

MINUTES
MIFFLIN COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING
THURSDAY, MARCH 27, 2008
MIFFLIN COUNTY COURTHOUSE, MEETING ROOM B – 3:30 P.M.

ATTENDANCE

Members

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

Others

Dave Gates, PA DEP

Staff

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

Item #1 – Call to Order

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

Item #2 – Record of Public Attendance

Jim reminded everyone to sign the attendance sheet.

Item #3 – Approval of Meeting Minutes

Neal Shawver made a motion to approve the minutes of the February 21, 2008 meeting and the March 19, 2008 annual meeting. Don Kauffman seconded the motion. All members voted aye.

Item #4 – Sewage Planning

Dave Gates of the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) attended the meeting to discuss sewage planning. Mr. Gates distributed copies of his presentation to the attendees. He discussed basic planning instruments for subdivision, such as Components 1, 2 and 3, planning exemptions, planning waivers and non-building declarations. The Form 4A, which is completed by local planning commissions, and the Form 4B, which is completed by county planning commissions, were also discussed. There was also some discussion about prime farmland soils, criteria for exemptions, non-building waivers and the 10-acre planning and permitting exemption process.

Item #5 – Committee Reports

A. Subdivision and Land Development Committee Plan Reviews: Dan Dunmire reported that the Subdivision and Land Development Review Committee reviewed eight plans, which were under municipal ordinances for which the Planning Commission provides recommendations only. The Subdivision Review Committee recommended approval of the comments and recommendations for the following plans: Smeltz & Aumiller subdivision in Armagh Township, Jacob M. Yoder subdivision in Armagh Township, Samuel K. Hostetler subdivision in Brown Township, Church Hill United Methodist Church in Brown Township, Christ R.J. Yoder subdivision in Brown Township, New Indian Valley High School final land development plan in Derry Township, Sheetz #158 Rebuild land development plan in Lewistown Borough and Wesley W. Parchey subdivision in Oliver Township.

Mark Colussy presented the Sheetz #158 Rebuild land development in Lewistown Borough. Mark indicated there was a separate lot consolidation plan submitted to merge the lots around this parcel, which are also owned by Sheetz. Mark briefly reviewed the recommendations in the committee's report, as well as the responses to those recommendations from Innovative Consulting Group, Inc.

Mark then reviewed the Jacob Yoder subdivision in Armagh Township. There was some discussion about Clean and Green, a driveway name and whether a shared driveway agreement was needed.

The Church Hill United Methodist Church was also discussed. Bill Gomes indicated that the review fee was not paid, and the plan was incomplete. The Brown Township Planning Commission was not acting on the plan at this time. If a completed plan was submitted, a second review would be done.

The final land development plan for the New Indian Valley High School was reviewed. Mark indicated that the school is a separate project from the Cedar Street improvements, and Derry Township is reviewing them as two separate projects. A comment was to be added indicating two Highway Occupancy Permits required for this project involving the crossing of Logan Boulevard with a stormwater facility and the redesigning of the intersection of Logan and Cedar are pending. There was also concern about the calculation of traffic flow at the light at this intersection and the release rate at the time of school dismissal. A comment was added regarding these concerns.

John Pannizzo made a motion to approve the comments and recommendations as presented and discussed, as well as the comments added to the New Indian Valley High School, for the plans under municipal ordinances. Kay Hamilton seconded the motion. All members voted aye.

The Subdivision Review Committee report:

Name of Plan: Smeltz & Aumiller

Tax Map #: 12-19-107C

Applicant Name: Godfrey, Anthony J.

Plan Preparer: Roth Surveying Service

Action Taken: *The County provides comments only.*

Plan Summary: *No Narrative provided.*

General Notes

1. Total area being subdivided = 20.24 acres.

2. Total of lot additions = 1.

3. Lot A-3 a 10.24 acre parcel is the residue tract proposed for the construction of a recreational residence to be served by an on-lot sewage system and an individual well. (See previous subdivision as filed in Plan Book 24 Page 19 for sewage facilities planning)

4. Lot A-2-B a 10.00 acre parcel shall be a lot addition to lands of Anthony and Susan Godfrey (Tax Map 12-19, Parcel 107-CB) and shall not be developed or conveyed independently.

5. The private roadway known as West Bud Road shown hereon, is a private roadway owned and maintained by the adjoining land owners. Construction and Maintenance of West Bud Road are in no way the responsibility of the Township of Armagh or the County of Mifflin.

6. This site is not mapped on the National Wetland Inventory, but there are apparent wetlands present on site. Prior to any construction a check of the requirements to build on this site is recommended with the Soil Conservation District or any other government agency concerned with such matters.

7. Portions of these lots are located in a special flood hazard area with no base flood elevation determined. Contact the local officials pertaining to regulations concerning construction requirements prior to obtaining a building permit.

Review Comments (List from Review Committee):

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

Soils - The plan notes there are wetlands on the site. According to the County GIS files, some portion of this property appears to have hydric soils. (AnB, AoB)

Right-of Way Widths - The right-of-way for both New Lancaster Valley Road and West Bud Road do not meet the road provisions of the Armagh Township's Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance. Since the parcel has the potential for future development, road improvements should be considered prior to further development. At a minimum additional right of way should be provided by the applicant as a condition if there is future development along this road.

