

MINUTES
MIFFLIN COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING
THURSDAY, AUGUST 28, 2008
MIFFLIN COUNTY COURTHOUSE, MEETING ROOM B – 3:30 P.M.

ATTENDANCE

Members

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

Others

Mark Sunderland, Mifflin County Commissioner
David Knox, John Knox & Sons
Nick Malawskey, The Sentinel
Troy Truax, Delta Development Group
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

With no corrections or changes to the minutes of the June 26, 2008 and the July 24, 2008 meetings, Jim Spendiff declared the minutes approved as written.

Item #4 – Mifflin County Hazard Mitigation Plan Update

Troy Truax of Delta Development Group gave an update of the Hazard Mitigation Plan and distributed copies of the executive summary. Mifflin, Juniata and Perry Counties jointly applied for the grant to complete the plan. The grant was awarded last summer, and a request for proposals was sent out for the competitive bidding process. In November 2007, Delta Development Group began working with the municipalities in each county to develop the plan. Each county has its own plan, and the municipalities must elect whether or not to participate. There was no cost to the municipalities other than their involvement in the public participation process. The detriment of not having a FEMA approved plan is that municipalities would not be eligible for mitigation funding from PEMA and FEMA. Troy reiterated that having this plan in place would make municipalities eligible for mitigation funds, not disaster relief funds. Private property is not governed by the document. The plan could also be used for leverage for other funding sources and projects. Once the plan is adopted by the county and the local municipalities, the plan must then be approved by PEMA and FEMA. To date, three municipalities had adopted the plan, and others anticipate adopting the plan in September. Troy discussed a special needs database that will be created to identify homebound and disabled individuals for evacuation situations. Individuals would self register with emergency services for temporary or permanent situations. David Knox asked to speak and indicated he wanted to make sure land rights are preserved. He also wanted assurance that adoption of the plan would not deter land development. Troy explained that the intent of this policy document is to provide guidance and does not regulate land use or incorporate zoning or other regulations.

Item #5 – Subdivision and Land Development Committee Report

Dan Dunmire presented the Subdivision and Land Development Review Committee's report. There were 15 plans reviewed. There were 3 plans under the Mifflin County Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance. The following plans were recommended for conditional approval: Rhoda Bratton subdivision in McVeytown Borough, Sara J. Peachey subdivision in Wayne Township and Tim Allen and Renee M. Feagley subdivision in Wayne Township.

There were 12 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: John N. Beck subdivision in Brown Township, Manasses Yoder subdivision in Brown Township, Walter J. Wooten, Jr. and Sally M. Wooten subdivision in Decatur Township, Derry Heights Phase 1A land development in Derry Township, Derry Heights Phase 1B land development in Derry Township, Snyder Family Real Estate, LP subdivision in Derry Township, Overhead Door Co. subdivision in Granville Township, Shirley Peachey subdivision in Menno Township, Nathan C. Stonerook subdivision in Oliver Township, Sylvester L. Peachey subdivision in Union Township, Isaac D. Yoder subdivision in Union Township and Connie L. Hartzler subdivision in Union Township.

Mark Colussy summarized the John N. Beck subdivision in Brown Township and went over some of the comments and recommendations. There was some discussion about the setback lines in relation to the zoning ordinance. It was noted that the regulations of the zoning ordinance supersede the subdivision and land development ordinance.

Bill Gomes discussed the Derry Heights Phases 1A and 1B land development plans in Derry Township. Bill indicated that the plan would be combined for the next submission, and he summarized the plans. The plan for Phase 1A is for a hotel and restaurant, and the plan for Phase 1B is for a movie theatre. There was some discussion about the zoning issues involving the height of a hotel and the light industrial zone classification rather than commercial zone for the movie theatre. It was recommended that the property for the movie theatre be rezoned rather than request a use variance. It was noted that the E&S plan was not yet submitted. Traffic concerns with respect to the Burnham exit capacity and the intersection stop signs, as well as the recommendation of turning lanes in this area, were discussed. An updated plan addressing the outstanding items and a master plan of the entire site were requested. There was also some discussion about the developer trying to move forward to break ground this year.

Mark discussed the revised plan for the Overhead Door Co. subdivision in Granville Township. He reviewed some of the comments and recommendations. Some of the comments were addressed on the revised plan, and the comments will be updated before mailing the letter.

Mark briefly went over some of the conditions for approval on the Rhoda Bratton subdivision in McVeytown Borough.

Mark then reviewed the Shirley Peachey subdivision in Menno Township. He briefly went over some of the comments. After some discussion, it was decided the comments should be revised to ask who is authorized to sign for the irrevocable living trust.

Mark also reviewed the comments for the Connie L. Hartzler subdivision in Union Township.

The revised plan for the Snyder Family Real Estate, LP subdivision in Derry Township was discussed. Mark reviewed the comments that had not yet been addressed, which included the comments about the setback lines, right-of-way width, private street agreement, deed restrictions, easements, zoning, boundary information and incorrect and missing abutters. The property owner requested a copy of the comments.

Dan then summarized the plans for the Manasses Yoder subdivision in Brown Township, Walter J. Wooten, Jr. and Sally M. Wooten subdivision in Decatur Township, Nathan C. Stonerook subdivision in Oliver Township, Sylvester L. Peachey subdivision in Union Township, Isaac D. Yoder subdivision in Union Township, Sara J. Peachey subdivision in Wayne Township and Tim Allen and Renee M. Feagley subdivision in Wayne Township.

Waiver requests were submitted for the Sara J. Peachey subdivision in Wayne Township from the topographical contours and tract boundaries. Kay Hamilton made a motion to approve the waiver request from the topographical contours, and Don Kauffman seconded the motion. All members voted aye.

After some discussion about the inadequacy of the reason for the waiver request from the tract boundaries, Kay Hamilton made a motion to deny this waiver request as presented. Christ Aumiller

seconded the motion. All members voted aye. If a valid reason is provided and reviewed by Bill Gomes and determined acceptable, the Planning Commission would approve the request.

Christian Aumiller made a motion to conditionally approve the plans under the Mifflin County Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance as presented and discussed. Neal Shawver seconded the motion. All members voted aye.

Brent Miller made a motion to approve the comments and recommendations as amended for the plans under municipal ordinances. Neal Shawver seconded the motion. All members voted aye.

The Subdivision Review Committee report:

Name of Plan: Beck, John N.

File Number: 2008-08-014

Tax Map #: 14-08-103B

Municipality: Brown Township (Municipal Ordinance)

Applicant Name: Beck, John N.

Land Owner Name: Beck, John N.

Plan Preparer: Taptich Engineering and Surveying

Action Taken: *The County provides comments only.*

Plan Summary: *This project involves the subdivision of one (1) lot from the lands of John N. II and Joyce K. Beck. Lot #1 is presently vacant and is intended to be developed with a single family residential home. Lot #1 will be served with an on-lot sewage disposal system and a private well to be developed by the future owner. Access to Lot #1 will be via a 50' Right-of-way off of Coffee Run Road. The future owner will be responsible for acquiring necessary permits to construct all proposed improvements.*

Review Comments (List from Review Committee):

Soils - According to the County GIS files, some portion of this property appears to have prime farmland soils. (No) 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. (No)

Setback Lines - The setbacks should be based upon the Brown Township Zoning Ordinance, not the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (See section 4.205.A of the Brown Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance). Therefore, the stated setbacks in General Note 4 are incorrect. The correct setbacks should be: Front - 40', Side - 15', Rear - 40'. (See Brown Township Zoning Ordinance, Section 506) The proposed house location is within the allowable setback area. House placement should be reconsidered.

