

MINUTES
MIFFLIN COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING
THURSDAY, JUNE 25, 2009
MIFFLIN COUNTY COURTHOUSE, MEETING ROOM B – 3:30 P.M.

ATTENDANCE

Members

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

Other

Dave Harmon, Newton Hamilton Borough
Megan Bollinger, The Sentinel
Karen Michael, PennDOT
Jim Saylor, SEDA-COG
Jim Tunall, Juniata Valley Area Chamber of Commerce
Jim Zubler, Downtown Lewistown, Inc.
Eric Casanave, PennTerra
Kenton Stuck, Quillas Creek
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

Jim asked if there were any changes or corrections to the meeting minutes of May 28, 2009. Since there were no changes, Jim stated the minutes would stand approved as written.

Item #4 – Transportation Projects Update

Karen Michael, Assistant District Executive for Design, at PennDOT presented an update on area transportation projects affecting Mifflin County. Karen began by indicating that PennDOT's District 2-0 consists of Mifflin, Juniata, Centre, Clearfield, Clinton, Cameron, Elk, Potter and McKean Counties. She briefly discussed recently completed projects in Mifflin County, such as the Monument Square Streetscape Project in downtown Lewistown, PA 655 Belleville bridge project, local T-702 Schoolhouse Road bridge project, as well as completed projects in Juniata County, such as SR 3008 Groninger Valley Road bridge project and the Academia/Pomeroy bridge enhancement project.

Projects underway in Mifflin County consist of the PA 305 Little Kish Creek bridge (let 8/28/2008), SR 2002-A03 Belltown Run bridge replacement (let 1/22/2009), SR 2007-A01 bridge replacement (let 5/14/2009). Projects underway in Juniata County consist of U.S. 22 resurfacing (let 3/6/2008), U.S. 22 resurfacing (let 11/13/2008), SR 3014 Willow Run bridge replacement (let 2/20/2009), PA 850/75 bridge replacements (bid 3/5/2009), SR 3021-L05 bridge rehabilitation (bid 3/19/2009), Port Royal Truss bridge rehabilitation (let 5/21/2009).

Upcoming projects for Mifflin County include the SR 4007-A02 Musser Run box culvert replacement (let 12/12/2008), SR 2002 Belltown Run box culvert replacement (let 3/10/2009), SR 1005 Electric Avenue highway restoration (let 10/29/2009), SR 1005 Buck Run bridge replacement (let 9/2010), SR 22 Bypass bridge rehabilitations (let Spring 2011), SR 322 Reedsville bridge rehabilitations (let Spring 2011), SR 1002 Honey Creek bridge replacement (let early 2012), SR 2001 Jacks Creek bridge replacement (let early 2012). Upcoming projects for Juniata County include local T-379 Milford Township bridge replacement (let 7/6/2009), U.S. 22 resurfacing (let 8/20/2009), SR 4003 Licking Creek bridge replacement (let 12/2009), SR 333 Hunters Creek

box culvert replacement (let 12/2009), SR 35 Juniata River bridge replacement (let 8/2010), SR 3031 Route 75 Connector bridge replacement (let Spring 2011) and SR 75 Tuscarora Creek bridge replacement (let Spring 2012).

Jim Tunall asked if bicycle lanes would be possible along Electric Avenue. Karen responded that bicycle lanes would not be possible along that road, but wider shoulders and “share the road” signs could be possible. Bill mentioned that the striping had been discussed previously with the central office of PennDOT. Jim Tunall also asked about the possibility of buggy lanes along Route 655. Karen suggested wider shoulders along this roadway as well, so that buggies could get off of the roadway. Jim wishes to have dialogue with PennDOT about future transportation matters that involve tourism.

There were also some questions for Karen regarding the lack of stimulus money for transportation in Mifflin County. Karen explained that for the stimulus funds, projects are required to be construction ready. However, the paving of Electric Avenue is being done with stimulus funds.

Jim Tunall asked about the progress on deeding the canal park in the Narrows to another entity. Karen thought that process was underway or complete, but will check on the status of the matter and get back with Bill Gomes.