Cartway Widths - The cartway does not meet the road provisions of the Armagh Township's Subdivision Ordinance. Since the parcel has the potential for future development, road improvements should be considered prior to further

development. At a minimum additional right of way should be provided by the applicant as a condition if there is future development along this road.

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

DEP Sewage Planning Module - The plan notes a reference to a previous subdivision for sewage facilities planning, yet a copy from DEP of the Component 1 should be provided.

Water Service - Note #3 on the plan is similar to the note shown on the October 2006 version. At that time, well and septic information was not shown and again on this plan. The only plan with some information on a septic system and well location area is shown on the July 2006 version of this plan.

Other Comments:

1. The Non-Building Waiver refers to Lot "A-2-A", should this be Lot "A-2-B"?
2. The Armagh Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance requires location maps to be not more than 1" = 800'. (See Section 6.202.a.14) If the location map was at a larger scale, it would be easier to determine the geographic location of the property.
3. This site is heavily wooded. At a minimum, this should be noted on the plan, especially considering the site is intended for a recreational residence.
4. According to County tax records, the Eastern most abutter appears to be T.M. 12-19-171, owned by Crane. Please confirm.
5. In October 2006, there was a recommendation that there be a shared driveway agreement between previous Lot A-1 (Brindel T.M. 12-19-107CA) and previous Lot A-2 (Godfrey T.M. 12-19-107CB). Was this addressed? It was also recommended that if both parties shared a driveway that a street name may be necessitated through the County GIS Department. Was this addressed since this shared driveway is linked to Lot A-2-B?

Name of Plan: Yoder, Jacob M.

File Number: 2008-03-005

Tax Map #: 12-16-107

Municipality: Armagh Township (Municipal Ordinance)

Applicant Name: Yoder, Jacob M.

Land Owner Name: Yoder, Jacob M.

Plan Preparer: Wright Land Surveying

Action Taken: The County provides comments only.

Plan Summary: This plan proposes to create Lots 2, 3 and 4. Lot 1 was previously approved as a 10 acre lot addition to the lands of A. Leslie Shank but was transferred to Kevin S. and Bonnie K. Shank. Lot 2 is being created for a single-family residence with 10 acres (8 acres from Lot 1 and 2 acres from Lot 3). Lots 3 and 4 are being created for single-family residences and were previously approved in November 2006 (DEP Code No. A3-44903-118-1)

Review Comments (List from Review Committee):

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

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

Right-of Way Widths - The right-of-way for T-471, Treaster Valley Road, does not meet the road provisions of the Armagh Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance. (See Table 1) Since the parcel has the potential for future development, road improvements should be considered prior to further development. At a minimum additional right of way should be provided by the applicant as a condition if there is future development along this road.

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

PennDOT HOP/Municipal Driveway Permits - A municipal driveway permit is required, and a copy should be provided to the Armagh Township Planning Commission for access onto T-471, Treaster Valley Road, for all proposed lots.

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

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

Water Service - The plan should indicate proposed well site locations, or at a minimum the well isolation distance from the proposed septic system. (Armagh Township Subdivision Ordinance, Section 3.213.a)

Other Comments:

1. The Northern most property line of Lot 3 and 4 differs from County tax records. Please confirm the boundary line.
2. The abutter Deamer, T.M. 12-16-107A, differs from tax records. Records show the owner being Heimbaugh. Please confirm the owner of this property.
3. There is no location for a proposed driveway to serve proposed Lot 2. Will the proposed house use Shank Lane, which is listed as a proposed 50' right-of-way linked with Lot 1? If so, there needs to be a private road agreement. If Lot 2 is going to use existing driveway (or Shank Lane), it should be noted on the plan.
4. The Armagh Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance requires the Location Map to be not more than 800' = 1". (Section 6.202.a.14)
5. Shank Lane should be labeled on the plan and verify if this will provide frontage to Lot 1.
6. If two or more residences or businesses are to use the same driveway, this will cause the private drive to be named and coordinated with the County GIS office. This may also necessitate a private driveway agreement. The plan needs to verify access to Lots 3 and 4.
7. This property has been subdivided in 2004, 2005 and 2006.

Name of Plan: Hostetler, Samuel K.

File Number: 2008-03-004

Tax Map #: 14-07-109

Municipality: Brown Township (Municipal Ordinance)

Applicant Name: Hostetler, Samuel K.

Land Owner Name: Hostetler, Samuel K.

Plan Preparer: Wright Land Surveying

Action Taken: The County provides comments only.

Plan Summary: This plan purposes to create Lot 2 for a single-family residence to be served by on-lot sewage disposal and private well. The residual tract, Lot 1, is vacant woodland with no development proposed.

Review Comments (List from Review Committee):

Floodplain - The plan should note the site does not lie within a 100-year floodplain. (See Section 7.302.A29 of the Brown Township Subdivision Ordinance)

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

PennDOT HOP/Municipal Driveway Permits - A PennDOT Highway Occupancy Permit (HOP) is required for access to SR 3006, as prescribed in the Municipalities Planning Code (Section 508 (6) and the Brown Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Section 4.208.C and 7.302.A.34). A copy of the permit should be provided to the Brown Township Planning Commission. (See Note 4 on the plan)

Shared Driveway - A shared driveway agreement for the private right-of-way should be noted on the plan. The agreement should include the following: "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." (See Section 4.205.G.4c in the Brown Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance)

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 - 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.

