



Mount Joy Borough Special Council Meeting July 23, 2026, beginning at 6:30 pm

Call to Order: President Hall called the meeting to order at 6:30pm.

Members Present: Councilors Deering, Gruber, Hall, Haigh, Hollcraft, Kark, Trave, and Youngerman were present.

Others Present: Borough Manager, Mark Pugliese, Assistant Borough Manager, Jill Frey, Codes & Zoning Officer, Brett Hamm, and Community & Economic Development Coordinator, Rachel Stebbins.

A **MOTION** was made by Deering, with a second by Kark, for approval of the agenda for the July 23, 2026, Special Council Meeting. A **MOTION** was made by Youngerman, with a second by Deering, to amend the agenda for item 6, the 175th Celebration, and to break down the one motion for funding into two separate motions, one for the drone show funding and one for the replacement band funding. *Amendment carries unanimously.* Haigh mentioned a typo on Item 5 and that the date should read July 6th. Hall called for a vote on the main motion. *Main motion as amended carries unanimously.*

Public Input Period:

Jen Angeles, 219 Marietta Ave., spoke on Item #5 concerning Little Chiques Crossing conditional use hearing. She said she is opposed to Chiques Crossing and feels it will have long term effects on traffic, flooding, stormwater issues, keeping wildlife protected and major impacts on the surrounding community.

Dave Christian, 227 Park Ave., said he is opposed to Little Chiques Crossing. He said it is uncertain what Council's plan is for this evening. He said it will either be they are going to more aggressively oppose, which he supports, or they are going to be less aggressive, which will be very disappointing. He said he hopes Council will agree to do everything that was approved at the July 6, 2026, meeting.

Dale Murray, 125 Farmington Way, said he was really happy with the last meeting of Council and the three motions they put in place concerning Little Chiques Crossing. He said he hopes it stays that way.

John Milar, 365 N. Barbara St., spoke concerning Little Chiques Crossing. He said we need to consider the danger this project is going to bring with flooding and traffic. He said the creek is dangerous when it floods. He said he is not against the project; he is against the location of the project.

Hall said that he asked for this meeting so he will be the main contact on it. He said that based on the Borough Solicitor's recommendations and on the Council's fiscal responsibility, maybe it is time we stopped spending the resident's money to try and stop something that is not going to be stopped. He said we may be able to put conditions on Rapho, but we are going to spend an unknown amount of money for the Solicitor, Traffic Engineer, and Floodplain expert, yet the project will continue.

Youngerman said he questions if we are dealing with someone that is trust worthy with the developer.

Haigh said that he read the Solicitor's response and does not entirely agree. He said he feels the Solicitor should go and that it would give us additional back up as opposition. He said he feels the number of permissible units is more that what is allowed and thinks there is a better place to put a development like this within Rapho Township. He said we need the Solicitor to go to the conditional use hearing, then it goes to the court and let the judge decide. Haigh said he would be willing to go as an expert witness and testify as a professional engineer. He feels we can change this, not at the Township level, but going in front of the court. He said he is not in favor of taking us out of the hearing.

Deering said that he was able to read the letter from the Solicitor and that she is not saying no, she is just saying that the Borough has to present evidence. He said he agrees with Mr. Haigh as far as the number of units allowed. He said he thinks we can prove that this will have a detrimental effect on the surrounding community. He proceeded to list some of his concerns.

Environmental and Wildlife Impacts:

Loss of wildlife habitat through fragmentation and edge effects.

