

MINUTES
MIFFLIN COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING
THURSDAY, JANUARY 24, 2008
MIFFLIN COUNTY COURTHOUSE, MEETING ROOM B – 3:30 P.M.

ATTENDANCE

Members

Jim Spendiff, Chairman
Dan Dunmire
Don Kauffman
John Pannizzo
Susan Heimbach
Neal Shawver
Brent Miller
Kay Hamilton

Staff

Bill Gomes, Director
Mark Colussy, Associate Planner
Millie Sunderland, Office Manager/Grants Manager

Item #1 – Call to Order

Jim Spendiff, Chairman, called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

Item #2 – Record of Public Attendance

Jim reminded everyone to sign the attendance sheet.

Item #3 – Approval of Meeting Minutes

Don Kauffman made a motion to approve the minutes of the meeting of November 15, 2007. Brent Miller seconded the motion. All members voted aye.

Item #4 – Reorganization – Election of Officers

Jim turned the meeting over to Bill Gomes to conduct the reorganization and election of officers. Don Kauffman made a motion to keep the same officers, which are Jim Spendiff, Chairman, Dan Dunmire, Vice Chairman and John Pannizzo, Secretary and close the nominations. Neal Shawver seconded the motion. All members voted aye.

Item #5 – Committee Reports

A. Subdivision and Land Development Committee Plan Reviews: Mark Colussy reported that the Subdivision and Land Development Review Committee reviewed five plans, which were all under municipal ordinances for which the Planning Commission provides recommendations only. The Subdivision Review Committee recommended approval of the comments and recommendations for the following plans: Warren W. Jones, Jr. Estate subdivision in Armagh Township, Walter Spigelmyer subdivision in Decatur Township, Betty Crider subdivision in Derry Township, Stryker Brigade Combat Team land development in Derry Township and Carol Baker and Barbara A. Levin subdivision in Granville Township.

Mark discussed the comments and recommendations in detail for the Betty Crider subdivision in Derry Township, and Bill Gomes provided further clarification on the plan and access.

The Stryker Brigade Combat Team land development plan in Derry Township was also reviewed. There was some discussion about whether access was sufficient and a pending driveway agreement.

Mark briefly went over the comments and recommendations for the Carol Baker and Barbara A. Levin subdivision in Granville Township.

John Pannizzo made a motion to approve the comments and recommendations as presented and discussed for the plans under municipal ordinances. Kay Hamilton seconded the motion. All members voted aye.

The Subdivision Review Committee report:

Name of Plan: Jones, Warren W., Jr. Estate
Tax Map #: 12-01-128A/12-01-128
Applicant Name: Woolley, George B.
Plan Preparer: Wright Land Surveying

File Number: 2008-01-004
Municipality: Armagh Township (Municipal Ordinance)
Land Owner Name: Jones, Warren W., Jr. Estate

Action Taken: The County provides comments only.

Plan Summary: This plan proposes to create a lot addition from the Warren W. Jones, Jr. Estate to the lands of George B. Woolley. No new construction is proposed.

Review Comments (List from Review Committee):

Clean and Green Program - 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.

Topographic information - Topographical contours at vertical intervals should be displayed on the plan (Armagh Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, Section 6.202.a.7). The applicant will request a waiver.

Soils - According to the County GIS files, some portion of this property appears to have hydric soils. The hydric soils information should be shown on the plan. (See Sections 6.202.a.8 and a.12 of the Armagh Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance) The applicant will request a waiver.

Right-of Way Widths - Based upon the Armagh Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, the right-of-way width is substandard for Field Lane. (See Table 1 of the Armagh Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance) Since the parcel has the potential for future development, road improvements should be considered prior to further development. At a minimum additional right of way should be provided by the applicant as a condition if there is future development along this road.

Cartway Widths - The cartway width should be shown on the plan for Field Lane (Armagh Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, Section 6.202.a.11).

Deed Restrictions and Easements - Deed restrictions and easements associated with the property, if any, should be provided in accordance with Sections 6.302.a.6 and 6.302.b.7 of the Armagh 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 is contingent upon receiving an approval from DEP following the filing of this form.

