



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, June 11, 2026

- 1) Chairman Gregory R. Hitz Sr. called the special meeting to order at 6:00 P.M. in the auditorium of the Elizabethtown Area School District Middle School, located at 600 East High Street, Elizabethtown, PA.
- 2) Meeting Attendance
 - Members Present: Gregory R. Hitz Sr., James E. Hershey, & Robert F. Newton Jr.
 - Members Absent: NONE
 - Township Representatives: Justin Evans, Assistant Zoning Officer
 - Lancaster County Court Reporter: Angela Kilby
 - Zoning Hearing Board Solicitor: John P. Henry, Esq. of Blakinger Thomas

Solicitor Henry gave introductory comments and recapped the prior meetings and continuances thereof. He spoke on the role of the Zoning Hearing Board then listed the various parties to the case:

- Mount Joy Township
- Randy Stevens, representing himself
- Diane Edmond, representing herself
- Sarah Haines, representing herself
- Marc & Joelle Myers, represented by Attorney Cluck
- P. Allen Sollenberger, represented by Attorney Cluck
- Bobbi Thompson, represented by Attorney Cluck
- Michelle Kennedy, represented by Attorney Cluck

- 3) Approval of Meeting Minutes

A motion was made by Robert F. Newton Jr. and seconded by James E. Hershey to approve the minutes of the April 14, 2026; April 30, 2026; & June 1, 2026 meetings. All members present voted in favor of the motion.
- 4) Zoning Case #260001 – Continued from the June 1, 2026 meeting
 - a. Applicant/Landowner: Franklin B. Greiner, Jr.
 - b. Property Location: 2843 Mount Pleasant Road, Mount Joy, PA 17552, Tax Parcel ID #461-89922-0-0000
 - d. Zoning District: (LI) Light Industrial
 - e. Special Exception Requests:
 - (1) Chapter 135, Article XVII, §135-163.B – establishment of an industrial use exceeding 50,000 sf.
 - (2) Chapter 135, Article XVII, §135-163.C – establishment of an industrial use not specifically referenced by §135-162.E
 - (3) Chapter 135, Article XVII, §135-163.E – establishment of an industrial park
 - (4) Chapter 135, Article XXVIII, §135-383.B(7) – extension of time in which to obtain a zoning permit and complete construction

The hearing continued where the April 14, 2026 proceedings left off; with Attorney Cluck's cross-examination of applicant's witness Matt Nunn.

- Is your area of expertise in design, approval, development, and implementation of warehouse and light industrial facilities? Yes.
- Are you the Greiners' representative? Correct. But you're not an independent, neutral expert? I am here on behalf of the Greiners.
- You work for Ethos Development, a for-profit development company that specializes in warehouse and distribution projects? Correct. I am here to provide my professional opinion on the application.
- Referring to the subject matter that Mr. Nunn previously testified to, Attorney Cluck inquired about his professional credentials. Mr. Nunn is not a licensed engineer or architect and defers to architect Alicia Heinsen on all architectural matters. He is not a traffic engineer, stormwater engineer, or wetland scientist. He is not certified in noise analysis or a land use planner. His degree is in business administration with a focus in real estate.
- Could the 603,200-sf warehouse building on Lot 1 meet the needs of local users? That is the largest building in the project. Compared to the prior application, this plan proposes several smaller buildings. The 603,200-sf building is to be used for warehouse/distribution. Smaller, local users are better served by the smaller buildings, but he can see a business that needs 600,000 sf. The buildings are designed to be multi-tenanted.
- Lot 2 is proposed to be an industrial park with buildings containing 378,000 and 246,580 sf. Are these the multiple, smaller buildings that could meet the needs of local users? Yes. What are those needs? The expansion or relocation of existing operations.
- How did you receive feedback from the Lancaster County Economic Development Office? Ethos requested feedback on the size of buildings and size of users in this market. Contact includes a phone call with John Biemiller from Economic Development. The goal is to meet the needs of a variety of tenants from warehousing to light industrial. Lancaster County has the lowest vacancy rates in eastern Pennsylvania for warehousing, distribution, and industrial uses. The vacancy rate is not zero.
- Are some of those buildings constructed on speculation? Yes.
- Your testimony spoke to the project guidelines, including minimizing and limiting truck traffic on Mount Pleasant Road accomplished by providing a single access point for trucks across from Archers Lane/Steel Way extended. Any development of the property will involve the construction of Archers Lane.
- How does this significantly reduce traffic on Mount Pleasant Road? It provides the main access point for trucks coming from Route 283 without travelling on Mount Pleasant Road.
- Will the applicant post signs prohibiting this? Yes. Signage will be placed on site upon approval.
- Is the prohibition based on signs and geometry, and not zoning? Attorney Yoder objected, clarifying that the application's statement in the application is related to business signage as opposed to directional signage.
- Do the signs physically prohibit use of Mount Pleasant Road? No.
- You did not propose bollards in addition to signage, correct? Those conversations would have to be done with PennDOT as part of their permit application process.
- Did you propose an ordinance to restrict truck traffic? Attorney Yoder objected. Mr. Nunn confirmed that no ordinance has been proposed.
- Did you propose a PennDOT truck prohibition? They will work with PennDOT for this purpose.

