

**MINUTES**  
**MIFFLIN COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING**  
**THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 2014**  
**MIFFLIN COUNTY COURTHOUSE, MEETING ROOM A – 3:30 P.M.**

**ATTENDANCE**

**Members**

J. Neal Shawver, Vice Chair  
Michele Bair  
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**

Lauren Kershner, Lewistown Sentinel  
Nancy Wert  
Don Wert  
Jim Smith, Granville Twp. Supervisor  
Sonja Smith  
Jan Snedeker  
Cindy Harvey, Friends of Jacks Mountain  
David Bargainnier, Reedsville / Brown Twp.  
Mary Jan Hayes, McVeytown  
Laura Simonetti, MC GIS  
Marie Mulvihill, United Way of Mifflin / Juniata  
Lucas Parkes, The EADS Group

**Call to Order**

J. Neal Shawver, Vice Chair, called the meeting to order at 3:30.

**Record of Public Attendance**

Neal reminded everyone to sign the attendance sheet.

**Approval of Meeting Minutes**

Jim Spendiff made a motion to accept the minutes. The motion was seconded by Thomas Lake. All members voted aye.

**Comprehensive Plan**

Neal turned the meeting over to Bill Gomes to conduct the public meeting of the Comprehensive Plan.

A PowerPoint presentation was prepared to highlight the main points of the plan to inform the board and public in attendance at the meeting.

Bill started off by stating that according to the PA Municipalities Planning Code, the comprehensive plan is to be updated every ten years. Furthermore he stated that a public meeting by the planning commission must be held to review the comprehensive plan. Following this public meeting, there is a 45 day review period. This process is followed by a public hearing held by the County Commissioners. They will review the plan and hopefully adopt it on April 24, 2014.

The overall purpose of the Comprehensive Plan is to update Mifflin County's policy documents on land use, transportation, economic development, housing, community services, and resource protection. To date, the consultant Gannet Fleming, Inc. in conjunction with the advisory committee has conducted a quality of life survey, set up a project website, conducted an analysis and plan chapter updates, held 8 committee meetings, conducted stakeholder interviews, news releases in the Lewistown Sentinel and County Observer and held two public meetings.

Additional points presented to the public were some of the plans and studies since 2000 that were used to develop the Plan, including trends and issues in the area of population, the economy and employment of Mifflin County, land use and future land use, housing trends, environmental and cultural resources, and

community services and facilities in Mifflin County. The Plan also has a more detailed transportation element that includes special studies dealing with parking in downtown Lewistown, an audit of road safety issues along State Route 522, and intersection analysis of Walnut and Valley Streets, Charles and Dorcas Streets, PA 655 and Three Cent Lane and Mill Street at Electric Avenue. Another important feature was the development of a model wind ordinance.

Bill concluded the review of the plan informing the public that the next steps are to publish the draft plan online and in print. All municipalities as well as the Lewistown Library, the County Commissioners' office and the Planning and Development office would have a print copy available to view. The plan will be on public review for 45-days and any comments could be directed to him within those 45 days. On April 24, 2014 at 9:15 AM in Meeting Room A, the Board of Commissioners will hold a public hearing to review the Plan and consider adopting it at this time. Once the plan has been adopted, implementations of priority items will be considered.

The meeting was turned back over to Vice Chair, Neal Shawver, who thanked Bill and the Comprehensive Plan Advisory Committee for the amount of work they put into the plan and that this plan is a great resource for the county.

### **Public Comment**

Neal next stated the public meeting policy on public comment to remind the audience to please limit their comments to five minutes. If you are making a comment, please state your name and if you are with a group.

Jim Smith, Granville Township Supervisor, spoke up with a question about the source of where the information came from to develop this plan. Was it from the committee?

Bill explained the process of how the advisory committee was chosen. He reinforced that this is a long process and that there is a diverse representation on the committee. He explained that there were interviews conducted, meetings held and a variety of data gathered including information from the Census.

Jim voiced that his concern is that once this plan is adopted and moved forward that the liberty and rights of the individuals are not infringed upon. He has seen before where land use is pushed at the expense of the individual land owners. Bill informed him that this is a policy document. It is not intended to violate anyone's rights. Everyone will not be in 100% agreement with everything. It is a road map of where we want to see the County go in the next ten years. Neal concurred this was a guide for the future.

