

**MINUTES**  
**MIFFLIN COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING**  
**Thursday, September 24, 2009**  
**Mifflin County Courthouse, Meeting Room B – 3:30 P.M.**

**ATTENDANCE**

**Members**

Dan Dunmire, Vice Chairman  
John Pannizzo  
Brent Miller  
Neal Shawver  
Kay Hamilton  
Susan Heimbach  
Shawn McLaughlin  
Don Kauffman

**Other**

Megan Bollinger, The Sentinel  
David Harmon, Newton Hamilton Borough  
Armond Aquilino, Nittany Engineering Association  
Rex Fink, Borough of Lewistown  
Jim Zubler, Downtown Lewistown Inc.  
Michael E. Reed, Armagh Township  
Jon Zimmerman, Downtown Lewistown Inc.

**Staff**

Bill Gomes, Director  
Mark Colussy, Associate Planner

**Commissioners**

Mark Sunderland  
Otis E. Riden, Jr.

**Item #1 – Call to Order**

Dan Dunmire called the meeting to order at 3:36 p.m.

**Item #2 – Record of Public Attendance**

Everyone is to sign the attendance sheet.

**Item #3 – Approval of Meeting Minutes**

Dan said the first item on the agenda is approval of the August 27 meeting minutes. Kay Hamilton made a motion to approve the minutes as written. Neal Shawver seconded the motion and consent was given.

**Item #4 – Comprehensive Planning**

Dan reminded everyone that the Mifflin County Comprehensive Plan was done in 2000 and the Municipal Planning Code requires that the Comp Plan be revisited and updated every ten years. Union County has just gone through this process. He introduced Shawn McLaughlin from the Union County Planning Department to give an overview of how they initiated this process. Mr. McLaughlin said Union County shares a common border with Mifflin County and has similar characteristics. He shared a land use map stating that 90% of Union County is undeveloped with 317 square miles, 14 municipalities, 10 townships and 4 boroughs. The population is probably 48,000-50,000. The last Comprehensive Plan in Union County was done in 1996. He said when they started that process in 1994 they were still using a doss-based computer program operating system. The GIS was just starting so they had no mapping capabilities. There was no internet. These are just a few of the changes that have occurred in their ten-year period. Another significant occurrence was more growth and development and they saw controversy over different land uses. There was no clear cut consensus on how things should be done. They were faced with the MPC ten-year deadline to do something. They hoped that the County and Municipalities would all work together to do the Plan and met in April 2006. In June 2006 they surveyed municipalities to see if they were interested in the proposal and by September of 2006 decided who wanted to work together. This was followed by the formation of multi-municipal Advisory Teams (PAT's) and the development of a scope of work and cost estimates. By December they had grant applications pending with PennDOT and DCED and started their consultant selection process. This committee consisted of representation from the

participating municipalities and other community leaders. Consultants were interviewed in January 2007 and by February a consultant was recommended to the Planning Commissioners and the County Commissioners. By June of 2007 Union County was notified that their grants from DCED and PennDOT were approved. The public kickoff was held September of 2007. The plan will be ready for adoption this fall.

Mr. McLaughlin then elaborated on the primary factors that interested the municipalities in participating:

- There was no pressure. All decisions were left up to the municipalities to decide if they wanted to participate. All but one participated and that municipality had just completed one.
- Everyone had time to research the proposal at the local level.
- There were work sessions from June through September of 2006 to keep in communication.
- Cost savings were tremendous for townships and boroughs.
- The County handled all the grant applications, consultant contracts and administrative costs.
- There are benefits from the State Planning Code when you do multi municipal planning that is not available when you do a single municipal plan. One of those things is if you have zoning and you have an individual plan you have to provide for every land use in your municipality. In multi municipal planning each municipality can have its own individual zoning and planning but they don't have to provide for every land use.

Mr. McLaughlin gave out hand outs to show the cost for their plan. Total project was \$390,000. He said Mifflin County will probably be in a much better situation than Union County was since it was done in 2000. PA DCED funded \$190,000, PennDOT \$50,000, the County \$50,000 in cash over two budget cycles and an in-kind match of \$50,000. Also 13 municipalities contributed \$50,000 based on population.