Right-of Way Widths - The right-of-way for Coffee Run Road does not meet the road provisions of the Brown Township Road Ordinance (Section 41.A). 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. The proposed right-of-way traversing T.M. 14-08-103B only measures 25', yet it is labeled as "50'". The Brown Township Road Ordinance requires a minimum right-of-way width of 50' (Section 41.A).

Cartway Widths - The cartway width for Coffee Run Road does not meet the road provisions of the Brown Township Road Ordinance (Section 41.B). 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 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.

Signature Blocks on Plan - The plan has a Mifflin County Planning Commission Review Certificate and a Mifflin County Review Signature Block. The signature block should be changed to "Brown Township".

Other Comments:

- 1. Lot 1 does not meet the minimum lot area of the Brown Township Zoning Ordinance. The lot must not be less than 40,000 square feet. (Section 504.A.1)*
- 2. Only two (2) plans were submitted for review. The Mifflin County Planning Commission requests at least three (3) plans be submitted for review.*
- 3. Tract boundaries of the entire property including distances and bearings should be shown on the plan. (See section 7.302.A.5 and A.7 of the Brown Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance)*
- 4. The site does not appear to be indicated on the Location Map. The Site Location should be shown. (See section 7.302.A.2 of the Brown Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance)*
- 5. Zoning information should be provided.*

6. Lot 1 does not meet the Brown Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance requirements for lot frontage unless this is a flag lot (See section 4.205 of the Brown Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance). The applicant may need to request a waiver.

Name of Plan: Yoder, Manasses

File Number: 2008-08-015

Tax Map #: 14-06-105

Municipality: Brown Township (Municipal Ordinance)

Applicant Name: Yoder, Manasses J.

Land Owner Name: Yoder, Manasses J.

Plan Preparer: Taptich Engineering and Surveying

Action Taken: The County provides comments only.

Plan Summary: This project involves the subdivision of one (1) lot from the lands of Manasses J. and Katie S. Yoder. Lot #1 is presently vacant and is intended to be developed with a single family residential home. Lot #1 will be served with an on-lot sewage disposal system and a private well to be developed by the future owner. Access to Lot #1 will be via Coffee Run Road. The future owner will be responsible for acquiring necessary permits to construct all proposed improvements.

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 prime farmland soils. (HaB, Hcb, No) 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. (No)

Setback Lines - The setbacks should be based upon the Brown Township Zoning Ordinance, not the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance. Therefore, the stated setbacks in General Note 4 are incorrect. The correct setbacks should be: Front - 40', Side - 15', Rear - 40'. (See Brown Township Zoning Ordinance, Section 506)

Right-of Way Widths - The right-of-way width should be shown on the plan for Coffee Run Road. (Brown Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, Section 7.302. A6).

Cartway Widths - The cartway width for Coffee Run Road does not meet the road provisions of the Brown Township Subdivision Ordinance (Section 4.204 F). 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 7.302. A6 and 7.302. B7 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.

Sewage Service - The sewage disposal location should be shown on the plan for the residue (See section 7.302.A.23 of the Brown Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance). Also, the residue may require being tested for a backup sewage disposal location. It is recommended the surveyor contact the local Sewage Enforcement Officer to confirm.

Water Service - The water supply location for the residue should be noted on the plan as prescribed in the Brown Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Section 7.302. A20). If the water source is off site, there should be evidence of an easement and right-of-way agreement on record and so noted on the plan. This information is particularly important if the water supply serves more than one household.

Signature Blocks on Plan - The plan has a Mifflin County Planning Commission Review Certificate and a Mifflin County Review Signature Block. The signature block should be changed to "Brown Township".

Other Comments:

1. Only two (2) plans were submitted for review. The Mifflin County Planning Commission requests at least three (3) plans be submitted for review.

2. Tract boundaries of the residue including distances and bearings should be shown on the plan. If survey data is not available, this information could be provided via the deed description. (See sections 7.302.A.5 and A.7 of the Brown Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance)

3. Zoning information should be provided.

Name of Plan: Wooten, Walter J, Jr. and Sally M

File Number: 2008-08-011

Tax Map #: 15-07-118

Municipality: Decatur Township

Applicant Name: Wooten, Walter J, Jr

Land Owner Name: Wooten, Walter J, Jr

Plan Preparer: Sarge Engineering and Surveying

Action Taken: The County provides comments only.

Plan Summary: The purpose of this plan is to subdivide the property of Walter J., Jr. and Sally M. Wooten into two lots. The total area is 68.363 acres. Lot 1, of 59.244 acres, does not contain any dwellings and will remain in

agricultural use. Lot 2, of 9.119 acres, contains an existing single-family residence, a well and an on-lot sewage system. There is no new building construction proposed with this project.

Review Comments (List from Review Committee):

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

Right-of Way Widths - The right-of-way for Ertley Road and the Private Drive does not meet the road provisions of Decatur 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 for the Private Drive should be shown on the plan (Decatur Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, Section 602.2.A.11). The cartway width for Ertley Road does not meet the road provisions of Decatur Township's Subdivision 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 cartway should be provided by the applicant as a condition if there is future development along this road.

Shared Driveway - It is not clear on the plan if Lot 1 has access to the 30' private right-of-way. If Lot 1 does have access to the Private Drive, deed book and page information should be provided proving access rights. If no agreement is in place, a private road agreement should be put in place that would establish access and maintenance responsibilities. Neither the County nor the Township will be responsible for maintaining any private drive and this should be noted on the plan.

Street Names - If more than one property has access to the private 30' Right-of-Way, then it will have to be named. Street names are to be coordinated with the County GIS (Mapping) Department. There is a fee associated with the street naming.

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

Sewage Service - A back-up septic field location may be required for Lot 2. It is recommended that the surveyor contact the local Sewage Enforcement Officer to confirm.

Other Comments:

1. The tax map numbers of all abutters should be provided (See section 603.2.A.16 of the Decatur Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance).

2. The plan shows a different parcel configuration than County Tax Assessment records. Records show some portion of T.M. 15-07-118 to be on the Northern side of Ertley Road. Please confirm.

Name of Plan: Derry Heights Phase 1A

Municipality: Derry Township (Municipal Ordinance)

File Number: 2008-08-007

Tax Map #: 16-01-113A

Applicant Name: Burnham Properties LP

Land Owner Name: Burnham Properties LP

Plan Preparer: Tri-Tech/Wagner Engineering & Surveying

Action Taken: The County provides comments only.

Plan Summary: Phase 1A and 16 will be combined into one phase. No narrative provided. Notes:

1. Perimeter survey was performed by Penn Terra Engineering and is reflected as such on these plans. (See ALTA/ACsM Land title survey dated May 8, 2006.)

2. A conditional use is required for the proposed motel on this site.

3. There are no wetlands or floodplain on this site,

4. Lighting for the proposed site will be full, cut-off shielded, downward directional lighting.

5. A municipal driveway permit will be obtained.

Review Comments (List from Review Committee):

Soils - No soil information is on the plan. 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 and could affect the overall development layout.

Setback lines - The specific setbacks should be listed on the plan (See section 403.2.K of the Derry Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance). Can the proposal meet the Access Drive requirements under Sections 311 of the Township Zoning Ordinance since there are setback requirements here as well?

Right-of Way Widths - It is not clear whether or not the proposal meets the Township right-of-way provisions for Ferguson Valley Road or the private road. Will the private drive become a public road? If not, a private right-of-way agreement concerning access and maintenance should be in place. (See Section 402.2K of the Derry Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance.)

Cartway Widths - It is not clear whether or not the proposal meets the Township's cartway requirements for Ferguson Valley Road or the private road. (See Section 402.2K of the Derry Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance.)