- Are the driver behaviors you want to regulate enforceable by the Township? Mr. Nunn will work with the Township and PennDOT on these restrictions but is unsure about enforcement. Those conversations have not taken place as PennDOT will not begin their process until zoning is in place for the proposed development.
- You testified that the site and buildings were designed to meet the criteria for industrial uses. Did you specify the circumstances in which an industrial use involving light manufacturing, assembly, fabrication, or other similar uses would be permitted in the smaller buildings (#2 & #3)? Yes.
- Would such a use not be allowed if it exceeded the number of trips projected for the warehouse use? Yes, as determined by projected trips from a user based on their operations or a post-occupancy study to estimate traffic impacts prior to receiving a certificate of occupancy. They have provided such studies to PennDOT for other projects and are willing to put this requirement on this project.
- If a proposed tenant wants to occupy Building 2, must they determine trip generation prior to approval for that use? Yes; the user needs to demonstrate that peak hour trip generation is lower than what was estimated.
- Must the proposed tenant use the same ITE land use code that the development's traffic study used to estimate the counts? This is best answered by the traffic engineer who has yet to testify.
- Your testimony states that you reviewed all the application documents and worked directly with all consultants before signing off on the application. Does the location of Lot 3 and stormwater management facilities help buffer the surrounding residences? Yes, by providing an additional setback. The residential homes are located to the east of the site as depicted on Ex. A-9.
- Mr. Nunn confirmed that he did not prepare the traffic study, stormwater plans, environmental and wetland materials, architectural plans, or civil engineering plans but did review them before submission. He relied on the expertise of the various professionals and his experience in developing such projects.
- Did the applicant submit sufficient information and data to demonstrate compliance with the special exception criteria for the proposed development on Lots 1 & 2? Yes, based on Mr. Nunn's professional opinion and not a legal opinion. He is not testifying as a zoning expert. Attorney Yoder objected to the line of questioning related to Mr. Nunn's professional opinion versus legal opinion.
- Attorney Cluck referenced Mr. Nunn's prior testimony that the project was designed in a manner so the uses on Lots 1 & 2 do not substantially injure or detract from the use of neighboring properties or the character of the neighborhood. How can this be stated without knowing the specific users and their uses? They stress tested their assumptions with the various uses that could be allowed there, then took certain uses off the table because of potential negative impacts like excessive traffic. The Zoning Hearing Board ultimately makes the determination on impacts to the neighborhood.
- Referring to Ex. A-4 and the photographs labeled "A" through "E" in Ex. A-5, prior testimony spoke to the industrial character of the surrounding area along Mount Pleasant Road. What about the winery and Myers property? There are residential homes to the east of the property, which is why they designed the site as such.
- Do you consider those to be industrial areas? Mr. Nunn acknowledged the residential uses and the winery that may be up to a half-mile away.
- Does the industrial park detract from the residential area? Not the way it is designed. The 600,000-sf building is located directly across from Greiner Industries and next to Hershey Excavating. View of the larger building is blocked from the residential properties to the east by the two smaller buildings.
- Did you perform an independent study of the technical reports? No. Attorney Yoder objected to the line of questioning about independent experts.

