



MOUNT JOY TOWNSHIP

• Lancaster County, Pennsylvania •

8853 Elizabethtown Road, Elizabethtown, PA 17022
717.367.8917 • 717.367.9208 fax
www.mtjoytwp.org

Minutes of a Special Meeting of The Mount Joy Township Zoning Hearing Board Thursday, April 27, 2023

1. Vice Chairman James E. Hershey called the meeting to order at 6:00 P.M. in the Elizabethtown Area School District Middle School Auditorium, 600 East High Street, Elizabethtown, PA 17022.

2. Meeting Attendance:

- Members Present: James E. Hershey and Gregory R. Hitz, Sr.
- Members Absent: Thomas N. Campbell
- Alternate Member Present: Robert F. Newton, Jr.
- Township Representatives: Josele Cleary, Esq., Township Solicitor and Justin S. Evans, Township Manager/Zoning Officer
- Lancaster County Court Reporter: Veronica Johnston-Gouck
- Zoning Hearing Board Solicitor: John P. Henry, Esq. of Blakinger Thomas

3. Reorganization of the Board

Solicitor John Henry noted that former Board chairman Thomas N. Campbell recently moved out of Mount Joy Township and cannot participate on the Zoning Hearing Board.

A motion was made by Robert F. Newton, Jr. and seconded by James E. Hershey to nominate Gregory R. Hitz, Sr. as Chairman. The motion passed.

A motion was made by James E. Hershey to nominate Robert F. Newton, Jr. as Secretary. The motion passed.

4. Approve & ratify the minutes of the April 18, 2023 meeting

A motion was made by Robert F. Newton, Jr. and seconded by James E. Hershey to approve and ratify the April 18, 2023 special meeting minutes. All members present voted in favor of the motion.

5. The Zoning Hearing Board Solicitor gave a procedural briefing, noting that parties Sarah Haines and Andrew Goodman have not yet provided testimony. Public comment by Mount Joy Township residents will take place once testimony is completed. Mr. Goodman provided the Board notice via email that he is unable to attend the hearing and does not wish to provide testimony.

6. Old Business:

Zoning Case #230001: [Continued from the January 17, 2023, February 15, 2023, March 9, 2023, and April 18, 2023 meetings]

- a. Applicant: PDC Northeast LPIV, LLC
- b. Landowner: Franklin B. Greiner, Jr.
- c. Property Location: 2843 Mount Pleasant Road, Mount Joy, PA 17552; Tax Parcel ID #461-89922-0-0000
- d. Zoning District: LI, Light Industrial District
- e. Special Exception Requests:

- 1) Chapter 135, Article XVII, §135-163.B & §135-163.C to permit an industrial use on the subject property.

Sarah Haines, resident at 1489 Grandview Road and owner of Grandview Vineyard, began her testimony. She lives at the residence with her husband and three children. The testimony included a slideshow presentation. Aerial images showed the distance between her property and the proposed warehouse estimated at less than 2,400' (approximately 0.4 miles). The decision on this case will have a large impact on their business as well as the larger community. Can the decision be made without knowing the exact use of the building or the number of vehicles coming and going to the site? Has the applicant proven without a doubt that this building will not be detrimental? How can they when most of the impacts are speculation?

Ms. Haines gave a brief history of Grandview Vineyard. Her parents, Larry and Marilyn Kennel, purchased the property in 1984 and constructed their home on it. The 5.5-acre vineyard was planted in 2009 and tasting room opened in 2013. The township approved the wedding venue shortly thereafter. She and her husband purchased the land and family business in 2020. This year is the tenth anniversary of the business. It is the environment and experience, serenity and beauty, and the grand view that sets their business apart. The warehouse threatens the legacy of her family and the heart of what makes their business thrive. She displayed multiple reviews of the business, many of which focused on the view from the property.

What will the warehouse do to their grand view? The wedding cove is located near the southwestern corner of the property closest to the warehouse. The peaceful setting is especially attractive for wedding events. Weddings are a means to bring new customers to the vineyard, sell wine, and grow their business. Music is a large attraction for events and must cease by 9:00 p.m. per the zoning ordinance. They use a decibel reader to stay under 90 dB in order to abide by the regulations and be good neighbors. Sound has a way of traveling across the rolling hills. For example, neighbors can still hear their music despite it staying under the 90 dB limit. Map 4 depicts several neighbors that can hear the music with distances between those residences and the vineyard (Thompson: 2,800', Myers: 4,100', and McVey: 3,800').