Item #5 – Twelve-Year Transportation Plan and Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP)

Jim Saylor, Director of Transportation Planning, at SEDA-COG gave an overview of the Twelve-Year Transportation Plan and Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP) processes. He reviewed opportunities for public input and how projects are added to the TIP. Jim Saylor began by indicating the purpose of updating the Twelve-Year Transportation Plan every two years. He indicated that some things about this update are uncertain such as the Highway Reauthorization Bill, Highway Trust Fund and Act 44. Ways to provide testimony for projects for the Twelve-Year Plan are written testimony (must be submitted by 9/30/2009), oral testimony along with the submission of an electronic abstract and a request at least one week before the hearing date and electronic submission of abstracts (preferred method). The State Transportation Commission’s 2009 public hearing for our region is scheduled for August 20, 2009 in State College. He also discussed the schedule and milestones for the TIP program. It was mentioned that the TIP is currently 95% bridge projects.

A question was asked if there are plans other than the Twelve-Year Transportation Plan. Jim Saylor responded that SEDA-COG has a 20-year plan that is updated as needed, which is now in the process of an update.

A question was also asked about the status of any further work on the South Central Centre County Transportation Study (SCCCTS). Karen Michael responded that the project was stopped and removed from the plan, as the project was not within the fiscal constraints. There were several comments from members and the public about the need for this project to be viewed as a priority. Karen mentioned that PennDOT has put highway safety improvement monies towards this area of roadway.

Item #6 – Subdivision and Land Development Review Committee Report

Kenton Stuck of Quillas Creek and Eric Casanave of PennTerra attended the meeting to discuss the Quill Creek Master Plan for a Traditional Neighborhood Development (TND) in Brown Township. Kenton Stuck began by presenting information about the location and neighborhood types of the proposed TND. Eric Casanave and Mark Colussy discussed some of the comments to be addressed. There was some discussion about the topographical challenges of the property, engineering design, phases of the development. Some of the comments will be addressed in future phases. The plan was reviewed as a preliminary plan, and the applicant was responsive to the comments listed. Steep slopes were of concern to the Planning Commission. Final plans will be submitted in phases. There was also discussion about stormwater management, public sewer, wetlands, easements. Mr. Stuck indicated they hope to break ground as soon as possible, but at least within a year.

Dan Dunmire reported that the Subdivision and Land Development Review Committee reviewed six plans. There were five plans 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: Quillas Creek Master Plan in Brown Township, Dorothy M. Parthemer subdivision in Decatur Township, Kish Creek Center III land development in Lewistown Borough,

Douglas S. Sellers and Daniel L. Elsesser subdivision in Lewistown Borough and James M. Metzler subdivision in Oliver Township.

There was one plan under the Mifflin County Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance. The Subdivision Review Committee recommended conditional approval of the Christopher M. Ganoë and William E. Marker subdivision in Bratton Township.

Mark briefly reviewed the Dorothy M. Parthemer subdivision in Decatur Township. No development is proposed, and the property is meant for recreational purposes. There was some discussion about access to the property.

Mark discussed the Kish Creek Center III land development in Lewistown Borough and reviewed some of the comments outlined in the report.

Dan Dunmire made a motion to conditionally approve the plans under the County ordinance and approve the comments and recommendations as presented and discussed for the plans under municipal ordinances. Kay Hamilton seconded the motion. All members voted aye.

The Subdivision Review Committee report:

Name of Plan: Ganoë, Christopher M. & Marker, William E.

File Number: 2009-06-005

Tax Map #: 13-07-112/13-07-112D

Municipality: Bratton Township (County Ordinance)

Applicant Name: Ganoë, Christopher M.

Land Owner Name: Marker, William E.

