

**MINUTES**  
**MIFFLIN COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING**  
**THURSDAY, MARCH 24, 2011**  
**MIFFLIN COUNTY COURTHOUSE, MEETING ROOM B – 3:30 P.M.**

**ATTENDANCE**

**Members**

Susan Heimbach, Chair  
Dan Dunmire Vice Chair  
Neal Shawver  
Kent Spicher  
Kay Hamilton  
Brent Miller

**Other**

Mike Fisher, SEDA-COG HDC  
Chad Stafford, PennTerra Engineering, Inc.

**Staff**

Mark Colussy, Associate Planner  
Bill Gomes, Director

**Call to Order**

Susan Heimbach, Chair, called the meeting to order at 3:35 p.m.

**Record of Public Attendance**

Susan reminded everyone to sign the attendance sheet.

**Approval of Meeting Minutes**

Susan asked for any changes to the January 27, 2011 CDBG Public Hearing minutes. Kay Hamilton made a motion and Brent Miller seconded the motion to approve the minutes as written. All members voted aye.

**Subdivision and Land Development Review Committee Report**

Dan Dunmire reported that the Subdivision and Land Development Review Committee reviewed eight plans. There were six plans under municipal ordinances for which the Planning Commission provides recommendations only: Reedsville Fire Company in Brown Township, Robert J. Betts in Derry Township, Mann Edge Terrace Elderly Housing Development Subdivision and Land Development in Lewistown Borough and Wilford C. Smith and Mountain Road Structures in Oliver Township. There were two plans under the County Ordinance for which the Subdivision Review Committee recommended conditional approval: Levi Mark & Sara Peachey, Bratton Township and Clair F. Boozel, et.al, Wayne Township.

Chad Stafford of PennTerra Engineering, Inc. gave a brief overview of the revised Mann Edge subdivision and land development plans. The purpose of the subdivision plan was to divide the property into two parcels. The land development will create a 31-unit elderly apartment complex. There were some minor changes to the plan since it was originally submitted, and most of the comments were addressed. There was some discussion about a private drive on Lot 1 and potential parking in the drive for snow removal purposes. There was also concern this would narrow the travel access during times of snow removal. The project engineer stated the access onto Water Street has been removed for Lot 2. A question was asked about distinguishing the floodplain and floodway. Bill Gomes asked that they show this on the plan.

Mark went over the Reedsville Fire Company plan in Brown Township. Brown Township subdivided their property in 2009 along Route 655 by the Township Building to build a new fire station. Mark mentioned concerns with the private drive along Super Shoes. The plan proposes to extend the drive past Super Shoes to a proposed parking lot. There was some concern about an additional opening onto Route 655 from the proposed fire station, which requires an HOP from PennDOT. Bill Gomes said a comment should be added indicating a traffic study should be conducted. There was also some discussion about parking. There were a number of items to be addressed on the plan.

The next plan discussed was Mountain Road Structures in Oliver Township. The previous subdivision plan was to divide ten acres from the farm for a residential structure. The owner is now planning to use this for a commercial structure. The building along with a shale parking lot has been done. A land development plan was never submitted. Bill said the owners were in violation of the Township's Land Development Ordinance and could be fined. As a compromise, the Township decided not to issue an occupancy permit for the building until a land development plan has been submitted and approved. Mark pointed out some outstanding issues including sewage approval, the HOP was for residential rather than commercial use and an E&S permit.

Mark discussed the Levi Mark and Sara Ann Peachey in Bratton Township. The surveyor gave Mark a revised plan, and the comments were revised. Most of the comments were addressed except for the residual information and a waiver has been requested.

A 30-day extension was requested for the Gerald Cramer plan in Wayne Township. Approval of the extension was done by electronic voting of the Planning Commission members, but needs to be addressed officially. Kay Hamilton made a motion to approve the extension request. Dan Dunmire seconded the motion. All members voted aye.

Dan made a motion to approve the waiver request on the residue for the Peachey plan in Bratton Township. Brent Miller seconded the motion and all voted aye.

Dan made a motion for the conditional approval of the plans under the Mifflin County Ordinance: Levi Peachey and Clair F. Boozel. Kent Spicher seconded the motion and all voted aye.

Dan made a motion to approve the comments with modifications on the six plans under municipal ordinances. Kay Hamilton seconded the motion. All members voted aye.