Jim then asked if any of this is coming down from the federal government and Bill informed him no that the plan is required by the PA Municipality Planning Code and is locally driven. He informed him that the 2000 plan provided good guidelines and this plan is going to do the same.

Lauren Kershner, from the Lewistown Sentinel, asked for more information on the SR 522 audit that was mentioned. Bill directed her to the website of the comprehensive plan for more details on the audit. He said a transportation priority is an improved connection to Centre County.

Cindy Harvey, Friends of Jacks Mountain, addressed the board first by thanking the committee for all the hours they have put into the comprehensive plan. She is proud to be from Mifflin County and to tell people that when she meets them. She continued to thank the committee for the excellent model ordinance and all the work that has gone into the ordinance. With her work with Friends of Jacks Mountain, she has been attending several of the township meetings and it upsets her to see the supervisors not working together. Working together is only going to make Mifflin County stronger and grow. Cindy stated that it is not just the wind turbines that drew people to attend the meeting but the overall development of the County. She did ask a question about the meeting on April 24, 2014 to adopt the plan, where would that be held and if an individual wanted to give input into the plan, what was the best way.

Bill answered her questions by informing her that the meeting would be held at the Mifflin County Courthouse in Meeting Room A at 9:15 AM and any input from individuals could be emailed to him. He prefers that they put things in writing.

He continued to state that he knows that one of the concerns is the wind ordinance and the proposed setbacks on the wind turbines. His concern was that the 2500 foot setback was going to cause issues because it would make it impossible to place a turbine on Jacks Mountain. With the natural area boundary that is placed on Jack's Mountain to protect the endangered species, it is hard to measure the setback exactly due to the large area the boundary covers. His work with Laura Simonetti in the GIS Department shows a large buffer and by placing a 1000 foot setback around that boundary, it is more reasonable. The natural area boundary is more limited on Stone Mountain.

Cindy responded that she was sure Laura Jackson would speak with Bill more about this and that they understand this is a model ordinance. However, townships with land on Jacks Mountain are going to look at this ordinance as a guide. She stated that having that 1000 foot setback is reasonable as we need to protect the ground and wildlife. Bill thanked her for her interest.

Speaking with Laura Simonetti and Ann Yost, the Open Space Study and its linkage to the Natural Area Inventory Study have helped in defining the buffer area. It still is not quite as definitive for measurement purposes as they would like. Laura commented that it is not symmetrical, but there are places all over Jack's Mountain that are protected for different species and the area that is protected is a range.

Bill ended the discussion stating that they have looked at several ordinances that already exist and they have not found one that they liked in its entirety. This ordinance is going to be used as a model and will be tweaked by the municipalities; everything can't be covered because each area will have its own concerns. The two main points are touched on is the setbacks, which is 2500 feet for non participating occupied properties and 1000 feet for unoccupied properties as well as provisions for zoning.

Neal stated the only thing that is paramount is public safety. The consultant has tried to look at and address every angle and will serve as an excellent model to be tweaked by municipalities. Citizens should support their municipalities and be vocal if they have concerns.

Don Wert, a local resident, stated that he has looked over the comprehensive plan and he feels it is a wonderful plan and thankful that we have a group that is willing to put the plan together to protect our area. The other plan that he has looked at in great lengths is the Juniata Mifflin County Greenways, Open Space and Rural Recreation plan of 2010 and suggests that the wind turbine people receive a copy of this plan. Their turbines in his opinion do not fit into what this plan outlines for this area. Bill noted that the plan is online and that anyone has access to the plan.

David Bargainnier, resident of Reedsville, commented that the buffer area on Jack's Mountain to protect the species should not only pertain to the land but also the water and air space. The topography that we have here just doesn't exist in other places. He moved here from Ohio because of the beauty of the area. This mountain range offers things that others don't and we need to take our time and take care of what we have.

Co-Chair Neal Shawver closed the public hearing at 4:15 PM and called for a vote to recommend the comprehensive plan to the Mifflin County Commissioners and that the plan be available for public review.. A motion was made by Kent Spicher and was seconded by Michelle Bair. All members voted aye. Following this action, the forty-five day review period will begin next week.

