

**MINUTES**  
**MIFFLIN COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING**  
**THURSDAY, JANUARY 23, 2014**  
**MIFFLIN COUNTY COURTHOUSE, MEETING ROOM B – 3:30 P.M.**

**ATTENDANCE**

**Members**

Dan Dunmire, Chair  
J. Neal Shawver, Vice Chair  
Thomas B. Lake  
Brent Miller, Secretary  
Dave Pennebaker  
Jim Spendiff  
Kent Spicher

**Staff**

Bill Gomes, Director  
Jim Lettiere, CD Administrator / Assistant  
Director  
Nicole Singer, Office / Grants Manager

**Others**

Michael Fisher, SEDA-COG Housing  
Development Corp  
Lucas Parkes, The EADS Group  
Robert Postal, MCIDC  
Chad Stafford, Penn Terra Engineering

**Call to Order**

Dan Dunmire, Chair, called the meeting to order at 3:30.

**Record of Public Attendance**

Dan reminded everyone to sign the attendance sheet.

**Reorganization – Election of Officers**

As provided for in the Mifflin County Planning Commission Bylaws, Bill Gomes opened the floor for nominations of 2014 officers, beginning with Commission Chair. Neal Shawver made the motion for Dan Dunmire to continue serving as Chair, which was seconded by Kent Spicher and unanimously approved. James Spendiff then made the motion for Neal Shawver to continue as Vice Chair, which was seconded by Brent Miller, with all voting in favor. A final motion was made by Neal Shawver for Brent Miller to continue in the role of secretary and seconded by James Spendiff with all voting in favor. Following the election of officers, the meeting was turned back over to the Planning Commission Chair.

**Approval of Meeting Minutes**

Discussion was held about the spelling of some of the names on the attendance section of the December 2013 minutes. Dan asked for a motion to approve the minutes for December 19, 2013 with the name corrections. A motion was made by Kent Spicher to accept the December minutes with the correction of Ed Fike and Lisa Nancollas name in the attendance section. The motion was seconded by James Spendiff and all members voted aye.

**Subdivision and Land Development Review Committee Report**

Jim stated the Subdivision and Land Development Review Committee reviewed seven (7) applications on January 16, 2014. Six of the applications were under municipal ordinances and one was under the county ordinance. Jim indicated he would like to review three (3) of the seven plans briefly.

Jim outlined the review comments for the Mann Edge Terrace subdivision in Lewistown Borough and stated the plan is related to the Mann Edge Terrace housing development and includes a non-building lot for access to Kish Creek. He stated that the tax parcel number is incorrect on sheet 2. The applicant has submitted a waiver from the 3 to 1 ratio requirement for the lot due to environmental concerns. In addition, there was a waiver for the driveway due to this being a land subdivision at this point. Furthermore, a waiver was presented for the sewer as well as one for the wetlands.

Chad Stafford, Penn Terra engineer, addressed the board about the previously prepared environmental covenant and the submittal of an environmental plan that was going to be submitted under a separate cover. His reasoning for delay in submitting the environmental plan was to review it first with his client.

Robert Postal, MCIDC representative, addressed the board. He had a copy of the covenant with him, which was given to DEP and governs the use of the site. He was hoping once he has a chance to go through the covenant with Chad, it would not be necessary to prepare an environmental plan as prescribed in Borough of Lewistown Subdivision Ordinance Section 4.203. He was told a plan would still need to be prepared.

Chad addressed the four pages of comments that were received. He stated the creating of new lot lines doesn't create a nuisance or a health issue on the community. The main reason for the land division is so that SEDA-COG Housing Corporation doesn't have to put the land in their name and that MCIDC holds responsibility for the land.

Bill replied to Chad that he needed to note on the plan the long term provisions for lot 3 and indicate that the subdivision was not going to create a problem in the future.

Jim then spoke to the Chad about the waiver for the driveway. The existing driveway is not shown on the plan. It is shown on the plan as a depressed curb at this point. James Spendiff said the concern was that MCIDC has access to lot 3. Rob stated there is an easement agreement between SEDA-COG Housing Development Corporation and MCIDC to have access to lot 3, since there is no direct driveway to this lot at this point. The agreement is specific for lots 1 and 2, but Chad will need to pull the agreement to see the exact language.

Jim discussed the waiver for the wetlands. He noted that Chad has a disagreement with the data about the wetlands. Jim commented that he spoke to Laura in the GIS Department. He suggested that perhaps Chad and Laura could meet to discuss the wetlands on the property. Jim questioned the granting of the waiver.

Chad disagreed because as a professional he is not comfortable certifying a document with inadequate data in regards to wetlands. He feels that the problem lies with the GIS Department taking global information and recording incomplete data. He sees this not only in this county but many counties. Chad believes there is no wetland at the site. A question was brought up by Bill if there is anything on the development plan addressing the wetlands and Chad responded no due to the fact he feels there are no wetlands.

Dan spoke up and said that GIS is probably making assumptions due to shorelines since this property goes up against Kish Creek. Chad added he understood that especially since there was a stream going through this property before development. Neal asked if there was a process in place to help with this issue. Dan responded that the only sure way is to hire a consultant to go to the site.

