

**MINUTES**  
**MIFFLIN COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING**  
**THURSDAY, OCTOBER 22, 2009**  
**MIFFLIN COUNTY COURTHOUSE, MEETING ROOM B – 3:30 P.M.**

**ATTENDANCE**

Members

Jim Spendiff, Chairman  
Dan Dunmire  
Don Kauffman  
Susan Heimbach  
Neal Shawver  
Brent Miller

Other

Otis Riden, Jr., Mifflin County Commissioner

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**

Don Kauffman made a motion to approve the minutes of the meeting of September 24, 2009. Susan Heimbach seconded the motion. All members voted aye.

**Item #4 – Stormwater Management Plan Update**

Doug Weikel of HRG presented an update on the Stormwater Management Plan. He briefly mentioned the pending status of the DEP funding for which we should get some direction within the upcoming weeks. Doug discussed the plan goals and the modeling that was performed for the Juniata River and Jacks Creek watersheds. He went over the stormwater management control standards and discussed cumulative impacts with a vast majority of the impact coming from small subdivision activity. Doug provided a draft Small Project Stormwater Management Application and a calculation sheet to determine impervious area to be managed, as well as examples of small projects. He also discussed credits that would affect these calculations, such as rain gardens, infiltration trenches and dry wells. Doug concluded by asking for comments and suggestions.

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

Dan Dunmire reported that the Subdivision and Land Development Review Committee reviewed eight plans. There were four plans under the Mifflin County Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance. The Subdivision Review Committee recommended conditional approval of the following plans: McVeytown United Methodist Charge subdivision in McVeytown Borough, Ruth E. Turpin subdivision in Wayne Township, K. Wade Fisher subdivision in Wayne Township and Betty J. Snyder Estate subdivision in Wayne Township.

There were four 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: Joy E. Klinefelter subdivision in Granville Township, John & Kathy Lee Schmidt subdivision in Granville Township, Michael A. Bowers-Lot 1 subdivision in Granville Township and Robert E. Bowersox subdivision in Oliver Township.

Mark Colussy reviewed the McVeytown United Methodist Charge plan and indicated a land development plan will be submitted at a later time. There was some discussion about the proposed alley and maintenance of that alley.

The K. Wade Fisher plan was also reviewed. There was some discussion about the right-of-way and the floodplain. A waiver was requested from the road frontage requirements for Lot 2. Neal Shawver made a motion to approve the waiver as requested, and Don Kauffman seconded the motion. All members voted aye.

Mark then discussed the Betty J. Snyder Estate plan. There was some discussion about access, lot frontage for which a waiver was requested, the substandard right-of-way and cartway, the non-building waiver and any future development. There was further discussion about the right-of-way width, and a decision was made to revise the condition to require a 50-foot right-of-way for the entire easement. A waiver was requested from the road frontage requirements for Lot 2. Dan Dunmire made a motion to approve the waiver as requested, and Don Kauffman seconded the motion. All members voted aye.

Mark went over the Ruth E. Turpin plan. He indicated that some of the conditions had been met, and the comments would be revised based on the conditions that were addressed.

Susan Heimbach made a motion to conditionally approve the plans under the County ordinance with the changes to the comments as discussed. Neal Shawver seconded the motion. All members voted aye.

Dan Dunmire made a motion to approve the comments and recommendations on the plans under municipal ordinances. Brent Miller seconded the motion. All members voted aye.

The Subdivision Review Committee report:

**Name of Plan: Klinefelter, Joy E.**

**Tax Map #: 17-01-104A/17-01-104AA**

**Applicant Name: Klinefelter, Joy D.**

**Plan Preparer: Wright Land Surveying**

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

**Plan Summary:** *This plan proposes to create Lot Addition A. No new development is proposed. Lot Addition A is a lot addition and shall be come an integral part of the property owned by Blaine R. Stricker, Jr. Lot addition A is not a building lot and cannot be maintained or developed as a separate individual lot.*

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

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

*Topographic information - Topographical contours at vertical intervals should be displayed on the plan (Granville Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, Section 6.202.a.7). Considering this plan involves a lot addition, this provision could potentially be asked to be waived.*

*Cartway Widths - The cartway width for Nascar Lane does not meet the road provisions of Granville 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 if there is future development along this road.*