### **Subdivision and Land Development Review Committee Report**

Jim stated the Subdivision and Land Development Review Committee reviewed five (5) applications on February 20, 2014. All five of the applications were under municipal ordinance. Jim indicated he would like to review two (2) of the five plans briefly.

The first plan that was reviewed was the Valley View Haven project in Union Township. This project involves the consolidation of three (3) lots into one (1) parcel. In addition, portions of the site will be

developed with a proposed skilled care nursing wing. This new wing will include care for dementia patients, inpatient/ out-patient therapy and office / meeting rooms. Additional parking facilities are proposed in the vicinity of the proposed addition. The existing public water and sewer facilities which serve the current structure will likewise serve this proposed addition. Access to the site will be the existing developed access onto SR 655 and Applehouse Road.

Jim outlined the comments of the plan. The plan's authorized agent should sign plan, the tax parcel numbers and labels were missing the zero before the last three numbers. This property is in the Agricultural Security Area and should be noted on the plan. It is encouraged that the township removes all lands having this designation for the portions being developed. According to the GIS Department, some of this property has prime farming soil. Under the general notes 21 of Sheet 1, any access via a state highway will require a PennDOT HOP. Additional comments made were regarding the parking spaces, the height of the building, and signage for the building, how the land development impacts traffic patterns, zoning information, lane width in the parking lot and the NPDES permit review. Jim Spendiff stated that DEP already had the permit needed. There was no further discussion on the plan.

The next plan that Jim reviewed was the Richard Ritter plan in Burnham Borough. This plan proposes to create Lot 2 with an existing single-family residence served by public sewer and water. In addition, it is also being created as a lot addition to the lands off Harry S. Sheaffer. The residual tract, Lot 1, is proposing a new residence to be served by public sewer and water. All utilities shown are approximate and must be verified before any earth disturbance begins.

Outlined in the comments were that the total acreage of Mr. Sheaffer's land was not listed on the plan as well as the total lot acreage with lot A addition. There was no mention of whether the lot was located in the 100 year floodplain. A small strip of land indentified as lot 4, north of lot 1, was part of a 14 foot public alley that was suppose to be deeded to each respective property owner, as noted in map book 11-24. This need to be addressed or this land would be land locked.

Mr. Wright, the surveyor on the plan, was sent these comments and told that they needed to take action on the strip of land and make an addition to Lot 1. The Borough of Burnham was contacted and said they would not allow access from Fourth Street without the land addition being addressed.

Neal questioned the plan being brought to the board and Brent remarked that the Borough is also aware that there is a single family home on the property. The problem lies with the land owner because he did not do his part that was needed to obtain the strip of land when it was deeded over to the land owners.

Lucas Parkes, from The EADS Group spoke to this plan and said that the property has been for sale for a long time through the bank and that the owner bought it from a local realtor for a good price. He added that most likely the property owner never modified the deed at the courthouse to show that the strip of land is part of this lot.

There was no further discussion of either plan. Neal asked for a motion to accept the comments made on the five plans made by the board. A motion was made to accept the comments by Kent Spicher and seconded by Michelle Bair. Members voted aye with three abstentions on the Valley View Haven plans by Jim Spendiff, Brent Miller and Neal Shawver.

### **Subdivision and Land Development Municipal Reports**

#### *Brown Township (Municipal Ordinance)*

Name of Plan:	Hostetler, Samuel P. & Carol J.
Municipality:	Brown Township
File Number:	2014-02-005
Tax Map #:	1408-08-0120/14-08-0120C
Applicant Name:	Hostetler, Samuel P. & Carol J
Land Owner Name:	Hostetler, Samuel P. & Carol J
Plan Preparer:	Wright Land Surveying

This plan proposes to take two existing properties owned by Samuel P. and Carol J. Hostetler and rearrange the lot lines to result in three lots. Lots 1 and 2 have existing houses served by on-lot sewage systems and off-site water source. Lot 3 has a proposed house to be served by on-lot sewage disposal and private well.

**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**

The rear sections of lots 1 and 3 lie within the 100 year floodplain.

**Topographic information**

Suitability considerations should be made for this plan. It appears, according to County GIS information, that there are steep slopes (grades over 15%) on this site and development in these should be discouraged.