PennDOT HOP/Municipal Driveway Permits - A municipal driveway permit is required, and a copy should be provided to the Derry Township Planning Commission.

Street Names – Since more than one business will use this entrance, a street name is required. 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 Section 402.2L of the Derry Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance.

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 Derry Township Planning Commissions.

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

Signature Blocks on Plan - A signature block should be on the plan for the Mifflin County Planning Commission,
Other Comments:

1. A motel is allowed under the conditional use provisions of the Derry Township Zoning Ordinance. This has not been approved by the Township and needs to be approved prior to final plan approval.

2. The proposed height according to the surveyor is 5 stories, which is taller than the height restrictions in the Derry Township Ordinance. The current height provisions call for 35 feet. This too needs to be resolved before final plan approval.

3. A separate sheet labeled 3 of 4 was submitted on August 14, 2008, providing an overview of the tax parcel 16-01-113A and its connection with tax parcel 16-04-105. There is already a sheet 3 of 4 with the Land Development Plan on it. If both plan sheets are to be part of the plan submittal, then the sheet numbering should be corrected. Since two tracts are involved, has there been any consideration of a lot consolidation?

4. The front sheet has an index, but individual sheets are not labeled to correspond with the index. This needs to be addressed.

5. Sheet 2 of 4, Existing Conditions, shows an existing recreation area and a house. Sheet 3, Land Development Plan, shows the recreation area is still present on the plan, which lies in the middle of the proposed right-of-way and a note that the existing structure is to be removed. What is being removed is not clearly shown on the plan.

6. The existing abutters are not all listed on the plan. (See Section 402.2.0 of the Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance.)

7. The proposed right-of-way does not align with the existing road on the other side of Ferguson Valley Road. This should be corrected. Also, the road across Ferguson Valley Road, Reserve Lane, should be labeled on the plan.

8. The plan has no narrative explaining what is proposed. This would be helpful particularly since this plan and the proposal involving a movie theatre on the adjoining property are inter-linked.

9. Section 402.2.D of the Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance requires that the owner of the property be listed on the plan.

10. There are no provisions shown for exterior lighting both in terms of street lights and parking lot lighting. (See Section 312.3D of the Township Zoning Ordinance.)

11. The plan does not include a site location map as required under Section 402.2.D of the Derry Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance.

12. If there are man made features including electric power and gas lines, they should be shown as provided in Section 402.2J of the Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (SALDO)

13. If there are any existing or proposed fire hydrants to serve this tract they should be shown on the plan. (See Section 402.2J of Derry Township SALDO).

14. Will the proposal meet the street design standards under Section 504 of the Derry Township SALDO? This includes: right-of-way and cartway width, provisions for a cul-de-sac or turnaround area, street alignment at the intersection, street grades information and pavement design. There is also no road profile information provided, which needs to be reviewed by the Township Engineer. Further, does the proposal meet the lot grading provisions under Section 507 of the Township SALDO?

15. There are no stormwater management provisions at this time. This information needs to be provided and reviewed by the Township Engineer. This tract falls under the Kish Creek Stormwater Management Ordinance.

16. The primary opening to the proposed facilities is a driveway opening along a curve off Ferguson Valley Road. This driveway opening needs to meet requirements under Section 311.10 of the Derry Zoning Ordinance in terms of providing a clear sight triangle and provisions for adequate sight distance. A second entrance providing a right in and right out opening is also proposed and is less than a quarter of a mile from the main opening according to the traffic impact study conducted for this development. This information should be provided with the plan as well.

17. There is no traffic circulation plan for the proposal in terms of insuring safe ingress and egress within the property as well as traffic lane and parking space dimensions. Also how will the second driveway opening affect this tract?

18. This proposal should include an Erosion and Sediment Control Plan that needs to be reviewed by the Mifflin County Conservation District. (See Section 402.2T and 0512 A and C of the Township SALDO.) Also, this proposal will require an NPDES permit.

19. Can this proposal meet the block length requirements as provided in Section SO8.2A of the Township SALDO?

20. Sheet 1 has a listing of the number of parking spaces proposed for the two facilities but it is unclear the proposal can fully meet Section 312 of the Derry Zoning Ordinance including screening provisions.

21. There are no provisions shown for an off street loading area as listed in Section 313 of the Township Zoning Ordinance.

22. There is no general landscape plan as provided for in Section 314 of the Township Zoning Ordinance.

23. Under Section 402.2Q of the Township SALDO, where the preliminary plan covers only a part of the subdivider's entire holding, a sketch shall be submitted of the prospective street layout for the remainder. This needs to be addressed.

24. The plan does not include provisions for outdoor signage as provided under Section 315 of the Township Zoning Ordinance.

25. At the time of the final plan, a developer's agreement will need to be in place.

26. There are additional comments for the Traffic Impact Study.

27. The plan does not provide building square footage or height information. Also, the application did not provide building square footage information.

28. Are there provisions for sidewalks?

29. As large as the proposed development will be, a master plan of the overall site should have been prepared instead of what appears to be a piecemeal development. The Township should not take action on this plan until these items are addressed.

TRAFFIC IMPACT STUDY - The Mifflin County Planning and Development reviewed the Traffic Impact Study for the Proposed Derry Heights Development dated August 12, 2008 (and August 14 supplement) and have the following concerns:

.The main entrance to the proposed development off Ferguson Valley Road entering what has been labeled the Rowe property is offset from the driveway entrance across the road that serves the mini-warehouse. The street alignment should be at a 75-90 degree angle and should be aligned with the corresponding drive entrance to avoid traffic conflicts.

.Page 4, under Vehicular Trip Generation, first paragraph, there is some mention of trip generation by type of land use, but the way it is presented it appears that Land Code 445 ties to a document rather than a trip generation rate. Also the third paragraph mentions something about an Appendix, which was not initially provided.

.Page 4, under Vehicular Trip Generation, second paragraph, it would be helpful if the study defined "pass-by trips". If you are making the assumption that a restaurant, hotel or movie theater are not primary destination points I would question that. In Table I, you mention that morning and Saturday peaks are assumed to be 50% of the afternoon rate. Is there some basis for this assumption?

.Page 8, under the second bulleted item, discusses eliminating one of the existing stop signs and not adding a northbound left turn lane to improve the delay for the Route 322 Westbound off ramp approach. What is the potential for traffic backup from the west bound off ramp off Route 322 if the developer eliminates the stop sign heading south along Ferguson Valley Road? Has a warrant for a traffic light been checked at this intersection? Also, if the increased site traffic through the intersection results in the warrants for a left turn lane being met why is the left turn lane not being considered? Can additional or alternate mitigations be proposed that address both the Level of Service degradation and the need for a left turn lane? I think this is important considering the size of the proposed restaurant being almost 14,000 square feet in size. The Developer should undertake a simulation of existing and proposed stop control configurations at this intersection coming off Route 322. The traffic consultant should look at using the Sim Traffic program to make sure cars coming off Route 322 have sufficient deceleration distance. This program should also be used at the intersection of Ferguson Valley Road and Freedom Ave. where the proposed traffic light is proposed since the queue is projected to block an existing permitted access during the afternoon and Saturday peak hours.

.Page 8, under the third bulleted item, this traffic information was based on a David Wooster study for a proposed Sheetz. Unfortunately, when that study was completed it failed to take into consideration other intersections that could affect this development.

.Page 12, under Crash Data Summary, discusses a request for crash records, but they have not been provided to date.