The proposed warehouse will be located less than 2,400' from the wedding venue. Noise from the warehouse, parking lots, and dock positions are concerns, as well as the jockey trucks that pull trailers around the site. Jockey trucks are required by law to have backup alarms that typically range from 85-112 dB. 112 dB is over ten times the intensity of their music at 90 dB or less. How will this change the character of their wedding space and deck? How will this affect their ability to market their space, sell wine, and attract customers? Ms. Haines stated that the applicant has not and cannot prove that the presence of this warehouse will not affect their environment and their business. If she had more resources and more time, she would build a case on how diesel pollution affects crops – grapes in particular – or how the presence of the warehouse could affect their labor shortage. It is her hope to continue their legacy and provide this setting to customers.

Exhibit Haines-1 was submitted into evidence and accepted by Mr. Hershey on behalf of the Board.

Attorney McCombie cross-examined Ms. Haines. She confirmed her testimony that the warehouse is approximately 0.4 miles away, as measured at the wedding cove. He distributed the following exhibits:

- Exhibit A-14: 3 photos from Grandview Vineyard looking toward the southwest
- Exhibit A-15: 2 aerial images
- Exhibit A-16: 1 aerial image

Ms. Haines confirmed that the first image in Exhibit A-14 appears to have been taken from a deck near the tasting room's entrance toward the proposed warehouse site. She confirmed that the Greiner property was located over the hill in the distance. The second page shows a similar view though it was not taken from the deck area. Is the Greiner property located over the mature trees and over the hill? Yes, to the right a bit. Is it visible in the photo? Maybe on the far right but not directly behind the Stauffer Road neighbor's buildings. Are the structures in the third image the ones discussed on the neighbor's property? Yes. They include houses, barns, a hoop house, and several trailers on the neighbor's property, not the Greiner property.

Exhibit A-15 was reviewed. Page one was an aerial image with the vineyard property circled in yellow and the neighboring property on Stauffer Road circled in red. Is the property circled in red owned by Ms. Kennedy? She did not disagree. Is the Greiner property to the west of Kennedy's property? Yes, but it is not shown. Does this depict an area of mature trees on the left edge of your property? Yes. Are they the same trees as in the previous images? Yes. Further west, does the image depict a stand of mature trees toward the top left corner? Yes. Are those the same trees seen earlier in images? Yes. The second page contains a zoomed-in aerial of the Kennedy property. Are you familiar with it? Yes. What is shown on the property? A barn, hoop house, and trailers.

Exhibit A-16 was reviewed. It contains a yellow circle around Ms. Haines' property, a red circle around the Kennedy property, and a green circle around the Greiner property. A large hill, the Kennedy property, and two swaths of mature trees separate the vineyard and Greiner property. Do the trees, hill, and structures on the Kennedy property block the

view of the site to some extent? The land, but not necessarily a 50'-high building. Would the building be located on the other side of the hill or on top of it? She could only speculate because the elevations are unknown. Is the Greiner property at a lower elevation than the properties in between? Ms. Haines referred to photos in her presentation, noting that the images taken from outside the tasting room's right side submitted by the applicant have an obstructed view of the warehouse site. The 80' deck on the left side of the tasting room has a different angle with views of the site. There would be views of the warehouse from the deck even though part of it could be obstructed by trees.

She believed that a 50'-high warehouse could still be seen above the tops of the Kennedy structures. She is not sure of the existing buildings' elevations or heights, or that of the Greiner property. As you are leaving Grandview and heading toward Stauffer Road, do you head uphill or downhill? Downhill. Heading on Stauffer Road, is this uphill or downhill? There is a valley in between the two properties but generally across. Can you see the vineyard from Mount Pleasant Road near Greiner Industries? Standing from the road, doubtful. From 50' above grade, she speculated that she could see the vineyard?

Donna Bucher cross-examined Ms. Haines. Would the noise still carry even if the warehouse is not visible from the vineyard? She speculated yes but could not elaborate without knowing the use of the property.

Randy Stevens cross-examined Ms. Haines. What is the most common route whenever the limos and buses come to the vineyard? She assumes they do not turn on Stauffer Road since the signage from the highway directs people onto Cloverleaf Road, Mount Pleasant Road, and then Grandview Road. However, GPS could lead them onto a different route.