Plan Preparer: Wright Land Surveying

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: *Christopher M. Ganoë is proposing to subdivide his property into two parcels. Lot A and Lot B. Also as part of this plan William E. Marker is proposing to transfer two lot additions to the lands of Ganoë. Lot Addition A will be added to Lot A, the Ganoë residual, and Lot Addition B will be added to the new Ganoë Lot B. Both the Ganoë and Marker properties have existing private wells and are connected to public sewer. The new Lot B is proposing a private well and will connect to public sewer.*

Review Comments (List from Review Committee):

Floodplain - *The property lies within the 100-year floodplain, and the floodplain 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. (BrB)*

Right-of-Way Widths - *The right-of-way width for T-714 & T-477 does not meet the road provisions of the County's Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Section 4.204.F.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 for T-714 & T-477 does not meet the road provisions of the County's Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Section 4.204.F.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.*

Shared Driveway - *The existing private 30' private Right-of-Way may need a shared drive agreement established if more than one user is intended to use the drive. A shared driveway 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." (Mifflin County Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, Section 4.205.G.4c)*

Street Names - *The existing private 30' private Right-of-Way may need to be named if more than one user is intended to use the drive. 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. A6 and 7.302. B7 of the Mifflin County Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance.*

DEP Sewage Planning Module - *A copy of the DEP Public Sewage Mailer should be provided to the County Planning Commission. Plan approval will 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 Mifflin County Planning Commission.

Signature Blocks on Plan - The Wayne Township Supervisors' Signature Block should be changed to the Bratton Township Supervisors' signature block.

Other Comments:

1. It appears as if the public sewer line on the plan terminates without connecting to a main line. Please confirm the line does not extend beyond what is shown on the plan. If it does indeed extend beyond what is shown, it should be shown on the plan. (See section 7.302.A.11 of the Mifflin County Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance) Other than a sewer line shown in front of the Gano property, there is no indication it runs along T-714 or how lot B will be served. This should be clarified on the plan.

2. Electric service lines and any other significant man made features should be shown on the plan. (See section 7.302.A.20 of the Mifflin County Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance)

3. The plans should indicate if the proposed house on Lot B will use the existing driveway off of T-714.

Name of Plan: Quillas Creek Master Plan

File Number: 2009-06-003

Tax Map #: 14-08-115

Municipality: Brown Township (Municipal Ordinance)

Applicant Name: Coffee Run Equity Associates LP

Land Owner Name: Coffee Run Equity Associates LP

Plan Preparer: PennTerra Engineering, Inc.

Action Taken: *The County provides comments only.*

Plan Summary: *Copies of Developer's Narrative are provided. This proposal represents a 557-unit Traditional Neighborhood Development Master Plan, with mixed use elements, for Tax Parcel No. 14-08-115, which is a 97 acre tract located along Shelly Drive and State Route 655 in Brown Township, Mifflin County. The plan has been prepared in accordance with the provisions of Article X of the Brown Township Zoning Ordinance, "Traditional Neighborhood Development Overlay Zone," subparagraphs 1003 and 1019. The plan was presented to the Brown Township Planning Commission May 26, 2009. The Commission recommended the plan to the Brown Township Board of Supervisors for approval.*

Review Comments (List from Review Committee):

Floodplain - A portion of the property lies within the 100-year floodplain. Future development in this area should be discouraged.

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

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, At, Ma)

*Right-of-Way Widths - The right-of-way width should be shown on the plan for all proposed streets. (See Brown Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, Section 7.202. A.11). *According to the project engineer, a proposed road schedule will be provided on the final plan to show proposed cartway widths, ROW, and names.*

Cartway Widths - The cartway width for Shelly Drive should be shown on the plan (See Brown Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, Section 7.202. A.11).

PennDOT HOP/Municipal Driveway Permits - A PennDOT Highway Occupancy Permit (HOP) is required 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. Clear sight triangles and sight distances should be provided on the plan for all proposed street connections with the existing public road system.

Shared Roadway - The following note shall be included on all subdivision and land development plans proposing the use of private streets (See section 4.204.1.c of the Brown Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance): "The owners of lots _____ agree and understand that " _____ Road" is a private road and as such are responsible for maintenance, care, improvements, and snow removal at their own diligence and expense. Further, if at any time in the future, the property owners adjacent to this road 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 place at such time. The maintenance and use of said private road shall be in accordance with the private road maintenance and use agreement recorded in Deed Book __ Page__ of the _____ County Recorder of Deeds Office."