Required Signatures on Application - The landowner's signature needs to be on the subdivision application form. The plan states this is the Warren Jones, Jr. Estate, yet lists George Woolley as the applicant requesting the lot addition. The plan shows Owners Statement of Intent, so who will sign this?

Lot Addition - A lot addition is considered a consolidation and therefore, results in the creation of two new lot configurations. Lot consolidation meets the definition of a subdivision according to the Municipalities Planning Code. Under these circumstances new deeds must be developed as part of the property transfer process and adequate information must be available in order to develop an accurate property description. The Township must also be assured that the parent and recipient lots still meet the subdivision and Land Development Ordinance requirements. Residue dimensional information should be provided. (Armagh Township Subdivision Ordinance Sections 6.302.a.5 and 6.302.a.12)

Other Comments:

1. The abutters to the residue, Aumiller and Penn Central Conference were not listed. (See Section 6.302.a.17 of the Armagh Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance)

2. An inset map would be helpful in showing the exact geographical location of the lot addition in relation to surrounding property.

3. Since a private right-of-way is involved for Field Lane, then the plan should note a private right-of-way agreement is in place. The note could read as follows:

"The owners of tax parcels 12-01-0128 and 12-01-0128A agree and understand that "Field Lane" is a private road and as such are responsible for maintenance, care, improvements, and snow removal at their own diligence and expense. Further, if at any time in the future, the property owners adjacent to this road be required at their own expense to improve said road to meet the public road and street specifications of the Municipality in place at such time. The maintenance and use of said private road shall be in accordance with the private road maintenance and use agreement recorded in Deed Book ____ Page _____ of the _____ County Recorder of Deeds Office."

Name of Plan: Spigelmyer, Walter
Tax Map #: 15-13-125A
Applicant Name: Pannebaker, Brett
Plan Preparer: Roth Surveying Service

File Number: 2008-01-001
Municipality: Decatur Township (Municipal Ordinance)
Land Owner Name: Spigelmyer, Walter

Action Taken: The County provides comments only.

Plan Summary:

1. Total area being subdivided = 57.0 +/- acres.
2. Total number of lots = 2.
3. Lot 1 the residual parcel of 55.0 +/- acres is a vacant tract.
4. Lot 2 the proposed 1.00 acre parcel contains an existing single family residence and 1 garage. This property is served by an existing on-lot sewage system and an individual well.
5. The residual parcel of this site (Lot 1) is located in a special flood hazard zone. The proposed Lot 2 is not. For more information reference to FIRM Map 421880-0195C.
6. Per the U.S. Department of Interior portions of Lot 1 contains wetlands. No wetlands are encroaching upon Lot 2 per National Wetland Inventory Map Alfarata, PA.

Review Comments (List from Review Committee):

Clean and Green Program - 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.

Topographic information - Topographical contours at vertical intervals should be displayed on the plan (Decatur Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, Section 602.2.A.7).

Soils - According to the County GIS files, some portion of this property appears to have hydric soils. The hydric soils information should be shown on the plan. According to the County GIS files, some portion of this property appears to have prime farmland soils.

Deed Restrictions and Easements - Deed restrictions and easements associated with the property, if any, should be provided, in accordance with Sections 603.2.A.6 and 603.2.B.7 of the Decatur Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance.

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

Other Comments:

1. Both old and new tax records do not show T.M. 15-13-125A crossing Dormantown Road. Please confirm it is part of the tract. Also, should the adjoiner symbol be on the plan since the parcel crosses the road?
2. No dimensional information is provided for the residual tract (See Section 602.2.A 5, 9 and 12 of the Decatur Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance. This information can be provided from deeds if it has not been surveyed with a disclaimer.

Name of Plan: Crider, Betty

File Number: 2008-01-002

Tax Map #: 16-01-121

Municipality: Derry Township (Municipal Ordinance)

Applicant Name: Crider, Betty

Land Owner Name: Crider, Betty

Plan Preparer: Taptich Engineering and Surveying

Action Taken: The County provides comments only.

Plan Summary: This project involves the subdivision of the lands of Betty L. Crider. Proposed Lot #1 (99.2362 Ac.) is to be a "Stand-Alone" parcel to be used for recreational purposes. Proposed Lot #1 is presently vacant at this time. Residue lands (256.0556 Ac.) are likewise vacant and will be used for recreational purposes. Access to both parcels will be via existing means.