Page 14, Conclusions/Recommendations, there appears to be no consideration of a right turning lane from Ferguson Valley Road going northbound into the proposed driveway entrances to insure through traffic on Ferguson Valley Road is not impeded by those turning into one of the three proposed facilities. Have warrant requirements for a right turn lane at the entrances been evaluated?

.Based on consultation with the Township, the speed limit along Ferguson Valley Road is not constant. The developer needs to verify if 35 mph is the sole speed limit along Ferguson Valley Road since this apparently was the basis for the proposed traffic control devices along this stretch of road. It is also clear that the sight distance onto

Ferguson Valley road from one of the proposed driveway openings is short by 6 feet and this is supposed to be accommodated by the removal of vegetation here. What is not known is how fast cars are really traveling on this road. A spot speed study is needed to insure the design as proposed is appropriate.
.The traffic study does not look at the adequacy of the existing interchange and the west bound on and off ramps from Route 322. It is our understanding that a follow-up study of the ramps is underway and would appreciate a copy and an opportunity to comment.

Name of Plan: Derry Heights Phase 1B

Municipality: Derry Township (Municipal Ordinance)

File Number: 2008-08-008

Tax Map #: 16-04-105

Applicant Name: Burnham Properties LP

Land Owner Name: Burnham Properties LP

Plan Preparer: Tri-Tech/Wagner Engineering & Surveying

Action Taken: The County provides comments only.

Plan Summary: Phase 1A and 1B will be combined into one phase. No narrative provided. Notes:

1. Perimeter survey was performed by Penn Terra Engineering and is reflected as such on these plans. (See ALTA/ACSM Land Title Survey dated May 8, 2006.)
2. A conditional use is required for the proposed motel on this site.
3. There are no wetlands or floodplain on this site. Lighting for the proposed site will be full, cut-off shielded, downward 4 directional lighting
5. A municipal driveway permit will be obtained.

Review Comments (List from Review Committee):

Floodplain - According to GIS files, one portion of this tract lies within the 100 year floodplain.

Soils - No soil information is on the plan (See section 403.2.K of the Derry Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance). 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 and could affect the overall development layout.

Setback Lines - The specific setbacks should be listed on the plan. Can the proposal meet the Access Drive requirements under Section 311 of the Township Zoning Ordinance since there are setback requirements here as well? Based on the Phase 1A Plan, the proposed 50 foot driveway to access the site was not shown on the land development plan. Also, the secondary access for a right in and right out drive was not shown.

Right-of Way Widths - The proposed fifty foot driveway to access the site was not shown on the land development plan. Also, the secondary access through the right in and right out drive was not shown. Based on Phase 1A plan it is not clear. (See Section 402.2K of the Township Subdivision and Land Development Plan.)

Cartway Widths - The cartway width should be shown on the plan for Ferguson Valley and proposed access to facility. (Derry Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, Section 402.2K).

PennDOT HOP Municipal Driveway Permits - A municipal driveway permit is required, and a copy should be provided to the Derry Township Planning Commission.

Street Names - Proposed access routes into the property may need to be named. Street names are to be coordinated with the County GIS (Mapping) Department. There is a fee associated with the street naming.

Deed Restrictions and Easements - Deed restrictions and easements associated with the property, if any, should be provided in accordance with Section 402.2L of the Derry Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance.

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 Derry Township Planning Commissions.

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

Signature Block on Plan - A signature block should be on the plan for the Mifflin County Planning Commission.

Other Comments:

*1. A movie theatre is defined as Commercial Recreation and under the Commercial Zone considered a conditional use. The proposed theatre is to be located in a Light Industrial Zone which does not permit this use. This needs to be addressed. The applicant can either request a rezoning of the property to General Commercial or consider a use variance. From the development around the area, it is unclear why this property was zoned Light Industrial. This needs to be addressed before the plan is approved. *The Planning Commission believes the applicant should request a rezoning to Commercial instead of asking for a use variance as is now being proposed.*

2. A separate sheet labeled 3 of 4 was submitted on August 14, 2008, providing an overview of the tax parcel 16-04-105 and its connection with tax parcel 16-01-113A. There is already a sheet 3 of 4 with the land development plan on it. If both plan sheets are to be part of the plan submittal, then the sheet numbering should be corrected. Since two tracts are involved, has there been any consideration of a lot consolidation?

3. The front sheet has an index, but individual sheets are not labeled to correspond with the index. This needs to be addressed.

4. The existing abutters and tax parcel data are not listed on the plan. (See Section 402.20 of the Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance.)

5. *The plan has no narrative explaining what is proposed. This would be helpful particularly since this plan and the proposal involving a motel and restaurant on the adjoining property are inter-linked.*
 6. *Section 402.2d of the Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance requires that the owner of the property be listed on the plan.*
 7. *There are no provisions shown for exterior lighting both in terms of street lights and parking lot lighting. (See Section 312.3D of the Township Zoning Ordinance.)*
 8. *The plan does not include a site location map as required under Section 402.2D of the Derry Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance.*
 9. *If there are man made features including water and sewer lines and electric power and gas lines, they should be shown as provided in Section 402.2J of the Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (SALDO)*
 10. *If there are any existing or proposed fire hydrants to serve this tract they should be shown on the plan. (See Section 402.2J of Derry Township SALDO).*
 11. *Will the proposal meet the street design standards under Section 504 of the Derry Township SALDO? This includes: right-of-way and cartway width, provisions for a cul-de-sac or turnaround area, street alignment at the intersection, street grades information and pavement design. There is also no road profile information provided, which needs to be reviewed by the Township Engineer. Further, does the proposal meet the lot grading provisions under Section 507 of the Township SALDO?*
 12. *There are no stormwater management provisions at this time. This information needs to be provided and reviewed by the Township Engineer. This tract falls under the Kish Creek Stormwater Management Ordinance.*
 13. *Access to the movie theatre is not clearly shown on the sheet. Based on the phase 1A plan, the primary opening to the proposed facilities is a driveway opening along a curve off Ferguson Valley Road. This driveway opening needs to meet requirements under Section 311.10 of the Derry Zoning Ordinance in terms of providing a clear sight triangle and provisions for adequate sight distance. A second entrance providing a right in and right out opening is also proposed and is less than a quarter of a mile from the main opening according to the traffic impact study conducted for this development. This information should be provided with the plan as well.*
 14. *There is no traffic circulation plan for the proposal in terms of insuring safe ingress and egress within the property as well as traffic lane and parking space dimensions. Also how will the second driveway opening affect this tract?*
 15. *This proposal should include an Erosion and Sediment Control Plan that needs to be reviewed by the Mifflin County Conservation District. (See Section 402.2T and 0512 A and C of the Township SALDO.) Also, this proposal will require an NPDES permit.*
 16. *Can this proposal meet the block length requirements as provided in Section S08.2A of the Township SALDO?*
 17. *Sheet 1 has a listing of the number of parking spaces proposed for the two facilities but it is unclear the proposal can fully meet Section 312 of the Derry Zoning Ordinance including screening provisions.*
 18. *There are no provisions shown for an off street loading area as listed in Section 313 of the Township Zoning Ordinance.*
 19. *There is no general landscape plan as provided for in Section 314 of the Township Zoning Ordinance.*
 20. *Under Section 402.2Q of the Township SALDO, where the preliminary plan covers only a part of the subdivider's entire holding, a sketch shall be submitted of the prospective street layout for the remainder. This needs to be addressed.*
 21. *The plan does not include provisions for outdoor signage as provided under Section 315 of the Township Zoning Ordinance.*
 22. *At the time of the final plan, a developer's agreement will need to be in place.*
 23. *There are additional comments for the Traffic Impact Study.*
 24. *The plan does not provide building height information.*
 25. *The plan Notes 2 and 3 are incorrect since this plan deals with a movie theatre and not a motel. Also, there is a small portion of the tract within the 100 year floodplain.*
 26. *There are high tension power lines over the parking lot. Has Penelec been consulted on this as to what is permitted under these lines?*
 27. *Are there provisions for sidewalks?*
 28. *As large as the proposed development will be, a master plan of the overall site should have been prepared instead of what appears to be a piecemeal development. The Township should not take action on this plan until these items are addressed.*
- TRAFFIC IMPACT STUDY - The Mifflin County Planning and Development reviewed the Traffic Impact Study for the Proposed Derry Heights Development dated August 12, 2008 (and August 14 supplement) and have the following concerns:*
- .The main entrance to the proposed development off Ferguson Valley Road entering what has been labeled the Rowe property is offset from the driveway entrance across the road that serves the mini-warehouse. The street alignment should be at a 75-90 degree angle and should be aligned with the corresponding drive entrance to avoid traffic conflicts.*