Street Names - This proposal will elicit the need for the proposed streets 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. A6 and 7.302. B7 of the Brown Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance. *According to the project engineer, there are two recorded easements. Both easements are shown on the plan, but they should be supplemented with additional information including deed book and page numbers.*

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.

*Sewage Service - A letter from the municipality acknowledging availability of public sewer should be submitted to the Mifflin County and Brown Township Planning Commission. *According to the project engineer, the project has already*

been approved for 216 EDU's for their first planning module. If this is going to be developed in phases, the applicant should still acquire a capacity letter to ensure the entire development can be served in the future.

Water Service - A letter from the municipal water authority acknowledging availability of public water should be submitted to the Mifflin County and Brown Township Planning Commission. *According to the project engineer, a verbal commitment has been made, but he will try and acquire a letter from MABL.

Other Comments:

1. Are the proposed streets to be private streets or are they to be dedicated to the Township? Adequate information regarding this should be provided. If the roads are to be dedicated, road improvements should be coordinated with the Township Roadmaster. Additionally, a covenant for maintenance should be developed. (See section 32.F of the Brown Township Road Ordinance) *According to the applicant, the roads will be dedicated to the township.
2. A plan narrative should be placed on the plan. (See section 7.302.A.1 of the Brown Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance)
3. North Arrows should be provided for the maps on Sheets 1 and 2. (See section 7.202.A.2 of the Brown Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance)
4. Fire Hydrants, if any, as well as any other significant man made features should be shown on the plan. (See section 7.202.A.10 of the Brown Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance). Also, the applicant should coordinate with the Fire Marshall about any new fire hydrants that will be needed for this proposal.
5. A separate utility plan should be provided, at a minimum with the final set of plans, so the features can more easily be distinguished from the rest of the information that is provided on the plan.
6. The proposed site topography shown at vertical intervals should be shown on the plan. (See section 7.202.A.6 of the Brown Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance) *According to the project engineer, proposed site topography will be on each final phase plan. Also, a map is available that shows the development with the steep slopes. It is a concern for developments to occur in areas of steep slopes. According to the Mifflin County Comprehensive Plan, development in areas with slopes greater than 15% should be restricted or limited. The rear section of this tract has slopes greater than 15%.
7. The proposed roads should be supplemented with accompanying road profiles. (See Brown Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, Section 7.202. A.15).
8. There appears to be several areas for Condo/Apartments and Mixed-Use, yet a proposal for the layout in these areas has not been provided. This is important to show on the plan to understand if Zoning regulations and parking provisions are going to be met. A layout of these areas should be shown on the plan. *According to the applicant, he is considering selling these lots as out parcels that will be developed by somebody else. This has yet to be finalized.
9. It is concerning that several dead-end streets are proposed in this development. Maintenance and snow removal will be difficult in these areas without a turn around area proposed. Section 5.204.B.1.b.2 of the Brown Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance states that adequate area be provided to allow vehicles to turn around. The design of these dead end streets should be reconsidered.
10. A stormwater management plan will need to be prepared, reviewed, and approved prior to any final approval of the plan. Sheet 2 on the plan alludes to the fact that the stormwater facilities have not yet been designed, yet stormwater areas are shown on the plan. Lot configurations may have to be altered if appropriate areas for stormwater retention is not made at this time.
11. An Erosion and Sediment (E&S) Control Plan will need to be prepared, reviewed, and approved prior to approval of this plan. This proposal will elicit the need for an NPDES permit from DEP, which should be coordinated with the Mifflin County Conservation District.
12. Is street lighting proposed? If so, the lights should be shown on the plan. Also, a lighting plan should be included in the final set of plans.
13. Have the Natural Gas, Electric, Telephone, and Cable Television companies been determined? If so, the utility information should be on the plan.
14. Will the final plan propose land development with developer built homes, or will empty lots be sold to allow for proposed buyers to build their own home? Some of the lots, particularly in Phase I, appear to have insufficient lot width to build a Single Family house on. A plan should be prepared to show a mock up of proposed home footprints on the plan to ensure adequate lot sizes are provided. *According to the applicant, he has a home builder that can build a home for any site proposed. A mock up can, and should, be provided by the applicant to show all lots proposed can support a SF home.
15. Upon final plan approval, a developer's agreement will need to be set up with the Township. Coordination of the agreement should be started at this time if it hasn't already.
16. A traffic impact study may be required for this proposal. The developer should meet with the township and PennDOT to discuss this matter as early as possible.
17. Have landscaping provisions been provided? An appropriate landscaping plan should be included, at a minimum, with the final set of plans.
18. According to the applicant, there will be several trails that traverse the site. These trails should be shown on the plan.
19. Considering all appropriate information has not been submitted, the Mifflin County Planning Commission is requesting to review this plan again once all needed information is prepared. At that time, a more in depth review can be conducted that will also include zoning regulations.