#### The Subdivision Review Committee Report:

Name of Plan:	<u>Peachey, Levi Mark &amp; Sara Anna</u>
Municipality:	<u>Bratton Township (County Ordinance)</u>
File Number:	<u>2011-03-005</u>
Tax Map #:	<u>13-05-128C/128CB</u>
Applicant Name:	<u>Peachey, Levi Mark &amp; Sara Anna</u>
Land Owner Name:	<u>Peachey, Levi Mark &amp; Sara Anna</u>
Plan Preparer:	<u>Sarge Engineering and Surveying</u>

#### Action Taken:

The County approved the plan conditionally based on meeting the following conditions within the next 90 days. If these requirements are not completed within 90 days, the approval is void. If necessary, extensions can be requested by the applicant before the end of the 90 days.

#### Plan Summary:

The purpose of this plan is to subdivide Lot A, of 2.000 acres, from the land of Levi Mark and Sara Anna Peachey as an addition to the land of the Church of God in Christ Mennonite, Living Springs Congregation. Lot 1, the +/- 164 acre remainder, is agricultural.

#### Review Comments (List from Review Committee):

##### Basic Plan Information

All abutters should be shown on the plan with deed book and page numbers. If all abutters information cannot be fit onto the plan, an abutters table may be an option. (Mifflin County Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, Section 7.302.A.17)

\*An abutters table has been added to the revised plan dated 3/15/11.

##### Clean & Green / Agriculture

As noted on the Plan, 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.

##### Right-of Way Widths

Based upon the Mifflin County Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, the right-of-way of Ridge Road width is substandard (Section 4.204.F).

##### Cartway Widths

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

##### DEP Sewage Planning Module

A copy of the DEP "Request for Planning Waiver and Non-Building Declaration" form needs to be provided. Plan approval will be 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 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 Lot 1, 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. (Mifflin County Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, Sections 7.302.A.5, A.7 and A.9)

\*The surveyor has requested this provision be waived due to an inadequate deed description of the residual tract. This was granted on 3/24/11.

##### Features

According to aerial photography, there are buildings on Lot 1. It is assumed a dwelling has an associated well and septic system. 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 revised plan dated 3/15/11 shows the location of structures and well and septic information for the residual lot.

##### Other Comments:

1. The Church of God in Christ Mennonite parcel (T.M. 13-05-128CB) is listed in the GIS records as owned by Peachey and Nolt. Is this correct, or are these the trustees?

\*According to the surveyor, Peachey and Nolt are the trustees.

Name of Plan: Reedsville Fire Company  
Municipality: Brown Township (Municipal Ordinance)  
File Number: 2011-03-008  
Tax Map #: 14-01-115EE  
Applicant Name: Reedsville Fire Company  
Land Owner Name: Brown Township  
Plan Preparer: Taptich Engineering and Surveying

**Action Taken:**

The County provides comments only.

**Plan Summary:**

This project involves the development of one (1) lot of the lands of Brown Township. The site will be developed with the Reedsville Fire Company. The site will be served with public water as well as public sewer. Access to the site will be via S.R. 0655.

**Review Comments (List from Review Committee):**

**Start Notes**

The subdivision plan for the Brown Township Supervisors was reviewed by the Mifflin County Planning Commission on November 19, 2009.

**Administrative**

Only one plan was submitted for review. An appropriate amount of plans should be submitted for review. The Mifflin County Planning Commission requests at least three (3) plans be submitted for review.

**Basic Plan Information**

A North arrow on Sheet 5 and graphic scale bar on Sheets 3 and 5 should be on the plan. (Brown Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, Section 7.302.A.2)

**Topographic information**

Sheet 4 is labeled as the Grading Plan, yet it appears that only the existing contours are shown. However, the proposed contours should be shown on the plan. (See Brown Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, Section 7.302.A.23)

**Soils**

Soils information should be shown on the plan. (Brown Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, Section 7.302.A.10)

According to the County GIS files, some portion of this property appears to have prime farmland soils. (Soil: HaB)

**Setback Lines**

General Note 5 on Sheet 1 references the Brown Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance for setbacks. This note should reference the Zoning Ordinance.

**Cartway Widths**

The cartway width of the paved drive on the Esther Pomeroy Hayes Estate property should be shown on the plan. Also, the travel lane widths throughout the site (parking lots, entrances, etc.) should be shown on the plan. (Brown Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, Section 7.202.A.11)

**PennDOT HOP / Municipal Driveway Permit**

The plan shows a proposed driveway off of S.R. 655. Access onto a state route requires a PennDOT Highway Occupancy Permit (HOP), as prescribed in the Municipalities Planning Code (Section 508 (6)) and in the Brown Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Section 4.208 C). A copy of the permit should be provided to the Brown Township Planning Commission.

