

Date: May 26, 2026

Final round of comments for supervisors

Comments are based on Exhibit 3 – Revised Proposed Curative Amendment dated May 18 2026

1. Amendment to Article 15 – Landowner is proposing to modify the current table in Article 15.9.4.1, page 15-17 from a range of Frequency Band, Cycles per second, to an Octave Band Center Frequency. This matches the standard used by the American National Standards Institute and is designed to allow consistent measurement of sound pressure levels by all users. Recommend confirmation by Acoustical engineer. Noise from data centers is known to be an issue primarily related to the cooling systems used. Cooling systems operate at low frequencies, which are not well accounted for with measurements of dB(A) alone. As such some level of dB(C) needs to be included to address these concerns.

Landowner recommends adding the “overall sound level shall not exceed a 30 minute Leq of 55 dB(A). We would refer the supervisors to Exhibit 4 for some noise related definitions. Does this ease the restrictions by doing an average? Not sure of the benefit when there was already language for an adjusted average. In a later portion of their amendment, Section 8.1.b., they suggest a +10dB(A) for any buildings that are zoned CM. Have several concerns regarding this additional level due to existing medical clinic (eye center), zoo (Clyde Peeling) and “Grandfathered” residential uses at the north end of the CM district. Also would recommend considering differing levels for day versus night time levels for any residential use, no matter the District. Louden County, Va. has a table in their zoning ordinance, “Table 7.05.03-1” that might serve as the basis for a table we can use for our ordinance. This table shows different noise levels for different uses, and we would add a day/night section as appropriate for uses. It may be ok to consider higher noise levels for certain uses within the Commercial Manufacturing District after reviewing multiple tables from other ordinances, but should not ever exceed our noise protection standards. *Some members are concerned that, considering the proximity to other uses and sensitive receptors, there may be harm to the community by allowing an increase. This increase may only cause greater complications with the ordinance.* Also, would recommend acoustical engineer review any final version to explain values, such as “30 minute Leq” and appropriate use of this. Louden County, under section 7.05.03C has a different method of measurement for sound levels as do many other ordinances and would like acoustical engineer to provide guidance on approach. Our current ordinance, under Article 15.9.1.2 Nuisance standards states “ The proposed operation shall

not : result in noise or vibration exceeding the AVERAGE INTENSITY of the ambient noise or vibration occurring from other sources at the boundary line". **Article 15.9.4.1 Noise Protection Standards** states" No person shall operate or cause to be operated on private or public property any source of sound in such a manner as to create a sound level which **EXCEEDS THE LIMITS** set forth in this Section, when measured at property line upon which the emission occurs. The **maximum permissible sound-pressure levels for smooth and continuous noise** shall be as follows: (Refers to table modified in number 1). These work together, but are not the same noise levels. Article 15.9.1.2 deals with nuisances, whereas Article 15.9.4.2 protects from noise levels exceeding certain values. As of the date of our last meeting, we had no information to determine the nuisance standard criteria (average intensity of the ambient noise at the boundary line). They provided several plan sheets (See Exhibits 2.a.ii, 2.a.iii, and 2.a.iv.) Exhibit 2.a.ii notes it represents Route 15 with normal traffic levels. At the May 20 meeting, PNK engineer was asked if they had performed field testing to create this model, and he said they had not, but were planning on beginning this process. This plan sheet also lacks any numbers for dB levels, unlike Exhibits 2.a.iii, and 2.a.iv, which do show numbers. We are unsure how an accurate model can be created for the chillers and chillers with 15' noise wall without having a baseline model of ambient noise levels to start with. Also, if you review the plan showing the normal operations with chillers, versus the normal operations with chillers and 15' noise wall, there is only an approximate 2dB noise level drop at the boundary with the Village. It appears that this is a first approach to noise mitigation, as there appear to be noise mitigation systems that can provide much better reduction in noise levels. (See Exhibit 7 for online links for such resources). We believe an actual noise study in the field must be conducted, that it account for day versus night levels, and that such a model should be used for assessing any data accessory use equipment (noise generation) as well as any sound absorptive designs done. There are also concerns regarding line of sight effects of noise on residential uses, whether such uses are at the boundary line or not. As noted before, would highly recommend we request an expert opinion on these matters.