Name of Plan: Parthemer, Dorothy M.

Tax Map #: WB-9-61

Applicant Name: Parthemer, Dorothy M.

Plan Preparer: Ralph M. Griffin, PE, PLS

Action Taken: The County provides comments only.

Plan Summary: The proposed subdivision involves 24.402 acres of land being subdivided from a 129.292 acre parcel in Mifflin and Snyder (Primarily Snyder) Counties. The plan calls for no construction on Lot 5. The property fronts on Back Mountain Road in Snyder County.

Review Comments (List from Review Committee):

Prime Farmland Soils - The residue tract, lot 1, contains prime farmland soil.

Right-of Way Widths - There is an existing private road paralleling lot 5, which should be shown with a name (if applicable) and right-of-way/cartway information. (See Decatur Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, Section 602.2.A.11) Additionally, since multiple users are using the drive, the road may need to be named if isn't already named. This should be coordinated with the Mifflin County GIS Department.

PennDOT HOP/ Municipal Driveway Permits - In 2006, when this plan originally was reviewed by the Mifflin County Planning Commission, it was noted that it is not clear from the plan whether or not West Beaver Township in Snyder County requires a permit. The surveyor was not aware of any permit requirement and he did not believe they cared since the driveway had been there. A follow up with Snyder County indicated a permit was normally required. The applicant needs to confirm this requirement.

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 receipt of approval from DEP.

Signature Blocks on Plan - The Mifflin County Planning Commission signature block should be replaced by the Mifflin County Review Certificate. If a copy of the certificate is required, one can be obtained at the Mifflin County Planning and Development Department.

Other comments:

1. The plan shows a flag lot with a long and strange driveway arrangement. The driveway is over 3,300 feet long, or approximately three-fourths of a mile. Additionally, in 2006 when the plan was originally reviewed by the Mifflin County Planning Commission, the surveyor confirmed there is an existing private road which parallels the proposed driveway location which he believes will be the access to the proposed lot since this is the drive that the Parthemers currently use. Access should be clearly indicated on the plan. The surveyor is not aware of any access agreement for the Parthemers to use the existing private road. A maintenance /access agreement would be appropriate to eliminate the need of constructing this long parallel driveway. The maintenance agreement provided on the plan may not be sufficient. The statement should include the following language: "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." *A crude statement is on the plan concerning the private drive, however, if the statement is not going to be replaced with wording such as was mentioned above, the statement should include information about the township and county not being responsible for the maintenance of a private drive. Additionally, according to the surveyor, no maintenance agreement is in place at this time. It is recommended that the landowner consider establishing a maintenance agreement for the private drive at this time.

2. The only road frontage for the lot is only 58.7 feet instead of 125 feet as provided in the Decatur Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance. However, the opening and access is from Snyder County. *According to the surveyor, the minimum lot width is 50' in West Beaver Township.

3. A stream is shown on the plan crossing the property. The stream name should be identified on the plan and be clearly shown on the inset map to show how it will affect this lot. *According to the surveyor, this is an unnamed stream.