.Page 4, under Vehicular Trip Generation, first paragraph, there is some mention of trip generation by type of land use, but the way it is presented it appears that Land Code 445 ties to a document rather than a trip generation rate. Also the third paragraph mentions something about an Appendix, which was not initially provided.

.Page 4, under Vehicular Trip Generation, second paragraph, it would be helpful if the study defined "pass-by trips". If you are making the assumption that a restaurant, hotel or movie theater are not primary destination points I would question that. In Table I, you mention that morning and Saturday peaks are assumed to be 50% of the afternoon rate. Is there some basis for this assumption?

.Page 8, under the second bulleted item, discusses eliminating one of the existing stop signs and not adding a northbound left turn lane to improve the delay for the Route 322 Westbound off ramp approach. What is the potential for traffic backup from the west bound off ramp off Route 322 if the developer eliminates the stop sign heading south along Ferguson Valley Road? Has a warrant for a traffic light been checked at this intersection? Also, if the increased site traffic through the intersection results in the warrants for a left turn lane being met why is the left turn lane not being considered? Can additional or alternate mitigations be proposed that address both the Level of Service degradation and the need for a left turn lane? I think this is important considering the size of the proposed restaurant being almost 14,000 square feet in size. The Developer should undertake a simulation of existing and proposed stop control configurations at this intersection coming off Route 322. The traffic consultant should look at using the Sim Traffic program to make sure cars coming off Route 322 have sufficient deceleration distance. This program should also be used at the intersection of Ferguson Valley Road and Freedom Ave. where the proposed traffic light is proposed since the queue is projected to block an existing permitted access during the afternoon and Saturday peak hours.

.Page 8, under the third bulleted item, this traffic information was based on a David Wooster study for a proposed Sheetz. Unfortunately, when that study was completed it failed to take into consideration other intersections that could affect this development.

.Page 12, under Crash Data Summary, discusses a request for crash records, but they have not been provided to date.

.Page 14, Conclusions/Recommendations, there appears to be no consideration of a right turning lane from Ferguson Valley Road going northbound into the proposed driveway entrances to insure through traffic on Ferguson Valley Road is not impeded by those turning into one of the three proposed facilities. Have warrant requirements for a right turn lane at the entrances been evaluated?

.Based on consultation with the Township, the speed limit along Ferguson Valley Road is not constant. The developer needs to verify if 35 mph is the sole speed limit along Ferguson Valley Road since this apparently was the basis for the proposed traffic control devices along this stretch of road. It is also clear that the sight distance onto Ferguson Valley road from one of the proposed driveway openings is short by 6 feet and this is supposed to be accommodated by the removal of vegetation here. What is not known is how fast cars are really traveling on this road. A spot speed study is needed to insure the design as proposed is appropriate.

.The traffic study does not look at the adequacy of the existing interchange and the west bound on and off ramps from Route 322. It is our understanding that a follow-up study of the ramps is underway and would appreciate a copy and an opportunity to comment.

Name of Plan: Snyder Family Real Estate, LP File Number: 2008-08-016
Tax Map #: 16-03-109/16-03-109C Municipality: Derry Township (Municipal Ordinance)
Plan Preparer: Tri-Tech/Wagner Engineering & Surveying Land Owner Name: Snyder Family Real Estate, LP
Applicant Name: Snyder Family Real Estate, LP

Action Taken: The County provides comments only.

Plan Summary: The purpose of this minor subdivision is for a Lot Addition to the existing lands of Eugene and Mildred Williams. (Lot 1A) Lot 1B is being subdivided as part of the Estate planning.

Final Review Comments:

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 plan should note the site does not lie within a 100-year floodplain. *This information was added to Note 3 on the plan.*

*Topographic information - Topographical contours at vertical intervals should be displayed on the plan (Derry Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, Section 402.2.G). *The surveyor has requested a waiver for this requirement.*

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)

*Setback Lines - The setback lines should be shown on the plan as prescribed in the Derry Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Section 403.2.K). The setbacks in the Forest District are 50 feet from all property lines. *Setback information was added to the plan. It appears that the proposed lot configuration for Tract 1B would*

place the garage within the building setback area. This should be addressed. **The lot lines have been adjusted to allow the garage to fit within the minimum setback.

Right-of-Way Widths - Based upon the Derry Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, the right-of-way width should be shown on the plan for Michael's Lane. (Section 403.2.G). Based upon the Derry Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, the right-of-way widths for Wilderness Drive, Waterway Drive and Edwardtown Road are substandard (Section 504.2). Providing additional right-of-way should be considered.

Cartway Widths - The cartway width should be shown on the plan for Michael's Lane and Waterway Drive (Derry Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, Section 403.2.G). The cartway width for Edwardtown Road, Wilderness Drive, and Old Reservoir Drive do not meet the road provisions of Derry 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 cartway should be provided by the applicant as a condition if there is future development along this road.

Private Street - The following note should be included on the plan regarding the use of a private street: "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 Derry Township 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 Mifflin County Recorder of Deeds Office." *A Private Street Maintenance Agreement has been added to the plan. The lots should be listed.

Deed Restrictions and Easements - According to the application, there are known deed restrictions or easements associated with the property. In which case, deed restrictions and easements associated with the property should be provided in accordance with Sections 403.2.G and 403.7 of the Derry Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance. *The original application that was submitted stated that there were deed restrictions and/or easements associated with the property. However, the latest application that has been submitted states that there are no deed restrictions or easements. This should be clarified.

DEP Sewage Planning Module - Considering no new development of the residual tract seems to be occurring at this point, including sewage testing, a copy of the DEP "Request for Planning Waiver and Non-Building Declaration" form needs to be provided for the residual property. Plan approval should be contingent upon receiving an approval from DEP following the filing of this form. As presented, a future Land Development Plan will need to be submitted if the residual tract is to be developed.

Sewage Service - The septic field location for Tract 1B should be shown on the plan (See section 402.2.J of the Derry Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance). *This information has been added to the plan.

Signature Blocks on Plan - Signature blocks should be on the plan for the Mifflin County Planning Commission and Derry Township. The Mifflin County Planning Commission Signature Block should be changed to "Reviewed by the Mifflin County Planning Commission" instead of "Approved".

Additional Comments:

1. A Zoning Boundary traverses the center of the property between the Forest District and the Rural District. This boundary should be shown on the plan. *A zoning boundary has been added to the plan, but it does not appear to match the County's zoning map for Derry Township. Please confirm zoning boundary location.
2. According to County GIS records, Michael's Lane does not extend to Tract 1B, as shown on the plans. Please confirm. *If Michael's Lane does extend to this lot, the lane should be labeled on Sheet 2.
3. Lot design should be reconsidered. Given the fact that the gap between the proposed lot addition of T.M. 16-03-109C and Tract 1B is approximately 15 feet at its narrowest, it renders the entire wedge shaped area behind the gap useless. As presented, this portion of the lot will unlikely be approved for further subdivision or development.
4. Tract boundaries including bearings and lengths in feet and hundredths of a foot should be shown on the plan for the entire property (See Sections 403.2. F and N of the Derry Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance).

