proposes grading away from roadway to:
 - Improve stormwater quality.
 - Direct runoff into landscaped areas
 - Avoid directing water back to pavement.
- Applies to both internal loop road and Country Club Road frontage.

8. Curb & Sidewalk Requirements (Waiver #4 & #7)

- Request to waive installation of curb and sidewalk:
 - Internally (industrial setting, no pedestrian use anticipated)
 - Along Country Club Road (unlit rural road; sidewalks may not be appropriate)
- Discussion included potential deferral versus full waiver.
- Township practice may allow future installation if desired within a defined timeframe.
- Concern raised about future sidewalk installation conflicting with mature landscaping.

9. Recreation Fee

- Fee in lieu of recreation required: approximately \$154,000.
- Payment to be made as a condition of approval.

Stormwater Management Modifications

1. 3:1 Basin Side Slopes (Ordinance Requires 4:1)

- Request for 3:1 slope.
- Justified by basin design and planting requirements.
- Treated as a modification request.

2. Basin Bottom Slopes (>2%)

- Managed Release Concept (MRC) design requires basin bottom slopes greater than 2%.
- Justified by system functionality and drainage requirements.

3. Swale Slopes

- Minimum slope requirements will exceed ordinance standards due to site size and drainage demands.

Additional Conditions & Third-Party Approvals

- DEP General Permit (earth disturbance) required prior to Final Plan approval.
- NPDES/erosion control coordination ongoing.
- Fire protection and utility coordination in progress.
- Development Agreement will incorporate applicable requirements.

The Commission reviewed the outstanding items within the HRG letter, distinguishing between:

- Conditions of Preliminary Approval
- Deferrals to Final Plan
- Waivers and Modifications requiring action.
- Third-party agency approvals

Most requests were described as engineering-driven for safety, stormwater performance, or long-term maintenance practicality. Several items remain subject to final coordination with Township staff and outside agencies prior to Final Plan approval.

Route 11 Improvements

- Right-hand turning lane included in plan.
- Financial security to be posted.
- Installation timing to be addressed in Development Agreement.

Public Comment

Stan Shivell, Teaberry Drive: Had questions about the water line and where it exits. He then suggested creating a development theme that honors the area's historical rural character and raised questions about the site's historical use (agricultural, residential, or industrial) and concerns noted that the proposal may not be following the action plan.

Justin Ross responded that the water is connecting where it enters the property and where it is existing the property in the transmission right-of-way.

Zoning Officer Mark Carpenter responded that:

- The Penterra and McNaughton properties were originally zoned Agricultural/Residential.
- Around 2000, the Board of Supervisors rezoned the area to a UDA (Urban Development Area) Overlay to permit traditional neighborhood and open space residential development.
- The Township Comprehensive Plan was adopted in 2003; it serves as a policy document and is not legally binding.
- In 2025, the Board of Supervisors rezoned the area to include a Data Center Overlay.
- For each zoning amendment, the Township properly advertised and posted notices in accordance with the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code.
- The Planning Commission recommended approval of prior zoning amendments.

Mike Coulson, Oak Ridge Road asked what would occur if Phase 1A (substations) is constructed but additional campuses are not developed.

Justin Ross responded that if other phases are not built, financial responsibilities remain with the developer. Any other components associated with the project would be reimbursed to PPL by the developer. PPL still requires a substation in the region as it is an integral part of PPL's overall program. Approximately \$14–15 million would be set aside as financial security for the township. These funds would allow the township to hire contractors to complete improvements and restore the site to a satisfactory condition if necessary.

Barb Simpson, Teaberry Drive raised questions about the noise pollution and whether it is for the whole complex and cumulative from the multiple phases.

Justin Ross responded that noise studies will be prepared for each phase and cumulatively for the entire project to ensure that each standard is met.

A resident asked how this was done and stated that the Planning Commission did this to the community. Larry Claycomb responded as follows:

- The Planning Commission does not approve or deny zoning ordinances or land development plans.
- The Commission reviews applications and makes recommendations to the Board of Supervisors.
- Decisions must be based on the Township's adopted ordinances.
- The Commission cannot deny a compliant application based on personal preference.
- Every lawful use must be permitted somewhere within the Township if there are no restrictions in place.

Barb McClaren, N. Middlesex Road, what was the purpose of the overlay on that property if the data center had to be allowed.

Mark Carpenter responded that prior to adoption of data center regulations, the use could potentially have been permitted elsewhere in the Township by conditional use or special exception. By creating the district, it limited where the use could have been.

Ashley Aspers, Horners Road raised a question regarding the requirement to have an overlay as part of the zoning ordinance and whether it must be approved for such a large piece of land.

Larry Claycomb responded that you must allow it at a place that makes sense.