Bill recommended moving forward and that the County Planning Commission pass on their recommendations and concerns to the Borough Planning Commission. Bill stated that before the Borough Planning Commission meeting Jim needed to be able to revisit the plan and make sure all the comments are updated.

Jim then reviewed comments on the Reedsville Asphalt Facility in Brown Township. He stated this is a land development plan that is very premature due to their need to obtain a variance and special exception for the development. The facility is located about a quarter of a mile from the intersection of Three Cent Lane and SR 655. The land is zoned industrial, but the land to the north is residential. Concern was presented as to whether they had the right to present the plan due to the fact that the deeds have not been updated to reflect ownership by Centre Lime and Stone, Inc. There are concerns over the size of the proposed driveway, traffic on Three Cent Lane and access from SR 655. The plan showed some berms were created to the east and north as buffers and this was confirmed. Landscaping requirements were a concern due to missing information for parking isles as presented and meeting rear yard requirements which are near SR 655. Questions were raised about the plan that the proposal will not create any dangerous noise vibration, smoke and dust, dirt or other hazardous material in accordance with provisions of Brown Township's Subdivision Land Development Ordinance.

The third plan to be reviewed was Nehemiah Martin in Oliver Township. The plan proposes to add a 55' x 80' addition to an existing 44' x 60' building. Jim stated the name of the registered surveyor should be on the plan, as well as, lot number and any official Parcel Information Number established by the County, and Deed Book and Page Number of the tract. In addition, a plan narrative should be placed on the plan to state the purpose of the project. The boundary information on the plan was based on a prior subdivision plan and not on an actual field boundary survey. This property lies within the 100-year floodplain, and the floodplain should be delineated on the plan. Additional access points to U.S. Highway 22/522 will require a PennDOT Highway Occupancy Permit and a copy of the permit should be submitted to Oliver Township. A stormwater plan should be included with the plan and submitted to the Township Engineer for review. Another question was whether the applicant entered into a Development Agreement and Financial Security Agreement in accordance with Article 7 of the township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance. A new plan was to be submitted by the meeting time, however, the Planning Department had not received the plan.

Neal Shawver next asked if there could be discussion held on the Zimmerman plan. This plan proposes to create lots 2 and 3 as non-building lots at this time, as well as create a lot addition for the existing residence. This plan is just for subdivision at this time. It is a proposed site for a Life Science complex, however, at this time this is just a land subdivision not a development plan. David was not familiar with the location and asked for clarification as to its location. The property lies off Ferguson Valley Road.

A motion was made by James Spendiff for approval of the Subdivision Review committee comments for the six municipal plans and was seconded by Neal Shawver. Members voted aye with one abstention by David Pennebaker.

A motion was then needed to approve the comments for the plan in Wayne Township under the county ordinance. A motion was made by Neal Shawver and seconded by Thomas Lake. The motion passed.

Name of Plan: Reedsville Asphalt Facility  
File Number: 2014-01-001  
Tax Map #: 14, 01-0104-000 / 14, 01-0106BB-00  
Municipality: Brown Township (Municipal Ordinance)  
Applicant Name: Centre Lime & Stone Company  
Land Owner Name: Edgewood Estate  
Plan Preparer: Hawbaker Engineering

**Action Taken:**

The County provides comments only.

Centre Lime & Stone Company, Inc. is proposing to locate an asphalt facility in Brown Township, Mifflin County, PA. The facility will access the intersection of Three Cent Lane and Airport Road. The property is located close to SR 322, a major highway, which will allow for safe and convenient access for vehicles supporting the facility. The property is zoned (I) Industrial and allows for manufacturing.

**Basic Plan Information**

The abutters to the east of the subject parcel should be shown on the plan. ( Brown Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, Article 7 Section 7.302 A.17. ) The tax parcel numbers on the application and the labels on the plan are missing the zero digit before the last three numbers. Please add these digits to the tax parcel numbers. The absence of the zeros creates inaccuracies within our plan tracking software.

**Subdivision Information**

On February 20, 2013, the subdivision plan combining B2 Lot#1 with Tax Parcel Number 14,01-0104-000 was recorded. This lot addition subdivision created a combined acreage of plus or minus 80.050 acres. The Assessment Office never received deeds reflecting this action. Therefore, the lots were not combined. In December 2013, a lot addition subdivision added B2 Lot #1 with Tax Parcel Number 14,01-106BB,000 totaling 14.5163 acres, however, the deeds for this action have not been processed at this time. Therefore, Lot B2#1 is currently owned by Edgewood Estates while Tax Parcel Number 14,01-0106BB-000 is owned by Centre Lime and Stone. There is a pending sales agreement between both parties for the transfer of the 2.06 acres from Edgewood Estates to Centre Lime and Stone, Inc. However, does Centre Lime and Stone have standing to make application for development on a parcel they do not currently own?

**Soils**

According to the County GIS files, some portion of this property appears to have prime farmland soils.

**PennDOT HOP / Municipal Driveway Permit**

Will the 70' and 80' ingress, egress, regress and utility easements provide access to State Route 655 and or Carriage House Lane? If so, this should be noted and shown on the plans and a HOP may be required if it provides direct access to SR 655.

\*The Hawbaker representative stated the easement will not connect to Carriage House Lane.