Other Comments:

1. The Location Map is at the scale 1" = 1 mile. The Brown Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance requires the scale to be not more than 2000' = 1" (Section 7.202.A.14).
2. According to the County tax records, T.M. 14-7-112 touches the Northeastern most property line of the residual tract. The township calls for the identification of all abutters. (See Section 7.302.A.17 of Brown Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance)
3. The plans should note information regarding the proposed 50' right-of-way. In other words, the plan should note access provisions are shared by both lots 1 and 2. This could also trigger a road naming question that should be coordinated with the County GIS Office.
4. According to County GIS records, there appears to be a structure on the residual tract. Please confirm if this is true or not. All structures or manmade features within 50' of the property should be shown (See Section 7.302.A.23 of the Brown Township Subdivision Ordinance).
5. A portion of the property lies in the Industrial Zone. This zoning information should be shown on the plan.

Name of Plan: Church Hill United Methodist Church **File Number:** 2008-03-007
Tax Map #: 14-14-252 **Municipality:** Brown Township (Municipal Ordinance)
Applicant Name: Church Hill United Methodist Church **Land Owner Name:** Church Hill United Methodist Church
Plan Preparer: Taptich Engineering and Surveying
Action Taken: The County provides comments only.
Plan Summary: No Narrative provided.

Notes:

1. The subject parcel is TM 14-14-252.
2. The total project area is: 2.88 acres.
3. The current owner of record is: United Brethren Church of Reedsville. Reference DB 183, PG 685 as recorded in the Office of the Mifflin County Register and Recorder.
4. Topographic and Boundary information shown is based on a field survey performed by Taptich Engineering & Surveying, Inc. In May 2006. The vertical datum is assumed. The contour interval is 1.0'.
5. No wetlands are known to exist onsite.
6. This survey was prepared without the benefit of title report. No claims are made as to title.
7. Not all improvements or encumbrances are shown.
8. As indicated in the Act 167 Storm Water Management Plan, Phase II, Kishacoquillas Creek Watershed, Final Report, dated November 2003, the site lies within the area designated for 100% Release Rate.
9. According to the Brown Township Zoning Ordinance, the subject parcel is Zoned R-2 Residential. The following setbacks apply for principal buildings or principal use: Front Yard: 50' (Fronting on a Minor Arterial Road); 40' (Fronting on a Collector Road); 30' (Fronting on a Local Street). Side Yard: 10' Minimum, 25' Total'; Corner Lots: not less than 20' on the street side. Rear Yard: Not less than 30'. The yard designation will be as determined by Brown Township. Reference the Official Brown Township Zoning Ordinance for clarification, and additional restrictions and requirements.
10. All construction material and practices within or adjacent to the public rights-of-way shall be in strict conformance with the requirements of the Pennsylvania Department of Transportation.
11. Development of the proposed lots shown hereon shall be performed in strict conformance with the requirements of the Mifflin County Conservation District, the Pennsylvania DEP and the Stormwater Management / Erosion Control Narrative prepared by Taptich Engineering & Surveying, Inc. dated November 2006.
12. The development of the lots hereon by the future lot owners will be subject to restrictive covenants and zoning requirements including, but not limited to: providing and maintaining exterior dusk to dawn lights, and 30% landscaping on each lot. All development shall be performed in strict conformance with the relevant requirements and restrictions.
13. The proposed on-lot sewage disposal systems shall be installed in strict conformance with all requirements of the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection including, but not limited to required isolation distances.
14. The site does not lie within a designated 100 year flood zone.
15. Water service shall be coordinated by the future individual lot owners and the Municipal Authority of the Borough of Lewistown.

Review Comments (List from Review Committee):

Soils - Soils information should be shown on the plan. (Township Subdivision Ordinance, Section 7.302.A.10) According to the County GIS files, some portion of this property appears to have prime farmland soils. (HaB)

Right-of Way Widths - The right-of-way does not meet the road provisions of Brown Township.

Deed Restrictions and Easements - Deed restrictions and easements associated with the property, if any, should be provided in accordance with Sections 7.302.A.10 and 7.302.B.7 of the Brown Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance. (See Note 12 on the plan)

DEP Sewage Planning Module -The plan shows water and sewer lines running along Woodland Circle and Marlick Avenue. Will these lots be served by public sewer since there is no evidence of on-lot testing as alluded to in Note #13 on the plan. If public sewer will serve these lots, a DEP Public Sewage Mailer should be provided with the plan. Plan approval should be contingent upon receiving an approval of DEP following the filing of the form.

Sewage Service - A letter from the Sewer Authority acknowledging the 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. Note 15 on the plan is not sufficient.

Signature Blocks on Plan - The Mifflin County Planning Commission Signature Block should be changed to "Reviewed by the Mifflin County Planning Commission" instead of "approved".

Required Signatures on Application - The landowner's signature needs to be on the subdivision application form. Included with the plan submittal should be the signature page.