Ms. Bucher asked if she can hear Greiner Industries pulling beams across Mount Pleasant Road. Not all of the time, but construction sounds at Greiner Industries can be heard from the deck.

Mr. Hitz referred to the middle of the image on page one of Exhibit A-14. Where is the warehouse in relation to the building with the canvas cover? Behind the hoop house is a stand of trees. Behind the trees is a field. The Greiner site is behind the peak of a hill behind the trees. Part of the warehouse is behind the second stand of trees. Another part of the warehouse is behind the rooftops of the structures located on the Kennedy property. Attorney William Cluck asked for the exhibit to be marked to show the proposed warehouse location and other features being discussed. Attorney McCombie stated that he could not scale the building on the images. Ms. Haines said this is generally shown on the maps in her exhibit.

Exhibits A-14, A-15, and A-16 were moved into evidence. Attorney Henry noted that Ms. Haines was sworn in on the first night of the hearing.

Ms. Haines referred to an image on the sixth page in Exhibit Haines-1. Depending on the angle of where someone would be on the vineyard property, the trees will not block the entire warehouse. She could not speak to the elevation though. Attorney McCombie asked if the top of the structure at the bottom right of the image is the hoop house on her property. It is. She said the pavilion is located near the structure. Attorney Henry asked if the Kennedy property is visible in this picture. The buildings are seen right where the sun is setting in the picture.

Ms. Bucher asked a question that could not be heard on the audio recording. Ms. Haines responded that barns and other structures can often be seen when looking across Lancaster County. No such structures are located in the view of the sunset from her property. Mr. Hershey asked if the photo of the sunset was taken from the east side of Grandview Road? She believes that the photo, which was provided by her neighbor, was taken from the road itself.

Testimony was closed. Prior to public comment, Attorney Cluck noted that the Board made a request about elevations. With the evidentiary record closed, how would the Board like to be provided with the elevation data for the relevant properties, if at all? Mr. Hershey stated that the Board did not request the elevation data. Attorney Henry stated if that is the case, the Board is not to examine any of that information out of this hearing in connection with the decision to be made.

The meeting was opened to public comment with the following citizens making remarks:

- Robert Miller, 2625 Stauffer Road – The subject property is a little more than 106 acres of Lancaster County farm ground where eagles and deer are, and where corn, soybeans, and wheat grow. No warehouse should go there.
- Karen Vanderschaaf, 2341 Stauffer Road (letter read by Ryan Spahr in her absence) – She attended all of the meetings but was out of town for this hearing. She is opposed to the warehouse and recalled a July 2020 meeting where Frank Greiner requested permission to put a one-acre stone pad on the property to store products waiting for delivery with the possibility of constructing a storage building in the future. That would not have jeopardized the character of the community. The warehouse does not meet those requirements or the original intent for the stone pad. She has lived on Mount Pleasant Road or Stauffer Road for 74 years. She and her husband walk on

these roads five days a week. The surrounding agricultural area contains farms and residences in which they feel safe. Where is the evidence that the proposal will not change the character of her neighborhood, as required? The large warehouse and traffic will forever change it. The applicant should provide credible evidence that the impacts will be safe for the residents. Truck traffic conflicts with farm implements, walkers, and bikers. Why do a traffic study after the building is constructed?