#### **Private Street / Shared Driveway**

Is the sixty (60) foot access easement located on the northern boundary line going to be a right-of-way dedicated to the Township or will it be a private right-of-way or neither? On sheet 3, why does a proposed access drive to Three Cent Lane show variable widths before it has been constructed?

#### **Street Names**

If multiple parties are to use a private drive, the roadway will need to be named. Street names are to be coordinated with the County GIS (Mapping) Department. There is a fee associated with the street naming.

#### **DEP Sewage Planning Module**

A copy of the DEP Component 2 Individual and on Lot Disposal of Sewage should be submitted to the Brown Township Planning Commission. Plan approval should be submitted to the Brown Township Planning Commission. Plan approval should be contingent upon receiving an approval from DEP following the filing of this form. The agreement of sale dated October 17, 2013, states on Page 9 Number 17 Sewage System Permit there is no existing community sewage system available for the property. It also references that Centre Lime and Stone should contact the local agency for requirements related to obtaining a permit for the individual sewage system. General Note 9 states sewage service will be provided by Brown Township Municipal Authority. Is there a letter from the Brown Township Sewer Authority indicating the availability of public sewer?

\* The Hawbakwer representative stated he has a letter from the Sewer Authority.

#### **Water Service**

A letter from the municipal water authority acknowledging availability of public water should be submitted to the Brown Township Planning Commission.

\* The Hawbaker representative stated he has a letter from the Water Authority.

#### **Signature Blocks on Plan**

The Mifflin County Planning Commission Review Certificate's signature lines should contain a line designated as Plan Tracking Number and the second line stating Chairman or Designated Representative.

#### **Lot Addition**

Why are there lot combination symbols combining which appears to be Tax Parcel Number 14,-01-0166DA to the 25' side setback? The plan narrative or notes on page 1 make no reference to such a combination.

\* The Hawbakwer representative stated the intent was not to show a lot addition but that the two sections are one of the same parcel.

#### **Zoning**

A variance is required to allow the sixty (60) foot easement on Residentially Zoned Land. A special exception is required to allow for Manufacturing Heavy in an I Industrial District based on Article XI Sections 1103 of the Brown Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance. The presentation of this plan before a decision has been rendered by the Brown Township Zoning Hearing Appeals Board appears to be premature. Any decision on this plan should await this decision.

#### **Land Development**

A traffic circulation diagram should be included with this plan submission to verify adequate site circulation. If a private street is proposed, the plan should be reviewed by the Brown Township Engineer. A letter from Douglas Hill, P.E., or Wooster and Associates concluded that the trip generation does not generate fifty (50) or more peak hour trips or three hundred (300) total trips per day and a TIS is not required. Can a traffic analysis be completed? In 2007 a traffic study was done for the Edgewood Estates proposal showing the need for improvement to the intersection at Three Cent Lane. A follow up report was completed for the Mifflin County Planning Commission in the summer of 2012, which identified the need for intersection improvements including a left hand turn lane if additional traffic demands are placed here. Considering the decision by the applicant to use Three Cent Lane to access State Route 655, a traffic analysis should be warranted, despite the assertion of the applicant they do not meet the threshold. The existing residential development, the residential development that is proposed by the owner of Edgewood Estates, the proposed Quillis Creek development and the proposed Sheetz must be considered which all have an impact on this intersection. The last thing you want is for the Township to be held responsible for improvements that will be needed for Three Cent Lane and the intersection. Has Three Cent Lane been evaluated to meet industrial use? Does the road meet the Township standards? This needs to be evaluated as well as the 21 foot wide cartway to handle truck traffic. The plan needs to show turning movements for trucks entering and leaving the proposed access road onto Three Cent Lane. The plan barely shows Three Cent Lane and does not show its connection to SR 655. This needs to be shown on the plan.

\* The Hawbaker representative stated he will add an insert map showing access to SR 655.

#### **E & S / Stormwater**

Centre Lime and Stone has applied for an individual NPDES Permit from the PA (DEP). Stormwater drainage provisions should be included with the plan submission. The stormwater plan should be reviewed by the Brown Township Engineer. Does this plan propose over an acre of earth disturbance? This proposal may require Erosion and Sedimentation (E & S) provisions included with the plan submission. The applicant should contact the Mifflin County Conservation District.

#### **Other Comments:**

1. Is the top soil berm along the northern and eastern property lines a buffer between the R-3 Suburban Residential Zoning District to the east and the R-1 Rural Residential District to the north?

\*The Hawbaker representative stated yes.

2. A ten (10') foot wide landscape strip shall be provided along the rear property line Article XVII Section 1707 landscaping and screening 1.C.
3. The ends of all parking rows shall be separated from the driving lanes by planted islands Article SVII Section 1707 Landscaping and Screening 1.D Planting Island shall be constructed in accordance with Article XVII Section 1707 Landscaping and Screening 1.H.

What are the driveway widths entering the property?