4. Based on a review of the plan, at least 75% of lot 5 lies in Mifflin County. The regulations of Decatur Township should take precedence because of this fact. Also the lot should receive a tax parcel number from the Mifflin County Assessment Office. The tax office has informed the Planning Commission that they are prepared to assign the parcel with the following number: 15-11-127.

5. Is this property in the Clean and Green Program? This should be investigated because roll back taxes could apply. The applicant should contact the tax assessment office for more information. *According to the surveyor, the property is not in the clean and green program.

6. Is this property in an Ag Security Area? This should be investigated. Certain stipulations may incur if the property is enrolled in this program. *According to the surveyor, the property is not in the ag security program.

7. Are there any Deed Restrictions? If so, this information should be provided. *According to the surveyor, there are no known deed restrictions.

8. Distances and Bearings of the residual tract property boundaries should be provided. This information may be able to be asked to be waived.

9. Is the residue property included in the non-building waiver request? This should be made clear on the plan. The provided statement could be amended to include the proposed subdivided property and the residue property.

10. According to the surveyor, access is via a 10' private drive that the users are only allowed to use via a verbal agreement. This is concerning for safety reasons. It is recommended that plan approval be contingent upon an agreement being established to not allow future development of the proposed parcel unless the current access drive can be improved to private road standards.

Name of Plan: Kish Creek Center III

Tax Map #: 03-03-130

Applicant Name: Havice, Timothy

Plan Preparer: Thomas H. Metz Engineering, Inc.

Action Taken: The County provides comments only.

Plan Summary: Mr. Timothy I. Havice, owner of the Kish Creek Center, is proposing to expand the plaza with the proposed construction of an additional 9,600 s.f. commercial building along with associated parking (53 spaces) and drive aisles as required for the facility. The proposed construction will require the conversion of 0.891 Acres (38,810 square feet) of existing stock yard area (assumed semi-impervious) surface. The site is approximately 2 blocks south of the Monument Square or intersection of Market Street with South Main Street in the Borough of Lewistown. The project is to be served by public water and sewerage for which no service extensions will be required. The only stormwater improvement/facilities are necessary as to conform with the requirements of the Kishacoquillas Creek Watershed. A combined filtration - recharge trench is proposed for along the lower edge of the existing and proposed parking lot in an effort to retain 25 percent of the pre-development runoff rate and percolate the differential runoff. An overflow conduit is proposed to be directly discharged onto the Kishacoquillas Creek, situate along the entire length of the northerly site boundary. The proposed conduit will allow 2 off-site runoff to traverse the current parking perimeter. Very minimal grading for proposed parking lot drainage and stormwater improvements will be necessary as well as the construction of an underground recharge trench/pit. All proposed construction will be limited to the existing area as indicated above. Of the total 2.50 acres in the project site, only the 0.891 acres will be disturbed for the building and parking lot construction. Grading at various locations of the site for parking and stormwater facility construction will be initially required in an effort to create positive drainage, control runoff, and divert the post-development stormwater. The development consists of the tributary discharging its flow into the Kishacoquillas Creek (TSF). The site's stormwater runoff is then discharged into the nearby Juniata River, (Chapter 93 designation "WWF"). No other developments, stream or tributaries are affected by runoff from the same.

Review Comments (List from Review Committee):

Floodplain - The property lies within the 100-year floodplain, as noted in General Note 7 on Sheet S1-2, and appropriate measures should be taken.

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

Cartway Widths - The cartway width should be shown on the plan for all public roads and internal driveways. (See Borough of Lewistown Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, Section 303.1.C)

Street Names - The internal driveways may need to be named for 911 / Emergency Service purposes. Street names are to be coordinated with the County GIS (Mapping) Department. There is a fee associated with the street naming. *According to the applicant, all buildings within the development are addressed to South Main Street.

Deed Restrictions and Easements - Deed restrictions and easements associated with the property, if any, should be provided in accordance with Sections 302.2.B and 303.4 of the Borough of Lewistown Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance. *According to the applicant, there are no deed restrictions associated with the property. The river walk may be an easement, in which case this easement should be supplemented with additional information such as Deed Book and Page information on the 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. *According to the applicant, he has already paid the tap fees.