- Did you evaluate alternative site layouts? Yes; a variety of layouts including a two-building layout, different orientations for the buildings to minimize impacts on the residents to the east, and different sizes of the buildings. They went with the current proposal after evaluating the alternatives based on mitigation to the neighbors. He does not personally live near this property nor did he conduct noise studies at the site. He has been present at various times of day to observe traffic.
- What is the peak traffic hour at Greiner Industries? The shift change is between 3:00 and 4:00 pm, generating heavier traffic flow on Steel Way.
- How does the proposed development's peak hour line up with Greiner's? Mr. Nunn deferred to the traffic engineer. He has not spoken with any neighbors or evaluated the agricultural uses adjacent to the site other than viewsheds and other elements he testified to.
- On April 9, 2026, Lancaster Civil Engineering Company (the Township Engineer) issued a letter directed to the Township Manager containing 23 comments for consideration. Mr. Nunn said their civil engineer will address that letter and any follow-up to the comments.
- Attorney Cluck asked if Mr. Nunn is familiar with the March 18, 2026 letter from Transportation Resource Group, Inc. Yes; their traffic engineer will address that letter.
- Is there a written response to this letter and its 15 comments? The traffic engineer will speak on that. He does not know if a formal response was submitted.
- Does the traffic impact study (Ex. 7) assume that Archers Lane has yet to be built? Yes. Did the study evaluate traffic without Archers Lane? The road will be constructed prior to occupancy of the buildings.
- Can you guarantee that PennDOT will approve Archers Lane? Mr. Nunn believed it to be under the Township's jurisdiction but deferred to the traffic engineer regarding approvals for a new road. The developer will fully fund its construction and not request Township money. They will use reasonable means to ensure trucks will use Archers Lane, as it is the most logical route to and from Route 283.
- Is it correct that the applicant is requesting three years to pull a zoning permit and four years to complete construction? Yes; additional timing is needed to gain PennDOT approvals since that can take longer than a year. Their traffic engineer could testify in more depth to this permitting process.
- Does this indicate the project is not fully planned, financed, or ready to proceed? Absolutely not; this project is in the very early stages of the process. Attorney Yoder objected to the line of questioning regarding the basis for this time extension.
- Is your statement correct that public water service is anticipated but not yet confirmed by the water authority? The civil engineer will address.
- Is there adequate public water capacity? He defers to the civil engineer who spoke with the authority and received their letter.
- If public water is not available, will you propose the use of on-site water? We intend to extend the water line as part of the application. They have not evaluated the use of an on-lot water supply as the plan is to connect to the public water system.
- Do you intend to exclude high-cube and last mile uses including Amazon SSD/AMZL under ITE Codes 155 & 156? Yes. Are those uses listed in the Zoning Ordinance? No.
- Is your proposal to exclude such uses binding since they are not addressed in the Ordinance? Attorney Yoder stated that the testimony is bound to the application and can be the subject of any conditions. Mr. Nunn confirmed the applicant's prohibition on uses listed as ITE Codes 155 & 156.

Attorney Cluck concluded his cross-examination of Mr. Nunn. Solicitor Cleary stated that the Township does not have questions for Mr. Nunn.

Randy Stevens cross-examined Mr. Nunn.