4. Has Centre Lime and Stone entered into a Development Agreement with the Township in accordance with Article 8 Section 8.400 Development Agreement?
5. Has the applicant demonstrated to the Township that this land development plan will not create any noxious, dangerous, noise vibration, smoke, dust, dirt, traffic congestion or other objectionable disturbance through detailed expert review in accordance with Article 4 Design Standards 4.203 A.-J. inclusive? If so, are there documents available to substantiate the project will not adversely impact the residential areas to the north and east?  
\*The Hawbaker representative stated these matters are being discussed at the public hearings currently being conducted as part of the variance and special exception requests.
6. Has the lighting plan and road profiles been reviewed by the Township Engineer to insure compliance with Township Standards.
7. There are potentially karst formations on the site. Has a geologist been retained for these purposes?
8. Signage information should be provided as part of the land development plan.
9. Please confirm the right-of-way

Name of Plan: Boreman, Douglas L. & Tabitha A.

File Number: 2014-01-007

Tax Map #: 15, 12-0113-000 / 15, 12-0126-000

Municipality: Derry Township (Municipal Ordinance)

Applicant Name: Douglas L. & Tabitha A. Boreman

Land Owner Name: Douglas Boreman / Rufus M. and Anna N. Yoder

Plan Preparer: Colony, Charles Maynard, PLS

**Action Taken:**

The County provides comments only.

This project involves the subdivision of the Douglas L. and Tabitha A. Boreman property. Lot #1 was previously separated from the parent tract by subdivision under name of Robert E. Snook et. Al. dated March, 2013, recorded as Inst. # 2013-005051. The current plan provides for Lot #2 of 3.0225 acres with long existing SFRD, on lot well retained by the Boremans and be used as an additional part of the Juniata River Game Farm. There are no improvements planned for the Residue.

**Basic Plan Information**

The tax parcel numbers for the properties owned by Rufus M. and Anna N. Yoder and Douglas Boreman are labeled incorrectly. They are 15,12-0113-000 and 15,12-0126-000 respectively.

**Subdivision Information**

Lot 1 consisting of 5 acres was subdivided in October 2013. In accordance with the Decatur Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, Part 3 Section 22-302 G. (2), all lots shall front on a public street, except that such frontage may be located on a private street where such a private street is permitted as set forth in Table 1 and Subsection (D). The plan calls for a fifty (50) foot easement and there is no reference to a private street.

Is the easement a private road? If so, it only has a ten (10) foot wide cartway which is not adequate for two way vehicular traffic. Currently it appears to look more like a driveway.

**Clean & Green / Agriculture**

The property is in an Agricultural Security Area and should be noted on the plan.

**Soils**

According to the County GIS files, some portion of this property appears to have hydric soils. Hydric soils can indicate the presence of wetlands. The hydric soils information should be shown on the plan.

**Setback Lines**

The setback lines should be shown on the plan as prescribed in the Decatur Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Part 6 Section 22-603.2.A. (10)).

**PennDOT HOP / Municipal Driveway Permit**

A notation about the requirement stating: Any access via a State Highway to lots shown on this subdivision plan will require the issuance of a PennDOT Highway Occupancy Permit (HOP). PennDOT regulations provide that a Highway Occupancy Permit is required prior to constructing, altering or exceeding the permitted capacity for any access connected onto a State Highway. A Highway Occupancy Permit is also required prior to altering the existing pattern or flow of surface drainage or directing additional surface drainage onto or into the highway rightof- way or highway facilities. Approval of this plan neither implies nor guarantees permit approval by PennDOT.

**Private Street / Shared Driveway**

If a private street is proposed, the plan should be reviewed by the ( \_\_\_\_\_ Township/Borough) Engineer. If a private street is proposed, appropriate supporting information (i.e. the length(s), curve(s), tangent(s), angle(s), right of way width, cartway width, and if applicable, a road profile) should be provided on the plan. All private drives that are used by more than one party should have a shared driveway agreement in place. An

agreement for the private right-of-way should be noted on the plan stating: "The owners of lots \_\_\_\_, which have a common driveway, agree and understand this is a shared driveway, and as such are responsible for maintenance, care, improvements, and snow removal at their own diligence and expense. The maintenance and use of said shared driveways shall be included in the deeds as said lots are sold."

**Street Names**

If multiple parties are to use a private drive, the roadway will need to be named. Street names are to be coordinated with the County GIS (Mapping) Department. There is a fee associated with the street naming.

**Deed Restrictions and Easements**

Has the owners of the residue land granted the proposed fifty (50') ingress, egress, and utility easement? Does the easement serve lot 1?

**DEP Sewage Planning Module**

A copy of the DEP Component 1 Sewage Facilities Planning Module should be submitted to the Decatur Township Planning Commission. Plan approval should be contingent upon receiving an approval from DEP following the filing of this form.

**Other Comments:**

1. The proposal calls for a fifty (50) foot easement, ten (10) foot wide along an existing gravel driveway. The driveway is over 1,554 feet long and encompasses over 1.7 acres of land. The applicant needs to show what the existing gravel driveway width is and if widened, how much it will be widened. The main concern is if the area disturbed is greater than one (1) acre then a NPDES Permit could be required.
2. Please clarify the locations and labeling of Whiskey and Mail Pouch Roads.

Name of Plan: Zimmerman, Jon C. & Candice  
File Number: 2014-01-005  
Tax Map #: 16-04-0101A  
Municipality: Derry Township (Municipal Ordinance)  
Applicant Name: Jon C. & Candice Zimmerman  
Land Owner Name: Jon C. & Candice Zimmerman  
Plan Preparer: Wright Land Surveying

**Action Taken:**

The County provides comments only.

