

MINUTES
MIFFLIN COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING
THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 25, 2008
MIFFLIN COUNTY COURTHOUSE, MEETING ROOM B – 3:30 P.M.

ATTENDANCE

Members

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

Others

Jim Wagner, Tri-Tech/Wagner
Doug Weikel, HRG

Staff

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

Item #1 – Call to Order

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

Item #2 – Record of Public Attendance

Jim reminded everyone to sign the attendance sheet.

Item #3 – Approval of Meeting Minutes

Jim suggested a word change to Item #4, Mifflin County Hazard Mitigation Plan Update in the minutes of the August 28, 2008 meeting. The new sentence should read, "Private property is not governed by the document." Christian Aumiller made a motion to approve the meeting minutes with the change. Don Kauffman seconded the motion. All members voted aye.

Item #4 – Subdivision and Land Development Committee Report

Dan Dunmire presented the Subdivision and Land Development Review Committee's report. There were four plans reviewed, all of which are 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: David J. Peachey subdivision in Brown Township, Derry Heights Phase 1 land development in Derry Township, Eleanor Aurand subdivision in Granville Township and Simon R. & Lena M. Peachey subdivision in Union Township.

Bill Gomes first discussed the situation where Union Township signed the plan before the Mifflin County Planning Commission reviewed it.

Jim Wagner attended the meeting to present the Derry Heights Phase 1 land development in Derry Heights. Jim summarized the plan and reviewed the comments that were addressed with the revised plan, which are noted in the committee's report. Buchar Horn's comments on the plan and the traffic impact study were provided to the Planning Commission. Derry Township's Planning Commission conditionally approved the plan at their meeting today. The final plan will be submitted soon.

Christian Aumiller made a motion to approve the comments and recommendations for the plans under municipal ordinances. Don Kauffman seconded the motion. All members voted aye.

The Subdivision Review Committee report:

Name of Plan: Peachey, David J.

Tax Map #: 14-08-101

Applicant Name: Peachey, David

Plan Preparer: Wright Land Surveying

Action Taken: The County provides comments only.

Plan Summary: This plan proposes to place a seasonal residence to be served by on-lot sewage disposal system on the Peachey property. No subdivision is proposed. Drinking water is to be supplied from an existing well. This will be the third residence on the Peachey Property.

File Number: 2008-09-001

Municipality: Brown Township (Municipal Ordinance)

Land Owner Name: Peachey, David

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 plan should note a portion of the residue lies within a 100-year floodplain (See section 7.302.A.29 of the Brown 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, 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. (Ma)

Right-of-Way Widths - The right-of-way for Coffee Run Road does not meet the road provisions of Brown Township'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 Coffee Run Road does not meet the road provisions of Brown Township'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 cartway should be provided by the applicant as a condition if there is future development along this road.

Shared Driveway - A shared driveway maintenance agreement should be in place since more than one user will be using the driveway.

Street Names - According to County GIS records, the driveway is already named "Peaceful Waters Drive". Please confirm and label on the plan.

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.

Water Service - If the existing well that will serve the proposed residence is the well that is shown on the plan to the South of the barn, the plans should be more specific as to the water supply location. Is a water line to be installed to connect to the proposed residence? The water supply for the proposed residence should be confirmed on the plan. (See section 4.211.A of the Brown Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance)

Signature Blocks on Plan - The Mifflin County Planning Commission asks that the new county review certificate be placed on plans. If a copy of the review certificate is requested, one can be obtained at the Mifflin County Planning and Development Department office.

Other Comments:

1. Tract boundaries are not shown on the plan and should be put on the plan. If survey data is not available, this information could be supplied via the deed description. This information could be shown on the property plan. (See sections 7.302.A.5, A.7, and A.9 of the Brown Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance)

2. Deed Book information for abutters of the parcel should be listed on the property plan. (See section 7.302.a.17 of the Brown Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance)

Name of Plan: Derry Heights Phase 1

File Number: 2008-08-007

Tax Map #: 16-01-113A

Municipality: Derry Township

Plan Preparer: Tri-Tech/Wagner Engineering & Surveying Land Owner Name: Burnham Properties LP

Applicant Name: Burnham Properties LP

Action Taken: The County provides comments only.

Plan Summary: *Phase 1A and 1B were combined into one phase.

Narrative - This project is proposing a 5 story, 120 room Hampton Inn and Suites motel and also a 10,000 square foot Damon's Restaurant on the 8.02 acre tract of land. The tract is called the Row Tract of Land. An 8 plex movie theater is proposed for the adjoining tract, called the Northern Tract, a 57.377 acre tract. The proposed Facilities will have access from Ferguson Valley Road at two proposed locations. The site is located at 13153 Ferguson Valley Road, the Rowe Tract is currently zoned as General Commercial. There is an existing vacant residence on the tract which will be demolished. The Northern Tract is currently zoned Light Industrial. It is a vacant tract of land. The site will be served with public water and sewer.