- Can you clarify the impacts of traffic flow on local roads? This would be better answered by the traffic engineer.
- Is there currently a traffic flow situation on Schwanger Road and Mount Pleasant Road that needs to be addressed? Mr. Nunn deferred to the traffic engineer.
- Prior testimony used photographs to demonstrate that the area is industrial in nature, including a photo of two tractor trailers passing by the site. Do you recall where they came from? No; the trucks passed by while he was visiting the site. Were those observed trucks used for agriculture or manufacturing? He was not able to tell.
- You stated the site is located across from an industrial use in Greiner Industries, but what about the nature of other surrounding properties? Mr. Nunn clarified that the site and both access points are located across from industrially-zoned land. He acknowledged the presence of residential homes to the east.
- Are there other agricultural businesses near the site other than the winery? There may be, which is why the site is designed the way it is with additional berms and buffering toward that direction.
- Will parking spaces be leased to outside parties? He does not expect to use the facility as one-off auxiliary parking spaces for trailers or tractors.
- How many dock doors will be in the largest building? Approximately 120.
- What about air, noise, and light pollution? Other aspects will testify to those subjects.
- How would the storage of lithium affect the neighbors and the risk thereof be mitigated given the speculative nature of the project? Attorney Yoder objected, citing prior testimony for the provision of sprinklers and a water tank for fire suppression as well as compliance with the building code for the storage of such materials.
- As mentioned in the April hearing, why were Exhibits 13 & 14 not provided? Attorney Yoder objected, noting the application and all exhibits were entered into the record. Nothing was kept out of the record or hidden from the public. There was a clerical oversight with the list of exhibits. Exhibit 14 contains a list of adjoining property owners for the purpose of the Township providing notice of the application.
- Can you provide examples of the type of water storage tank to be used? Mr. Nunn reiterated the architect's statement that the water storage tank will alleviate pressure demand on other users of the water supply in case of fire.
- Are you aware of what is across the road from the stormwater basin proposed on Lot 1? He is aware of the stream that enters the site there. Attorney Yoder objected, stating that forthcoming design and permitting processes for stormwater management must address these impacts.
- How can you verify the use of a particular tenant when it is not currently known? The applicant is seeking approval of the overall use of the site. Performance standards for the project consider standard traffic assumptions accepted by PennDOT. They were conservative in their traffic assumptions and stress tested impacts from various types of tenants.
- Have you reviewed the location of where Archers Lane will intersect Mount Pleasant Road? The traffic engineer will address the specifics of its design, but did confirm that the location is part of their study.
- What is the purpose of the engine brake restriction sign posted near the proposed intersection of Archers Lane? Mr. Nunn noted that all trucks must follow that restriction.

- How will you stop vehicles going in and out of the site from traveling on Mount Pleasant Road, especially if other trucks use the road? The most direct route is via Archers Lane and Steel Way.
- Who sets the standards for the location of stormwater facilities, the county or the Township? An NPDES permit issued by the state is part of the land development process and will further inform design.
- How long can Hershey Excavating utilize the property the way it is? Attorney Yoder objected as the question is speculative and not relative to the application.

Diane Edmond was not present for cross-examination, though her husband was. He had no questions for Mr. Nunn. Sarah Haines was not present for cross-examination.

Attorney Cluck asked Attorney Yoder if Ex. A-10, the list of twelve exhibits attached to the application, would be updated to contain the actual full list of exhibits. He will.

Mr. Hitz questioned Mr. Nunn.

- Referring to the April 14, 2026 meeting minutes, he recalled Mr. Nunn's statement that there would not be a data center or immigration detention center. Does that prohibition include a jail? Mr. Nunn confirmed the facility will not be used for a jail of any kind.
- Mr. Hitz asked if there will be on site management to ensure compliance? They typically use a third party property manager that is available 24/7.
- What is the capacity of the fire suppression water tank? A flow test and analysis by a fire system designer will determine the size. A similar facility using public water typically has a tank capacity of about 150,000 gallons for fire suppression purposes.

Applicant's witness Joshua Hoffman was called to testify as a licensed professional engineer in the state of Pennsylvania, specializing in land development. Mr. Hoffman reviewed his professional credentials as detailed in his resume found in Ex. A-16. He has training and experience in all aspects of the land development approval process, including the preparation of zoning and land development plans pursuant to the requirements of local planning and zoning ordinances. This includes evaluating and planning site access, public utilities, and other similar aspects. He has been involved in the design of more than 30 plans for warehousing projects.