This plan proposes to create Lots 2 and 3 as non-building lots at this time. Both lots are vacant lands and will require a land development plan to address any proposed changes. Also, Lot Addition A is being proposed as shown. The residual tract, Lot 1, is vacant farmland and woodland with no development proposed at this time. Lot Addition A consisting of 1.847 acres is to be added onto land of Tax Map 16-04-0101A. Lot Addition A is a lot addition and shall become an integral part of Tax Map 16-04-0101A to become a total of 10.845 acres. Lot Addition A is not a building lot and cannot be maintained or developed as a separate individual lot.

**Soils**

According to the County GIS files, some portion of this property appears to have prime farmland soils. According to the County GIS files, some portion of this property appears to have hydric soils. Hydric soils can indicate the presence of wetlands. The hydric soils information should be shown on the plan.

**Cartway Widths**

What will the cartway width be?

\* The Zimmerman representative stated this is not to be developed at this time and will be depicted as a paper road on the plan.

**PennDOT HOP / Municipal Driveway Permit**

As noted in Note 5, a PennDOT Highway Occupancy Permit (HOP) is required as prescribed in the Municipalities Planning Code (Section 508 (6)). A copy of the permit should be provided to the Derry Township Planning Commission.

**Street Names**

If multiple parties are to use a private drive, the roadway will need to be named. Street names are to be coordinated with the County GIS (Mapping) Department. There is a fee associated with the street naming.

**DEP Sewage Planning Module**

A copy of the DEP "Request for Planning Waiver and Non-Building Declaration" form needs to be provided. Plan approval should be contingent upon receiving an approval from DEP following the filing of this form.

**Sewage Service**

Are the subdivided lots and residual able to connect to public sewer?

\*The Zimmerman representative stated the sewer service extends to the single family home and this line will be depicted on the plan.

**Water Service**

The water supply location should be noted on the plan as prescribed in the Derry Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Part 4 Section 403.2.x). If the water source is off site, there should be evidence of an easement and right-of-way agreement on record and so noted on the plan. This information is particularly important if the water supply serves more than one household. The surveyor will note both are off site and make reference to easement/right-of-way agreements on record.

**Other Comments:**

- 1. Is this subdivision plan for the development of the Life Science complex?  
\*The Zimmerman representative indicated yes.
- 2. Is there a timeline for the submission of the land development plan for the Complex?  
\*The Zimmerman representative stated April, 2014 or later.
- 3. Note 3 should include Lot Addition A as part of Commercial Zone.

Name of Plan: Fink, Barbara Mae  
 File Number: 2014-01-006  
 Tax Map #: 17,14-0101H  
 Municipality: Granville Township (Municipal Ordinance)  
 Applicant Name: Barbara Mae Fink  
 Land Owner Name: Barbara Mae Fink  
 Plan Preparer: Wright Land Surveying

**Action Taken:**

The County provides comments only.

This plan proposes to create Lot 2 for agricultural purposes only. No development is proposed. Lot 1, the residual tract, also has no new development proposed.

**Clean & Green / Agriculture**

The parcel is enrolled in the Clean and Green program. The applicant or landowners should be aware rollback taxes can be applied in some subdivision situations, and if they have any questions, they should contact the Mifflin County Assessment Office for more information.

**Floodplain / Wetlands**

Note 5 mentions floodplain provided by County GIS Department, yet floodplain is not clearly shown on the plan and it's impact on lots 1 and 2.

**Soils**

According to the County GIS files, some portion of this property appears to have prime farmland soils.

**Setback Lines**

The plan lists building setbacks, but there are no setback lines on the plan.

**Right-of Way Widths**

Based upon the Granville Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Appendix A/Table 1), the right-of-way widths of Roundhouse Road and Fink Lane are substandard.

**Cartway Widths**

The cartway width for Fink Lane should be shown on the plan (Granville Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, Section 6.202.a11). The cartway width of Round House Road is substandard Granville Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Appendix A/Table 1).

**Deed Restrictions and Easements**

Deed restrictions and easements associated with the property, if any, should be provided in accordance with Sections 6.302.a6 and 6.302.b7 of the Granville Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance.

**DEP Sewage Planning Module**

A copy of the DEP "Request for Planning Waiver and Non-Building Declaration" form needs to be provided. Plan approval should be contingent upon receiving an approval from DEP following the filing of this form.

**Features**

All significant natural features, including swales, ditches, trees, water courses, sinkholes, rock out-cropping, and dwelling units (which include campers) etc. should be shown on the plan. (Granville Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, Section 6.202.a9 )

**Other Comments:**

- 1. It is not clear the purpose of Lot 1 which creates a ribbon lot and is greater than a standard lot for exceeding a 3 to 1 ratio. Will there be restrictions on the development of lot 1?

Name of Plan: Mann Edge Terrace Elderly  
 File Number: 2014-01-002  
 Tax Map #: 03-30-3010  
 Municipality: Lewistown Township (Municipal Ordinance)  
 Applicant Name: Mifflin County Industrial Development  
 Land Owner Name: Mifflin County Industrial Development  
 Plan Preparer: PennTerra Engineering, Inc.

**Action Taken:**

The County provides comments only.