Review Comments (List from Review Committee):

Clean and Green Program - 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. T.M. 16-01-125 is in Clean and Green, but T.M. 16-01-121 is not.

Topographic information - Topographical contours at 5' intervals are required by Derry Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance. (Section 402.2.G) The applicant has provided 100 foot contours and can request a waiver from this requirement.

Setback Lines - The setback lines should be shown on the plan as prescribed in the Derry Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Section 403.2.K). Minimum setbacks for the Forest Zone is 50' from all property lines. (Section 212.7 of the Derry Township Zoning Ordinance)

Deed Restrictions and Easements - Deed restrictions and easements associated with the property, if any, should be provided in accordance with Section 403.7 of the Derry Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance.

DEP Sewage Planning Module - If no development is intended for this property, a copy of the DEP "Request for Planning Waiver and Non-Building Declaration" form needs to be provided. Plan approval is contingent upon receiving an approval from DEP following the filing of this form.

Lot Addition - A lot addition is considered a consolidation and therefore, results in the creation of two new lot configurations. Lot consolidation meets the definition of a subdivision according to the Municipalities Planning Code. Under these circumstances new deeds must be developed as part of the property transfer process and adequate information must be available in order to develop an accurate property description. The Planning

Commission must also be assured that the parent and recipient lots still meet the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance requirements. (Derry Township Subdivision Ordinance Sections 403.2.F, H and J). Dimensional information should be provided for the recipient tract. An inset map could show this information.

Other Comments:

1. Proposed Lot 1 appears to already be part of T.M. 16-01-125 and the residue property already appears to be a separate stand-alone lot as T.M. 16-01-121, according to tax assessment records. Both of these properties are assessed for tax purposes at 150 acres. Please provide clarification.
2. The date on the plan does not list day, only month and year.
3. The project narrative states that "access to both parcels will be via existing means," yet the only "existing means" plotted on the plan is an Earthen Trail. Is this the access to this property, and if so, is there a private right-of-way agreement in place? Section 502.5 of the Derry Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance does not allow for subdivision of lands that are land locked. If this is the access, right-of-way and cartway data should be provided (Section 403.2.G). An inset map showing access to the properties would clarify how access is provided to these properties.
4. The applicant only provided the County Planning Commission with one copy of both the original and revised plans.
5. The flood plain statement, Note #5, on the plan only refers to Lot #1, but should include the residue.

Name of Plan: Stryker Brigade Combat Team Additions & Alterations **File Number: 2008-01-005**
Tax Map #: 16-10-0101-000/DB 209-0001 **Municipality: Derry Township (Municipal Ordinance)**
Applicant Name: Stryker Brigade Combat Team Additions and Alterations
Land Owner Name: Commonwealth of Pennsylvania **Plan Preparer: DAWOOD Associates, Inc.**

Action Taken: The County provides comments only.

Plan Summary: NARRATIVE Pennsylvania Army National Guard Stryker Brigade – Lewistown: The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania owns approximately 22.7 acres of land located in Derry Township, Mifflin County, Pennsylvania. The project site is generally bound on the north, east and west by woods; and on the south by East Walnut Street. The site area consists of an existing Army National Guard Site. DGS in cooperation with the DMVA and the PAARNG is proposing to utilize the project site, to add an addition to the existing armory building in order to meet the Pennsylvania Army National Guard's mission to transform the 56th Brigade into a Stryker Brigade Combat Team. The addition will increase the building's gross surface area from approximately 17,300 sf to approximately 53,600 sf. The purpose of the facility is to train National Guard personnel in various aspects of military operations associated with the Stryker mission. Proposed infrastructure improvements include: earthwork to create a building pad, two (2) buildings, sanitary sewers, parking areas, storm sewer, landscaping, a potable water system, electric and telephone service, gas, cable television and permanent stormwater management facilities. The construction will disturb approximately 9.8 acres. The plan is designed to meet the regulations of the Derry Township Land Development Ordinance to which Final Plan approval was conditionally granted on July 20, 2006. See attached letter. General NPDES Permit, Erosion and Sediment Control Permit and Chapter 105 General Permit 4 and 5 have all been applied for and granted. See attached. All applicable utility agencies are aware of this project and points of contact have been established. The site will be graded to accommodate the layout and necessary soil preparation/improvements accomplished to provide support for building footings and site pavements. The site is to be graded for positive surface water drainage from building pad areas and pavements. On site detention of storm water runoff and outlets to in-place drainage conveyances are to be constructed. In order to meet Sustainable Project Rating Tool guidelines, a storm water management plan will be implemented that results in no net increase of storm water runoff. Privately owned vehicle (POV) and military equipment parking (MEP) areas are to be paved. Bituminous curb and concrete sidewalk are to be constructed near the training center and POV parking areas. Concrete aprons are to be constructed at vehicle maintenance doors and the loading area. Landscaping, trash enclosure and exterior site lighting are required for the site. The plans presented to the Mifflin County Planning Commission and to be discussed at the November 19th Derry Township Board of Supervisors meeting are to communicate that the changes made to the previously approved plan are "di-minimus" and to discuss the proper procedure to obtain re-approval and recording of the Land Development Plan.