**Setback Lines**

The rear setback lines are not clearly shown on the plan. (Section 7.302. A. 10.) of the Brown Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance)

**Cartway Widths**

The cartway width should be shown on the plan (Brown Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, Section 7.202. A.11.). There is no cartway information for Hooley Lane or Creek Side Lane. Why does the plan indicate Hooley Lane is a proposed private right-of-way, when it currently exists in its proposed location?

**PennDOT HOP / Municipal Driveway Permit**

Note #4 calls for a PennDOT HOP.

A Clear Sight Triangle and Sight Distances should be shown on the plan for any new access onto a State Route.

**Deed Restrictions and Easements**

The plan states there are no deed restrictions but what about easements? (See Section 7.302 A.6.) of the Brown Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance).

**DEP Sewage Planning Module**

A copy of the DEP Component 1 Sewage Facilities Planning Module 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.

**Water Service**

The plan states off-site water source for Lots 1 and 2 and along SR 655 it lists a 20 foot water easement. Does this serve Lots 1 and 2? The water supply location should be noted on the plan as prescribed in the Brown Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Section 7.302. A.23.). 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.

**Zoning**

The front and side yard setbacks as listed do not

*Burnham Borough (Municipal Ordinance)*

Name of Plan: Ritter, Richard E.  
Municipality: Burnham Borough  
File Number: 2014-02-004  
Tax Map #: 08-17-0811  
Applicant Name: Ritter, Richard E.  
Land Owner Name: Ritter, Richard E.  
Plan Preparer: Wright Land Surveying

This plan proposes to create Lot 2 with an existing single-family residence served by public sewer and water. Also being created as a lot addition to the lands off Harry S. Sheaffer. The residual tract, Lot 1, is proposing a new residence to be served by public sewer and water. All utilities shown are approximate and must be verified before any earth disturbance begins.

**Subdivision Information**

The plan shows dimensions of the Sheaffer property but not total acreage. This should be listed on the plan as well as what the total lot acreage will be with Lot Addition A.

**Floodplain / Wetlands**

The plan should note whether or not the site lies within a 100 year floodplain or designated wetland. (See Section 402. 3K (2) of the Burnham Borough Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance)

**Topographic information**

Topographical contours at vertical intervals should be displayed on the plan. (Burnham Borough Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, Section 402. 3. J.). This provision can be waived by the Burnham Borough Planning Commission.

**Right-of Way Widths**

Based upon the Burnham Borough Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, the right-of-way width of Dry Valley Road is substandard (Part 5 Section 502.3.).

**Cartway Widths**

Based upon the Burnham Borough Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, the cartway widths for Dry Valley Road and Fourth Street are substandard (Section 502.3 ).

**Deed Restrictions and Easements**

Deed restrictions and easements associated with the property, if any, should be provided in accordance with Sections 403.2A and 403.2B of the Burnham Borough Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance.

**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.

**Sewage Service**

A letter from the municipality acknowledging availability of public sewer should be submitted to the Burnham Borough Planning Commission.

**Water Service**

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

**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. ( Burnham Borough Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance,(Part 4 Section 402.3. .L ).

**Other Comments:**

1. The small strip of land identified as lot 4, north of lot 1 containing 961.2 square feet of land, was part of a fourteen (14) foot public alley, which each portion was to be deeded to each respective property owner, as noted in map book 11-24. This needs to be addressed before the subdivision is approved. As part of the subdivision process, the small piece would then be a lot addition to Lot 1. Without this lot addition, Lot 1 will be land locked since the Borough will not allow access from Fourth Street.

*Granville Township (Municipal Ordinance)*

Name of Plan: Valley View Haven Lot Consolidation  
Municipality: Granville  
File Number: 2014-02-002  
Tax Map #: 17-13-107A / 17-13-107  
Applicant Name: Valley View Haven  
Land Owner Name: Valley View Haven  
Plan Preparer: Taptich Engineering and Surveyor

This plan is intended only to permit the consolidation of the various parcels currently owned by The Home and Hospital Association of the Ancient and Illustrious Order Knights of Malta of Pennsylvania. All existing encumbrances will survive the consolidation.