Review Comments (List from Review Committee):

*Review Revision - *Review Comments are based on a revised plan dated September 2, 2008, updating the review of August 28, 2008.*

*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. *Soil information is now shown but hydric soil information is still not delineated. Additionally,*

wetland information on the Riden property should be shown on the plan. **A hydric soil note was added to the soils legend on the September 22, 2008 plans.

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? **This provision was clarified by the Township Zoning Officer.

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.) *The right-of-way provisions for both roads are now clearly shown. However, whether the private road will remain private needs to be confirmed as well as a provision for a private right-of-way agreement.

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.) *This was corrected on the September 2 revised plan.

PennDOT HOP/Municipal Driveway Permits - A municipal driveway permit is required, and a copy should be provided to the Derry Township Planning Commission. *This has been noted on the September 2 revised plan. A permit is supposed to be under review.

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. *A street name has been applied for, but has not been noted on the plan. **According to the surveyor, the street names will be added to the final plan upon approval.

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. *According to the surveyor, there are no deed restrictions on this property.

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. *A copy of the mailer has been provided.

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. *This was corrected on the September 2 revised plan.

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. *A conditional hearing has been held and should be noted on the plan. Also a note that a variance is needed to meet Section 432.5 of the Zoning Ordinance should be on the plan. **A note has been added to the September 22, 2008 plans to address this issue.
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. *Plan proposal will require a variance and this needs to be stated on the plan. **A note has been added to the September 22, 2008 plans to address this point.
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? *This has been addressed with the September 2 revised plan.
4. The front sheet has an index, but individual sheets are not labeled to correspond with the index. This needs to be addressed. *This has been addressed with the September 2 revised plan.
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. *The structure removal has been noted on the plan, but not the recreation area. **This has been corrected on the September 22, 2008 plans.
6. The existing abutters are not all listed on the plan. (See Section 402.2.o of the Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance.) *This has been addressed with the September 2 revised plan.
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. *This has been addressed with the September 2 revised 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. *This has been addressed with the September 2 revised plan. **Based upon the comments by the Township Engineer, the plan narrative will be updated.

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. *This has been addressed with the September 2 revised 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.) *There is now a lighting plan, but the plan and legend are not clear as to street lighting versus parking lighting.

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. *This has been addressed with the September 2 revised plan. **The location map will be updated by the surveyor to make it clear.

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 Derry Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (SALDO). *Some features are shown but not all. A separate utility sheet including water and sewer lines would be helpful. **According to the surveyor, there are no gas lines on the tract and that a utility sheet will be provided with the final set of plans.

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). *Fire hydrants are now shown but the plan symbol in the legend does not meet what is on the plan. **This has been corrected on the September 22, 2008 plans.

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 are 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? *Right-of-way and cartway widths are shown but the other information including a cul-de-sac, street grades, and road profile information are not present. **According to the surveyor, this additional road information will be added to the final set of plans.

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. *A plan was submitted to the Township Engineer and under review. The September 2 revised plan does show basins but no information on size or dimensions and if fencing around them will be included. **Volume size information for the stormwater basins has been added to the September 22, 2008 plans and the Township Engineer is satisfied with the plan for preliminary review purposes.

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. *A clear sight triangle has been shown for the main entrance of Ferguson Valley Road, but nothing about vegetation clearance or sight information for second entrance. The plan needs to show how the site will be served by the second entrance. **The clear sight triangle information has been added to the September 22, 2008 plans, however, additional information should be supplied about the removal of vegetation at the main entrance on the final plans.

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? *A traffic plan has been provided but directional arrows for the main road should be shown. The plan should also show the travel widths around the movie theater. **This has been corrected on the September 22, 2008 plans.

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. *An NPDES permit has been requested.

19. Can this proposal meet the block length requirements as provided in Section 508.2A of the Township SALDO? *The September 2 revised plan now states this requirement can be met.

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. *The September 2 revised landscaping plan appears to have addressed this question.

21. There are no provisions shown for an off street loading area as listed in Section 313 of the Township Zoning Ordinance. *This has been addressed with the September 2 revised plan, however, the plan should provide dimensional information.

22. There is no general landscape plan as provided for in Section 314 of the Township Zoning Ordinance. *This has been addressed on the September 2 revised plan.