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

Given the conditions already along S.R. 655, if a new driveway opening is proposed a Traffic Impact Study (TIS) might be required in this scenario. Considering a HOP may be hard to obtain for this proposal, would the applicant consider directing all fire engine and other fire equipment to the private drive to the East of the property either via a driveway connection or a changed configuration of the fire house garage doors?

The plan shows two proposed driveways, one being off of S.R. 655. Is this not to be open to the public? Will proper signage be installed to direct public to the public entrance and parking area? Will a gate be installed to ensure minimal use?

---

**Private Street / Shared Driveway**

It appears that the private street to the East of the property is being lengthened. Also, the private street will need to have a Private Street Agreement established since a new user will be utilizing the street. The following note shall be included on the plan: "The owners of lots \_\_\_\_\_ agree and understand that " \_\_\_\_\_ Road" is a private road and as such are responsible for the 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 desire to dedicate said road to Municipal ownership, then such owners shall be required at their own expense to improve said road to meet the public road and street specifications of the Municipality in case 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 Mifflin County Recorder of Deeds Office." (See Brown Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, Section 4.204.B.1.c)

Since 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.

Since a private street is proposed, the plan should be reviewed by the Brown Township Engineer.

---

**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**

Deed restrictions and easements associated with the property, if any, should be provided in accordance with Sections 7.302.A.6 and 7.302.B.7 of the Brown Township 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 Brown Township Planning Commission.

---

**Water Service**

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

---

**Features**

Sheet 2 of the plan shows an existing water line; however, the proposed lateral to the building is not shown on the plan. The plan narrative also states the facility will utilize public sewer, so the public sewer line and the lateral should be shown on the plan as well as all other significant man-made features. (Brown Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, Section 7.302.A.20)

---

**Land Development**

Provisions for Street Lighting should be included with the plan submission. (See section 4.203.I of the Brown Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance)

The applicant should consult the local Fire Marshall to see if new fire hydrants will be required and included with the plan submission.

---

**E & S / Stormwater**

The plan shows two proposed stormwater facilities. However, these facilities are shown on the plan without any details or any proposed grading. More detail should be provided and the stormwater plan should be reviewed by the Brown Township Engineer.

The Erosion and Sedimentation (E & S) provisions included with the plan submission should be reviewed the Mifflin County Conservation District. A NPDES permit may be required.

---

**Other Comments:**

1. General Note 8 on Sheet 1 needs to be updated for this proposal.

2. The parking spaces on the East side of the Building appear as if they could be dangerous. Vehicles could potentially reverse into the travel lane of the main access to the rear parking lot. It appears there could be additional room to the West of the proposed parking lot at the rear of the building for additional spaces.

3. The parking requirements of the Brown Township Zoning Ordinance doesn't seem to be entirely met. The plan states that one space per volunteer is required. However, the Zoning Ordinance (Section 1703) requires one space per volunteer and one for each employee for the largest shift. Also, the plan should specifically indicate how many ADA accessible spaces have been provided. Additionally, it is our understanding that this facility will also be used as a community facility as well as the fire company. In this case, one space will need to be provided for every 200 square feet of gross floor area and one per employee. Both land uses should be accounted for. How much square footage will the fire company be and how much will only be for the community facility? The square footages should be provided on the plan.

Name of Plan: Betts, Robert J.  
Municipality: Derry Township (Municipal Ordinance)  
File Number: 2011-03-001  
Tax Map #: 16-39-021/16-39-022  
Applicant Name: Betts, Robert J.  
Land Owner Name: Betts, Robert J.  
Plan Preparer: George R. Campbell, PLS

**Action Taken:**

The County provides comments only.

**Plan Summary:**

This plan proposes a lot addition from the lands of Robert J. & Delores M. Brett to their existing Lot #21. contains a dwelling with Public Water & Sewer.

**Review Comments (List from Review Committee):**

**Soils**

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

**Cartway Widths**

Based upon the Derry Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, the cartway width of Peachwood Avenue is substandard (Section 504.2).

**Deed Restrictions and Easements**

Deed restrictions and easements associated with the property, if any, should be provided in accordance with Sections 403.2.G and 403.7 of the Derry 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.