Review Comments (List from Review Committee):

Other Comments: 1/17/07 updated comments from 11-15-07

Floodplain - The plan should indicate that property is not within the 100 year floodplain. *This has been addressed on the December 2007 plan.

Hydric Soils - There was no soil information on the plan. Based on the 2005 plan AnB is considered a hydric soil and should be noted on the plan. Hhc is considered a prime farmland soil. *Soil information has been provided on the 12/31/07 plan. Also AnB and Hhc has been noted.

Right-of Way Widths - The right-of-way for Armory Lane is not listed on the plan. (See Section 403.2G of the Derry Township Subdivision Ordinance) *This has been addressed on the 12/31/07 plan.

*PennDOT HOP/Municipal Driveway Permits - Has PennDOT been contacted to confirm that the existing HOP does or does not need to be updated? The applicant was to follow up on this item. This still has not been confirmed. *This is still pending.*

*Shared Driveway - It appears that Armory Lane is a shared driveway with two houses, one of which is not shown on the plan. Is there a shared access/maintenance agreement in place as provided for in the township zoning ordinance? Also, the second adjoining dwelling should be noted on the plan. The engineer was to follow up on this item. This has not been confirmed. *The second house is shown on the plan but there are no provisions for a shared access agreement.*

*Deed Restrictions and Easements - Deed restrictions and easements associated with the property, if any, should be provided, in accordance with Section 403.2G of the Derry Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance. *According to the engineer, there are no known deed restrictions.*

*Signature Blocks on Plan - The plan does not provide for a signature review block for the Mifflin County Planning Commission, Township Supervisors or Township Planning Commission. * This has been addressed on the December 2007 plan.*

OTHER COMMENTS:

*1. The plan legend lists existing fire hydrants, but they are difficult to identify on the plan. Based on a presentation in 2005 by the engineer, there are no fire hydrants now on the parcel, but two will be installed – one on the north side and one on the south side of the Readiness Center. *This has been addressed on 12/31/07 plan, but the plan still shows existing fire hydrants in the legend.*

*2. In 2005, the plan indicated the demolition of oil tanks and the removal of propane tanks. According to the engineer in 2005, they will be replaced with natural gas service. On the 2007 plan there is no mention of these tanks. * This has been addressed on the December 2007 plan.*

*3. The main building configuration has changed. The square footage of the proposed building should be labeled * The size of the existing and proposed buildings is only shown in a table on sheet C-1 but not on the site plan, sheet C-3.*

*4. In 2005, a question was raised about a circulation plan showing traffic was routed around the building. According to the engineer, the area around the Readiness Center will be restricted with two new gates to be installed. Is this still correct? * According to the engineer up to four gates are shown on the plan including the ornamental gate and the ramp gate.*

*5. In 2005, there was a landscaping plan and now there is no mention of this. *This was provided with the 12/31/07 set of plans.*

*6. Do the aprons on the north and south sides of the building meet the loading space provisions in the Derry Zoning Ordinance? *According to the township code officer, two spaces are required. However, there is no dimensional information provided to insure size standards are met.*

*7. The Mifflin County Conservation District reviewed the E & S Plan and NPDES permit in 2005. Have these been approved. *There is a 2006 letter from the Conservation District but since then there have been some changes and would recommend the plan be checked again. The Conservation District did do a follow up and found they will not require anything else.*

8. The Derry Township Engineer will be reviewing the plan and stormwater plan. His comments are pending. The property falls within the Kishacoquillas Creek Watershed and needs to follow the Kishacoquillas Creek Watershed Stormwater Management Ordinance.