Mr. McLaughlin talked about the Baker's Dozen of Lessons Learned, Overall Experience and Observations that was on the back of the hand out sheet. Some of these were; it takes a lot of time and effort; work closely with municipal officials – both elected and planning commissioners; advertise widely for consultants and don't be afraid to use a firm you have not heard of before; you may have disagreements that will have to be resolved; get consultant prices in advance so you know what to apply for in grants; get as many people involved as possible. Last he said listen to residents. They have some very good ideas.

Dan asked how many documents they actually had. Mr. McLaughlin said when they started out they anticipated they would have basically four documents, a County plan and three municipal plans. The consultant team felt they should have one consolidated document that works for everyone. What they ended up with is three main parts in their plan. The County Plan will be all three of those parts and the municipalities will adopt parts one and two like the County but then part three they will only adopt the parts that apply to them.

Bill Gomes said the process to start a new comprehensive plan will begin next year. He said some of the municipal plans in the County date back to the early 70's. There was one multi-municipal plan adopted in the County in 2001 involving Newton Hamilton, Kistler and Wayne Township. Bill stated the process would not start before the end of next year. The census data will not be out until the beginning of 2011. He said he does not know what funding may be available for budget purposes, but felt the process is worth while for the municipalities who don't have plans to look at working together. Mr. McLaughlin said the process helps to get things solved as well as open up communication lines between the municipalities and the County.

Mr. McLaughlin said he would leave contact information for anyone to feel free to ask any questions they may have.

**Item #5 – Subdivision and Land Development Review Committee Report**

Dan thanked the non members for coming and said they were welcome to stay for the remainder of the business meeting or they may leave. He then turned the meeting over to Mark Colussy and Susan Heimbach for the Subdivision Review Report. Armond Aquilino from Nittany Engineering & Associates was present to explain the Fame Emergency Medical Services Plan. He said they received the comments and concerns of the review committee and indicated they would make some plan revisions that were appropriate on future plans. He stated he had submitted plans to Derry Township and said they will just be reviewing without commenting since very little of the project area is in Derry.

Mr. Aquilino stated the majority of the comments from the County are graphics and depiction of the development. This proposal consolidates the two existing parcels Fame owns and the old alleys and streets that were set aside in the 1950's. The land development aspect involves a parking lot and changing the location of the existing entrance which requires a PennDOT permit. A question was asked as to the impact this change will have on the existing residence. Mr. Aquilino said it will have no impact on this property as they intend to keep a gradual slope going up to that existing property. The plan will create a nice level parking area. A question was asked how far this has been moved from the original parking lot. The answer given was 60 – 100 feet. Bill asked if a sight triangle was shown. Mr. Aquilino said they did not show one but they met with the PennDOT inspector and it was approved as adequate distance. He said by bringing the entrance up the hill it is creating a safer entrance.

Mark Colussy discussed a subdivision not included in the packet sent to each member. The Michael Bowers subdivision was submitted one day prior to the review committee meeting so he did not have a chance to get it reviewed prior to that meeting but has since reviewed it. He said it is up to the Planning Commission whether they want to take action on it. According to Granville Township they are actually not going to act on this until November so there is no time crunch. Mark said he gave his initial review but the review committee has not seen this plan. Dan asked if Mark felt confident that he had looked at it all he needed to. Mark said the plan is pretty simple. He said there is a ravine going down the center of proposed lot #1 and the rear lot lines are not at substantially right angles. He said that was one of the questions he had. The Granville Township Ordinance says that lot lines have to be at substantially right angles to the street line; it doesn't necessarily say the rear line. Mark said it was just a question as to why they are proposing it this way. Dan questioned why the topographic features were at 100 feet intervals instead of 10 or 20 feet. Bill said he felt there should be another look at this plan. It was decided that this plan should be reviewed next month.

Dan said there are three subdivisions under municipal ordinances and one under the County so he asked for a motion to approve the comments for the municipal subdivisions. John Pannizzo made the motion and it was seconded by Don Kauffman with Kay Hamilton and Neal Shawver abstaining on the Fame subdivision. A separate motion was made on the subdivision in Wayne Township for Pete Searer by John Pannizzo and seconded by Don Kauffman.