**Other Comments:**

1. The plan should indicate that no development is proposed.
2. The plan should state that the lot line between the two consolidated lots is to be removed. Also, there should be a lot merger symbol (Z) on the plan.
3. Note 4 on the plan should be expanded to state that the lot addition cannot be developed as a separate lot.
4. Only two (2) plans were submitted for review. The Mifflin County Planning Commission requests at least three (3) plans be submitted for review.
5. An old version of the application was submitted. If a copy of the new application is required, please contact the Mifflin County Planning and Development Department.

Name of Plan: Mann Edge Terrace Elderly Housing Dev.  
Municipality: Lewistown Borough (Municipal Ordinance)  
File Number: 2011-03-006  
Tax Map #: 03-03-310/03-03-320  
Applicant Name: Mifflin County Industrial Dev. Corp.  
Land Owner Name: Mifflin County Industrial Dev. Corp.  
Plan Preparer: PennTerra Engineering, Inc.

**Action Taken:**

The County provides comments only.

**Plan Summary:**

Tax Parcel 03-03-320 consisting of 0.222 acres (9,679 square feet) is to be added onto Tax Parcel 03-03-310 consisting of 2.991 acres (130,296 square feet), as a LOT CONSOLIDATION). Tax parcel 03-03-320 is a LOT ADDITION and shall become an integral part of Tax Parcel 03-03-210. The Consolidated Lot Tax Parcel 03-03-310 shall now consist of 3.213 acres. Furthermore, after the lot is considered "consolidated" the lot shall then be subdivided to create two (2) lots as depicted herein these plans.

**Review Comments (List from Review Committee):**

**Start Notes**

The plan comments are based off the original plan, dated 3/9/11, and modified based off the revised plan, dated 3/21/11, that was submitted at the Planning Commission meeting on March 24th.

**Basic Plan Information**

A plan narrative should be placed on the plan and should be a brief description stating the purpose of the project. Project Note 4 appears to be an adequate project narrative if it were labeled as such. (Borough of Lewistown Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, Section 7.302.A.1)

\*A plan narrative has been added to the revised plan dated 3/21/11.

**Floodplain / Wetlands**

According to County GIS DFIRM data, the property lies within the 100-year floodplain, and a portion is also in the floodway. Future development in this area should be discouraged. The plan references the Floodway elevation, but not the 100-year Floodplain elevation. Both should clearly be indicated on the plan.

Also, Note 7 on Sheet 1 states that the property is located in the "X Zone", however, a portion of the property is located within the "AE Zone". This should be clear on the plan.

Additionally, the dark dashed line labeled as the "Floodway Elevation" should be in the Legend, as well as all other items shown on the plan.

**Cartway Widths**

The plan lists the cartway width of South Dorcas Street as variable. The cartway width should be shown on the plan at least along the property boundary. (Borough of Lewistown Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, Section 7.202.A.11).

\*This information has been added to the revised plan dated 3/21/11.

**Deed Restrictions and Easements**

Deed restrictions and easements associated with the property, if any, should be provided in accordance with Sections 7.302.A.6 and 7.302.B.7 of the Borough of Lewistown Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance.

\*According to the Project Engineer, there are none known.

**Signature Blocks on Plan**

A signature block should be on the plan acknowledging the review of the Borough of Lewistown Planning Commission and not their approval.

\*This information has been updated on the revised plan dated 3/21/11.

The Mifflin County Review Certificate should be on the plan instead of the approval block. If a copy of the certificate is required, one can be obtained from the Mifflin County Planning and Development Department.

\*This information has been added to the revised plan dated 3/21/11.

**Other Comments:**

1. Note 2.d on Sheet 1 of the plan references the lot coverage requirements. It lists both 12,802 sq. ft. as the footprint size and then states that the minimum lot size necessary is 18,288. Clarification on this should be made on the plan.

\*This information has been updated on the revised plan dated 3/21/11.

2. Considering this plan is reconfiguring two lots into two differently sized lots, it should be clear on the plan as to the purpose of the project.

\*This information has been explained in the project narrative on the revised plan dated 3/21/11.

Name of Plan: Mann Edge Terrace Elderly Housing Dev.  
Municipality: Lewistown Borough (Municipal Ordinance)  
File Number: 2011-03-007  
Tax Map #: 03-03-310/03-03-320  
Applicant Name: Mifflin County Industrial Dev. Corp.  
Land Owner Name: Mifflin County Industrial Dev. Corp.  
Plan Preparer: PennTerra Engineering, Inc.

**Action Taken:**

The County provides comments only.