*9. In the 2005 review, there appeared to be a safety problem with the current access from the driveway (Armory Lane) entering onto State Route 522, particularly for certain types of vehicles using this intersection. There is a 90 degree turn for tractor trailer type vehicles coming out of the driveway, which is difficult for vehicles to maneuver into the road without crossing both lanes entering onto Route 522. This requires manpower to stop traffic in order for the vehicles to enter Route 522. There is also some site visibility concerns related to the adjoining house along Armory Lane for vehicles entering Route 522 from the driveway (Armory Lane). This opening onto the highway needs to be reviewed as part of the HOP process. Has this been addressed or has there been consideration of widening the entrance? *This has not been addressed, particularly the question on site visibility. The Planning Commission is still very concerned about safety based on the change in the size and number of vehicles using the facility in terms of ingress and egress onto Route 522.*

STRYKER BRIGADE COMBAT TEAM ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

*1. The original plan has a scale of 1" = 40', yet the updated plans submitted on November 8th has a scale of 1" = 37.5' - Why is this? *This has been addressed in the Dec 2007 plan.*

*2. The now unmoved unheated storage building is not labeled on the updated plan. *This has been corrected in the 12/31/07 plans.*

*3. The current distance between the storage shed retaining wall and the apron is now 20'. If the apron cannot be driven over or is occupied by a truck, this is not sufficient room to drive vehicles past this area. If the apron is simply level with painted lines, this needs indicated. *This has been partially addressed on 12/31/07 plans.*

*4. The application lists the deed book number and not the tax map parcel number, which is 16-10-0101. This needs to be listed on the plan and application. *This has been addressed on sheet C-1 on December 2007 plan.*

5. The only drawings submitted were: C - 1 - Existing Conditions Plan; C - 3 - Site Plan; and C - 3 - Old Site Plan. Please submit the entire set. *This has been addressed with the December 2007 plans.
6. The legend does not list what "AT/FP" is. * According to the applicant, this is a security issue involving the curb and distance from buildings. This should be defined on the plan.
7. There is a "K-4 Rated Vehicle Gate" on Armory Lane, yet there doesn't seem to be a fence connecting to this gate. Is this supposed to be a security gate or just ornamental? What is "K-4"? Could a vehicle drive around the gate? Also, if a civilian accidentally drove down the drive and had to turn around, where would they do this? * According to the engineer, the K-4 gate will be removed and the ornamental gate installed. As for vehicles getting around the gate that is possible as well as a way for cars to get off the site if they accidentally drive into the facility. The engineer, however, has agreed to delineate a circulation plan with arrows around the building and site to show how visitors and other personnel will access the site.
8. If the MEP is converted to a POV parking lot, will the relocated MEP be sufficient for holding all equipment? The proposed area is less than the existing.
9. Although a narrative was given in the November application, it was provided with the updated plan. This needs to be placed on the plan.
10. The applicant needs confirm whether an ornamental gate shown on the plans dated 4/22/07 was existing or proposed. New plan shows it was deleted. If existing it should be shown on Sheet C-1. * According to the engineer, the ornamental gate will be placed back on the plan.

Name of Plan: Baker, Carol and Barbara A. Levin **File Number: 2008-01-003**
Tax Map #: 17-02-113 **Municipality: Granville Township (Municipal Ordinance)**
Applicant Name: Baker, Carol **Land Owner Name: Baker, Carol**

Plan Preparer: Taptich Engineering and Surveying

Action Taken: The County provides comments only.

Plan Summary: This project involves the subdivision of one (1) lot from Tract No. 1 of the reference lands of Carol Baker and Barbara Levin. Current Lot #1 (2.00 Acres) is to become a stand alone parcel. This lot will contain an existing log house, on-lot sewage disposal system and domestic water source (well). The residue of Tract #1 likewise has an existing house (and other improvement) and a domestic water source. The on-lot sewage disposal system service the residue lies on Tract #2 of the subject deed. Access to Current Lot #1 and the residue will be via the existing private Right-of-Way from Ferguson Valley Road.