Other Comments:

1. The parallel dashed lines traversing the property on the plans should be clarified and labeled. Considering the application lists 10 lots and the lines divide property into 10 divisions, are these division tracts on the deed? The plan also shows 4 new lots and a residue lot.

2. Abutter information is not provided.
3. The parking spaces are substandard. The Brown Township Zoning Ordinance, Section 1203.A, requires spaces to be not less than 10' in width and 20' in length. The proposed spaces are 18' x 9'.
4. A calculation showing how the number of parking spaces proposed was not provided. Section 1201.B.7 of the Brown Township Zoning Ordinance prescribes the number of spaces required for a church or chapel.
5. All man made features within 50' of the parcel should be placed on the plan. (Section 7.302.A.23 of the Brown Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance). According to County GIS files, there appears to be two buildings not shown.
6. A brief narrative should be provided. (Section 7.302.A.1 of the Brown Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance).
7. The residual lot (52) does not list total acreage.
8. The square footage of the building has not been provided.
9. What is the height of the proposed building addition?
10. Any proposed impervious area should be reviewed by the Township Engineer for stormwater. There is no stormwater information provided with the plan. Plan Note #11 lists a Stormwater Management and Erosion and Sediment Control Plan, yet neither has been provided.
11. Are there adequate fire protection measures (hydrants) in place or proposed?
12. Section 4.203.J.3.a of the Brown Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance requires exterior lighting for parking areas and pedestrian sidewalks. Has this been accounted for? There is no sign of this on the plans.
13. Ownership listed under Note #3 of the plan lists United Brethren Church of Reedsville as the owner, yet the plan title lists owner as Church Hill United Methodist Church. Please confirm ownership. The owner of property needs to sign the application.
14. The applicant only provided one copy of the plan.

Name of Plan: Yoder, Christ R.J.

File Number: 2008-03-001

Tax Map #: 12-06-101C

Municipality: Brown Township (Municipal Ordinance)

Plan Preparer: Roth Surveying Service

Land Owner Name: Yoder, Christ R.J.

Applicant Name: Yoder, Christ R.J.

Action Taken: The County provides comments only.

Plan Summary:

1. Total area being subdivided = 62.2 +/- acres.
2. Total number of lots = 2.
3. Lot 1 the residue parcel of 52.2 +/- acres contains an existing single family residence, barn and a number of out buildings, it is served by an on-lot sewage system and an individual well.
4. Lot 7 a 10.00 acre parcel is proposed for the construction of a single family residence to be served by an on-lot sewage system and an individual well.
5. 20' contours are plotted from U.S.C. & G.S. and approximate.
6. Soils information taken from "Soil Survey of Juniata and Mifflin Counties, Pa. U.S.D.A., S.C.S., April 1981."
7. This site is not located within an identified 100 year flood zone or wetland area.
8. This site contains prime farmland soils.

Final Review Comments:

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.

Other Comments:

1. Lot 1 is shown on the tract map as 52.2 acre parcel, but no dimensional information has been provided as required under Section 7.302.a.7 of the Brown Township Subdivision Ordinance. The ordinance states that if the residual tract is over 20 acres, the surveyor can provide bearings and distances as mete and bounds description from the property deed. If this information cannot be provided, a written waiver request should be submitted by applicant.
2. The applicant needs to confirm whether the tax map number is 12-06-101C or 12-06-101. * This has been corrected on one of the four of the most recent submitted plans.

Name of Plan: New Indian Valley High School

File Number: 2008-03-003

Tax Map #: 16-04-0107

Municipality: Derry Township (Municipal Ordinance)

Plan Preparer: EADS Architects, Inc.

Land Owner Name: Mifflin County School District

Applicant Name: Mifflin County School District

Action Taken: The County provides comments only.

Plan Summary: The Mifflin County School District is currently planning to construct a new 249,203 square foot High School and associated improvements on their existing lands located along Sixth Street in the Borough of Burnham and Derry Township, Mifflin County, Pennsylvania. This project is located behind the existing school campus that houses the existing High School. The proposed improvements associated with the development will include a new building, parking lots, access roads, improvements to Sixth Street, Eighth Street and Cedar Street, and water/sewer utility extensions including an offsite sanitary sewer and water tie ins. Access to the project site will be via Sixth Street. Stormwater management for the new improvements will be achieved by constructing a series of proposed inlets, storm sewer pipes, and underground stormwater detention facilities adjacent to the proposed High School. The underground detention facility will utilize a standard inlet box as an outlet structure. The plan sheets indicate the stormwater collection system. Stormwater Management for the site will meet the Derry Township and the Kishacoquillas Creek Watershed Act 167 Stormwater Management Plan. The proposed project will utilize public water and sewer service. Sewage and water lines will be extended to the project area from existing locations in the immediate area. An NPDES Permit is required for this project as the disturbed acreage for the project is 29.55 acres.

Final Review Comments:

*Floodplain - The plan should note the site is not within a 100-year floodplain. *This has been addressed.*

*Soils - According to the County GIS files, some portion of this property appears to have prime farmland soils. (HcB) Soils are Mapped for areas A, B & D on the E & S plans, but not for Area C. Also, there doesn't seem to be a list of all the soils anywhere on the plans. *A note was placed on the plan stating Soil E₇B occupies Area C. A soils list has been provided.*

Cartway Widths - The cartway width for the Eighth Street Extension is substandard based on the Derry Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (See Section 504.) 25' is provided, but the ordinance calls for 30' for a local access road.