**Plan Summary:**

The purpose of this plan is to create/develop a 31-unit elderly apartment complex land and building development for (current) tax parcel 03-03-0310 on the proposed concurrent Subdivision of Lot 1 for the parcel located in the Borough of Lewistown, Mifflin County, PA.

**Review Comments (List from Review Committee):**

**Start Notes**

The plan comments are based off the original plan, dated 3/9/11, and modified based off the revised plan, dated 3/21/11, that was submitted at the Planning Commission meeting on March 24th.

**Basic Plan Information**

A plan narrative should be placed on the plan and should be a brief description stating the purpose of the project. Project Note 4 on Sheet 4 appears to be an adequate project narrative if it were labeled as such and placed either on the cover sheet or the second sheet. (Borough of Lewistown Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, Section 7.302.A.1)

\*A narrative has been added to the revised plan dated 3/21/11.

**Floodplain / Wetlands**

According to County GIS DFIRM data, the property lies within the 100-year floodplain, and a portion is also in the floodway. Future development in this area should be discouraged. The plan references the Floodway elevation, but not the 100-year Floodplain elevation. Both should clearly be indicated on the plan. Also, Note 7 on Sheet 4 states that the property is located in the "X Zone", however, a portion of the property is located within the "AE Zone". This should be clear on the plan. Additionally, the dark dashed line labeled as the "Floodway Elevation" should be in the Legend, as well as all other items shown on the plan.

**Cartway Widths**

The plan lists the cartway width of South Dorcas Street as variable. The cartway width should be shown on the plan at least along the property boundary. (Borough of Lewistown Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, Section 7.202.A.11).

\*This information has been added to the revised plan dated 3/21/11.

**PennDOT HOP / Municipal Driveway Permit**

A municipal driveway permit is required, and a copy should be provided to the Borough of Lewistown Planning Commission.

**Private Street / Shared Driveway**

Sheet 13 indicates future development on Lot 2 that connects what appears to be a driveway to the proposed

private drive on Lot 1. Is this why a shared driveway agreement is on the plan? Is this drive to be built or is this just a possibility? It appears if this drive were installed as proposed on Sheet 13, the drive would be very steep and could be problematic.

\*According to the Project Engineer, the configuration on Sheet 13 is purely conceptual. According to the developer, access onto Water Street for Lot 2 is going to be removed since this could cause a through traffic issue for people utilizing the driveway as a shortcut onto S Dorcas Street. The Borough should consider at this time if a driveway opening will be granted to Lot 2 in the future in alignment with Brown Street.

\*\*The private drive's access onto Water Street has been removed from the revised plan dated 3/21/11.

Since a private street is proposed, road profiles should be provided and the drive should be reviewed by the Borough of Lewistown Engineer.

---

**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**

Deed restrictions and easements associated with the property, if any, should be provided in accordance with Sections 7.302.A.6 and 7.302.B.7 of the Borough of Lewistown Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance.

\*According to the Project Engineer, there are none known.

---

**DEP Sewage Planning Module**

If the project is to utilize public sewer, a DEP Component 3, or Exemption from Sewage Planning (Maier), 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 Borough acknowledging availability of public sewer should be submitted to the Borough of Lewistown Planning Commission.

---

**Water Service**

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

\*A letter dated 2/3/11 has been provided.

---

**Signature Blocks on Plan**

A signature block should be on the plan acknowledging the review of the Borough of Lewistown Planning Commission and not their approval.

The Mifflin County Review Certificate should be on the plan instead of the approval block. If a copy of the certificate is required, one can be obtained from the Mifflin County Planning and Development Department.

\*The review certificate has been added to the revised plan dated 3/21/11.

---

**Land Development**

Parking provisions should be indicated on the plan, including handicap space provisions. Note 2.g on Sheet 4 provides the number required, but doesn't list the number provided. Considering all 32 spaces have been provided, this should be clear on the plan.

\*Parking provisions have been clearly indicated on the revised plan dated 3/21/11.

Since 31 units are proposed, a traffic study will not be required. The waiver request for this provision does not seem necessary.

The applicant should consult the local Fire Marshall to see if new fire hydrants will be required and included with the plan submission.

---

**E & S / Stormwater**

Stormwater drainage provisions should be included with the plan submission. The stormwater plan should be reviewed by the Borough of Lewistown Engineer. Has the stormwater system been designed to meet the new Stormwater Management Ordinance requirements?

\*According to the Project Engineer, the stormwater controls have been designed to meet the new ordinance requirements.