Sewage Service - A letter from the municipality acknowledging availability of public sewer should be submitted to the Mifflin County Planning Commission. *According to the applicant, he has already paid the tap fees.

Water Service - A letter from the municipal water authority acknowledging availability of public water should be submitted to the Mifflin County Planning Commission.

Other Comments:

1. The plan proposes 53 parking spaces, with only two (2) being handicap accessible. The ADA Accessibility Guidelines require at least three (3) spaces be provided for 51+ spaces.
2. Off-street parking requirements for other principal uses in the Manufacturing and Industrial Zone shall be: one space for every two employees and two spaces for each motor vehicle in connection with the business. It is unclear how the parking requirement was determined in General Note 8 on Sheet S1-2 on the plan. This determination should be clarified and state the Zoning Ordinance section it refers. *According to the applicant, he has taken this into consideration.
3. The General Notes on Sheet S1-2 should be consolidated into one list or at least labeled differently. *According to the project engineer, the second list will be labeled "Construction Notes."
4. General Note 4 on Sheet S1-2 contradicts General Note 8 on the number of parking spaces that are provided. This information should be clarified. *According to the project engineer, note 4 is incorrect and will be revised.

5. The Stormwater Management Report should be reviewed by the Borough Engineer. *This has been done and an the Borough Engineer has submitted his review letter.
6. The Erosion and Sedimentation (E & S) Plan should be reviewed by the Mifflin County Conservation District. *The E&S plan has been reviewed and a review letter has been submitted.
7. The main proposed circulation lanes do not align with the driveway that continues past the original building (containing Goin' Postal, the State Store, etc) in the development. Also, a solid line is shown, that travels to the parking lot to the rear of the bank. This line should be broken to show the opening to the parking lot that leads to S Main Street. It is recommended that the main travel lanes in the current proposal be aligned with the travel lanes through the remainder of the development. *After discussion with the applicant, the alignment may not be possible to be rearranged but stop signs will be installed on site to ensure safety concerns are met. The stop signs should be shown on the final plan.
8. Traffic signage should be shown on the plan.
9. Loading spaces located at the rear of the building need to be supplemented with a posted "Loading Area" sign. (See section 708.3 of the Borough of Lewistown Zoning Ordinance)
10. What type of business is proposed for this building? This should be provided to ensure proper Zoning regulations are met. *According to the applicant, the business will be Office/Commercial.
11. Utility service providers should be listed on the plan.
12. A plan narrative should be provided on the plan. *According to the project engineer, a narrative will be supplied on the final plan.
13. The maps on the cover sheet are not accompanied with a North Arrow, which should be provided. (See Borough of Lewistown Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, section 304.1.N)
14. The plan distinguishes the building site area of 2.5 acres from the remainder of the Kish Creek Center. According to Tax Assessment records, the parcel is larger than what is shown with distances and bearings. The entire parcel should be shown with property boundary distances and bearings. (See Borough of Lewistown Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, section 303.1.A) *According to the applicant, the area shown with distances and bearings is the area of the property that has not yet been developed, and not the entire parcel. He has been directed by the Borough that he didn't need to submit a plan for the entire parcel and only the undeveloped area.
15. All property abutters should be shown and accompanied with the associated Tax Map numbers. (See Borough of Lewistown Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, section 304.1.J)
16. Are there any fire hydrants in the area? Are any hydrants proposed? The applicant should contact the local Fire Marshal to confirm the potential need for a fire hydrant. *According to the applicant, there are adequate fire hydrants in the area, as well as being nearby to the creek.
17. The travel lanes in the proposed parking lot do not appear to have sufficient width. The main travel lanes should have a 24' travel lane.
18. Note 5 states the amount of land that will be disturbed. We assume this is the impervious area. This needs to be re-verified. It appears to be 43,235 sq. ft. of disturbed area.
19. Are there provisions for landscaping?