*PennDOT HOP/Municipal Driveway Permits - A municipal driveway permit is required, and a copy should be provided to the Derry Township Planning Commission for access onto Sixth Street. *The proper paperwork has been provided. **There are two highway occupancy permits required for this project involving the crossing of Logan Boulevard with a stormwater facility and the redesigning of the intersection of Logan and Cedar. Both are pending.*

*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. * This has been listed on the Lot Consolidation Plan.*

*DEP Sewage Planning Module - A copy of the DEP Public Sewage Mailer should be provided. Plan approval should be contingent upon receiving an approval from DEP following the filing of this form. *This mailer was supplied and approved.*

*Sewage Service - A letter from the municipality acknowledging availability of public sewer should be submitted to the Derry Township Planning Commission. (See Section 403.2.X of the Derry Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance) *A letter was supplied.*

*Water Service - A letter from the municipal water authority acknowledging availability of public water should be submitted to the Derry Township Planning Commission. (See Section 403.2.X of the Derry Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance) *A letter was supplied. The letter from Municipal Authority of the Borough of Lewistown (MABL) is not clear as to whether the Borough can accommodate the water needs of the new Indian Valley High School. The purpose of getting a letter from the Municipal Authority is to have proof that it will have the capability to serve the needs in the future, much like the sewage letters that were provided. **The applicant will provide an updated letter from the Water Authority that they can accommodate the new school.*

Other Comments:

1. Not all abutters are listed on the plans, which should include tax map number, deed book and page number. (See Section 403.2.S of the Derry Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance) *This still has not been addressed. The southern-most abutters are still not labeled. **The applicant will correct the plan.

2. The Composite Site Plan lists various old parcel owners, numbers and Deed Book information, yet old tract boundaries are not shown. A plan to show the clear merger of all parcels into one would be helpful. *The applicant has provided a separate lot consolidation plan to show this information.

3. The transportation report, dated May 23, 2007, by Trans Associates indicates one point of access off of Cedar Street and two off of Sixth Street, with the main access to the New Indian Valley High School being off of Cedar Street. However, the plans submitted show an access point off of the Eighth Street Extension. A circulation diagram would be helpful to show not only vehicular traffic onto and off the site, but bus traffic as well. *The applicant has provided an 11 x 17 circulation plan but it is not part of the plan submittal and should be. **The circulation plan will be submitted with the final draft.

4. Some structures are shown on abutting properties, but none are shown along the northeastern most property line. There are numerous structures along S. Logan Boulevard. Why are these structures not shown? *According to the Surveyor, these structures are beyond 50', the required distance in the ordinance.