This proposal should require Erosion and Sedimentation (E & S) Control Plan and NPDES Permit. The applicant should contact the Mifflin County Conservation District.

---

**Other Comments:**

1. Why is Sheet 4 not Sheet 2, considering the signature blocks and plan description are on this sheet?

2. The plan appears to propose leaving a large existing concrete area. Is this true? If so, why does it appear the proposed parking lot goes overtop the concrete? If the concrete is to be removed, it should be indicated as such on the plan.

\*According to the Project Engineer, the concrete is to remain. Fill will be placed overtop the concrete.

3. Multiple layers (i.e. soils, existing elevations, easements, etc.) are shown on the Record Plan (Sheet 5). At least one sheet should clearly indicate only what is proposed and eliminate additional layers to remove clutter.

\*The contours have been removed from Sheet 5 on the revised plan dated 3/21/11. However, there still a few layers still appearing on this sheet that clutters the main building layout on the site (i.e. easements, soils

---

information, floodway, etc.).

4. The applicant should contact the Borough of Lewistown to coordinate a developer's agreement.

5. Note 2.d on Sheet 4 of the plan references the lot coverage requirements. It lists both 12,802 sq. ft. as the footprint size and then states that the minimum lot size necessary is 18,288. Clarification on this should be made on the plan.

\*This information has been added to the revised plan dated 3/21/11.

6. Traffic control signage, as well as any other signage on the site, should clearly be indicated on the plan.

\*This information has been added to the revised plan dated 3/21/11.

7. The driveway opening width onto Water Street should clearly be labeled on the plan.

8. According to the developer, the driveway of the property will be utilized for parking during snow removal. Considering the narrow width of the travel lane, this could greatly impact travel on the site. This should be considered if this is going to be the sole access onto Lot 2.

---

Name of Plan:	Smith, Wilford C.
Municipality:	Oliver Township (Municipal Ordinance)
File Number:	2011-03-002
Tax Map #:	19-02-121C
Applicant Name:	Smith, Wilford C.
Land Owner Name:	Smith, Wilford C.
Plan Preparer:	Roth Surveying Services

**Action Taken:**

The County provides comments only.

**Plan Summary:**

No narrative provided.

Total area being subdivided - 75.00 acres.

Lot 1 a 35.20 acre parcel is vacant woodland and shall be a lot addition to the lands of David M. & Lynette D. Bratton, Tax Map 19-02, Parcel 129 and may not be developed nor conveyed independently. Lot 2 a 35.20 acre parcel is the residual tract and contains a cabin served by an existing on-lot sewage system and an individual well.

This site is not located in a designated flood hazard area nor contains wetlands.

**Review Comments (List from Review Committee):**

**Basic Plan Information**

A plan narrative should be placed on the plan and should be a brief description stating the purpose of the project.

All abutters should be shown on the plan, including tax map numbers. (Oliver Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, Section 6.302.a.17). According to County Tax Assessment records, some of the abutters on the plan do not match. Additionally, it appears that some of the parcel tax map numbers differ than tax assessment records. Please confirm.

**Topographic information**

Topographical contours at vertical intervals should be displayed on the plan (Oliver Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, Section 6.202.a.7).

**Soils**

Soil information is not on the plan. Since the plan involves a lot addition/merger, the applicant should request a waiver from the subdivision ordinance.

**Right-of Way Widths**

Based upon the Oliver Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, the right-of-way width of Little Kansas Road is substandard (Table 1).

**Private Street / Shared Driveway**

There appears to be a shared driveway between Parcel 2 and Lot 2. 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**

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 Oliver Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance.

**DEP Sewage Planning Module**

A copy of the DEP "Request for Planning Waiver and Non-Building Declaration" form should be provided. Plan approval should be 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 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 grantee property of the Lot Addition (David Bratton, T.M. 19-02-129). If survey data is not available, this information could be supplied via the deed description and could be shown on an inset map. (Oliver Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance Sections 6.302.a.5, 7, 9 & 12)

A lot addition plan should include an inset map. An inset map is a general location map of sufficient size and detail for the Commission to readily determine geographically where the subdivision, or lot addition, is proposed.

**Other Comments:**

1. Is Parcel 2 linked to Lot 2, or is it a stand alone lot? There should be a connection symbol (Z) if they are joined.
2. Since Lot 1 is to be added to the David Bratton tract, access to the public road system should be shown on the plan.
3. The site location map does not appear to be showing the proper location. Please confirm.
4. The plan shows a gravel lane on the East side of Lot 2. Does Lot 2 have access to this lane? Is there an easement or maintenance agreement associated with this lane? If not, one should be considered at this time.