2. **Definitions**, Article 2, Section 2.2 – Landowner suggest adding Data Center, and Data Center Accessory use – These are consistent in language to other ordinances reviewed. Commission would recommend the addition of "Sensitive Receptor" and "Warehousing" as part of this amendment. Sensitive receptors will be used later to help better define distance between primary structures and noise levels no matter what the District the structures are located within. Sensitive receptors are residential uses, zoo/zoological gardens, and other uses that are occupied by full time residents. A suggested listing from our schedule of uses is provided as Exhibit 13, but should be further reviewed. Warehousing is

currently a permitted use, but needs clearly defined to prevent future issues. Recommend -

**Warehousing** is the indoor storage of goods, products, and materials, often accompanied by the receipt of bulk products and the separation and distribution of those products to another warehouse/logistics facility or directly to individual end-users.

3. **Landowner is proposing** amending Article 10, Section 10.2 use regulations for the commercial manufacturing district, Section 10.2.1 and adding Data Center and/or Data Center accessory use as a **permitted use**. This would also modify the table of schedule of uses. **Commission is recommending conditional use**. An option suggested by the solicitor was to consider an exception to the conditional use for anyone who has already completed all requirements of a conditional use during the amendment process, but this would require a substantial amount of information we have not yet received based upon conditional use submittals in Article 26.2. As an example, we have not received, nor have they yet completed an ambient noise level study, and such methods for completing this are still under review. From the municipal planning code, it appears that we should be provided additional information under **Section 916.1.c.1** to evaluate the proposed curative amendment.
4. Under Section 16.20, the landowner is proposing **modifying the supplemental use criteria**. Our comments follow
  - a. **(#1 per their curative amendment) Commission ok with #1 dimensional standards**. This refers to Article 10.2, Height and coverage requirements.
  - b. **(#2) Data Center Setbacks** – recommend this be denied. We believe the use of distances between the primary structure of a data center or the accessory use to a sensitive receptor can provide much clearer guidelines. The word adjoining residential district does not address earlier concerns regarding several existing uses with the CM district (zoo, medical clinic, grandfathered residential uses). Use of distances to sensitive receptors is recommended. The range of these distances is highly variable. Many ordinances use setbacks (equivalent to our yards- Article 10.4.3.3 for this purpose) but prefer using distances between primary structures to eliminate any concerns over districts and/or roadway boundaries. Separation distances are still to be determined as they range from roughly 150' up to 1,000' There is not yet consensus on the distance to be used. We recognize the reason for paragraph #2 comment, but the language about “more restrictive when owned but applicant...” makes for a confusing

ordinance that could be interpreted incorrectly or not be advantageous to the township during future applications

- c. (#3) Landowner is recommending Data Center accessory uses be set back a minimum of 100 feet from any road frontage and 50 feet from all other property lines. Commission does not agree with this. It is well known that accessory uses (chillers, generators) are of greatest concerns for noise and air quality. Given the minimal noise from the existing substation along Enterprise Blvd., we are less concerned about substations setbacks due to low noise levels, provided they are properly screened (still need to be back sufficiently for safety) than we are about noise/air issues with chillers, generators, and other equipment such as large wall-through fans. Noise level readings were taken at the existing electric substation on Enterprise Blvd, south of Russell Road, and it appears the substation creates barely perceptible noise levels ( 35-37 dB(A)) with no other noise levels present. Consideration should be given to using similar language separating physical structures of accessory uses from primary structures on other sensitive receptors. If abutting CM use not containing a sensitive receptor, standard yards in 10.4.3.3 apply. Also, Data center accessory should be, to the extent feasible, set in the yard (if ground based) that is the most distant from a residential sensitive receptor. At the May 20 2026 meeting, the landowner noted that if they can meet noise levels, separation distances should be less of a concern. We still have line of sight concerns for roof or ground mounted, which is less a setback issue and more of a noise issue. Generation of noise can travel significantly further than the property line, and is one of the reasons for the italicized comment for #1, paragraph 2, above.
- d. (#4) The minimum parking requirements in the amendment appears to match language in many other ordinances. Normal concern with parking is spillage of vehicles onto public highways, but Data Centers should use very little parking so Commission is ok with the parking change.