5. CR8-3A is not listed on the Signage Schedule. Should it be CR7-9? *The applicant has corrected the plan.
6. What does "EJ" stand for? Does it stand for expansion joint? If so, this should be stated somewhere. *The applicant has corrected the plan.
7. C3-4A, C3-4B and C3-4C are not listed in the Signage Schedule. Should they be C3-5A, C3-5B and C3-5C? (See Sheet L1.2) *The applicant has corrected the plan.
8. There is a safety concern considering there are no sidewalks leading from Cedar Street to the school. This could cause students to walk on the road. *According to the project engineer, walking will be restricted and monitored on Cedar Street. However, talking to the transportation director for the school, this is not solidified. According to the School District, monitors could be supplied.
9. The Derry Township Zoning Ordinance requires that parking lots with more than 20 spaces provide 5% of those spaces for bicycle use. See Section 312.3.2.E of the Derry Township Zoning Ordinance. *The applicant has accounted for this.
10. All signs should abide by Section 315 of the Derry Township Zoning Ordinance. *A detailed signage schedule and detail drawings were supplied.
11. Section 311 of the Derry Township Zoning Ordinance requires clear-sight triangles and adequate sight distances to be provided for access drives. *The applicant has addressed this question.
12. Fire hydrants should be shown on the plans. (See Section 402.2.J of the Derry Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance) *The applicant has addressed this. However, the symbol is not in the legend until Sheet C5.1. **The applicant will correct the plan.
13. The narrative that was faxed to the Planning Commission should be placed on the plan. *The applicant has corrected the plan.
14. The existing bus routes to the existing high school have all buses driving off of South Logan Boulevard onto Cedar Street, through the driveway down the bus driveway onto Sixth Street, and down to the signal on Electric Avenue. Based on the Trans Associates Report, cars enter off of Cedar Street (35%), Sixth Street (52%) and 8th Street (13%). The traffic study shows a net decrease in traffic off of Sixth & Eighth Street and a net increase onto Cedar Street. Since there was no circulation provided, it is not clear whether the existing traffic pattern will remain or if a new one will be proposed oriented toward Cedar Street. The narrative, however, states that access to the site will be via Sixth Street. Is this correct? Considering the student lot is where it is, won't students access the site via Eighth and Cedar Streets? *The applicant has corrected the narrative and supplied a circulation diagram on a separate sheet but not part of the plan submittal.
15. The West Cedar Outfall should show what it drains into on Sheet C3.6. *The applicant has labeled this as "Buck Run".
16. A Permanent Drainage Easement and a Temporary Construction Easement shown as the Stormwater Plan Sheet CZ.5 should be augmented with supporting information. Has the stormwater plan been reviewed by the Township Engineer? If so has his comments been accommodated? *The Township Engineer reviewed the plan and a copy of the drainage and temporary construction easements were provided. **Based on a letter from the township engineer dated March 25, 2008, he has not received an updated stormwater plan addressing his comments of February 22, 2008. This needs to be addressed.
17. Will the existing bus driveway to the north of the existing high school to remain and continue to function for bus only traffic? *The applicant states it will no longer be used for bus traffic.
18. Outdoor lighting does not appear to be addressed on the plans. If lighting is not provided, this could be a potential safety concern. *This has been addressed. However, the symbol is not labeled or found in the Legend anywhere on the plans. **The applicant will correct the plan.
19. Are there provisions to widen the intersection of Cedar Street and Logan Boulevard to accommodate left and right hand turns onto Logan Boulevard? If not, this could create a stacking problem. *The applicant provided Trans Associates' Cedar Street plans, which show no turn lane proposed. The County Planning Commission is still concerned about this issue. According to a measurement on the Cedar Street Plans, the distance from the intersection of Cedar Street & South Logan Boulevard to the intersection of Cedar Street and Eighth Street is approximately 530'. Considering an average of 17.5' for a vehicle, only 30 vehicles could queue along Cedar Street; this could cause a significant staking problem. Also, it should be noted that the American Public Transportation Association (APTA) considers the average length of a bus is 39.7', which would allow for 13 busses between South Logan and Eighth Street. Additionally, John Czerniakowski, Assistant Superintendent of Mifflin County School District and Director of Transportation, informed the County that both Indian Valley Middle School and Indian Valley High School dismissal begins at 3:10 p.m. and ends at 3:40 p.m. This would cause even more traffic stacking when both schools are letting out students at the same time. Considering the number of students, busses, parents, and local traffic that will be leaving at similar times, can the applicant substantiate this will not cause a staking problem? **Also, according to Bob Froehlich, the Engineering Manager for Trans Associates, only 9 vehicles could exit in one signal cycle. Based upon calculations that the length of the Cedar Street signal recycles every 58 seconds, as well as an average of the total amount of vehicles and busses using Cedar Street at peak hours, it would take 56 cycles to empty Cedar Street. This would take approximately 55 minutes to get all the vehicles through the

signal. According to Dr. Czerniakowski, it is not certain that traffic monitors will be supplied to ensure the proposed traffic circulation. Considering the length of wait time, how can it be assumed that all traffic will exit off Cedar Street and not other residential streets? Please see the letter from Alan Wrye of Buchart Horn to Burnham Borough and Derry Township dated February 22, 2008 in reference to the Preliminary HOP submission review. Additional thought should be given to a turn lane, since this would shorten the wait time considerably.

20. Sheet L1.1 or CS1.1 should list the size of the proposed building. *The applicant has corrected the plan.

21. The height of the proposed building should be listed on the cover sheet and confirm whether it meets the Township's Zoning Ordinance. * This has been addressed. Currently, the building height exceeds the zoning requirements. The review of final plans at this time could be considered premature. The zoning issue has not been resolved to date including a zoning amendment dealing with the height and a conditional use approval. **A hearing has been scheduled for April 7 to address this.

22. The plan lists two waiver requests involving Sections 504.6B and 510.4. Have these requests been reviewed by the Township Engineer? *The Engineer reviewed and recommended the waiver requests. **According to the Architect, the Township has approved these requests. A confirmation letter will be provided.

23. The Planning Commission would like to have confirmation on how parking and loading provisions were determined to insure they meet the Derry Township Zoning Ordinance. * A separate calculation page has been provided, yet there is still a question about the number used. The plans state that 1,300 students will attend the new Indian Valley High School, yet the letter from the Municipal Authority of the Borough of Lewistown references a request to serve 1,468 students. Will there be an additional 168 students? If so, the parking needs to reflect this. **According to the Architect, the building is designed for 1,300 students.

24. Even though PennDOT has deemed Logan Boulevard as a hazardous walking route, that doesn't prevent people from walking to school and along Logan Boulevard. Representatives for the project mentioned there will be traffic monitors placed outside the facility at the start and end of the school day, but that does not prevent people from trying to walk to this area during the day, early in the morning, in the evening, or at night. Since there are no sidewalks whatsoever planned for the school, this could cause pedestrians to walk on the travelway of the road. This is a public safety concern.

25. The traffic study, as pointed out by Engineer Alan Wrye, shows significantly less traffic exiting the school than entering. There doesn't seem to have been an adequate explanation of this phenomenon. Further investigation should be looked at since this could contribute to egress from the school at peak times.