September 2009 Subdivision and Land Development Report:

***Name of Plan: Goss, Gerald K.***

***Tax Map #: 15-13-126***

***Applicant Name: Goss, Gerald K.***

***Plan Preparer: Wright Land Surveying***

***Action Taken: The County provides comments only.***

***File Number: 2009-09-003***

***Municipality: Decatur Township (Municipal Ordinance)***

***Land Owner Name: Goss, Gerald K.***

Plan Summary: This plan proposes to create Lot 2 with no new development proposed. There are five existing mobile homes on Lot 2 being served by two on-lot sewage disposal systems and a private well. Access is by an existing deeded right-of-way from SR 0522. Additional soils testing was completed and this area designated as a replacement area for on-lot sewage disposal.

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, MrB). According to the County GIS files, some portion of the residual property appears to have hydric soils. The hydric soils information should be shown on the plan. (BrB) Soils information should be shown on the plan. (Decatur Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, Section 602.2.A.8)*

*Right-of Way Widths - The right-of-way width for the existing private drive, Carol Lane, 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 existing private drive, Carol Lane, should be shown on the plan (Decatur Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, Section 602.2.A.11).*

*PennDOT HOP/Municipal Driveway Permits - Is an existing Highway Occupancy Permit (HOP) in place for Carol Lane? If so, permit information should be submitted to the Decatur Township Planning Commission. If a permit does not exist, the applicant should be aware that PennDOT may require a HOP if future development is to occur along Carol Lane.*

*Shared Driveway - Is an existing shared driveway agreement in place for Carol Drive? If not, one may want to be considered by the applicant. 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 603.2.A.6 and 603.2.B.7 of the Decatur Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance. \*According to the surveyor, there are no known deed restrictions or easements.*

*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. Considering multiple structures are to utilize the same septic field, the local Sewage Enforcement Officer should be contacted to verify that a non-building waiver will be appropriate in this situation and if the septic field in place is adequate for the needs of the tract. \*In coordination with the Surveyor and the SEO, the system is adequate.*

*Water Service - Does the existing well shown on Lot 2 service all five existing mobile homes? Clarification of the water service should be on the plan. \*According to the surveyor, the one well supplies all five existing mobile homes on the tract.*

Other Comments:

1. According to aerial photography, it appears Carol Lane extends beyond what is depicted on the plan. If the drive does indeed extend further than what is shown on the plan, it should be shown as such. (See section 602.2.A.10 of the Decatur Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance) \*According to the surveyor, the lane does not extend beyond what is shown on the plan.

2. According to County Tax Assessment records, Lot 1 encompasses additional property than what is shown on the property plan. Please confirm. \*The area mentioned had been subdivided previously, but not deeded. The reference to the map book and page number of the subdivision plan should be on the plan.

3. Property boundary information should be provided for the residual property, Lot 1 (See sections 603.2.A.5, 7, 9 and 12 of the Decatur Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance). If property survey information is not available, this information could be provided via a metes and bounds description of the property deed.

4. Based upon aerial photography, it appears there is one or more structure on the residual property. All significant man-made features should be shown on the plan.

5. All abutters, including tax map numbers, should be shown on the plan. (See section 603.2.A.16 of the Decatur Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance)

6. Considering this property has multiple dwelling units on the same property, was it ever approved as a Land Development Plan? \*According to the surveyor, the dwelling units have existed prior to SALDO regulations going into effect.

**Name of Plan: Fame Emergency Medical Services Facility File Number: 2009-09-001**

**Tax Map #: 10-5-110/16-18-200**

**Municipality: Lewistown Borough (Municipal Ordinance)**

**Applicant Name: Fame EMS**

**Land Owner Name: Fame EMS**

**Plan Preparer: Nittany Engineering & Assoc., LLC**

Action Taken: The County provides comments only.

