	1
1	COUNCIL FOR THE BOROUGH OF DUNMORE
2	SAPA PUBLIC HEARING
3	HELD:
4	
5	Monday, June 14th, 2021
6	
7	TIME:
8	7:00 P.M.
9	
10	LOCATION:
11	DUNMORE COMMUNITY CENTER
12	1414 Monroe Avenue Dunmore, Pennsylvania
13	
14	COUNCIL MEMBERS:
15	MICHAEL DEMPSEY, President
16	THOMAS HALLINAN, Vice President - absent
17	CAROL SCRIMALLI
18	VINCE AMICO
19	THOMAS EHNOT
20	JANET BRIER
21	ELIZABETH ZANGARDI
22	MICHAEL P. PERRY, Esquire, Solicitor
23	TIMOTHY BURKE, Mayor
24	VITO RUGGIERO, Borough Manager
25	MARIA McCOOL, RPR OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER.

MR. RUGGIERO: Next is the public hearing pursuant to the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code on Dunmore Borough Resolution 2021-1; the consideration to enact the proposed comprehensive update to the Dunmore Borough Zoning Ordinance, which is going be to SAPA. So, gentlemen, do you have anything?

MR. SWARTZ: Andrew Swartz,

Environmental Planning and Design, 100 Ross

Street, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15210. So I

think you all have the ordinance in front of

you or had the opportunity to review the

proposed ordinance which was described as a

comprehensive -- your existing ordinance was

originally drafted in 1977 and I think had some

amendments along the way.

It is kind of a reflection of the overall SAPA effort in terms of taking the major objectives that were defined as a part of the regional comprehensive plan and then bringing them kind of to fruition within each of the municipalities individual zoning ordinances.

So through the long process and

again COVID added an extra 12 months to the whole effort, the communities have been working together on individual ordinances of which they would be sharing parts and pieces so anything from definitions to specific standards.

One of the key things we'll get into the specifics of Dunmore and you guys asked questions and I know you had a previous meeting in terms of some issues came up related to the landfill.

But when the efforts started if we took all the zoning maps of all of the municipalities that were participating, there were about 90 different zoning districts. So one of the things that the SAPA group really wanted to try to do is streamline efficiency and get commonality where it was appropriate to have commonality.

What ultimately we were able to strike consensus and agreement on is boiling down those nearly 100 districts down to 25.

Your ordinance has 12 zoning districts. Your current ordinance has 12 zoning districts. So it really isn't changed. We added one overlay which is the landfill overlay.

So in some cases, some of the basic essentials of land use, etc., that you'll find in say one of your downtown districts will be very similar to say Clarks Summit, a community that has a similar or even some portions of Scranton where they're similar in character, meaning the building having the lot sizes and those types of things.

Each of the land use lists though is unique. So everybody has kind of their own set of land uses. And that was kind of worked through extensively -- Steve can describe how many meetings in terms of going through and reaching agreement.

And part of kind of the scheme of zoning across the region, you guys will have kind of a sharing agreement that you're sharing land. So you're municipal responsibility, the legal responsibility that you normally would have as per kind of a Municipalities Planning Code as well as court opinion you're only responsible what is currently in your ordinance.

So you don't in your current draft, the proposed draft don't necessarily

accommodate all land uses. Some of the other communities are maybe picking up some uses that you didn't necessarily feel were appropriate for you and vice versa.

You picked up some land uses that you won't find anywhere else in terms of this partnership, landfill being the example. You guys picked up the landfill.

So the number of communities that were participating in this was a really good effort and really pinpoint the types of uses that we thought should be in your community and ones that could be accommodated somewhere else. That's what you did. So with that said, the landfill currently, the way you treat the landfill it's a conditional use.

You're continuing to treat it as a conditional use. We moved land use. It's still an industrial district. We took all the conditions and standards and attached them.

Part of the discussion that was happening back as we were working with the committee was what would happen in the future if the landfill if they added solar panels. That's becoming a trend.

Would they be capturing gas and doing things like that? Maybe there would be some other things going on. And so we thought it was best to set the landfill in terms of an overlay. It would give you more flexibility in the future to be able to deal with it.

The standards that you guys reviewed at the last meeting related to the conditional uses are the same as you currently have in the books. So that was an unfortunate thing. I think there was a lot of discussion and a lot of questions. The standards were exactly the same.

As we were working through kind of the ordinance putting the draft together, everybody wanted to be able to maintain those standards, not really change anything. So things like you had an issue over structure, the interpretation of structure related to landfill.

That was the only thing that kind of adjusted and would mirror basically what had been agreed upon and decided previously through some other actions.

So the current draft the one that is

advertised right now, the only change that happened in terms of that, if you go back under the 6.5 FF description, if you compare it to the first paragraph in terms of your conditional use in your current ordinance, the only change that has been made is the reference to the trash being really kind of for Lackawanna County municipalities. That has been removed.