5. Landowner is proposing to have minimum of 1 loading space. Commission is ok with this change. Landowner can have additional loading spaces, so choice on requirement is based on their specific need.

**6. Landscape buffer – see letter b below as well.**

The Commission did not agree on whether to accept this or not. Some felt the impact of route 15 was sufficient to not require any additional buffering unless the use abutted an adjoining residential use. Also, this would currently only affect Data Centers and not other large facilities

such as warehousing. Others had concerns on the lack of any buffering for residential uses that do not directly adjoin the Data Center, such as residents across route 15 near Purity Candy. Our current screening requirement does not require screening unless we adjoin a residential district (by definition), and therefore route 15 and other roads do not count as they provide a ~~break in ownership.~~ What they state seems to match what we require, so this should probably be ok

- b. Commission has the following comments. The landowner made some modifications to this language from their April 24 2026 amendment. The change was a definite improvement in the original language if landscape buffers are defined as Screen Plantings, From our ordinance, the definition of screen plantings is " A vegetative material of sufficient height and density to conceal from the view of property owners in adjoining residential districts the structures and uses on the premises on which the screen planting is located." This addresses any concerns on actual height at maturity of plantings. For this, the Village, Commercial, Agriculture, and Rural Residential Districts abut. Village ,Agricultural, and Rural Residential allow for residential uses, Commercial and Commercial manufacturing have existing grandfathered residential uses as well, so would protect them.
- c. Ok
- d. Ok – This section helps address concerns of tree species from previous meetings (See Exhibit 9.a. , ***provided Landscape buffers are defined as screen plantings.***
- e. Ok
- f. Recommend that 180 days is too long and timeframe to replant dead / diseased plants should be more restrictive. We recognize there is a cycle in spring and fall that works bests for re-planting, but if a plant needs replaced, and it is within the growing season, it should be replaced sooner.
- g. Ok
- h. We should consider adding either an artist rendering or AI generating rendering of the landscape buffer from the nearest residential boundary line to the primary data center building to show what the buffer will actually look like at
  - i. Initial planting
  - ii. 10 years growth
  - iii. Full maturity – with date of full maturity

7. Ok with this provided the distance between the accessory use and the primary structure of a residential use complies with the distance established in 4.c. above.

8. **Noise – recommend full review by acoustical engineer** – our specific comments are included below.

- a. Section 15.9.4.1 should include a table based on various use types. Also, the CM District abuts Village, Agricultural, Commercial, and Rural Residential and does abut Woodland preservation. The inclusion of Agricultural is needed to address the residential uses located on Beck's Farm, and at the north end of the CM district. Again, this could be addressed via a table with defined uses and noise levels of sensitive receptors. Do not concur as is written. They also need to comply with the overall sound level that is established, not just the maximum permitted sound pressure level.
- b. As noted under #2 above. This does not give consideration to some existing uses within the CM district (zoo, grandfathered residential). We do believe levels higher than 55dB(A) should be allowed with the CM district, as almost all ordinances, including our own allow higher levels, but need additional information to establish that level. They noted a maximum of 65 dB(A) for both day and night. There is not concurrence among the commission on higher levels in CM district and needs more discussion.
- c. Ok with periodic maintenance testing time and dates.
- d. Don't concur as written without a sound study to show these levels. Continuous use. Looking at letter c above, and this language, you can do periodic maintenance testing one generator at a time and create a much lower noise level than if you are running all your generators at once. This provides no noise level limits and could be at dangerous levels without some kind of control. (see definition of maximum sound pressure levels in Exhibit 4.) They have also proposed setbacks of 100' from any road frontage and 50 feet from all other property lines for accessory uses, which could put full time running generators with no noise controls very near to residences. Also, need to make sure power outage means a full loss of power and not just a reduction in load. EPA currently defines emergency generator operations as 50 hours per year, but could change. (Exhibit 10.b.) We need further clarification as to why there is a need to exceed noise levels for an additional 2 hours after restoration of power.
- e. Concur on study performance, but need an acoustical engineer to confirm specifics of the testing to assure (2) locations are sufficient and that they represent more than just the highest anticipated noise levels. Again, Louden County Virginia has different methods of measurement

under Section 7.05.03 C. and want to confirm whatever method is used also allows us to confirm both day and night time levels, especially for residential uses.