Attorney Yoder offered Mr. Hoffman as an expert in the field of civil engineering as it relates to all aspects of civil engineering including preparing zoning and land development plans in compliance with local and Federal requirements. There were no objections. A motion was made by Robert F. Newton Jr. and seconded by James E. Hershey to accept Mr. Hoffman as an expert in the field of civil engineering and all aspects including preparing zoning and land development plans. All members present voted in favor of the motion.

Mr. Hoffman confirmed preparing the plans that were attached to the zoning application as Ex. 3. The plan set includes an aerial view of the proposed development, existing conditions/survey, overall site plan, grading and drainage, utilities and easements, and truck turning exhibits for emergency vehicles and other trucks navigating through the site. He also confirmed the submission of a comprehensive landscaping plan (Ex. 4), comprehensive lighting and photometric plan (Ex. 5), and off-site improvements plan (Ex. 12). All plans were developed in accordance with the Mount Joy Township Zoning Ordinance and the standards for sketch plans in the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance.

This development will require submission and approval of a land development plan. That process includes plan revisions to address comments from the Township and the specifics of the Land Development Ordinance. Initial feedback from the Township Engineer and Township Traffic Engineer has already been incorporated into the exhibits. A stormwater management plan and PennDOT HOP application will also be developed. The latter will be prepared by the traffic engineer.

Mr. Hoffman provided insight into the land development process for a project of this size requiring outside agency approvals. After gaining zoning approval, the applicant submits a preliminary land development plan to the Township and County Planning for review and comment. This takes several months. An NPDES permit application is sent to the County Conservation District or DEP, which can take the better part of a year for approval. Preliminary plan approval can take around six months followed by the final plan process. PennDOT approvals can take around 18-24 months from scoping to approval for a project of this size. A recorded final land development plan is required before pulling a zoning permit, which can take two to three years to get to. The applicant has limited control over the length of time to obtain an HOP from PennDOT. This is why the applicant is requesting additional time for the zoning approvals.

The NPDES permit requires a complete stormwater management plan pursuant to state and federal regulations, which can be a lengthy procedure. This can be submitted concurrently with the land development plan and takes about twelve months for approval. Both the local and state standards require the management of volume and rate controls to prevent off-site problems.

An existing conditions survey plan included as Ex. A-17 identifies the location of steep slopes, wetlands, floodplains, and other natural features on the property. Steep slopes are shaded and wooded areas are outlined. A stream starts at the road and crosses the site eventually through a ravine. A pond with wetlands and a storage building are also present. Exhibit A-18 contains a letter from the PA Historical and Museum Commission confirming no above ground or archaeological resources on site. The property is enrolled in the Clean & Green preferential assessment program. A note stating as much will be provided on the land development plans.

Mr. Hoffman walked the site with Mr. Nunn prior to the hearing, acknowledging that existing improvements are limited to a storage building and gravel lane. During that site visit he observed materials processing on the Hershey Excavating site to the west with dump trucks entering and existing the site. Equipment were using back up beepers and other noises associated with their operation. The operations at Greiner Industries included the movement of cranes and other machines throughout the property. Noises included grinding, machine operation, back up beepers, etc. Trucks and other traffic could be heard from Mount Pleasant Road and Route 283.

He referred to Ex. A-4, noting the character of the area around points A, B, & C as industrial in nature. Area D is adjoined by industrial zoning. Area E eastward is zoned agricultural and contains residential homes.

The site plan in Ex. A-9 depicts the subdivision of the site into three lots. Lot 1 contains a cross-dock distribution facility with the main access point being a four-way intersection with Archers Lane and Mount Pleasant Road. Lot 2 is an industrial park with two single-load buildings. There will be a shared access driveway between Lots 1 and 2 as well as a passenger vehicle access point onto Mount Pleasant Road. No improvements are proposed for Lot 3, which separates the development from Stauffer Road. There will not be access to the site from Lot 3. The Greiners also own a long flag lot on the eastern side of the site between Stauffer Road. Mr. Hoffman provided distances between adjoining residential properties and the closest corner of the closest proposed building:

- Kennedy: 401'
- Hollinger: 303' & 612'
- Myers: 633'

The applicant proposes an integrated development with shared access and internal circulation, landscaping, stormwater management, and utilities. All three lots have been designed to meet the area and bulk requirements of the Zoning Ordinance. This data is provided in the top right corner of Ex. A-9 and is enlarged in Ex. A-19. He provided additional information in the zoning chart as a response to comments from the Township Engineer.