- Montana Thompson, Hereford Road – His mother and aunt own the Stauffer Road farm. He spoke to the line of sight issue discussed in Ms. Haines' testimony. How will the warehouse affect the future of their farm and welfare of the animals? Why is it needed here?
- Henry Federowicz, 979 Snyder Road – An impact statement regarding the natural and human environment provided after the warehouse has been constructed does not make sense. His impact statement is based on existing traffic concerns with large vehicles and the physical capability of local roads. The applicant's traffic study assumes the least impactful model. The use should be classified as a distribution center, and it makes no sense to approve a special exception for such. It is flawed to assume that all traffic entering and existing the facility would use the Cloverleaf Road interchange exclusively. What is the cost to the public in terms of services and legal costs? The site plan on the township website shows four buildings. Approving this warehouse will set the precedence for approval of the three other buildings. The residents are fighting for their quality of life while Panattoni fights for a financial interest that does not fit in the community.
- Doris Levin, 1731 Milton Grove Road – Don't take the joy out of Mount Joy Township. Approving the warehouse will be detrimental to this township.
- Donna Coble, 570 Cassell Road – She lives near the Dauphin County line but is here to help all the neighbors around the property as well as the small businesses and farms. What will happen to all of the deer that use the property? Her daughter's car was hit by two deer while driving by the warehouses up Route 230. What is going to happen when more farmland and woods are taken away? The large warehouse does not belong in Mount Joy Township. How long will Grandview stay in business once the warehouse goes in? How about the farms around it?
- Crystal Narkiewicz, 681 Knoll Drive – She and her sons live next to Donna Bucher's house. The noise that will come from the road will be so loud. They use sound machines to drown out the brake retarder sounds. How will she take Mount Pleasant Road by this site to get to the CTC? Trucks are already an issue in the area. The bus stop for her children is at the corner of Knoll Drive and Schwanger Road. Will crossing guards be provided for the children's safety? What about light pollution?
- Carol Hess, 210 Ridge Run Road – This decision has huge ripple effects on families, businesses, and individuals. Her family owns a century preserved farm about three miles from the proposed warehouse location. They will not see the warehouse but will experience effects such as increased traffic that conflicts with moving farm machinery. The nearby creek is downstream from the proposed warehouse. It is used to irrigate their 10 acres of produce that is sold locally. How will the runoff from the parking lots affect the crops and farmland? This is a pending hardship for generations to come.
- Jena Hostetter, 2097 Ridge Road – Ridge Road would be affected by the traffic and population from the warehouse. She has not heard the applicant prove that it would not impact the community. These negative effects would outweigh any positives.
- Finley Kennedy (accompanied by Crystal Narkiewicz, 681 Knoll Drive) – The warehouse will not let him get across the street to his home.
- Rebecca Ulrich-Decamp, 2103 Sheri Lane – She sees many trucks on Ridge Road and more trucks will make it worse. What will the warehouse do to the children and grandchildren if approved? She spoke to the wealth of Carl Panattoni, who does not live near a mega warehouse. She does her part to recycle and save water for the future of Lancaster County.
- Aubrey Bucher, 680 Cloverleaf Road – The carbon footprint, traffic, runoff, and pollution from the warehouse is too much. She works long hours and raises a child. Traffic and noise pollution is already horrible and this will only add to it. What is going into the warehouse? Who is working for the people and not for the profit?
- Jill Breneman, 2487 Mount Pleasant Road – She opposes the zone changes for the warehouses. The proposed warehouse is a distribution center, which cannot be categorized as a warehouse since it involves more intense effects compared to a warehouse. She pointed out the negative effects of diesel, noise, and light pollution as well as lowered property values, increased crime, and production and traffic 24/7. She read the purpose of the

Light Industrial District and stated that the warehouse does not meet those standards. This is not a reasonable exception to the ordinance. A mega warehouse is a heavy industrial use. The amount of traffic alone will have a negative impact on the community. The warehouse will take away from the character of the community. Can the infrastructure handle it? Will the taxpayers have to pay for the upgrades associated with it?