The purpose of this Subdivision Plan is to create a Two Lot Subdivision (Lot 2R and Lot 3) of current Tax Parcel 03-03-0310,000 for the parcels located in the Borough of Lewistown, Mifflin County, Pennsylvania. Lot 2R shall be a future Development lot for elderly housing & Lot 3 shall be a "Non-Building Lot" for access to the Kishacoquillas Creek.

\* The plans were amended based on the 1/16/2014 preliminary comments and resubmitted on 1/21/2014. These comments include the review of the resubmitted plans and the waiver requests.

**Basic Plan Information**

The tax parcel numbers for the adjoining parcels to the west and south of lot 3 and the tax parcel number referenced in note 4. are missing the zero digit before the last three numbers. Please add these digits to the tax parcel numbers. The absence of the zeros creates inaccuracies within our plan tracking software.

**Floodplain / Wetlands**

According to the County GIS files, the property lies within a designated wetland, and wetland information should be delineated on the plan Borough of Lewistown Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Part 7 7.302 A. 28.). Future development in these areas should be discouraged.

\*The Penn Terra representative has requested a waiver from depicting a wetland on the plans. Since the Penn Terra representative believes it's possible that the County GIS files may be inaccurate, they have noted in note 8. that there are no jurisdictional wetlands located on the site as determined by field views. This notation has justified the waiver to this provision and the County recommends granting the waiver.

**PennDOT HOP / Municipal Driveway Permit**

The proposed driveway location for Lot 2R should be shown on the plan. A municipal driveway permit is required, and a copy should be provided to the Lewistown Borough Planning Commission.

\*The Penn Terra representative has requested a waiver to these provisions and indicated that the plan is a land subdivision and not a land development plan. The County agrees with this explanation and recommends the waiver be granted and notes that these will be provided as part of the land development plan submission.

**Private Street / Shared Driveway**

Will there be a shared driveway between Lot2R and existing Mann Edge Terrace 1 site? If so, it should be noted on the plan.

\*The Penn Terra representative has noted in note 13. that there will be a (partial) shared driveway. This is acknowledged, but this should be depicted on the land development plans when prepared.

**Deed Restrictions and Easements**

Deed restrictions and easements associated with the property, if any, should be provided in accordance with Sections 7.302.A6 and 7.302.B7 of the Lewistown Borough Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance.

\*The Penn Terra representative indicated they researched and none were found.

**DEP Sewage Planning Module**

If the project is to utilize public sewer, a DEP Component 3, or Exemption from Sewage Planning (Mailer), should be provided. Plan approval should be contingent upon receiving an approval from DEP following the filing of this form.

\*The Penn Terra representative has requested a waiver to this provision and stated that at the time of a Land Development submission, the applicant will submit for the DEP Planning Permit at that time. The County finds this acceptable and recommends approval of the waiver.

**Other Comments:**

1. The applicant has requested a waiver from Section 4.205C in regards to a 3 to 1 ratio of lot width to length for Lot 3. The applicant has an option to develop a perpetual easement for MCIDC to maintain so that environmental concerns should not be an issue in the disposition of the property. A sample of such an easement was provided several months ago to the applicant. The County has reservations about approving this waiver when an option is available and recommended by the County Planning Commission Solicitor. If the waiver is granted based on environmental concerns as mentioned in the waiver, then Sections 4.202 and 4.203 of the Borough of Lewistown Subdivision Ordinance are applicable dealing with subdivision suitability and the need for an environmental plan to insure public health, safety and welfare.

\* The Penn Terra representative provided an explanation for the waiver request. However, they noted a separate and additional document responding to sections 4.202 and 4.203 will be provided to the County on Monday, January 27, 2013. At this time, the County has not received this correspondence.

2. The plan should state how lot 3 will be used in the future since by its configuration and proximity to Kish Creek would not appear to be developable.

\*The Penn Terra representative has indicated in the boxed comment on sheet 1, that lot 3 shall be a "non-building lot" for access to the Kish Creek.

Name of Plan: Martin, Nehemiah

File Number: 2014-01-003

Tax Map #:

Municipality: Oliver Township (Municipal Ordinance)

Applicant Name: Ezra Martin

Land Owner Name:

Plan Preparer: Hershey Surveying, Inc.

**Action Taken:**

The County provides comments only.

This plan proposes 4,400 SF of new impervious area. 600 SF of stormwater credit remains for the property. This plan proposes to add a 55' x 80' addition to an existing 44' x 60' building.

**Basic Plan Information**

The name of the registered surveyor and/or Engineer responsible for the plan should be on the plan, including an appropriate registered professional's seal.

Lot numbers, and any official Parcel Information Number(s) (PIN) established by the County, and Deed Book and Page Number of the tract should be provided on the plan. (Oliver Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, Article 6 Section 6.302.a.13) All abutters should be shown on the plan, including tax map numbers. (Oliver Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, Article 6 Section 6.302 a.17. ) A plan narrative should be placed on the plan and should be a brief description stating the purpose of the project.

**Subdivision Information**

General Plan Note 2. indicates the boundary information is based on a prior subdivision plan and not on an actual Field Boundary Survey. The survey should be referenced and a registered surveyor's stamp should validate the property boundaries.