Name of Plan: Mountain Road Structures  
Municipality: Oliver Township (Municipal Ordinance)  
File Number: 2011-03-003  
Tax Map #: 19-02-117H  
Applicant Name: Lapp, John P.  
Land Owner Name: Lapp, John P.  
Plan Preparer: Taplich Engineering and Surveying

**Action Taken:**

The County provides comments only.

**Plan Summary:**

This project is intended to address the Land Development requirements of Oliver Township. The structure which is noted on the Plan of Subdivision recorded in Instrument Number 2010-1127 as "under construction" was initially intended for use for agricultural purposes only. Since that time, the owner has decided to perform commercial activities at this site. These activities include the fabrication and sale of wooden accessory buildings. In addition to the building, the required site improvements include a gravel access and staging / display areas adjacent to the structure.

Some of the requirements for a Land Development Plan have been addressed as part of the original subdivision. For instance, the Sewage Facilities Planning has been addressed with the Pennsylvania DEP. While soils testing to accommodate an on-lot sewage disposal system has been completed and approved, the Owner has installed Holding Tanks to address the sewage flows generated at this site. The Township SEO approved and permitted the Holding Tank design / installation.

The previous Plan of Subdivision provided for access to the site and the previous Residue via a Minimum Use Highway Occupancy Permit (HOP) issued by the PennDOT. To accommodate the proposed use of the site, it will be necessary to obtain a Low Volume HOP from PennDOT.

**Review Comments (List from Review Committee):**

**Start Notes**

This property was previously reviewed as a subdivision plan on January 28, 2010.

**Basic Plan Information**

A scale and graphic scale bar on sheets 3, 4, & 5 should be on the plan. (Oliver Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, Section 6.302.a.2)

**Clean & Green / Agriculture**

The parcel is enrolled in the Clean and Green program. Considering this development changes the land use of the property, this proposal could violate the terms of the Clean and Green program. If the applicant should have any questions, they should contact the Mifflin County Assessment Office for more information.

**PennDOT HOP / Municipal Driveway Permit**

The project narrative states a Highway Occupancy Permit (HOP) has already been issued by PennDOT. The permit

number should be listed and a copy of the permit should be provided to Oliver Township.

---

**Street Names**

Plan sheet 3 points to the driveway opening to the property and lists Knable Court and Mountainside Structures Drive. Has the driveway already been named Mountainside Structures Drive? Isn't the name of the business named Mountain Road Structures instead of Mountainside Structures? According to the Mifflin County GIS (Mapping) Department, this drive has never been named. The Applicant should coordinate this with the GIS Department. There is a fee associated with the street naming. If this road isn't to be named, this name should be removed from the plan.

---

**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 Oliver Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance.

---

**DEP Sewage Planning Module**

The Plan Narrative states the SEO already approved the holding tank design and installation. This paperwork should be provided to Oliver Township. Considering the previous subdivision plan that was submitted indicated the development was to be residential, is the previous DEP approval sufficient considering this is going to be a commercial retail operation?

---

**Land Development**

A traffic circulation diagram should be included with this plan submission to verify adequate site circulation. Also, will there be any circulation between this property and the abutting property where the sheds currently sit? If so, an easement and maintenance agreement may need to be put in place.

Parking provisions should be indicated on the plan, including ADA compliant spaces.

Provisions for Street Lighting may be required and should be included with the plan submission.

---

**E & S / Stormwater**

Considering this proposal disturbs more than 5,000 sq. ft. of earth, a Erosion and Sedimentation (E & S) Control Plan will be required and NPDES Permit may be required. 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 Oliver Township Engineer. Have the stormwater drainage provisions been designed to meet the new Stormwater Management Ordinance?