Review Comments (List from Review Committee):

Soils - According to the County GIS files, some portion of this property appears to have hydric soils. The hydric soils information should be shown on the plan. (BrB)

Right-of Way Widths - The right-of-way does not meet the road provisions of the County's Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance. Since the parcel has the potential for future development, road improvements should be considered prior to further development. At a minimum, additional right of way should be provided by the applicant as a condition if there is future development along this road. (See Table 1 of the Granville Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance) Swarms Lane should be listed on the plan since two or more residents are on the same right-of-way.

Cartway Widths - The cartway width should be shown on the plan (Granville Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, Section 6.202.a.11). It is also not clear if the cartway can safely handle two-way traffic.

Deed Restrictions and Easements - Deed restrictions and easements associated with the property, if any, should be provided in accordance with Sections 6.302.a.6 and 6.302.b.7 of the Granville Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance.

Signature Blocks on Plan - Signature blocks should be on the plan for the Mifflin County Planning Commission and the municipality.

Other Comments:

1. Please confirm North arrow points North.
2. Since two or more parties share the same access, a private right-of-way or shared driveway agreement should be in place to insure who is responsible for maintenance and improvements. It should further state that this private right-of-way is not the responsibility of the township.
3. The applicant only provided the County Planning Commission one copy of the plan.
4. There should be a signature block verifying that the Mifflin County Planning Commission has reviewed this plan.

An updated plan was provided for the Special Needs Center in Lewistown Borough. No formal action was required since Lewistown Borough had already taken action on the plan. Mark discussed the updated plan. There was some discussion about concerns the Planning Commission had with respect to handicapped accessibility and the parking configuration. Another concern discussed was the manner in which the Planning Commission received a copy of the plan. A letter to this effect was sent to Lewistown Borough, and a follow up was anticipated from the Borough Manager to insure the County and the

Borough were reviewing the same plan. The Planning Commission decided that since they did not have an opportunity to review the revised plan that a follow-up letter should be sent to Lewistown Borough and the engineer outlining their concerns. Bill will draft a letter for the Planning Commission to review.

The following waiver requests were submitted for plans reviewed in previous months:

- Lee R. Forgey subdivision in Wayne Township (reviewed in December 2007) – A waiver was requested from the lot addition statement language provided in Section 7.302 A. 22. in the Mifflin County Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance. The surveyor has asked to drop “this is not a building lot” from the language since there is no new construction proposed, the plan is for a simple lot addition and the residue tract (Lot 1) is agriculture and shall remain as such.

John Pannizzo made a motion to deny this waiver and require the language in the ordinance. Susan Heimbach seconded the motion. All members voted aye.

- Lee R. Forgey subdivision in Wayne Township (reviewed in December 2007) – A waiver was requested from the inset map provision since the total property and adjoining properties are shown on the subdivision plan.

John Pannizzo made a motion to approve this waiver, but note the importance of why an inset map is normally required and that waivers are granted on a case-by-case basis. Don Kauffman seconded the motion. All but one member voted aye. One member was opposed.

Mark discussed the conditions that had been addressed, as well as the conditions that still needed to be addressed for approval of the Lee R. Forgey plan.

- Annie Stoltzfus subdivision in Wayne Township (reviewed in December 2007) – A waiver was requested from the bearings and distances on the residue parcel (Lot 1) due to the deed having a closure error. A waiver was also requested from the soils information since there is no new construction proposed.

Kay Hamilton made a motion to approve both waivers for this plan. John Pannizzo seconded the motion. All members voted aye.

Mark discussed the conditions that had been addressed for approval of the Annie Stoltzfus plan.

Item #6 – Public Comment

There was no public comment.

Item #7 – Other Business or Comments

- Bill reported that he met with PennDOT regarding the Highway Occupancy Permit (HOP) process. Bill also mentioned a field survey request on jake break information in Derry Township that should be available for the next meeting. PennDOT may provide a presentation to the Planning Commission in the future.
- Bill has asked DEP to make a presentation on sewage enforcement process to the Planning Commission as well.

The meeting adjourned at 5:27 p.m. upon a motion by John Pannizzo that was seconded by Don Kauffman.

mjs