**Administrative**

The authorized representative of Valley View should sign their name on the application to authorize Daniel Taptich as the authorized agent.

**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. Please add these digits to the tax parcel numbers. The absence of the zeros creates inaccuracies within our plan tracking software. A plan narrative should be placed on the plan and should be a brief description stating the purpose of the project. (Granville Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, Article 6 6.100 ). Note number 7 only provides a partial explanation. There should be a clearer explanation of what parcels are being consolidated.

**Subdivision Information**

Since tax parcel numbers 17-13-010F and 17-13-0107 are part of this lot addition subdivision, they should show a lot combination symbol, as well as any others that don't have this symbol.

**Floodplain / Wetlands**

According to County GIS information, a portion of tax parcel number 17,13 -0107A - 000 lies within the 100-year floodplain, and the flood plain 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 hydric soils. Hydric soils can indicate the presence of wetlands. The hydric soils information should be shown on the plan.

**Right-of Way Widths**

Based upon the Granville Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, the right-of-way widths of Apron Green Lane, Red Cross Drive, Malta Drive and Bowersox Lane should be shown on the plan Granville Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Article 6, Section 6.202 a. 11.). Bowersox Lane and Red Cross Drive should be shown on the plan.

Based upon the Granville Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, the right-of-way widths of Miller Lane, Granville Road, Malta Park Road, Malta Drive, Apron Green Lane, Red Cross Drive are substandard Granville Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Appendix A Table 1).

**Cartway Widths**

Based upon the Granville Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, the cartway widths of Apron Green Lane, Red Cross Drive, Malta Drive, Malta Park Road, Granville Road and Miller Lane are substandard (Appendix A-Table 1). The cartway width of Bowersox Lane should be shown on the plan (Granville Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, Article 6, Section 6.202 a. 11).

**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.

**Deed Restrictions and Easements**

Deed restrictions and easements associated with the property, if any, should be provided in accordance with Article 6 Section 6.202 a. 13 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.

**Sewage Service**

Where are the locations of the sanitary sewer lines or on-lot septic systems? (Granville Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance Article 6 Section 6.202 a. 10.).

**Water Service**

The water supply location should be noted on the plan as prescribed in the Granville Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Article 6 Section 202 a.10). 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.

**Signature Blocks on Plan**

A signature block should be on the plan acknowledging the approval of the municipality.  
A signature block should be on the plan acknowledging the review of for the Municipal Planning Commission.  
The County verification statement for the Township's signature should be on the plan.

**Lot Addition**

Under the insert site location map, it appears language regarding the lot additions were attempted, however, it is incomplete and cut off. Is the net area of 159.2866 acres the total acreage after the lot additions or does 159.2866 represent only the lot addition acreage to the parent tract?

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."

**Zoning**

Zoning information should be stated on the plan.

*Union Township (Municipal Ordinance)*

Name of Plan: Peachey, Nathan P. & Linda B.  
Municipality: Union Township  
File Number: 2014-02-001  
Tax Map #: 20-03-108 / 20-13-313  
Applicant Name: Kent Stauffer  
Land Owner Name: Peachey, Nathan P. & Linda B.  
Plan Preparer: Taptich Engineering and Surveyor

This project involves the subdivision of one (1) lot from the lands of Nathan P. and Linda B. Peachey (TM 20-03-108). Lot #1 is intended to be a non-building lot addition to the adjacent lands of Kurt A Stauffer (TM 20-13-312). No changes are proposed concerning access or utilities for the existing parcels. The residue is currently used for agricultural purposes. There are no changes proposed to water or sewer sources for the Residue. Access to the Residue will be via the existing developed driveways which are not shown. A proposed 16' Ingress, Egress, Regress Easement in favor of TM 20-13-108 is being created on the lands of Stauffer (TM 20-13-312).

**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. Please add these digits to the tax parcel numbers. The absence of the zeros creates inaccuracies within our plan tracking software.

**Subdivision Information**

Property boundary information should be shown for the entire property, including the residual property. If survey data is not available, this information could be supplied via the deed description and could be shown on an inset map. ( Union Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance Article IV Section 402 2.h.).

**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**

General Note 4. states "As shown on the Mifflin County Mapping Department Website, no portion of the site lies within a flood hazard area." However, as noted on the overall tract plan the residue lies within the 100 year floodplain. Please correct note number 4.