Plan Summary: Fame Emergency Medical Services Owns three (3) parcels of land and has acquired portions of unopened right-of-ways. Included in the submitted to combine all parcels into a single parcel that contains approximately 1.6 acres. The parcel is located in both Lewistown Borough and Derry Township. The northern portion of the property consists of a paved entrance, building and associated paving. The southern portion of the property has a tiered gravel parking lot. The applicant intends to remove the existing tiered gravel parking lot and install a new parking lot. The applicant intends to install an upstream cutoff swale with associated piping, cutting the parking lot down to proposed grade, installing a new entrance, removing the existing gravel parking and overlaying portions of the existing pavement. The limit of disturbance for the current design encompasses approximately 0.92 acres.

Review Comments (List from Review Committee):

*Topographic information - The plans should differentiate in the legend between existing and proposed contour lines.*

*Soils - It appears soils information has been provided on Sheet 6, yet the soil boundaries are hard to distinguish since it does not appear they correspond to the symbology in the legend.*

*Setback Lines - The building setback lines are listed in the legend on all sheets yet the building setback lines do not appear to be shown on the plan. The lines should be shown on the plan (See section 7.302.a.10 of the Lewistown Borough Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance). Additionally, Note 8 on Sheet 1 mentions setback lines, yet the setback requirements are not stated. The setback requirements should be listed on the plan.*

*Cartway Widths - The cartway width should be shown on the plan (Lewistown Borough Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, Section 7.202.A.11).*

*PennDOT HOP/Municipal Driveway Permits - Clear sight triangles and distances should be provided for the proposed driveway entrance. As stated on the plan, a PennDOT Highway Occupancy Permit (HOP) is required as prescribed in the Municipalities Planning Code (Section 508 (6)) and in the Lewistown Borough Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Section 4.208 C.). A copy of the permit should be provided to the Borough Planning Commission.*

*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 Lewistown Borough Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance. \*According to the project manager, there are no known deed restrictions or easements.*

*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.*

*Signature Blocks on Plan - Signature Blocks for the Derry Township Planning Commission and Supervisors should be on the plan. Both the Borough of Lewistown and Derry Township should be given the opportunity to review this plan. If Derry Township has opted out of the review of this plan, a letter stating this should be submitted. \*Derry Township has opted to not have a formal review of the plan, and won't need signature blocks on the plan. A letter should be requested from Derry Township stating this stance.*

Other Comments:

*1. It appears the Abbreviations Legend title is mislabeled over the Revisions Block on Sheets 2 and 3.*

*2. Parking Site Data has been provided for Sheet 2, but this should be supplemented with Zoning Requirements.*

*Additionally, the parking standards for the Borough of Lewistown and Derry Township are different. For instance, the size of a parking space in Derry is 9' x 19', not 9' x 18'. Can the applicant confirm the width of the spaces? \*The spaces are to be 9' x 18', which is what the Borough of Lewistown requires. There will be no development in Derry Township.*

*3. General Zoning requirements (setbacks, parking stall size and number required, lot coverage, etc.) should be provided on the plan, as well as an indication of the requirements have been met.*

*4. Are there any Fire Hydrants in the area? The applicant may want to speak with the Fire Marshall to see if a hydrant is needed in the area. \*There are no fire hydrants on the property, or proposed.*

*5. Have street lights and sidewalks been considered? \*Street lights are going to be installed along the proposed parking lot, and this information will be added to the final plan prior to recordation. Sidewalks are not being proposed.*

6. There should be an inset map showing the lots that are being merged. It is difficult to see what is being added to what as shown on Sheet 1. \*According to the project manager, a previous quit claim deed and plan were prepared for acquiring areas of the unopened alleys. This plan will supplement the lot consolidation plan proposed.
7. Sheet 2 shows that one of the driveways is being removed, yet the second driveway only lists the trench being removed. Is the one of the original driveways to remain? \*According to the project manager, both existing driveways are to be removed. A note of such should be on the plan.
8. The stormwater plan needs to be reviewed by the municipal engineer for Derry Township and the Borough of Lewistown. \*According to the project manager, since stormwater will only be affecting the Borough, Derry Township will not need to review the stormwater plan. The plan has been submitted to the Borough.
9. This plan will require an NPDES permit as well as an Erosion and Sediment (E&S) Control Plan. Has the E&S Plan been reviewed by the Mifflin County Conservation District? \*According to the project manager, this proposal does not elicit the need for an NPDES permit, but the E&S plan has been submitted to the MCCD for review. A joint permit (encroachment) will also be required to allow the development to occur in a small designated wetland.