Name of Plan: Sellers, Douglas S. & Elsesser, Daniel L.

File Number: 2009-06-004

Tax Map #: 05-06-114/05-06-116

Municipality: Lewistown Borough (Municipal Ordinance)

Applicant Name: Sellers, Doug

Land Owner Name: Sellers, Doug

Plan Preparer: Wright Land Surveying

Action Taken: The County provides comments only.

Plan Summary: This plan proposed to transfer Lot Addition A from Lot 1 to Lot 2. Lot Addition A consists of 2407 square feet. Lot Addition A is a lot addition and shall become an integral part of TM: 05-06-116. Lot addition A is not a building lot and cannot be maintained or developed as a separate individual lot.

Review Comments (List from Review Committee):

Floodplain - The plan should note the site does not lie within a 100-year floodplain. *This information was added to the revised plan.

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

Right-of Way & Cartway Widths - It appears there may be a private drive to the rear of T.M. 05-06-114. If this is so, the Right-of-Way and Cartway widths should be shown on the plan. (See section 303.2.A of the Borough of Lewistown Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance). Additionally, if this is the case, the drive may need to be named, have a private right-of-way statement on the plan, and have a maintenance agreement developed of one has not been established thus far.

Deed Restrictions and Easements - Deed restrictions and easements associated with the property, if any, should be provided in accordance with Sections 303.2.B and 304.4 of the Borough of Lewistown Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance. *This information was added to the revised plan.

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 Service - The water supply location should be noted on the plan as prescribed in the Borough of Lewistown Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Section 303.2.C). *This information was added to the revised plan.

Other Comments:

1. According to County Tax Assessment records, the area proposed as Lot Addition A is already part of T.M. 05-06-116. Please confirm. *According to the applicant, the records are incorrect.
2. According to County Tax Assessment records, T.M. 05-06-114 is owned by Kishacoquillas Valley Bank. Please confirm. *According to the applicant, this information is out dated and provided the deed as proof.
3. The "20' Easement to Sellers Lot" does not clarify the purpose of the easement on the plan. Additional Easement information should be provided which clarifies the purpose of this easement. *This information has been added to the revised plan.
4. Since no new construction is proposed, a Non-Building statement should be on the plan. *This information has been added to the revised plan.
5. A private drive statement should be on the plan for the existing 12' Right-of-Way for the driveway to T.M. 05-06-114 stating the Borough, County and State will not be responsible for the maintenance of any private drives.

Name of Plan: Metzler, James M.

File Number: 2009-06-006

Tax Map #: 19-10-110D

Municipality: Oliver Township (Municipal Ordinance)

Applicant Name: Metzler, James M.

Land Owner Name: Metzler, James M.

Plan Preparer: Wright Land Surveying

Action Taken: The County provides comments only.

Plan Summary: This plan proposes to create Lot 2 for a single-family residence to be served by on-lot sewage disposal and private well. The residual tract has an existing house, sewage system and well with no new development.

Review Comments (List from Review Committee):

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

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

PennDOT HOP/Municipal Driveway Permits - As mentioned in Note 4 on the plan, a municipal driveway permit is required, and a copy should be provided to the Oliver Township Planning Commission.

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 is contingent upon receiving an approval from DEP following the filing of this form.

Required Signatures on Application - The subdivision application form should be signed by Oliver Township.

Other Comments:

1. Access to the Residue property should be shown on the plan. (See section 6.202.a.11 of the Oliver Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance)
2. The house on the residue property should be shown on the plan, as well as any other significant man made features (well, septic system, electric lines, driveway, etc.) See section 6.202.a.10 of the Oliver Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance.

Mark and Bill provided updated information on the Joe and Frank Pannizzo land development and the Geisinger Medical Group land development in Derry Township, which were reviewed in May.

Item #7 – Public Comment

There was no public comment.

Item #8 – Other Business or Comments

- Bill mentioned that Jan McDonald will give a CDBG update at the next meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 5:25 p.m. upon a motion by John Pannizzo that was seconded by Don Kauffman.

mjs