New Comments:

5. The lot configuration for Tract 1B has changed, making it larger than the previously proposed lot configuration. The total area should have changed. The acreage information should be updated on the plan.
6. It appears a few abutting properties are not shown on the plan at the Northwest corner. All abutting property owners should be shown on the plan. (See section 403.2.S of the Derry Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance)
7. According to a member of the Snyder family, some of the property owners are incorrect. The plans reflect the same information as the County Tax Assessment records, with the exception of: the abutter "F. Farlington Jr." should be "Darlington F. Marks Jr." This should be confirmed and revised.
8. The plan revision date has not been added to the plan.
9. It appears a property line is missing, separating the Grace Vasil property (T.M. 16-32-101) from the Agnes Potepan property (T.M. 16-32-100). This property line should be shown to distinguish the two properties from each other.

Name of Plan: Overhead Door Co.

Tax Map #: 17-12-97

Applicant Name: Overhead Door Company

Plan Preparer: Tuscarora Land Surveying

Action Taken: The County provides comments only.

Plan Summary: No narrative provided

Review Comments (List from Review Committee):

Floodplain - The plan should note the site does not lie within a 100-year floodplain (See section 6.202.a.14 of the Granville Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance). *This information was added to the plan.

Setback Lines - Setback information should be provided (See section 6.302.a.10 of the Granville Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance). *This information was added to the plan.

Right-of Way Widths - Based upon the Granville Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, the right-of-way width should be shown on the plan. (Section 6.302.A.6) *This information was added to the plan.

Cartway Widths - The cartway width should be shown on the plan. (See section 6.302.a.11 of the Granville Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance) *This information was added to the plan.

PennDOT HOP/Municipal Driveway Permits - The driveway location should be shown on the plan (See section 6.202.a.10 of the Granville Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance). *This information was added to the plan.

Deed Restrictions and Easements - Deed restrictions and easements associated with the property, if any, should be provided in accordance with the Granville Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance. (Sections 6.302.A.6 and 6.302.B.7) *A note was added to the plan stating that there are no known deed restrictions.

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

Required Signatures on Application - The landowner's signature needs to be on the subdivision application form. *The surveyor asked to sign the application on behalf of the applicant as the surveyor waits for the signature from the landowner.

Other Comments:

1. Lot Addition Number 2 is unclear as to what property it is being added. An appropriate lot addition symbol should be used. *According to the surveyor Lot 2 is still being determined which lot it will be part. A note was added to the plan describing this information.

2. A narrative should be provided explaining what is being proposed. *This information was added to the plan.

3. Tract 2 is labeled as "Overhead Door Co.", yet according to tax assessment records, the property is owned by the "Dallas Corporation". This should be clarified. *This information was corrected on the plan.

4. A site location map should be shown on the plan. (See section 6.202.A.14 of the Granville Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance) *This information was added to the plan.

5. A property plan should be shown on the plan showing the overall location including what is existing versus what is proposed.

6. Only one (1) plan has been submitted. The Mifflin County Planning Commission requests three (3) plans for review. *Three revised plans were submitted to the County Planning Commission prior to the Planning Commission meeting that are dated August 23, 2008.

7. All abutters names and tax map numbers should be shown on the plan. (See section 6.202.A.16 of the Granville Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance) *This information was added to the plan.

8. A scale bar and North arrow should be on the plan. (See section 6.302.A.2 of the Granville Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance) *This information was added to the plan.

9. Owner information, including deed book and page, should be on the plan (See section 6.302.a.3 of the Granville Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance).

10. Zoning information should be provided including building setback information (See section 6.302.a.10 of the Granville Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance). *This information was added to the plan.

11. Man made features (i.e. utility lines) should be shown on the plan. (See section 6.302.A.11 of the Granville Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance) *It appears some utilities may be shown on the plan, but they are not labeled. Labels and clarification should be provided.

Name of Plan: Bratton, Rhoda

Tax Map #: 10-00-619/10-00-620

Applicant Name: Morgan, Lee

Plan Preparer: Roth Surveying Service

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

Plan Summary: This subdivision is being prepared to add lots 1-B, 2-A and 2-B to the adjoining owners as shown.

File Number: 2008-08-005

Municipality: Granville Township

Land Owner Name: Overhead Door Company

File Number: 2008-08-009

Municipality: McVeytown Borough

Land Owner Name: Bratton, Rhoda

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) Right-of Way Widths - The right-of-way for Canal Street and Boyles Alley does not meet the road provisions of the County's Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Section 4.204 F). 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 Canal Street and Boyles Alley does not meet the road provisions of the County's Subdivision Ordinance (Section 4.204 F). Since the parcel has the potential for future development, road improvements should be considered prior to further development. At a minimum additional cartway 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 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 "Request for Planning Waiver and Non-Building Declaration" form needs to be provided. Plan approval should be contingent upon receiving an approval from DEP following the filing of this form.

Other Comments:

- 1. Are there any existing fire hydrants near the property? All man-made structures should be shown on the plan. (See section 7.302.A.20 of the Mifflin County Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance)*
- 2. Is Lot 1A the Rhoda Bratton Property? If so, it should clearly be listed on the plan with tax parcel information. If not, where is the Rhoda Bratton property?*
- 3. Plan does not provide an inset map as provided under section 7.302.A.24 of the County Subdivision Ordinance.*
- 4. The plan narrative states that Lots 1-B, 2-A, and 2-B are to be adjoined to the owners as shown. However, lot addition 1-A appears to be going to the same owner, therefore the statement should be clarified.*

Name of Plan: Peachey, Shirley

Tax Map #: 18-09-100

Applicant Name: Peachey, Shirley

Plan Preparer: Taptich Engineering and Surveying

Action Taken: The County provides comments only.

Plan Summary: *This project involves the subdivision of one (1) lot from the lands of Ruth A. Peachey Revocable Living Trust. Lot #1 is presently vacant and is intended to be a non-building lot addition to the adjacent lands of Ivan D. and Ruth A. Peachey (DB 439, PG 021). There are no changes proposed to the lot access. Likewise, there are no improvements proposed. The Residue is presently developed with a single family residential dwelling and associated out buildings. These facilities are served with an on-lot sewage disposal system and domestic water from a private source.*

Review Comments (List from Review Committee):

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

Topographic information - The Topographic contour lines should be labeled with the appropriate elevation (See section 6.202.a.7 of the Menno Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance).

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

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 Menno Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance.

DEP Sewage Planning Module - The residual lot and the lot of the grantee of the lot addition may require a backup sewage disposal location. It is recommended the surveyor contact the local Sewage Enforcement Officer to confirm. 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 and Sewage Service - The sewage disposal location and water supply location should be shown on the plan for T.M. 18-9-100B and 18-9-100 (See section 6.202.a.10 and 6.302.a.11 of the Menno Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance).