There has been two other additions and it's just the additions are pointing specifically to the Solid Waste Act as well as the DEP in terms of the requirements the DEP would be imposing and in terms of any landfill type of operation, any future application. If you had another application it would cover that.

MS. BRIER: That was my question.

The expansion approval for 44 years, who knows what's going to happen. So say we needed to amend this ordinance -- and I know we have that five-year window where we have to pay for everyone else's. Would that be the case if we needed -- if something occurred that was unanticipated because this is, you know, kind

of a massive undertaking.

 $\mbox{MR. SWARTZ: Steve, I think this is} \\ \mbox{more of a question for you.} \\$

MR. PITONIAK: Steve Pitoniak,

Planning Department Manager for Lackawanna

County. The five year change is just for the

five years once the ordinance is adopted.

Right now of the nine municipalities, six have

adopted the ordinance.

The last three are Dunmore, Waverly Township, which is also meeting tonight and the City of Scranton. We're anticipating Scranton will take action sometime in July. The ordinance doesn't go into effect until all nine municipalities approve it. Once it's approved, that five-year window --

MS. BRIER: Steve, we really can't anticipate what may or may not -- a different type leachate treatment, you know, we have no idea, you know, what may or may not come up. I mean, I just think we'd be crazy to lock ourselves in for five years in light of what has just been proposed.

MR. PITONIAK: The five-year window only comes in if there is a major change that

would affect the other municipalities. For instance, with the landfill, okay, because Dunmore is the only municipality that has the landfill.

If you decided that you want to eliminate the landfill from the borough, that affects the other eight municipalities because now we have to find someplace for the landfill. But as long as you're maintaining that and you're changing just the internal structure, it doesn't affect the other municipalities then that five-year window doesn't have it for you.

It's only if you're eliminating something or adding something that impacts the other eight.

MS. BRIER: Okay. Thank you.

MR. PITONIAK: And again, just to reiterate that Waverly Township is meeting tonight. We're hoping that City of Scranton does it by July. And that's when everything will take effect for the nine municipalities then all approve it.

MS. BRIER: And what if one didn't?

MR. PITONIAK: If one didn't, we're back to the drawing boards because we have to

find where those uses would go. And the only other caveat just to make everybody aware of it because the municipalities must be continuous --

MS. BRIER: Right.

MR. PITONIAK: -- if for some reason the City of Scranton votes this down, Dunmore is out.

MS. BRIER: We're out. I read that.

And how about, you know, we're the only ones,
of course, with the landfill. So are there any
uses that, you know, we benefit from the other
say Clarks Summit has that -- some use that we
wouldn't have?

MR. PITONIAK: Yeah, offhand I don't have them. But there are a couple uses that nobody else took. I believe -- yeah, most of them are what we call locally unwanted land uses so things like --

MS. BRIER: What's that?

MR. PITONIAK: Could be a gentleman's club. There is a whole variety.

There is also some other uses that I think from an impact standpoint meaning traffic and those types of things, some of the other

. .

municipalities took on because they already have those uses.

And that was kind of the ideal thing when you have as many communities working in the partnership as you guys did that you're able to kind of share, spread it out a little bit. And everybody has something. And so they weren't going to zone it out so-to-speak if it was already there.

But if it could free them of some of the other uses, that's what they did. And I -- no community -- this was one of the things we were all working towards -- no community took on more uses of those locally unwanted than any of the other communities.

So think of it as playing poker.

Everybody threw in the same number of chips and we had to sort out who was getting which chips. That's how they kind of made the gentleman's agreement and everybody stayed true to that. There were things like group homes, okay, every community still has their burden in terms of group homes.

There's a couple uses that were kind of treated from a land use standpoint a little

differently. There may be other federal legislation that is out there. There's other court legal protections. Solicitor, if I'm saying anything that you don't agree with chime in.

We didn't want to -- the group in terms of the SAPA partnership, didn't want to get into kind of exposing themselves to some sort of challenge over something like a group home. If you look in your ordinance, you'll still have that type of use.

So anything that was on that fair housing side of things you'll still see that. But most of this stuff was really related to more industrial uses which you guys have. You took a lot of the burden. You freed yourself of agriculture uses as where West Abington and Newton kind of picked up those types of land uses. So it -- that has worked out very well.

And to add -- so the language if you look at that 6.5 FF description, the reference what we adopted throughout that entire section most of it was already there. You guys have already had that kind of imbedded was the

general reference to the current standards of the Department of Environmental Protection.

So, yes, you have some specific things. But most of your standards reference to whatever the regulation the DEP has. So you don't necessarily have to go change any detail in the ordinance if you adopt the ordinance because you just did a blanket kind of description to what those standards are.

Again, most of that was already there. We just -- in terms of kind of reviewing having some discussions just kind of tightened that up a little bit.