**Soils**

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

**Right-of Way Widths**

Based upon the Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, the right-of-way width of Luther Lane should be shown on the plan. (Article IV (Section 402. 1.c.) of the Union Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance).

**Cartway Widths**

The cartway width of Luther Lane should be shown on the plan (Union Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, Section 402.1.c.).

**PennDOT HOP / Municipal Driveway Permit**

A municipal driveway permit is required, and a copy should be provided to the Union Township Planning Commission.

**Private Street / Shared Driveway**

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.

**DEP Sewage Planning Module**

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

**Sewage Service**

Where are the locations of septic systems or public sewer lines?

**Water Service**

The water supply location should be noted on the plan as prescribed in the Union Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Article IV Section 402. 1. d.). 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.

**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." 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 parent and recipient lots will still meet the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance requirements. Property boundary information should be shown for the entire property. Currently, no boundary information is provided for the Residue. If survey data is not available, this information could be supplied via the deed description and could be shown on an inset map. (Article IV Section 402. 2.h. of the Union Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance.

**Land Development**

If a private street is proposed, the plan should be reviewed by the Union Township Engineer. The plan as presented would appear to show tax parcel map 20-03-0108 (Peachey parcel) as land locked prior to the insertion of the proposed sixteen (16) foot easement that traverses both the Stauffer and Peachey properties. However, an aerial/GIS photo shows that the Peachey property is provided access by Luther Lane that connects into State Route 655. This is another reason why having Luther Lane shown on the plan is important.

*Union Township (Municipal Ordinance)*

Name of Plan: Valley View Haven  
Municipality: Union Township  
File Number: 2014-02-003  
Tax Map #: 20-06-121B  
Applicant Name: Valley View Haven  
Land Owner Name: Valley View Haven  
Plan Preparer: Taptich Engineering and Surveyor

This project involves the consolidation of three (3) lots into one (1) parcel. In addition, portions of the site will be developed with a proposed skilled care nursing wing. This new wing will include care for dementia patients, inpatient/ out-patient therapy and office / meeting rooms. Additional parking facilities are proposed in the vicinity of the proposed addition. The existing public water and sewer facilities which serve the current structure will likewise serve this proposed addition. Access to the site will be the existing developed access onto SR 655 and Applehouse Road. The proposed site improvements are detailed on the plans attached hereto.

**Administrative**

An authorized agent on behalf of Valley View Haven should sign the application designating Daniel Taptich as their authorized agent.

**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. Please add these digits to the tax parcel numbers. The absence of the zeros creates inaccuracies within our plan tracking software. The abutting property owners and tax parcel numbers directly north of tax parcel number 20-07-0111 are not labeled. Union Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Article IV Section 403 l.d.).

**Subdivision Information**

Under general Notes: 7, it lists tax parcel numbers 20-06-0121B, however, the plan shows the consolidation/lot addition of tax parcel numbers 20,06-0125A, 20, 06-0121BA, and 20-06-0121C. These should be labeled on Note 7.

**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. The property is in an Agricultural Security Area and should be noted on the plan. It is encouraged that the Township remove all lands having this designation for the portions being developed. The Township should contact the Mifflin County Conservation District for guidance about this process.

**Soils**

According to the County GIS files, some portion of this property appears to have prime farmland soils. As noted in General Note 14 of sheet 2.

**Setback Lines**

The setback lines should be shown on the plan as prescribed in the Union Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Article IV Section 402 2.g.). At minimum they should be listed in the general notes.

**Right-of Way Widths**

Based upon the Union Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, the right-of-way widths of King Lane, Center Lane, Hartzler Drive, Oliver Court and Erie Drive should be shown on the plan. (Article IV Section 402 2.a.). Based upon the Union Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, the right-of-way width of Applehouse Road is substandard (Article V Section 501. 2.).

**Cartway Widths**

Based upon the Union Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, the cartway widths of Hartzler Drive, Erie Drive, Oliver Court, King Lane and Center Lane are substandard (Article V Section 501. 2. ).

**PennDOT HOP / Municipal Driveway Permit**

As noted under General Notes 21 of Sheet 1, 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.