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. *The developer has not addressed this and should be on the final plan.
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. *Trans Associates submitted a response on September 9, 2008. Part of our concerns has been addressed.
27. The plan does not provide building height information. *This has been corrected on the September 22, 2008 plans.
28. Are there provisions for sidewalks? *This issue needs to be further discussed. At minimum, if the developer is not prepared to address this provision now, sidewalks should be part of the developers agreement. Also, sidewalks should be clearly marked on the plan. **According to the surveyor, the developer will added sidewalks as part of the developers agreement.
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. *This has only been partially addressed.
30. 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. *A use variance has been applied for and should be noted on the plan. The Planning Commission believes the applicant should request a rezoning to Commercial instead of asking for a use variance as is now being proposed. **A note has been added to the September 22, 2008 plans to address this issue.
31. There are high tension power lines over the parking lot. Has Penelec been consulted on this as to what is permitted under these lines? *This information should be noted on the plan.
32. Zoning boundary lines should be shown on the plan. *This has been addressed on the September 22, 2008 plans.
33. Traffic signage should be shown on the plan. *This has been addressed on the September 22, 2008 plans except for the right-in/right-out only signage for the second entrance.

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 alternative 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: Aurand, Eleanor

File Number: 2008-09-002

Tax Map #: 17-10-124

Municipality: Granville Township (Municipal Ordinance)

Applicant Name: Aurand, Eleanor

Land Owner Name: Aurand, Eleanor

Plan Preparer: Taptich Engineering and Surveying

Action Taken: The County provides comments only.

Plan Summary: This project involves the subdivision of 1 lot from the Eleanor Aurand Property. Lot #1 hereon is to be a non-building lot addition to the adjacent lands of James Aurand (TM 19-10-120).

Review Comments (List from Review Committee):

Clean and Green Program - The grantee 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. (See Section 6.202.a.14 of the Granville Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance)

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

Topographic information - Though the Location Map has some topographic information, it is undecipherable.

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

Soils - According to the County GIS files, some portion of this property appears to have prime farmland soils. (E1B, MeB) According to the County GIS files, some portion of this property appears to have hydric soils. The hydric soils information should be shown on the plan. (AoB)

Setback Lines - Plan Note 11 references the Granville Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance for setback requirements. However, the correct setback information should be referenced from the Zoning Ordinance. See section 4.404 of the Granville Township Zoning Ordinance for correct setback information. The setback lines should be shown on the plan as prescribed in the Granville Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Section 6.302.a.10).

Right-of-Way Widths - Though the plan states the "Right-of-Way varies" for both Big Ridge Road and Sand Ridge Road, correct right-of-way widths should be shown on the plan at minimum along the property boundary. (See section 6.302.a.6 of the Granville Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance)

Deed Restrictions and Easements - Plan Note 6 references a water line easement on the property. Also, plan note 7 references additional easements. All easements should be shown on the plan. (See section 6.302.a.6 of the Granville Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance)

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

Water & Sewer Service - The plan should show the existing water and sewage service for the residual lot and the grantee property. (See section 6.202.a.10 of the Granville Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance)

Signature Blocks on Plan - The Mifflin County Planning Commission asks that the new county review certificate be placed on plans. If a copy of the review certificate is requested, one can be obtained at the Mifflin County Planning and Development Department office.

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. The plan should show boundary information for the residual lot. If survey data is not available, this information could be supplied via the deed description. (Municipality Subdivision Ordinance Sections 6.302.A.5, A.7 & A.9)

Other Comments:

1. The tract map printed very light and the property lines are unreadable. Please provide a map with legible features.
2. The plan shows what is assumed to be a grove of trees on the Laughlin property. According to aerial photography, the Laughlin property is open farmland and proposed Lot 1 is covered in trees, the opposite of what is shown. Please confirm.
3. Zoning information should be provided. The property is located within the Agricultural Residential Zone.
4. Acreage information should be provided for the grantee property, as well as the proposed total acreage.

Name of Plan: Peachey, Simon R. & Lena M.

File Number: 2008-09-003

Tax Map #: 20-06-100AA/100AB

Municipality: Union Township (Municipal Ordinance)

Applicant Name: Peachey, Simon R. & Lena M.

Land Owner Name: Peachey, Simon R. & Lena M.

Plan Preparer: Taptich Engineering and Surveying

Action Taken: The County provides comments only.