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

Ordinance requirements. All boundaries including distances and bearings should be shown on the plan. If survey data is not available, this information could be provided via the deed description. The dimensional information and acreage for the residue and Ivan and Ruth Peachey property should be provided. (See section 6.302.A.5, A.7, and A.9 of the Menno Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance)

Other Comments:

- 1. All abutters, including tax map numbers, should be shown on the plan. (See section 6.202.A.16 of the Menno Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance)*
- 2. According to Tax Assessment records, the owner of T.M. 18-9-100 is Ruth Peachey. Yet, the stated landowner and applicant on the plan and application is Shirley Peachey. Please confirm and clarify. If Ruth Peachey is the owner she should have signed the application. *According to Supervisor, Ruth Peachey passed away. If there is a living trust, who has the right to sign or authorize the signature? Evidence of this information should be made known.*
- 3. The property that is the grantee of the lot addition is shown on tax assessment records as T.M. 18-9-100B, yet the plan lists the property as 18-9-100. Please confirm.*
- 4. Only two (2) plans were submitted. The Mifflin County Planning Commission requests three (3) copies of the plan for review.*
- 5. The residue and Ivan Peachey properties should list acreage information (See section 6.202.a.5 of the Menno Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance).*

Name of Plan: Stonerook, Nathan C.

File Number: 2008-08-003

Tax Map #: 19-07-101B

Municipality: Oliver Township

Applicant Name: Stonerook, Nathan C.

Land Owner Name: Stonerook, Nathan C.

Plan Preparer: Wright Land Surveying

Action Taken: *The County provides comments only.*

Plan Summary: *This plan proposes to create Lot 2 with an existing single-family residence, on-lot sewage disposal system and well. The residual tract, Lot 1, is vacant woodland with no development proposed.*

Review Comments (List from Review Committee):

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

Floodplain - Note 4 on the plan should specifically state what source the assumption is based off. Also, considering a portion of the residual lot is within the 100-year Floodplain, this should be mentioned on the plan (See section 6.202.a.14 of the Oliver Township Subdivision and Land Development 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. (Brb, Ma)

Right-of Way Widths - The right-of-way for Evergreen Road does not meet the road provisions of the Oliver 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 (Oliver Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, Section 6.202.a.11).

Shared Driveway - It appears that Lots 1 and 2 will have a shared driveway that runs through Lot 1. 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."

*Deed Restrictions and Easements - *Deed restrictions and easements associated with the property, if any, should be provided in accordance with Sections 6.302.a.6 and 6.302.b.7 of the Oliver Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance. *According to the Surveyor, there are no other deed restrictions or easements on the property other than the right-of-way shown on the 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.

Other Comments:

- 1. Tract boundaries should be shown on the property plan for the entire parcel including distances and bearings. If survey data is not available, this information could be supplied via the deed description. (See section 6.302.a.5 & 7 of the Oliver Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance)*
- 2. Evergreen Road is a private road serving at least four properties. Is there a private roadway agreement in place to insure access and maintenance responsibilities? The Township nor the County are responsible for the upkeep of the road, and this should be put into the agreement and on the plan.*

3. If there is existing on-site water and sewer service for Lot 1, this information should be shown on the plan (See sections 6.202.a.10 and 6.302.a.11 of the Oliver Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance).
4. If there is a separate road connecting to Evergreen Road, it should be shown and labeled on the plan (See section 6.202.a.11 of the Menno Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance).

Name of Plan: Peachey, Sylvester L.

File Number: 2008-08-002

Tax Map #: 20-03-116D

Municipality: Union Township

Applicant Name: Peachey, Sylvester L.

Land Owner Name: Peachey, Sylvester L.

Plan Preparer: Wright Land Surveying

Action Taken: The County provides comments only.

Plan Summary: This plan proposes to create Lot 5 with an existing house served by an on-lot sewage disposal system and private off-site water source. Soils testing to designate a reserve area for future on-lot sewage disposal needs was completed and is shown on this plan. This area should not be disturbed. The residual tract, Lot 4 is farmland and is not approved for any building purposes which would generate sewage disposal needs. No new construction is proposed.

Review Comments (List from Review Committee):

Floodplain - The plan should note the site does not lie within a 100-year floodplain.

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

Right-of Way Widths - The right-of-way for Peachey Road does not meet the road provisions of Union Township's Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Section 500.2). At a minimum additional right of way should be provided by the applicant as a condition if there is future development along this road.

PennDOT HOP/Municipal Driveway Permits - The existing driveway serving Lot 5 should be shown on the plan.

Shared Driveway - There appears to be a shared driveway between lots 4 & 5. 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."

Street Names - If Lot 4 is ever to be developed, the Private Drive will have 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 Section 402.2.b of the Union Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance.*

**According to the Surveyor, there are no known deed restrictions or easements associated with the property.*

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 (See section 402.2.c of the Union Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance). If the water source is off site, there should be evidence of an easement and right-of-way agreement on record and so noted on the plan. This information is particularly important if the water supply serves more than one household.

Required Signatures on Application - The subdivision application form should be signed by the municipality.

Other Comments:

1. The plan shows an existing 50' right-of-way serving lots 4 and 5, yet according to the County GIS department, Lot 5 is addressed to a driveway opening directly onto Peachey Road. This driveway is situated between a shed and barn on the Paul Peachey property (T.M. 20-03-116) and not clearly outlined on the plan. This access needs to be shown on the plan if this is to be access for Lot 4 and a shared driveway agreement between the Paul Peachey property and Lot 5 needs to be in place.

2. If there are any man-made features (i.e. water service lines) on Lot 4, they need to be shown on the plan. (See section 402.1.d & e of the Union Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance)

3. Part of the property lies within Menno Township and a copy of this plan should be provided to the Township for review.

Name of Plan: Yoder, Isaac D.

File Number: 2008-08-004

Tax Map #: 20-11-103B

Municipality: Union Township

Applicant Name: Yoder, Isaac D.

Land Owner Name: Yoder, Isaac D.

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, Lot 1, has an existing farmhouse and is agricultural with no development.

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 - A portion of the residue 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 the residue property appears to have prime farmland soils. (HaB)

Right-of Way Widths - The right-of-way for the existing private drive and South Dryhouse do not meet the road provisions of the Union Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Section 500.2). Since the parcel has the potential for future development, road improvements should be considered prior to further development. At a minimum additional right of way should be provided by the applicant as a condition if there is future development along this road.

Cartway Widths - The cartway width should be shown on the plan for the private drive (Union Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, Section 402.2a). The cartway along South Dryhouse Road does not meet the road provisions of the Union Township Subdivision Ordinance. (See Section 402.2a) 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 - Lot 2 and Moses Yoder share a private right-of-way accessing South Dryhouse Road. 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."

Street Names - If multiple properties are using the private right-of-way it will have to be named. Kish Creek Lane should be verified as an appropriate name and to be coordinated with the County GIS (Mapping) Department. If the private drive requires being named, 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 Section 402.2b of the Union Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance. *According to the Surveyor, there are no known deed restrictions.*

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

Water and Sewer Service - If there is on-site water and sewer service provided on Lot 1, this should be indicated on the plan (See section 402.2.b of the Union Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance).

Other Comments:

1. The tract boundaries including bearings and distances for the entire tract should be shown on the plan. If survey data is not available, this information could be provided via the deed description. (Section 402.1.a) This can be provided on the property plan.

2. All abutters should be shown on the plan. (Section 403.1.d)

3. Is there a name for the 12' Existing Private right-of-way? If so, it should be listed.

Name of Plan: Hartzler, Connie L.

Tax Map #: 20-06-109

Applicant Name: Hartzler, Connie L.

Plan Preparer: Taptich Engineering and Surveying

Action Taken: The County provides comments only.

Plan Summary: This project involves the subdivision of one (1) lot from the lands of John C. Hartzler and Connie L. Hartzler. Lot #1 houses an existing single family dwelling and an on-lot sewage disposal system. Access to Lot #1 will be via the existing gravel lane. While no new development is proposed as part of Lot #1, a site has been identified for an acceptable alternate sewage disposal. In addition an acceptable sewage disposal site has been identified on the residue. This area will lie within a proposed sewage disposal easement to be granted to TM 20-06-109B. The Residue lands (~57 Ac.) are vacant and used for agricultural purposes.