**Name of Plan: Byler, Raymond J.**

**File Number: 2009-09-002**

**Tax Map #: 19-08-115**

**Municipality: Oliver Township (Municipal Ordinance)**

**Applicant Name: Byler, Raymond J.**

**Land Owner Name: Byler, Raymond J.**

**Plan Preparer: Wright Land Surveying**

Action Taken: The County provides comments only.

Plan Summary: This plan proposes to create Lot Addition A to be added onto Lot 2. No new development is proposed. Also, a private 50' right-of-way is being proposed to access this property. Lot 2 was approved on July 10, 2008 and recorded on July 29th as Instrument #2008-4244.

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 - Plan Note 5 appears to be incorrect. A portion of the residual 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.*

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

*Soils - According to the County GIS files, some portion of the residual property appears to have hydric soils. (No, Pu) Soil information is not on the plan. Since the plan involves a lot addition/merger, the applicant should request a waiver from the subdivision ordinance. According to the County GIS files, some portion of this property appears to have prime farmland soils. (AbB, AoB, No, Ph)*

*Right-of Way Widths - Based upon the Oliver Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, the right-of-way width for Scenic Drive should be shown on the plan. (Section 6.302.a.6). The right-of-way width for T-329, S. River Road, does not meet the road provisions of Oliver Township's Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Table 1). Since the parcel has the potential for future development, road improvements should be considered prior to further development. At a minimum additional right of way should be provided by the applicant as a condition if there is future development along this road.*

*Cartway Widths - The cartway width for T-329, S. River Road, does not meet the road provisions of the Oliver Township's Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Table 1). Since the parcel has the potential for future development, road improvements should be considered prior to further development. At a minimum additional cartway should be provided by the applicant as a condition if there is future development along this road. The cartway width for Scenic Drive should be shown on the plan (Oliver Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, Section 6.202.a.11).*

*PennDOT HOP/Municipal Driveway Permits - The proposed driveway location should be shown on the plan. (See section 6.202.a.10 of the Oliver Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance) A copy of the municipal driveway permit that is required in Oliver Township should be provided to the Oliver Township Planning Commission.*

*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 known deed restrictions or easements.*

*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.*

*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 boundary information should be provided for the residual lot. If property survey information is not available, this information could be provided via a meets and bounds description from the property deed on the inset plan. This property was subdivided in 2008, and dimensional information was asked for at that time and not provided. The information should be provided at this time. (Oliver Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance Sections 6.302.a.5, 7, 9 and 12)*

***Other Comments:***

- 1. Since Lot 2 has been previously approved, but no deeded, the instrument number of the subdivision should be provided.*
- 2. According to County GIS information, there are structures on the residual property. All significant man-made features should be shown on the plan. (See section 6.202.a.10 of the Oliver Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance)*
- 3. This property was last subdivided in July of 2008, but no transfer of Lot 2 has taken place. With the proposed lot addition, this will bring the total lot size to just under 2 acres. We assume this is because of Clean and Green affecting the total tract. Why is there a proposed R-O-W across the Byler residual tract as access to Lot 2? Is this area intended to be a lot addition to Lot 2 in the future? \*According to the surveyor, there are no plans for further subdivision or lot additions to Lot 2. The location shown on the plan is where the land owners would like the driveway.*

***Name of Plan: Searer, Francis A.***

***Tax Map #: 12-14-108I***

***Applicant Name: Searer, Francis A. (Pete)***

***Plan Preparer: Wright Land Surveying***

***File Number: 2009-09-004***

***Municipality: Wayne Township (County Ordinance)***

***Land Owner Name: Searer, Francis A. (Pete)***

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

***Plan Summary:*** *This plan proposes to transfer Lot Addition A from the lands of Francis A. Searer to the lands of Donald A. McGee. No new development is proposed.*

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

***Floodplain -*** *The property lies within the 100-year floodplain. Future development in this area should be discouraged. The plan does not note that the area depicted as in the floodplain is actually the Floodway. Zone AE extends even further than what is shown on the plan. This should be shown on the plan.*