Name of Plan: Sheetz #158 Rebuild

File Number: 2008-03-008

Tax Map #: 01-15-334/01-15-335 Tract 1-2/01-15-336/01-15-338

Municipality: Lewistown Borough (Municipal Ordinance)

Plan Preparer: Innovative Consulting Group, Inc. Land Owner Name: Sheetz, G. Robert

Applicant Name: Sheetz, Inc. Attn. Brian Soyka

Action Taken: The County provides comments only.

Plan Summary: Project Narrative, Sheetz #158 Rebuild, Lewistown Borough, Mifflin County. Sheetz, Inc. is proposing to build a 4,056 S.F. convenience store at their existing location at the intersection of Juniata Street (SR 3002) and West Third Street. The existing site consists of five (5) individual parcels. A lot consolidation is proposed to merge the five lots into one. This project will involve the construction of a larger commercial building, parking lot, a stormwater management/conveyance system, utility laterals and demolition of the existing facilities. The area of the proposed project site is approximately 0.973 acres with the same amount being disturbed. Residential homes bound the site to the north and west, Juniata Street (SR 3002) to the south and McClintic Avenue to the east. The two existing driveways along Juniata Street and one existing driveway along West Third Street will remain unchanged within the street right-of-way. The existing driveway entrance along McClintic Avenue will be relocated northward closer to the 90-degree bend in the roadway. The existing store currently has 21 parking stalls and 6 double sided gas islands, the proposed store will have 29 stalls and 5 double sided gas islands. Water and sanitary sewer service will be provided by constructing new laterals to Lewistown Borough's existing lines located in McClintic Avenue. The proposed service laterals will consist of a 2" domestic water line and a 6" sewer service line. A sewage planning exemption will be applied for from the Department of Environmental Protection. A subsurface stormwater management facility is being proposed to control the increase in runoff from the new impervious areas. The facility will be located under the southwestern side of the proposed parking lot and will discharge into the proposed conveyance system within the site. The stormwater management facility has been designed as per the Lewistown Borough Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance. Storm sewer pipes and inlets shall be kept free of litter, debris and silt at all times. Clean out of these items will be done manually. Silt sacks and silt fence will be placed in inlets and throughout the development to prevent silt from leaving the site. Erosion Control will be provided as per the Mifflin County Conservation District. Construction is anticipated to begin in the spring of 2008 and be completed several months thereafter.

Review Comments (List from Review Committee):

*Soils - According to the County GIS files, some portion of this property appears to have prime farmland soils. (AbB)
According to the applicant, it will be noted on the plan that some portion of the property appears to have prime farmland soil.

*Right-of Way Widths - Based upon the Lewistown Borough Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance Section 501.9, the right-of-way width is substandard for Juniata Street and appears to be for McClintic Avenue. Based upon the Lewistown Borough Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, the right-of-way width for McClintic Avenue and unnamed alley should be shown on the plan. (Section 304.1.C). *According to the applicant, this information will be added to the plan.*

*Cartway Widths - The cartway width should be shown on the plan (Lewistown Borough Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, Section 303.2.A). *According to the applicant, this information will be added to the plan.
PennDOT HOP/Municipal Driveway Permits - Please provide the HOP permit number for entrances onto SR 3002.
According to the applicant, the permit number is 541438. This information should be provided on the plans.

*Deed Restrictions and Easements - Deed restrictions and easements associated with the property, if any, should be provided in accordance with Sections 304.1.B and 304.4 of the Lewistown Borough Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance. *The applicant responded that all deed restrictions and easements are shown on Sheet 2. A list of these should be provided.*

*DEP Sewage Planning Module - A copy of the DEP Sewage Planning exemption should be provided. Plan approval should be contingent upon receiving an approval from DEP following the filing of this form. *According to the applicant, a letter will be submitted to the Borough and forwarded to DEP.*

*Sewage Service - A letter from the municipality acknowledging availability of public sewer due to potential expansion of service should be submitted to the Lewistown Borough Planning Commission. *This question remains unresolved. This is separate from the Planning Exemption Mailer.*

*Water Service - A letter from the municipal water authority acknowledging availability of public water due to potential expansion of service should be submitted to the Lewistown Borough Planning Commission. *According to the applicant, the letter will be forwarded upon receipt.*

*Signature Blocks on Plan - Signature blocks should be on the plan for the Mifflin County Planning Commission, Lewistown Planning Commission and Lewistown Borough. *According to the applicant, the signature blocks will be added to the plan.*

Other Comments:

*1. The lights on the Utility and Landscaping Plan (Sheet 8) were not labeled on the legend except for the luminaire schedule. This should be clearly identified. *According to the applicant, a separate light legend will be added to the plan on Sheet 8.*

*2. Clearly identify one-way roadways. *According to the applicant, directional arrows are on Sheet 4, but the Legend is not clear. It confuses this information by stating arrows represent internal traffic circulation, not roadways.*

*3. The name of the alley that connects to McClintic Avenue should be listed. Presently it appears as an unnamed alley. *According to the applicant, this information will be added to the plan.*

*4. The travel ways through the site should be labeled as to travel widths to insure adequate site circulation and for parking maneuvering. *According to the applicant, dimensions are shown on Sheet 5, but the travel lanes, particularly around the gas pump island, are not shown to prove adequate site circulation widths.*

*5. The Mifflin County Register and Recorder's Office requires plans that are recorded to be no smaller than 24" x 36". This needs to be addressed. Also, why is the lot consolidation plan not part of the land development plan set? *The applicant will provide a correct plan size, but does not believe a combined plan is necessary. The County recommends that the lot consolidation plan be part of the overall plan.*

*6. The stormwater plans should be reviewed by the Borough Engineer. *To date, no comments from the Borough Engineer have been received.*

*7. The abutter at the Northwest corner of the property was not on the plans. (T.M. 1-15-323). *According to the applicant, this information will be added to the plans.*

*8. The front setback required in a Commercial District is 25'. This should be on the plan. (Section 304.1.6)
According to the applicant, the Borough Zoning Officer advised the applicant that this land use would require no setback. This needs to be verified.