John Manta, Wolfs Bridge Road, commented that it is difficult to satisfy everyone involved and is recommending a pause to allow for additional review of data, specifically regarding his concern of Potential vector-borne disease risks (West Nile virus, avian flu, etc.), vegetation growth and maintenance within basins, tree growth rates and adequacy of landscaping to screen lighting and structures, fire protection planning a water sourcing (concern raised about withdrawal from Conodoguinet Creek). He also asked about plans for walkways and sidewalks and whether a recreation area would be set aside.

Tracy Gleim and Charles Courtney clarified:

- Water is not proposed to be withdrawn from the creek.

- Recreation areas are not proposed on site; instead, a recreation fee in lieu (\$154,000) will be paid.
- Landscape plantings will be 2–3-inch caliper deciduous trees and other specified plantings per plan.

Andrew Dymski, Bernheisel Bridge Road raised concerns regarding low-frequency noise impacts and the effects on his children. He then asked whether the township noise ordinances are adequate for emerging data center technology and what enforcement options exist if violations occur.

Justin Ross responded:

- Noise studies will evaluate various frequencies.
- Industry standards and past project lessons are being considered.
- Future phases will include additional studies.

Mark Carpenter responded:

- Zoning Ordinance establishes a 70-decibel limit at the property line for data centers.
- Performance standards also address different frequencies.
- Enforcement action may be taken if ordinance limits are exceeded.
- Ordinance provisions could be revisited in the future if necessary.

Mike Hess, HRG Engineering noted that:

- Full noise study review will occur when submitted.
- Current review phase focuses on preliminary plan compliance. The current noise review applies only to the electrical substation associated with Phase 1A.
- The substation noise levels were reviewed and determined to be well below the applicable ordinance threshold.
- Future phases of the data center campus will require more complex noise modeling and calculations.

Mike Hess also addressed stormwater & soils (MRC Basins)

- Concerns were raised regarding infiltration of stormwater into tight shale and clay soils.
- It was explained that:
 - Extensive on-site soil testing was performed (approximately 450 tests).
 - Only limited site areas are suitable for infiltration.
 - Most of the site will utilize Managed Release Concept (MRC) basins, consistent with current DEP guidance.
- Pre-treatment measures, including grit separators, will be installed before stormwater enters the MRC basins.
- Maintenance of stormwater facilities is required under the Operation & Maintenance (O&M) Plan.
- The Engineer emphasized that stormwater systems require ongoing maintenance and cannot be constructed and left unattended.
- Review comments have been progressively addressed over several months, with particular focus on O&M enforceability.

Mark Carpenter addressed the natural drainage patterns & wetland monitoring:

- It was explained that under existing conditions:
 - Rainwater infiltrates slowly into tight soils.
 - Water typically moves laterally and feeds intermittent streams that drain to the Conodoguinet Creek.
- The proposed managed release approach is intended to mimic existing natural drainage patterns.
- Monitoring of existing wetlands and intermittent streams is proposed to ensure base flow levels are maintained.
- The goal is to mirror natural hydrology, though the Engineer acknowledged the difficulty of doing so on a 700-acre development site.

Mike Hess addressed soil conditions & runoff characteristics stating:

- The site's soils are generally poorly drained and already generate a relatively high runoff rate.
- Because of the poor soil conditions, the difference between pre-development and post-development runoff is less than it would be on highly permeable soils.
- The ordinance-required stormwater thresholds have been met, and in some cases exceeded.

Kerry Whitelock, Elizabeth Way, understands the developer will be monitoring the runoff, but who from the township will be holding them accountable.

Justin Ross responded that they are ultimately accountable to DEP.

Mark Carpenter the clarified:

- The Township holds financial security and enforces a Developer's Agreement.
- An "as-built" survey will be required to confirm facilities are constructed per approved plans.

Ashley Asper, Horners Road, asked what is going to be done to mitigate the pollution runoff into the creek.

Justin Ross stated there was a violation with the sewer force main being installed that occurred during residential development for Cumberland Knoll who never got a permit and after acquiring the site the developer obtained the proper permitting.

Jim Gehr not in agreement with modification #8 for site lighting.

Following discussion by the Planning Commission and public comment, Pursuant to TPF 25-17, Larry Claycomb made a motion to recommend granting the twenty-one (21) waivers requested in Livic Civil letter dated February 23, 2026.

Doug Graham seconded the motion, and it passed by unanimous vote in favor.

Pursuant to TPF 25-17, Larry Claycomb made a motion to recommend approval with the following recommendations:

1. That the conditions listed in review comments of the Cumberland County Planning Commission dated September 9, 2025, be met.
2. That the conditions listed in review comments of HRG dated February 20, 2026, be met.

Doug Graham seconded the motion, and it passed by unanimous vote in favor.

Township Staff Informational Comments, with no discussion: The meeting concluded with no additional staff comments.

Adjourn Meeting

There being no further business, Tracy Gleim made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 10:39 p.m.