**Floodplain / Wetlands**

According to County GIS information, the property lies within the 100-year floodplain, and the flood plain should be delineated on the plan. Future development in this area should be discouraged. The plan should note what part of the site lies within a 100 year floodplain. (See Article 6 Section 6.202.a.1 of the Oliver Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance) According to County GIS information, a portion of the property lies within a designated wetland, and wetland information should be delineated on the plan. Future development in this area should be discouraged.

**Soils**

According to the County GIS files, some portion of this property appears to have prime farmland soils. According to the County GIS files, some portion of this property appears to have hydric soils. Hydric soils can indicate the presence of wetlands. The hydric soils information should be shown on the plan. Soils information should be shown on the plan. (Oliver Township Subdivision Ordinance, Article 6 Section 6.202 a.8.)

**PennDOT HOP / Municipal Driveway Permit**

Any additional access points to U.S. Highway 22/522 will require a PennDOT Highway Occupancy Permit (HOP). A copy of the permit should be provided to the Oliver Township Planning Commission. A notation about the requirement stating: Any access via a State Highway to lots shown on this subdivision plan will require the issuance of a PennDOT Highway Occupancy Permit (HOP). PennDOT regulations provide that a Highway Occupancy Permit is required prior to constructing, altering or exceeding the permitted capacity for any access connected onto a State Highway. A Highway Occupancy Permit is also required prior to altering the existing pattern or flow of surface drainage or directing additional surface drainage onto or into the highway rightof- way or highway facilities. Approval of this plan neither implies nor guarantees permit approval by PennDOT.

**Deed Restrictions and Easements**

According to the surveyor, there are no known deed restrictions or easements associated with the property.

**Sewage Service**

Will the development generate additional sewage? If so, can the existing on-lot septic system handle the additional sewage generation? Is there a non building waiver for this property? If so, it should be noted on the plan.

\*The representative stated the proposed addition will be attached to the existing building and no new sewage will be generated.

**Signature Blocks on Plan**

There should be a signature block area for the Recorder of Deeds of Mifflin County.

**Land Development**

Has this plan been reviewed by the Township Engineer?

**E & S / Stormwater**

Stormwater drainage provisions should be included with the plan submission. The stormwater plan should be reviewed by the Oliver Township Engineer.

**Other Comments:**

1. Has the applicant entered into a Development Agreement and Financial Security in accordance with Article 7 for any township required improvements?
2. How many existing parking spaces are there and does the plan require additional parking spaces.
3. A traffic circulation plan should be added to the plan.
4. What is the height of the new addition?
5. Are there elevation drawings available for the addition?
6. Will the addition be detached from the existing shop area?
7. Will the addition generate additional trips?
8. What will the addition be used for?
9. What is the nature of the existing business?

\*The applicant's representative stated the surveyor will make the requested changes to the plan and resubmit revised plans by January 23, 2014. The County did not receive revised plans as of January 23, 2014.

Name of Plan: Latherow, Merrill F.  
File Number: 2014-01-004  
Tax Map #: 21-016-0103 / 21-016-0103A  
Municipality: Wayne Township (County Ordinance)  
Applicant Name: Merrill F. Latherow  
Land Owner Name: Merrill F. Latherow  
Plan Preparer: Tuscarora Land Surveying

**Action Taken:**

The County provides comments only.

This plan proposes a lot addition from the lands of Merrill F. Latherow (T.M. 21-016-0103) to the lands of Kevin C. & Larry F. Latherow, (T.M. 21-016-0103A).

**Basic Plan Information**

The tax parcel numbers on the application and the labels on the plan are missing the zero digit before the last three numbers and incorrectly lists a zero as the third number. Please add and remove these digits to the tax parcel numbers. The absence and additional zeros creates inaccuracies within our plan tracking software.

**Setback Lines**

The setback lines should be shown on the plan as prescribed in the Mifflin County Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Section 7.302. A10).

**Right-of Way Widths**

Ryde Road is only partially shown on the plan and does not show full access to the parcel. Based upon the Mifflin County Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, the right-of-way width of Ryde Road is substandard (Section 4.204.F).

**Cartway Widths**

Based upon the Mifflin County Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, the cartway width of Ryde Road is substandard (Section 4.204 F).

**PennDOT HOP / Municipal Driveway Permit**

The plan should show existing driveway access.

**DEP Sewage Planning Module**

There is some language about a Lot Addition and that no sewage facility is issued. It is unclear this meets DEP's Nonbuilding Waiver Declaration.

A copy of the DEP "Request for Planning Waiver and Non-Building Declaration" form needs to be provided. Plan approval should be contingent upon receiving an approval from DEP following the filing of this form.

**Sewage Service**

Is there an on-lot system for T.M. 21-016-0103?

**Water Service**

The plan appears to show a well easement from the Kevin Latherow property to the Kevin & Larry Latherow property. Is there a separate well on the Kevin and Larry Latherow property? Is there a well on the Merrill Latherow property?

**Signature Blocks on Plan**

Township signature should be review instead of approved.

A Mifflin County Planning Commission Approval Signature Block should be on the plan. The plan has the review certificate instead.