---

**Other Comments:**

1. Sheet 5 of the plan shows concrete endwall and storm trench details, yet the plan does not indicate the location of these items on the site. Is this information for the HOP, or for the stormwater plan? More information should be provided on the plan.
  2. Sheet 2 shows the entire tract, but sheet 3 only shows a portion of the parcel. Why isn't the entire tract shown on Sheet 3?
  3. The wording "(See Note #9)" is on Sheets 4 through 6. Is this supposed to be noted? Is this supposed to reference General Note 9 on the Cover Sheet? This reference doesn't seem to make an understandable correlation since General Note 9 references the Proposed Land Use.
  4. The application lists the building encompassing almost 7500 square feet of area. However, there is no mention of the building size listed on the plan, which it should. The plan only references the first floor elevation.
  5. The proposed driveway width for access to the parcel should be listed on the plan. There should also be a clear sight triangle to show the distance from the driveway opening to show sight visibility.
  6. There is a 20' right-of-way traversing the tract to the Miller property. Will this development, or any future development, utilize this right-of-way? Is there a shared driveway agreement in place for this right-of-way?
  7. The Township should consider amending their Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance to include specific provisions for non-residential off-street parking requirements (i.e. one space per 200 square feet of floor area). For more information, the Township can contact the Mifflin County Planning and Development Department.
  8. The plan states it has been copyrighted before it was submitted for review and approved.
-

Name of Plan:	<u>Boozel, et.al., Clair F.</u>
Municipality:	<u>Wayne Township (County Ordinance)</u>
File Number:	<u>2011-03-004</u>
Tax Map #:	<u>21-07-116</u>
Applicant Name:	<u>Boozel, et.al., Clair F.</u>
Land Owner Name:	<u>Boozel, et.al., Clair F.</u>
Plan Preparer:	<u>Wright Land Surveying</u>

**Action Taken:**

The County approved the plan conditionally based on meeting the following conditions within the next 90 days. If these requirements are not completed within 90 days, the approval is void. If necessary, extensions can be requested by the applicant before the end of the 90 days.

**Plan Summary:**

This plan proposes to create two lot additions as shown. The residual tract has an existing house with no development proposed.

Lot Addition A consisting of 3.950 acres onto land owned by Clair F. Boozel. Lot A is a lot addition and shall become an integral part of the property owned by Clair F. Boozel. Lot addition A is not a building lot and cannot be maintained or developed as a separate individual lot.

Lot Addition B consisting of 3.950 acres onto land owned by Glenn Clair Renninger. Lot Addition B is a lot addition and shall become an integral part of the property owned by Glenn Clair Renninger. Lot addition B is not a building lot and cannot be maintained or developed as a separate individual lot.

**Review Comments (List from Review Committee):**

**Clean & Green / Agriculture**

As noted in Note 5 on the plan, 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.

**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 plan does not indicate that the soil BrB is on the property, which differs from County GIS information. The hydric soils information should be shown on the plan.

**Right-of Way Widths**

Based upon the Mifflin County Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, the right-of-way width of Sechrist Road is substandard (Section 4.204.F).

**Cartway Widths**

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

**Deed Restrictions and Easements**

Deed restrictions and easements associated with the property, if any, should be provided in accordance with Sections 7.302.A.6 and 7.302.B.7 of the Mifflin County Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance.

\*According to the surveyor, there are none known.

**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.

**Water & Sewage Service**

Water and Sewage service information should be shown on the plan for Lot 1. (See Section 7.302.A.20 of the Mifflin County Subdivision and Development Ordinance)

**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 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 Lot 1. If survey data is not available, this information could be supplied via the deed description and could be shown on an inset map. (Mifflin County Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, Sections 7.302.A.5, A.7 and A.9)

**Features**

Based on aerial photography, it appears there are structures on Lot 1. 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)

\*According to the surveyor, he was unsure if there was an existing septic system on the residual lot. He will have to double check this item.

**Public Comment**

There was no public comment.

**Other Business or Comments**

Bill mentioned a lot merger in Wayne Township of Michael and Frances Smith. This was done prior to subdivision ordinance regulations. A neighbor, Mr. Peters, is concerned that the septic system is too close to his property. Bill said he just wanted to point out the importance of the subdivision ordinance to avoid situations like this. The second thing Bill mentioned was a plan that was recorded with a signature that was not an original signature from the Planning Office. When the plan was brought to this office for signing, Mark did not sign it because some issues were not addressed. The plan had not been signed by anyone from Derry

Township and after additional discussion was signed. Peggy Stewart was made aware of this situation and passed this information to the Derry Supervisors who in turn did not sign the plan. It was later learned that the plan was recorded by copying the Planning Commission signature from the preliminary plan to the revised plan. According to the ordinance, there must be an original signature. The Recorder's Office has asked that Mark and Bill sign with blue ink so they will recognize original signatures. Bill said he has learned that five municipalities do not require original signatures. There was some discussion whether blue ink can be copied electronically. There seems to be no easy solution to this problem at the present time.

**Adjournment**

Dan Dunmire made a motion to adjourn the meeting and Brent Miller seconded the motion. The meeting adjourned at 5:12 p.m.

db