Plan Summary: This project involves the subdivision of two (2) lots intended as Non-Building Lot Additions (for agricultural purpose) to the adjacent parcels TM 20-06-100AB. No new sewage disposal facilities are proposed. Access to TM 20-06-100AA and TM 20-06-100AB will be via existing right of ways as shown on plans of record of the Simon R. and Lena M. Peachey Property (TM 20-06-100A). This plan involves the further subdivision of Lot #1 as shown on the Plan of Subdivision, Simon R. Peachey and Lena M. Peachey Property, prepared by Taptich Engineering & Surveying, Inc. (TES) as recorded in Plat Book 24, Page 88 in the office of the Mifflin County Recorder of Deeds. TES found no evidence that Lot #1 of the referenced plan was conveyed previously.

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.

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

Topographic information - Topographical contours at vertical intervals should be displayed on the plan (Union Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, Section 402.1.g).

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

Right-of Way Widths - Based upon the Union Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, the right-of-way width for Belleville Lane should be shown on the plan. (Section 402.2.a). Though a 20 foot access easement is allowable via the Union Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Section 502), it is recommend the owner consider granting additional right-of-way along the existing private drive. This would especially be encouraged if additional development is proposed in the future.

Cartway Widths - The cartway width for Belleville Lane and White Oak Lane should be shown on the plan (Union Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, Section 402.2.a). The cartway width for the private drive may not meet the road provisions of Union 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.

PennDOT HOP/Municipal Driveway Permits - A municipal driveway permit is required, and if an existing permit is in place, a copy should be provided to the Union Township Planning Commission.

Shared Driveway - Is there a private drive maintenance agreement in place for White Oak Lane? An agreement is recommended to be established if one is not in place.

Street Names - According to the County GIS data, the existing gravel lane that is shown on the plan is named. The private drive is named "White Oak Lane." Please confirm and show the private drive's name on the plan.

Deed Restrictions and Easements - Deed restrictions and easements associated with the property, if any, should be provided in accordance with Section 402.1.b of the Union Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance. DEP Sewage Planning Module A copy of the DEP "Request for Planning Waiver and Non-Building Declaration" form needs to be provided. Plan approval should be contingent upon receiving an approval from DEP following the filing of this form.

Signature Blocks on Plan - The Mifflin County Planning Commission asks that the new county review certificate be placed on plans. If a copy of the review certificate is requested, one can be obtained at the Mifflin County Planning and Development office.

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. Tract boundary information for the residual lot should be shown on the plan. If survey

data is not available, this information could be provided via the deed description. This can be shown on the inset map. (See Union Township Subdivision Ordinance Sections 403.1.a and 403.1.c)

Other Comments:

1. Acreage information should be provided for the grantee property as well as the proposed total acreage. (See section 402.2.h of the Union Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance)

2. Plan note 8 mentions Lot 1, yet the plan does not indicate the location of Lot 1. Please clarify.

Mark Colussy discussed the Terry W. and Diane E. Harshbarger subdivision in Bratton Township that was submitted and reviewed in June. Mark reviewed the comment that stated, “The water supply location should be noted on the plan as prescribed in the Mifflin County Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, Section 7.302 A.20. 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.” He indicated the plan was brought in for signature and signed. However, the surveyor made a note on the plan stating that they “made no attempt to identify the water source for the subject parcel as it is not relevant to the current proposal. As mentioned in the project narrative, no changes are proposed to the existing utility services and no new utility services are proposed.” After some discussion, it was decided that a letter would be sent to the surveyor to clarify the need for this type of information on the plan and that a waiver request should be submitted for matters such as this in the future. Dan Dunmire then mentioned his familiarization with an offsite spring as the water source for this property.

Item #5 – Public Comment

Doug Weikel of HRG attended the meeting to give a brief update on the Stormwater Management Plan. Doug reported the Watershed Plan Advisory Committee (WPAC) met on September 16 to discuss the proposed standards to be used in the plan and development of the model ordinance. The new model ordinance will replace the existing stormwater management ordinances. A presentation will be made once the model ordinance is drafted. Doug suggested having an entity to review stormwater and asked for feedback from the Planning Commission on how it should be handled. Dan expressed his thoughts on the reviewing entity for stormwater, and indicated the ultimate decision will be made by the municipalities. There was also some discussion about enforcement of the ordinance. Bill suggested hiring a designated consulting engineering firm to handle the reviews. Doug indicated this could be accomplished through charging review fees. The next WPAC meeting is scheduled for December 16 to discuss developing a strategy to help stream impairments and water quality. Public meetings will be held to demonstrate water volume, water quality and peak rate.

Item #6 – Other Business or Comments

- Bill mentioned a program by Tim Kelsey on natural gas. Dan explained his understanding of landowners being approached by gas companies for lease deals to explore for natural gas. More information on the program will be forthcoming.
- Mark prepared a map showing substandard houses based on assessment values. Bill indicated he hopes to complete a housing study for updating the comprehensive plan.

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

mjs