**Lot Addition**

A lot addition statement should be noted on the plan stating the following on the plan:

"Lot # \_\_\_ consisting of \_\_\_ acres is to be added onto land owned by \_\_\_\_\_. Lot # \_\_\_ is a lot addition and shall become an integral part of the property owned by \_\_\_\_\_. Lot # \_\_\_ is not a building lot and cannot be maintained or developed as a separate individual lot." (See Mifflin County Subdivision Ordinance Section 7.302.A.22)

**Features**

All significant man-made features, including water and sewer lines, petroleum lines, electric poles, telephone lines, fire hydrants, dumps, railroad tracks, fence lines, historic features, culverts, etc. should be shown on the plan. (Mifflin County Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, Section 7.302.A.20)

\*The Tuscarora Land representative submitted revised plans dated January 21, 2014 that adequately addressed all County comments.

**Solid Waste Plan**

Dan informed the Planning Commissioners about the solid waste plan update that included receiving proposals for landfill space, and hauling for ten years. The Solid Waste Authority received 7 proposals and are looking over all of them. A decision will be made in June.

A question was asked by David about what the plan all included. Bill responded with a brief history of the project. When doing the update, they found out that the contract between the haulers and the needs of the transfer station was not in line.

Bill informed the Commission that a back up position in the plan is a flow control system. Right now the Authority has an arrangement between them and the haulers. If the haulers decide they want to go somewhere else, and not use the transfer station it will have an impact on the Authority.

Dan stated that the flow control system is very touchy because it was challenged in court in other areas. No one wants to do flow control but if you lose tonnage, it will affect the transfer station. This past year the tonnage exceeded 40,000 however in the past it has been as low as 32,000. When tonnage is low, it affects bills being paid and workers being employed.

A question was asked how low the tonnage could go for the Authority to survive. Dan commented that at 32,000 it was hard to operate. They operated in the red when the tonnage was at 36,000.

Neal asked the question about the sizeable amount of debt still sitting there. Dan stated there is debt for the construction of the transfer station itself still exists in addition to the costs that most don't face for post closure of the old landfill.

### **Comprehensive Plan**

Bill presented the draft executive summary of the Comprehensive Plan. He asked for feedback on the summary.

Jim Spendiff had two comments. He asked about the top of page 8 on the smartgrowth principles; what are they and where can they be found? Bill responded they are presented in the full plan and can be addressed. In addition, Jim had a concern in the same paragraph about the wording of re-committed. His final question was why Jim Lettiere name was not on the plan. Jim Lettiere responded that he did not have much to do with the plan that Mark was the one involved.

Bill commented that Mark put a lot of time into this plan and he wanted to make sure he received credit for the work. The purpose of the executive summary is to get people interested in reading the entire plan.

Neal Shawver stated that he had some challenges reading the summary without having more background. First on page 9, the report reads "stimulate infill", what is infill. A person without previous knowledge may not understand.

Bill responded with an explanation of "infill." He commented that if that is not clear then we can look at the wording.

Neal stated that is what he was stating some of the wording and transition is not clear for those without maybe a certain knowledge background. In addition, he asked how the Amish were ranked. Furthermore, on page 5 the report reads State Game Lands 107 and 113. What do those numbers mean?

Dan responded by stating that the game lands are numbered. He stated that 113 represents land up near Strodes Mills and 107 represent land down Maitland Road.

David asked if you could add in parenthesis what the numbers stood for or the land that it represented. The plan needs to be so everyone can understand the plan. Same with the wording of "Plain Sect" means nothing to him but if you say the Amish then he understands.

Dan gave clarification that Plain Sect is used a lot more because Amish refers to the religion not the group of people. Plain Sect includes more than just the Amish.

Bill stated that he would make the corrections with Michelle and that he felt we were moving in the right direction. He asked if anyone had any comment about the name and there was no discussion.

### **Public Comment**

There was no public comment

### **Other Business**

Bill brought up about the Wind Ordinance. He stated that we need to look at the setbacks. His concern is can we locate at least one wind mill within the proposed setbacks. We don't want it to look like we drew an arbitrary line not allowing the construction of a wind mill.

He stated he did not attend the last public hearing of the Friends of Jacks Mountain. However, David attended and commented that there were 264 people in attendance at the hearing. He stated that close to 70 of them were Amish and asking how they can break their lease.

Bill commented that he felt that the public comment from the December meeting regarding the wind mill was very calm. People voiced their concerns in a polite manner.

Dan said Volkswind was going to be in town on February 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> and wanted to meet about the setbacks. They feel that protection of the water sources, erosion, post construction storm water review and stipulations that go with their NPDES permit should be enough to provide protection to any down slope water supply.

Kent asked what the time frame was for the ordinance. Bill responded that the comp plan should be finished in March and then the ordinance. The model should be published as part of the comp plan. The county would not take any action on the Wind Ordinance until after March. He stated he had not received any negative responses from the general public on the ordinance.

Kent asked when Menno Township was going to adopt an ordinance and Brent responded. Brent informed the board that Menno Township is interested in adopting one because they do not want to see the wind mills.

Bill informed the board that Union Township is the only one to have adopted an ordinance at this point. The ordinance was a nuisance ordinance. Townships can adopt an ordinance at anytime.

Bill made sure that each member received the copy of the newsletter and pointed out that on the back of the newsletter it stated about the comp plan.

### **Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 5:20 p.m. upon a motion by James Spendiff that was seconded by Neal Shawver.