- Hope Wissler, 317 Ridge Run Road – Is it a warehouse or a distribution center? How will they build a one million-sf. building over 50’ high in Light Industrial? Once the farmland is gone you can’t get it back. Once it is built, who maintains the building? When trucks go by her house the windows rattle.
- Thomas McKinne, 2366 Valley View Road – He was previously denied party standing but asked a question that he does not expect to be answered. Water supply is a critical issue. The proper infrastructure is not in the area of the proposed warehouse. This type of building belongs in an industrial park where there is an adequate municipal water supply. Even if public water is extended to the site it will not be adequate. Is the water authority able to supply enough water to fight a fire at the facility? There is not enough volume or rate of flow necessary to manually fight a fire in a facility this large. He spoke to the recent warehouse fire in Emmaus that did not have adequate water supply to fight it. There is no waterway to pull from. This warehouse would be at the end of a water line, which creates firefighting issues. What will be in the warehouse? A fire could cause an evacuation, especially if the local fire companies are not able to extinguish the fire.
- Daniel Sheard, 11 Waterfowl Way – He spoke about representing the residents and the rapid loss of Lancaster County farmland. All of the negative effects of development jeopardize future generations. It takes 500 years to produce one inch of topsoil.
- Jay Forry, 1890 Ridge Road – He runs a business that he opened years ago. The approval process involved the Board knowing what kind of business it is. How can you approve this without knowing what will go into it?
- Jim Everly, Carmany Road (on behalf of son who could not attend) – He and his son have attended each meeting for this project to date. His son is coaching little league and cannot make it. What about the traffic affecting Colebrook Road? There is already a traffic issue along Cloverleaf Road and Colebrook Road headed to Route 441. Another issue is the fact that diesel trucks produce the most pollutants while they are idling compared to when they are in motion, which is what the emissions standards are based on. Who will enforce the idling regulations? What does the warehouse do for us?
- Sophie Kennedy, 231 Scott Avenue – She is Michelle Kennedy’s daughter-in-law. Her husband grew up on the farm and was raised with a good work ethic. If there is no land, there is no food. Growth like this leads to killing off the food supply, starting with her family’s farm. Farms are not just a business, they are a lifestyle. Don’t make a decision that will kill farms and farmers.
- Hunter Kennedy, 231 Scott Avenue – His mom is Michelle Kennedy and he grew up on the family farm. This development will have many negative effects on the farm. The warehouse will eliminate hunting on their property due to Pennsylvania laws.
- Steve Landis, 3529 Harvest Road – He would like his son and family to grow up in an agricultural community when he returns from the Air Force. Do you want to see warehouses when exiting at the Rheems exit? Colebrook Road is not suitable for much more truck traffic. Some of this traffic will go away when the landfill closes. But the trucks from this warehouse will use the shortest route to their destination, including back roads. Approving this will create a precedence that you won’t come back from. The applicant’s statements about traffic and controlling it, as well as controlling the tenant are not realistic.
- Kent Mummau, 2494 Stauffer Road – Stated there are people who want the benefits of the warehouse development but are afraid to speak out in favor of it. He disclosed that his father’s farm is under consideration for a warehouse but is indifferent to it being developed. It will be developed at some point. As a sales rep for outdoor LED lighting, he spoke about dark sky ordinances and technology that can mitigate offsite impacts. There will be limited number of residences impacted by the warehouse’s lighting, though he acknowledged there may be a different experience for the home across the street from the site. The location is appropriate being next to Greiner Industries and the extension of Steel Way Drive along with other measures that will keep most of the trucks off of Mount Pleasant Road. He spoke about tax benefits for the Donegal School District and the negative impacts of housing development.
- Larry Smith, 2361 Rob Drive – Runoff from the warehouse and parking lots will likely be discharged into a basin, but where does it go from there? Presumably a nearby stream. He does not want to live near a warehouse. There will be a significant amount of noise from trucks in addition to Route 283. He is an astronomer and does

not want more light in the sky. Negative impacts on the farming community including loss of crop land. He does not want to see a retail gas facility, a bank, or a warehouse.