- f. Need acoustical engineer to review the "post certificate of occupancy" sound study. It appears the sound study will address all four corners of the property line. The sound levels will be confirmed versus any table we would establish in #2 above.

9. **Water usage**— Some commission members believe letters d thru g can go away with language in letters a, b, and c. Some believe it does no harm to leave letters d-g (with noted comments for d) as it verifies water usage is make-up levels and also provides additional protection should a challenge declare b or c invalid.

a. Ok

b. Ok

c. Ok

- d. Ok, , but comment are as follows – the landowner has stated that the Data center/Data Center accessory use will use minimal "make up" water only for the chiller systems after the initial charge. This make-up water is only to address minor system losses and/or losses due to maintenance. Some residents have expressed concern over the actual volume of "make-up" water. The commission has contacted PA American Water (PAW) and they committed to providing a maximum amount of water that could be provided without creating a loss in pressure or volume to current users. They have noted this level is much higher than 10,000 gallons per day. They also stated that they look at both normal usage and usage during firefighting activities in coordination with local fire officials. **If ANY user requires amounts greater than PAW ability to maintain normal services all upgrade costs are paid by that user.**

Would suggest requiring Data Center to provide their water usage for each of the first three months (not billing, just volume) to confirm minimal usage and to see if any added conditions should be imposed on future developers. We are awaiting information from PAWC on reasonable water usage they can support with their current system.

e. Ok

f. Ok

g. Ok

10. **Wastewater disposal analysis** – We suggest review by Gregg Township Municipal Authority, but appears ok.

11. **Electric grid language** is the same as other ordinances. – At our May 20, 2026 planning commission, it was noted that many Allenwood residents received notice of informational open house scheduled for June 3, 2026 at the Clinton Township Volunteer fire company (See Exhibit 12.f.). Given this is a significant upgrade to transmission lines, but was also noted by PPL as “meeting growing energy needs, support new customer facilities and strengthen service by upgrading equipment and adding new pathways to reduce outage risks for the region” , there were several questions regarding how this costs was assessed for developer versus the normal residential user. It appears at least some of this costs will be borne by any users on the PPL system, so it was suggested we require submittal of a study similar in scope to that required by Montour County Data Center zoning amendment, Section H. Energy Systems/Supply. See Exhibit 5.a.: An order was also recently issued by the PUC regarding this type of occurrence, and can be seen on Exhibit 12.e., “But-For” hyperlink with a summary on pages 117-129.

12. **Emergency Response Plan** – review by Fire Department

- a. OK; impacts should identify any additional service requirements, not only training, but equipment needed to support emergency services response unique to the Data Center.
- b. Ok
- c. Ok
- d. Ok
- e. OK, but should also provide funding to cover any specialized apparatus or equipment identified under a above and provide pro-rated share of costs for initial purchase and periodic replacement of the apparatus or equipment. Pro-rated share is based on other data centers that may require similar apparatus or equipment.
- f. Ok
- g. Ok
- h. Ok – This matches word for word the language in Montour County’s ordinance under their Section F.2 Safety. Montour also has a Section F.1 that should be reviewed by the Fire Chief and provides additional protection to reduce likelihood of internal spread of a fire. (See Exhibit 5.a.).

**13. Other comments**

- a. We discussed the possibility of adding a decommissioning Article as part of this amendment, but the commission does not believe such decommissioning is needed. The value of the internal equipment is very high, and the continuous costs of an escrow account is burdensome to the developer with little gain. Only concern is if goes bankrupt, that any potential hazardous materials be removed from the data center (as an example, can chiller/cooling liquids leak and how this is handled.) Consider adding a decommissioning requirement (and amount) for any data center having hazardous materials contained within cooling systems and/or battery storage systems
- b. We also looked at other provisions, such as vibration levels. While Data Centers or Data Center accessory uses will create minimal vibration to adjoining structures, our current vibration level may need reviewed in the future (Article 15.9.5 needs work).
- c. Will need to add Data Center and/or Data Center accessory use to our schedule of uses.
- d. We, the Planning Commission of Gregg Township, recommend denying the revised Landowner Curative Amendment dated May 18, 2026 based on our comments.

Dan L. King

- Dan L. King, Chairman, Gregg Township Planning commission