Disruption of wildlife movement corridors, increasing vehicle collisions and isolating animal populations.
 Increased human-wildlife conflicts, including litter, feeding of wildlife, and encounters with protected species.
 Noise and light pollution disrupting nocturnal animals, nesting birds, and other sensitive wildlife.
 Introduction of invasive plant species from landscaping and disturbed soils.
 Degradation of water quality from stormwater runoff carrying sediment, nutrients, road salt, oil, and other pollutants into streams and wetlands serving the park.
 Loss of biodiversity due to changes in adjacent land use.
 Impact on the Passive Recreation Park:
 Diminished natural character and scenic views enjoyed by visitors.
 Increased noise from traffic, commercial activity, and construction.
 Increased litter and unauthorized access into protected areas.
 Pressure for additional parking and park facilities; not designed for higher use.
 Increased vandalism or illegal activities along park boundaries.
 Reduced visitor experience for hiking, birdwatching, fishing, photography, and nature observation.
 Stormwater and Flooding:
 Increased impervious surfaces leading to greater runoff volumes.
 Higher peak stormwater flows entering neighboring streams.
 Increased downstream flooding risks.
 Erosion of streambanks within the park.
 Greater maintenance costs for municipal stormwater infrastructure.
 Traffic and Transportation:
 Significant increases in traffic on roads owned and maintained by the neighboring municipality.
 Increased congestion at shared intersections.
 Additional wear and maintenance costs on local roads.
 Reduced emergency response times.
 Increased pedestrian and cyclist safety concerns near the park.
 Public Safety:
 Increased demand for police, fire, EMS, and rescue services through mutual aid.
 Challenges evacuating visitors during emergencies.
 Wildfire concerns if development borders forested areas.
 Infrastructure Impacts:
 Strain on regional water resources.
 Increased demand on shared utilities.
 Additional pressure on regional transportation networks.
 Planning and Land Use Concerns:
 Incompatibility with the comprehensive plan of the neighboring municipality.
 Conflict with county greenway, conservation, or open space plans.
 Failure to provide adequate buffering between development and conservation land.
 Loss of an important scenic gateway or rural landscape.
 Precedent for future development surrounding the park.
 Economic Impacts:
 Potential reduction in eco-tourism and outdoor recreation benefits.
 Increased municipal costs without corresponding tax revenue.
 Potential reduction in nearby residential property values if the park experience declines.
 Air Quality and Climate:
 Increased vehicle emissions.
 Loss of carbon-sequestering forests.
 Urban heat island effects adjacent to natural lands.
 Quality of Life:
 Increased noise and traffic affecting nearby residents.
 Loss of dark skies due to development lighting.
 Reduced opportunities for quiet outdoor recreation.

Deering said he is not saying development is bad, but we need to be smart, and this development is too dense for where it is located.

Haigh said that if this development were somewhere else, it would not have these impacts and that all the things Deering listed are true.

Hollcraft said it seems that our entire legal argument is that their own reading of their Ordinance is incorrect.

Hall said that for clarity, a motion to reconsider is a procedural motion and basically says that any member who was in the majority on the original vote can introduce a motion to reconsider. If it receives a second, and then a majority of those present now, then it is reconsidered; in other words, reversed and not there.

A **MOTION** was made by Hall, with a second by Haigh, to reconsider the Borough Council meeting and services of a professional in traffic engineering and a professional in stormwater hydrology and floodplain mapping to assist the Borough Solicitor in objecting Vista Block Chiques Crossing. Opinion of the chair the nay's have the vote. *Motion fails; majority voting NO.*

A **MOTION** was made by Youngerman, with a second by Gruber, to hire the band, The Nines, for the 175th Celebration on September 12, 2026, for a fee of \$800. *Motion carries unanimously.*

A **MOTION** was made by Youngerman, with a second by Gruber, to approve an additional payment of \$1,360 to cover the additional expenses for Open Sky related to the drone show prior cancellation and authorization to sign them for the 175th Celebration on September 12, 2026. *Motion carries 7 to 1; Hall voting NO.*

A **MOTION** was made by Youngerman, with a second by Gruber, to approve the appointment of James Yoder as an alternate to the Planning Commission. *Motion carries unanimously.*

Youngerman asked what the appropriate time would be to move that Council appoint Bruce Haigh to represent the Borough at the conditional use hearing. Hall said that the appointments come from the Chair, so there would not be an appropriate time, but that it is on his radar. Haigh said that he would ask the Manager to check with the Solicitor first to see how she wants to handle it. Deering said that Mr. Haigh may be too close to the project to represent. Haigh said he tends to agree but could possibly give expert testimony. He said the Solicitor has to run the hearing from our side and has to do it the way she sees best fit.

Any Other Matter to Come Before the Committee:

Hall appointed a Committee of Bruce Haigh, Josh Deering, and Dave Christian, a Borough resident, to work in consultation with the Solicitor in preparation for our objector party status to Vista Block Chiques Crossing Conditional Use Hearing.

On a **MOTION** by Youngerman, and a second by Kark, approval was given to adjourn the meeting at 7:35pm. *Motion carries unanimously.*

Respectfully submitted,



Mark I Pugliese
Borough Manager/Secretary