*9. A separate narrative was submitted but should also be on the plan. *The applicant does not believe a narrative on the plan is necessary. The narrative should not be considered a separate entity, privileged only to review officials. The narrative is important on the plan to understand the purpose of the plan.*

*10. Does the site have a loading zone for supplying the store? Where will supply vehicles for unloading purposes park? *Though the ordinance does not require a loading zone, it is still important to designate an area for unloading since this type of facility will be resupplied on a regular basis.*

11. Are there fire hydrants associated with this proposal? The plan only mentions a fire hydrant in the legend. Please clarify. *According to the applicant, no fire hydrants are located in the area. Considering this, did the applicant consult with the Fire Chief to see if this proposal would necessitate a new hydrant?
12. Clarification on how parking was calculated should be given to insure it meets the Borough Zoning Ordinance. *Though the site data points to one stall required per 300 square feet of building area, what section of the zoning ordinance was used to determine this requirement? Section 607.1.J appears to be the closest match.
13. Only one set of plans was submitted.

Name of Plan: Parchey, Wesley W.

File Number: 2008-03-006

Tax Map #: 19-10-103

Municipality: Oliver Township (Municipal Ordinance)

Applicant Name: Benny, Dustin

Land Owner Name: Parchey, Wesley

Plan Preparer: NAVTECH INC.

Action Taken: The County provides comments only.

Plan Summary: No Narrative Provided.

Notes:

1. The purpose of this plan is to subdivide this 38.3229 acre parcel into two single-family residential lots.
2. All underground utilities are approximate locations based on utility plans, marking, & above ground features.
3. North rotation based on Deed North.
4. No covenant (s) exist prior to this subdivision plan.
5. P.O.B. equals point of beginning; Control Point.
6. Soils information based on U.S.D.A. Soils Mapping.
7. Topography information based on U.S.G.S. (Belleville) Quad & Supplemented with field data.
8. There are no wetlands based on National Wetlands Inventory Mapping & U.S.D.A. Hydric Soil Mapping.
9. No well or septic on the adjoining properties are within 100 feet of boundary line.
10. No neighboring wells within 100 feet of our boundary lines.
11. No Easements or R.O.W.'S exist other than those shown hereon.
12. Residual tract T.M. 19-10- Parcel 103.
13. The subject parcel is enrolled in the "Clean and Green" Program. Some subdivision situations can trigger rollback taxes to be assessed. Contact the Mifflin County Tax Assessment Office with questions.

Review Comments (List from Review Committee):

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

Floodplain - The property lies within the 100-year floodplain, and the flood plan 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. The hydric soils information should be shown on the plan. (AnB) According to the County GIS files, some portion of this property appears to have prime farmland soils. (EdB, MuB)

Right-of Way Widths - The private right-of-way does not meet the road provisions of the Oliver Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance. (See Table 1 of the Oliver Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance) Considering the right-of-way provided is only 20', this is substandard and should be improved. At a minimum, additional right-of-way should be provided along Lot 4. When this property was subdivided in 2004, it was recommended that if this land was to be further subdivided, the applicant should provide additional right-of-way and improvements to the cartway.

Cartway Widths - The cartway width should be shown on the plan for the private right-of-way (Oliver Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, Section 6.202.A.11). Table 1 of the Oliver Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance requires a 20' improved portion with 3' shoulders.

PennDOT HOP/Municipal Driveway Permits - A municipal driveway permit is required for access onto T-397, Country Lane, and a copy should be provided to the Oliver Township Planning Commission.

Shared Driveway - When this property was subdivided in 2004, it was recommended that a shared driveway agreement be put in place. Has this been done?

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

Other Comments:

1. It is unclear as to the exact location of the proposed Eastern-most property line of Lot 4. It appears it could be the center line of Mill Road, but it isn't clear. If this is the case, the subdivision would leave an awkward cone shaped piece of land between proposed lot 4 and T.M. 19-10-103A.
2. Section 6.202.A.14 requires the location map to show all streets, roads, and municipal boundaries within 1000 feet of the property. The location map provided is unclear as to what it shows.

3. *The abutter Yoder, T.M. 19-10-109, conflicts with County GIS files. County records show this to be Dyer, T.M. 19-10-100A. Please confirm the correct abutter.*
4. *The plan should have a narrative explaining the proposal.*

Item #6 – Public Comment

There was no public comment.

Item #7 – Other Business or Comments

- Bill mentioned he received good comments about the annual meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m. upon a motion by Neal Shawver that was seconded by Dan Dunmire.

mjs