- Gary Luft, 2588A Mount Pleasant Road – He pointed out the health and safety issues related to the proposed warehouse, including well water quality, real estate values, traffic and diesel fumes, runoff and wetland effects, sleep of neighbors, impacts on the vineyard and farms with a 24/7 operation. How will vehicles traveling on Route 283 taking a left onto Cloverleaf Road be handled? No improvements to Mount Pleasant Road. What was the outcome of any conversations with PPL? There are already outages in the area. What about water for firefighting and if there was to be something like a battery fire? Is there a safety area for employees of the warehouse in case of a tornado? A local farmer was questioned about where the wash water for his trucks would go at a recent planning meeting. What about this facility? The zoning application narrative falsely states the presence of multiple buildings, so what else is false in the applicant's information? The ordinance speaks about 50,000 sf., not 1,000,000 sf. He discussed a multitude of conditions that could be attached to an approval, if so granted. Why is the property not fenced like Greiner Industries? Will this go to the Planning Commission next?
- Cortney Cameron, 2151 Sheri Lane – What prevents the applicant from using the property as it is zoned? What is the hardship? She attended a recent regional comprehensive planning meeting at which it was noted Nordstrom is struggling to find staff. The proposed warehouse location is not close to public transportation and could have more problems staffing it. She has the same traffic and environmental concerns as many others.
- Kensington Edmond, 2622 Mount Pleasant Road – She grew up here for 18 years and can see the site from her living room. The road is already busy. There are existing safety concerns with getting in and out of her home near the curve. She is going to college for environmental engineering and is disappointed to see the issues that could happen in the community.
- Jackie Smith, 2361 Rob Drive – Only one person has come out in favor of the project while many have voiced opposition, including herself.
- Robert William, 46 Old English Lane – The citizens of the Township should be able to voice their opinion, including those in favor of the warehouse. This is an open process where everyone should have their say. He told the story of him coming to America as a child and his ties to Mount Joy Township. Are you listening to the people? This is a large corporation moving to the area. Pennsylvania has a problem with many young people leaving the state. How will building a large warehouse in the rural community help with this problem? This is a beautiful place. Why do warehouses want to be here? The community should not stand for it. Government is meant to do for the people what they cannot do as individuals. This has the potential to destroy the community for generations. There are many industrial parks where warehouses should be located.
- Ken McCain, Misty Drive – He witnessed a near miss accident at the Norlanco Drive signal at Cloverleaf Road where a vehicle from a local company ran the red light. What will happen when service vans and tractor trailers from elsewhere are traveling that road? 1,600 more vehicles a day is a concern.
- Donna McGuirt, 1926 Mount Pleasant Road – She and her husband moved to the community a little over a year ago. They appreciate the farmland and the pleasant two-lane road. Should they invest in their home or consider leaving for somewhere else? Won't the roads need to be widened with employee traffic? They can live with the farm traffic because of what they do for the community. Has the applicant driven the local roads to see what the community is like? She sees the huge buildings on the way to Middletown. The community is why they appreciate living here. What will happen to the aquifer after it is paved over? Strong communities are built from the inside out, not the outside in.
- Jimmy Everly, 2347 Andrew Avenue – He spoke out against the negative impacts of the proposed warehouse such as noise pollution, light pollution, traditional environmental pollution, etc. The proposal does not meet the requirements of a special exception.
- Deb Burger (no address provided) – She lives 0.8 miles from the warehouse property and knows what kind of noise will come from a distribution center. Now she can hear the frogs and crickets. Growing up in Harrisburg she suffered from insomnia due to the noise and lights. That has dissipated living in this area. She spoke about Pennsylvania's farmland preservation program and how she and her family enjoy the quiet and darkness.
- Steve Ebersole, 9382 Elizabethtown Road – He spoke to the emotion of the public and negative effects on the surrounding neighbors, especially the horse and buggies used by the Amish population.
- Stacia Irwin, 689 Cloverleaf Road – She recounted her hearing before the ZHB for her small business around 6.5 years ago. She was questioned about traffic generation and roadway safety thoroughly during her hearing.

Her clients already have problems getting out of her site and expressed concerns with losing business if traffic gets worse.

- Judy McNally, 843 Cloverleaf Road – She recounted the issues with traffic on Cloverleaf Road where she has lived for 50 years. Congestion makes it unsafe for them to leave their home during high traffic times. She expressed sympathy for residents near the warehouse and the negative effects they will feel. Jake brakes and traffic from developments are already an issue for Cloverleaf Road.

Public comment was closed. Attorney Henry recounted the timeline on the way to the Board's decision. Parties will submit Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law to the Board within 15 days, or the first following business day, after the court reporter has completed the transcripts of the hearing. The Board will then have 30 days to review the materials and render a decision at a public meeting.

Attorney Cluck further explained the objection he raised at the previous meeting about how the decision will be formulated. Specifically, his concern with individual members being polled prior to the official vote when the Board has the opportunity to deliberate on the decision in an executive session. What happens if Board members change their minds between the polling and the night of the decision? Attorney McCombie waived the applicant's right to a deemed approval subject to a decision per the aforementioned schedule.

A discussion took place regarding the role of the forthcoming zoning decision and any other types of applications before the Township, such as the land development plan. The land development plan must have zoning approval before the application can be approved. Furthermore, the zoning decision can be appealed by any party member.

6. Next regular meeting of the Board is scheduled for Wednesday, May 3, 2023, beginning at 7:00 p.m.
7. A motion was made by James E. Hershey and seconded by Robert F. Newton, Jr. to adjourn the meeting at 8:55 p.m. All members present voted in favor of the motion.

Respectfully Submitted,



Justin S. Evans, AICP
Township Manager/Zoning Officer

For: Robert F. Newton, Jr., Secretary
Mount Joy Township Zoning Hearing Board