MR. AMICO: Is this updated yet?

MR. PITONIAK: Yes, everything's
been advertised. So everything that you guys
are looking through tonight has gone through
that advertising period that you needed to
have, etc.

I just wanted to raise one point that AJ mentioned. Through this whole process over the last two and a half years, whatever it's been, we probably had between virtual, meetings because of COVID and in-person meetings with all the municipalities, we're

probably at 65 or 70 meetings and at least a half dozen meetings virtually and in person with representatives from Dunmore.

As AJ said, everybody was dealing -we'll take this if you take that kind of thing.
So it's worked out because no municipality has
a burden larger than they had before I don't
believe.

MR. SWARTZ: In fact, I think some of the municipalities have much less of a burden. There is some communities that were not providing for if they were doing their own ordinance as they were currently before and you really read the law and you followed what the MPC and what the expectation is, they weren't -- they were exclusionary in some areas.

They had to fix that problem. There were some problems that weren't going to be easily able to fix that problem. That's what brings them to the table to the discussion. So some communities, obviously Dunmore was probably one of those communities you had a little bit more leverage because you had something like a landfill that you could free

everybody else up with having to deal with.

There's a whole series of land uses like everybody scratches their head, we're really by law supposed to have a place for that? And it's like, yeah. And then if you're Clarks Summit and you're built out, it's like where's that going to happen. So it was a good effort. So hopefully we --

MS. BRIER: When will Scranton meet?

MR. PITONIAK: Our meeting sometime
this month I believe the Planning Commission
was going to have their first meeting and
hopefully because of the process that they have
to follow, Scranton has to do three readings
with their Council to approve things.

We're hoping that they could do it in July. And just one other thing, the whole purpose behind SAPA beginning 12 years ago was economic development and avoid sprawl. And I think this ordinance has done both. It's going to be beneficial to Dunmore and to Scranton and a couple other municipalities because it will aim economic development to those municipalities.

As AJ said, West Abington doesn't

want a heavy industrial park. Well, Dunmore already has one. The Keystone park you have a lot of empty buildings there. So now it's going to force people to -- instead of developing in West Abington or Newton to come to Dunmore, the infrastructure is already available. The structures are already there. And it's going to have an economic benefit for Dunmore.

MR. AMICO: Those communities won't have the ability to -- West Abington, -- it's not a permitted use.

MR. PITONIAK: There is only a handful of communities that is a permitted use. And in the scale of development, you know, a place like say Clarks Summit may be able to have a little bit of industrial. But it would be small scale because the parcels are so small.

MR. SWARTZ: And Steve's absolutely right, from a land management standpoint the idea of doing the zoning on a regional scale would have made a lot of sense. If you're trying to protect your character and trying to promote economic development, what you guys

have gone through is exactly -- if I was coming in to do a training session and talk to the community, that's what I would be advocating for. You guys are already steps ahead in terms of going in that direction.

MR. PITONIAK: One of the other things that we are working on, the County Planning Commission right now is a regional freight plan. And we're working with Lehigh Valley, Lebanon County, the NEPA organization and Berks County because development if you don't -- if you're not aware of it is headed this way.

The Lehigh Valley is basically built out. And any available land is so expensive that developers aren't even looking at it.

They're looking here. And we have plans in our office for 10 buildings in Olyphant and Throop boroughs of 900,000 to 1.2 million square feet, the warehousing.

You've already got those buildings in Dunmore. So hopefully you could use that to get this development into where it's already planned for or where it's available.

MR. SWARTZ: And I do apologize for

1 wearing shorts and sneakers. My little thing 2 here, it's little hard to put a pant leg over 3 the top. Sorry. Any questions related to the 4 current draft before entertaining public 5 Anybody have any questions? comment? 6 MR. DEMPSEY: No? I guess we'll 7 take public comment. 8 MR. RUGGIERO: Anything from the 9 So, Mr. Chairman, that will close the public? 10 public hearing and at 7:00 the regular Council 11 meeting will commence. 12 MR. DEMPSEY: Okay. Thank you. MR. RUGGIERO: 13 Thank you. 14 MS. SCRIMALLI: Thank you very much. MS. ZANGARDI: 15 Thank you for coming. 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

$\mathsf{C} \; \mathsf{E} \; \mathsf{R} \; \mathsf{T} \; \mathsf{I} \; \mathsf{F} \; \mathsf{I} \; \mathsf{C} \; \mathsf{A} \; \mathsf{T} \; \mathsf{E}$

I hereby certify that the proceedings and evidence are contained fully and accurately in the notes taken by me of the above-cause and that this copy is a correct transcript of the same to the best of my ability.

Maria McCool,

Official Court Reporter

(The foregoing certificate of this transcript does not apply to any reproduction of the same by any means unless under the direct control and/or supervision of the certifying reporter.)