**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.

**Sewage Service**

A letter from the municipality acknowledging availability of public sewer should be submitted to the Union Township Planning Commission.

**Water Service**

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

**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.”

**Land Development**

Provisions for Street Lighting may be required and should be included with the plan submission. The applicant should contact Union Township for more information. The applicant should consult the local Fire Marshall to see if new fire hydrants will be required and included with the plan submission.

The building's height cannot exceed thirty-five (35) feet (Union Township Zoning Ordinance Article VI Section 609.2.). Building height information should be on the plan.

**E & S / Stormwater**

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

**Other Comments:**

1. Information regarding the number of parking spaces should be listed on the plan and must meet the zoning regulations.
2. Based on the scale of 1" = 40', the parking spaces do not meet the required dimensional requirement of nine (9) feet wide by twenty (20) feet long (Union Township Zoning Ordinance Article V Section 500. 2.)
3. Based on the scale of 1" = 40', the handicapped parking spaces do not meet the minimum 96" wide (Uniform Federal Accessibility Standards 41 CFR CH. 101) or the minimum 60" wide access aisle next to each parking space.
4. There also must be a minimum 36" wide accessible route from the handicapped parking spaces to the building (Uniform Federal Accessibility Standards 41 CFR CH. 101).
5. Will there be new signage associated with the construction of the new building? If so, the size type and location should be labeled on the plan.
6. How does this Land Development Plan impact existing traffic plans? Was there a traffic analysis completed as part of this plan? If so, how many additional trips will be generated as a result of its construction?
7. There is no zoning information on the plan.
8. What are the lane widths around the new parking lot?

**Other Business**

Neal thanked Bill and the advisory board for all their work on the comprehensive plan and wind ordinance.

As part of the forty-five day review period, Bill mentioned that we can not make major changes to the ordinances but we can make minor changes. Otherwise if we make major changes we need to restart the 45 process. Each township and borough will receive a hard copy of the plan and advisory committee members will be receiving a CD version.

Brent commented that there is so much more to this plan than the wind ordinance. The ordinance is getting the focus. The setback for the turbines has been a large part of the discussion as well as the defensibility of the ordinance.

There was more discussion on the wind ordinance. The questions were about the map that was presented showing the natural area of protection and then the buffer. The question was brought up about the labels on the map. Bill gave the explanation provided to him by Ann Yost. Neal wanted to clarify that there was a buffer created for the protection of the natural area and then the ordinance creates a buffer around that area. Dave spoke up and said it is not a buffer it is an area set aside for the protection of endangered species and then a buffer was created with the ordinance. Neal stated we will never be able to cover every “what if” situation.

Brent stated that there is so much more that people need to know since several of the individuals that signed leases are regretting their decision. David spoke up and said that he thinks the contacts can be broken because they have signed contracts without full information.

Jim Spendiff praised Bill on a well written plan and asked if it is a smart idea to be adopting the comprehensive plan and the wind ordinance at the same time. Should there be more time to review the ordinance. Bill said this is just being used as a tool. It is an attachment to the plan for consideration by municipalities and that only the Comprehensive Plan is being adopted at this time.

Brent then spoke up and said it is a very good model. It is a model that needs to be adaptable by the municipalities to meet their individual needs.

Neal then reminded the members of the annual dinner. The members received their invitations today at the meeting and make sure they RSVP. He also reminded about submitting nominations for the county planning award.

Bill then informed the board of the meeting with Lucas Parkes and The EADS Group involving the bridge inspections. Lucas added that it was well attended. There are 49 bridges in the county over 20 feet in length and 9 of them are owned by the county not the state. The only two that did not attend was Wayne Township and Derry Township. Derry Township is going to have a review at their meeting. As a whole, the bridges are above average. There are a few in need of repairs. A letter was sent out in January to all the townships and boroughs letting them know the priority of what needs to be done.

Jim Lettiere spoke and told Lucas about an MPO meeting he attended with PennDOT District 2 and they did a presentation on a bridge repair process and asked if he knew about it. It is a GeoTech process that can save tons of money.

At the next meeting, there will be a representative from DCED to talk about flood insurance program.

#### **Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 5:10 p.m. upon a motion by Brent Miller that was seconded by Jim Spendiff.