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

***Right-of Way Widths -*** *According to Section 7.302.A.6 of the Mifflin County Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, the right-of-way width needs to be labeled on the plan. Considering no specified Right-of-Way width is specified for the existing private R-O-W, Stayrook Way, no future development should occur along this private drive unless the width meets the requirements of the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance and all other applicable ordinances. \*According to the surveyor, the right-of-way width is unavailable due to poor past plans and deeds of the area.*

***Cartway Widths -*** *The cartway width for Stayrook Way should be shown on the plan (Mifflin County Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, Section 7.202. A11).*

***Private Drive -*** *A private drive agreement should be on the plan, stating the following: "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 private road shall be in accordance with the private road maintenance and use agreement recorded in Deed Book \_\_ Page\_\_ of the \_\_\_\_\_ County Recorder of Deeds Office." \*According to the surveyor, it will be very difficult to get a maintenance agreement established. The surveyor did mention that he could put a note on the plan stating that the state, county, and township will not be responsible for the maintenance of the private drive.*

*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. \*According to the surveyor, there are no known deed restrictions or easements.*  
*DEP Sewage Planning Module - A copy of the DEP "Request for Planning Waiver and Non-Building Declaration" form needs to be provided. Plan approval will be contingent upon receiving an approval from DEP following the filing of this form.*

*Other Comments:*

- 1. The tax map number for the Frederick Vrabel and the Francis A. Searer properties should be shown on the plan. (See section 7.302.A.13 of the Mifflin County Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance) \*According to the surveyor, tax mapping, deeds, and previous subdivision plans in the area are very poor, and no known tax map number could be determined for the Searer property.*
- 2. The abutter to the East of the property should be shown on the plan, including Tax Map Number and Deed Book and Page Number (See section 7.302.A.17 of the Mifflin County Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance).*
- 3. The connection to the public road system should be shown on the plan.*
- 4. The residual lot of the Francis A. Searer property should be shown on the plan unless this is a complete lot merger. Clarification should be made on the plan. \*According to the surveyor, residual tract information could not be determined.*
- 5. Stayrook Way is shown on the Inset Map as extending to the Vrabel property. Please confirm. \*According to the surveyor, the driveway to the McGee property is an extension of Stayrook Way, and crosses the Vrabel property.*

Dan said there is another extension request for Edgewood Country Estates Phase IV. Bill said he reminded these people a month ago that their six month extension is coming up. The applicant stated their primary hold up is DEP. Bill said they are trying to get all the adjoining property owners to sign off on a waiver dealing with stormwater volume. Dan remarked he had spoken with Floyd, at the Conservation Office, and he said it is a new requirement. After some discussion Bill said he was not opposed to giving them an extension. He said this is the last plan that is under the County Ordinance for Brown Township. They now have their own ordinance. This subdivision has been going on for 2 years. Don Kauffman said they should be given a three month extension to let them know there is an end to the extensions. Bill recalled they had agreed to all the comments except the walking trail. He said to give them three months without assurance of further extensions unless they make considerable progress. Don Kauffman said he would rather give two three month extensions than two six month extensions. Dan said they are in a position to let this plan expire and then submit a new plan to Brown Township. A motion was made by John Pannizzo for a three-month extension and seconded by Susan. Also it was suggested that Bill inquire of other counties if a charge may be considered for extensions.

**Item #6 – Public Comment**

There was no public comment.

**Item #7 – Other Business or Comments**

Bill commented on the Derry Heights project that the Planning Commission's review was very thorough but he felt it was ignored. He said he met with the Derry Township Planning Commission and suggested that they go over the parking space provision as well as other variances considered over the past five years. He said a variance should not be used as a vehicle to change an ordinance.

Dan asked Mark about member term expirations. Mark said Christian Aumiller's term is up in December and wanted to know if he was interested in another term. Bill was asked to check on this.

**Item # 8 Adjournment**

A motion was made to adjourn the meeting by Kay Hamilton and seconded by Neal Shawver. The meeting was adjourned at 5:05 p.m.

dab