A supplement to Ex. A-22 was distributed in addition to new exhibits A-26, A-27, & A-28. Mr. Hoffman recounted receiving the Township Engineer's review letter dated April 9, 2026 and a subsequent phone call to discuss. Most comments were related to land development and labeling issues on the plans. Ex. A-26 is the site plan with markups

related to the Township Engineer review. Addressing those comments did not result in a significant change to the plan layout. Additional information includes parking data, area and bulk standards compliance, landscaping, street trees, and access points.

Mr. Hoffman addressed how the plan meets these requirements, concluding that Lots 1 & 2 are compliant with respect to the proposed uses. He also confirmed that only uses permitted by-right or special exception will be allowed in buildings 2 & 3. At least 70% of their combined areas will be used for industrial purposes. No outside display of goods, materials, or refuse will be allowed on Lot 1 or 2. He reviewed the parking areas, landscaping, and building orientation, noting their goal is to retain as much of the existing woodlands as possible. Street trees are also governed by the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance.

Mount Pleasant Road does not contain sidewalks. The Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance requires additional roadway improvements like a sidewalk or pathway. Ex. A-20 is an "ability to serve" letter from the Elizabethtown Area Water Authority with confirmation of public water capacity for the project. Ex. A-21 is a letter from the Elizabethtown Regional Sewer Authority engineer stating that public sewer capacity is not currently available but will be once its expansion project is completed. That expansion should be complete before this development needs connection and service.

Ex. A-22 now contains both an offsite improvements plan and truck turning plan. Public water is located near the Cloverleaf Road/Route 283 interchange and will be extended through Steel Way, Archers Lane, and along Mount Pleasant Road. Public sewer is present in Steel Way and would be extended to the site via Archers Lane and along Mount Pleasant Road. All three buildings will be connected to public utilities.

Further evaluation is needed if public water cannot be provided to the site. A community well for approximately 12,000 gallons per day must be permitted by DEP. Up to 250,000 gallons would need to be stored in a fire suppression tank if connected to an on lot well. Water usage is anticipated to be minimal, mainly for bathrooms. The building code contains provisions for the fire suppression system, including tank capacity and infrastructure to be installed prior to occupancy. A third-party flow test will be required through that process.

The Archers Lane extension would connect Steel Way with Mount Pleasant Road. Mount Joy Township owns right-of-way for the future Township road. An HOP is required to connect Archers Lane to the PennDOT-owned Mount Pleasant Road. The new road is identified on the Township Official Map and will be constructed by the applicant at no cost to the municipality. Mr. Hoffman identified the location of Archers Lane on Ex. A-4 and the routing of truck traffic from Route 283 via Steel Way.

Internal circulation was discussed, referencing the site plan in Ex. A-9 and reiterating the truck restriction on Mount Pleasant Road. Trucks will be restricted from using the passenger vehicle access point by physical means. The applicant intends to pursue restrictions with PennDOT pertaining to truck usage of Mount Pleasant Road to and from the site. However, PennDOT will not review plans until zoning approval is in place. They have exclusive jurisdiction over Mount Pleasant Road including any driveway and road connections to it. That process begins with a scoping meeting between PennDOT, the applicant, and the Township. Attorney Cluck objected from the perspective that this discussion is relevant to the land development stage.

Upon reaching a stopping point for the night's hearing, Solicitor Henry announced a continuance to Thursday, July 16, 2026 at the Elizabethtown Area School District Middle School Auditorium (600 E. High Street) from 6:00 – 9:00 pm.

- 5) A motion was made by Robert F. Newton Jr. and seconded by James E. Hershey to adjourn the meeting at 9:06 P.M. All members present voted in favor of the motion.

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Justin S. Evans". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, looping initial "J".

Justin S. Evans
Assistant Zoning Officer

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