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 prime farmland soils. (Hab, HcB, No) 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. (No)

Setback Lines - The setback lines or at a minimum, setback information, should be shown on the plan as prescribed in Section 402.2.g of the Union Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance.

Right-of Way Widths - A right-of-way easement of at least 50' is recommended to be established to provide access to Lot 1. 30' does not meet the requirements of the Union Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Section 501.2). The right-of-way for Stayrock Road does not meet the road provisions of Union Township's Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Section 501.2). 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 Stayrock Lane does not meet the road provisions of Union Township's Subdivision Ordinance (Section 501.2). Since the parcel has the potential for future development, road improvements should be considered prior to further development. At a minimum additional cartway 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 Section 402.2.b of the Union Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance.

DEP Sewage Planning Module - A residual tract waiver will need to be placed on the plan. Also copy of the DEP "Request for Planning Waiver and Non-Building Declaration" form needs to be provided. Plan approval should be contingent upon receiving an approval from DEP following the filing of this form.

Other Comments:

- 1. Zoning information should be provided. The affected property is in the RA - Residential Agriculture Zone.*
- 2. Only two (2) plans were submitted. The Mifflin County Planning Commission asks for three (3) copies of the plan for review.*
- 3. Tract boundaries including distances and bearings should be provided (See section 403.1.a of the Union Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance). If survey data is not available, this information could be provided via the deed description.*
- 4. Barn remnants show up on both the residue and Lot 1. Will this create a zoning problem in terms of setback requirements?*
- 5. Lot 1 does not have direct frontage along Stayrock Lane (See section 504.3 of the Union Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance). A 30' gravel lane is suppose to be the access, but there is no indication this is a recorded right-of-way or easement to insure the owner of Lot 1 has continued access to Stayrock Lane. Also, does this lane provide access to other properties including the residue and Airport Authority property? A shared private right-of-way or driveway agreement should be in place concerning access and maintenance. Also, if the gravel lane provides access to multiple properties, it should be named through the County GIS Department.*

Name of Plan: Peachey, Sara J.

File Number: 2008-08-006

Tax Map #: 21-15-104

Municipality: Wayne Township

Applicant Name: Peachey, Sara J.

Land Owner Name: Peachey, Sara J.

Plan Preparer: Tuscarora 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: *This plan submitted for review by the Mifflin County Planning Commission for the proposed lot addition from lands of Sara J. Peachey to Matthew P. Peachey.*

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 note about the 100-year Floodplain appears to be inaccurate. A portion of the residual lot, according to County GIS records, is within the 100-year Floodplain. This information should be updated.

Agriculture Security Area - The property is in an Agricultural Security Area and should be noted on the plan.

*Topographic information - Topographical contours at vertical intervals should be displayed on the plan (Mifflin County Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, Section 7.302. A23.). Applicant can request a waiver since this proposal involves a lot addition. *The Planning Commission accepted the waiver request.*

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

Cartway Widths - The cartway width of the private drive should be shown on the plan (Mifflin County Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, Section 7.202. A11).

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.

*Lot Addition - A lot addition is considered a consolidation and therefore, results in the creation of two new lot configurations. Lot consolidation meets the definition of a subdivision according to the Municipalities Planning Code. Under these circumstances new deeds must be developed as part of the property transfer process and adequate information must be available in order to develop an accurate property description. The Planning Commission must also be assured that the parent and recipient lots still meet the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance requirements. Property boundaries, including distances and bearings, should be shown on the plan. If survey information is unavailable, this information could be supplied via the deed description. (Mifflin County Subdivision Ordinance Sections 7.302.A5, A7 and A9) *The Planning Commission did not accept the waiver request for tract boundaries as presented.*

Other Comments:

- 1. Property information for Lot 2 should include deed book and page information (See section 703.A.3 of the Mifflin County Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance).*
- 2. All abutters should be shown on the plan, including tax map numbers. (See section 7.302.a.17 of the Mifflin County Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance)*
- 3. The lot addition statement is missing, as provided for in Section 7.302.a.17 of the Mifflin County Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance)*
- 4. The application should be signed by the property owner, not just the surveyor to verify they are authorizing the subdivision.*
- 5. The signature block for the County is incorrect. This signature block is to only be used for those municipalities not under the County's Subdivision Ordinance.*
- 6. A copy of the DEP "Request for Planning Waiver and Non-Building Declaration" form needs to be provided. Plan approval is contingent upon receiving an approval from DEP following the filing of this form.*

Name of Plan: Feagley, Tim Allen and Renee M.

File Number: 2008-08-010

Tax Map #: 21-06-119

Municipality: Wayne Township

Applicant Name: Feagley, Tim Allen

Land Owner Name: Feagley, Tim Allen

Plan Preparer: Sarge Engineering and 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: *The purpose of this plan is to subdivide the property of Tim Allen and Renee M. Feagley into two lots. The total area is 44.218 acres. Lot 1, of 41.218 acres, does not contain any dwellings and will remain in silvicultural use. Lot 2, of 3.000 acres, contains the existing Hotel Wayne and an on-lot sewage system. The water source is a spring with a 20' easement for the waterline. The Hotel Wayne is not used as a hotel, but only as a tavern. Lot 2 has been tested for a sewage replacement area. There is not new building construction proposed with this project.*

Review Comments (List from Review Committee):

Soils - According to the County GIS files, some portion of this property appears to have prime farmland soils. (KrB, MuB) 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 - Based upon the Mifflin County Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, the right-of-way width for the private drive accessing T.M. 21-06-118B is substandard (Section 4.204 F.). If future subdivision and development of the property is to occur, it could be problematic to have such a narrow right-of-way, particularly for emergency access. Considering the location of the proposed Lot 2, granting additional right-of-way in the future may not be possible.

PennDOT HOP/Municipal Driveway Permits - The driveway accessing T.M. 21-06-120 should be shown on the plan (See section 7.302.A.20 of the Mifflin County Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance).

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

Other Comments:

- 1. *The Lot 1 label states it will be a lot addition to T.M. 21-06-120, which conflicts with the Project Narrative. Also, an appropriate Lot Addition statement or symbol is not on the plan. This should be clarified. *According to the surveyor, this is an error and no lot addition will take place.*
- 2. * The parcel configuration for T.M. 21-06-118, 21-06-119B and 21-06-120 differ from county tax assessment records. Please confirm configuration. *According to the surveyor, the plans show the proper lot configuration and the County Tax Records are in err.*
- 3. The narrative discusses a water easement and the plan shows a proposed 20' water easement. Information on the easement should be provided, including whether it has been recorded.*

A request for an additional six month extension on the Edgewood Country Estates Phase IV and Business Park in Brown Township was received. This plan was originally submitted under the Mifflin County Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance before Brown Township's ordinance was in place. Two extensions have been granted previously. The reason for this request is that the permitting process has been cumbersome, which has caused the plan to be delayed. Christian Aumiller made a motion to approve the additional six month extension for this plan. Kay Hamilton seconded the motion. All members voted aye.

Bill reported that he sent a letter to Lewistown Borough regarding the Special Needs Center. A copy of the letter was provided to the Planning Commission.

Item #6 – Public Comment

There was no public comment.

Item #7 – Other Business or Comments

There was no other business to discuss.

The meeting adjourned at 5:25 p.m. upon a motion by Dan Dunmire that was seconded by Christian Aumiller.

mjs