*Shared Driveway - A shared driveway agreement for the private right-of-way should be noted on the plan stating: "The owners of lots \_\_\_\_, which have a common driveway, agree and understand this is a shared driveway, and as such are responsible for maintenance, care, improvements, and snow removal at their own diligence and expense. The maintenance and use of said shared driveways shall be included in the deeds as said lots are sold."*

*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 Granville 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.*

*Signature Blocks on Plan - The Mifflin County Review Certificate should be on the plan. If a copy of the certificate is required, one can be obtained from the Mifflin County Planning and Development Department.*

**Other Comments:**

*1. Based upon aerial photography, it looks as if there may be an additional structure on the Stricker property, T.M. 17-01-104AA. All significant man-made features should be shown on the plan. (See Granville Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, Section 6.202.a.10)*

*2. The connection to the public road system should be shown on the plan.*

*3. An inset map would be helpful since this proposal involves a lot addition.*

**Name of Plan: Schmidt, John & Kathy Lee**

**Tax Map #: 17-01-103C**

**Applicant Name: Schmidt, John & Kathy Lee**

**Plan Preparer: Wright Land Surveying**

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

**File Number: 2009-10-002**

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

**Land Owner Name: Schmidt, John & Kathy Lee**

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. Access is by Peachtree Lane. The residual tract has an existing house, well and onlot system.

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)*

*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 this property appears to have hydric soils. The hydric soils information should be shown on the plan. (BrB)*

*Right-of-Way Widths - The right-of-way width for Peachtree Lane does not meet the road provisions of the Granville 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 Peachtree Lane should be shown on the plan (Granville Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, Section 6.202.a.11).*

*Shared Driveway - All private drives that are used by more than one party should have a shared driveway agreement in place. An agreement for the private right-of-way should be noted on the plan stating: "The owners of lots \_\_\_\_, which have a common driveway, agree and understand this is a shared driveway, and as such are responsible for maintenance, care, improvements, and snow removal at their own diligence and expense. The maintenance and use of said shared driveways shall be included in the deeds as said lots are sold." (See Granville Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, Section 3.204.e)*

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

*Signature Blocks on Plan - The Mifflin County Review Certificate should be on the plan. If a copy of the certificate is required, one can be obtained from the Mifflin County Planning and Development Department.*

Other Comments:

1. Property boundary information for the Residual Lot, Lot 1, should be provided on the plan. (See sections 6.302.a.5, 7, 9 & 12 of the Granville Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance)

2. What will the road frontage be for the residual tract because of the creation of Lot 2? It appears to be less than 100 feet with the proposed arrangement. The plan shows 349', yet it appears to be closer to 90'.

**Name of Plan: Bowers, Michael A. - Lot 1**

**Tax Map #: 17-016-100H**

**Applicant Name: Bowers, Michael A.**

**Plan Preparer: Frederick Seibert & Asso., Ron Skutch**

Action Taken: The County provides comments only.

Plan Summary: This plan proposes the creation of one 7.28 ac. Lot utilizing on-lot water and sewage disposal facilities. Both the proposed lot and the remaining lands have been perc tested for a primary and reserve septic disposal areas.

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 - Topographical contours are shown on the plan at 100' contours. Considering that the proposed lot has been tested for sewage, this lot appears to be intended for development. There are steep slopes in this area, and more detailed elevation data should be available and displayed on the plan at minimum at vertical 20' intervals (Granville Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, Section 6.202.a.7). Development in this area could be problematic and should be discouraged.*

*Setback Lines - 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 - Based upon the Granville Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, the right-of-way width for S.R. 0333 should be shown on the plan. (Section 6.302.a.6).*

*Cartway Widths - The cartway width for S.R. 0333 should be shown on the plan (Granville Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, Section 6.202.a.11).*

*PennDOT HOP/Municipal Driveway Permits - Is an existing Highway Occupancy Permit in place for access onto S.R. 0333? The applicant should consult with PennDOT to see if a HOP would be required if one is not in place. A notation about the requirement stating: Any access via a State Highway to lots shown on this subdivision plan will require the issuance of a PennDOT Highway Occupancy Permit (HOP). PennDOT regulations provide that a Highway Occupancy Permit is required prior to constructing, altering or exceeding the permitted capacity for any access connected onto a State Highway. A Highway Occupancy Permit is also required prior to altering the existing pattern or flow of surface drainage or directing*

additional surface drainage onto or into the highway right-of-way or highway facilities. Approval of this plan neither implies nor guarantees permit approval by PennDOT.

*Street Names* - The street lines and name of S.R. 0333 should be shown on the plan. (See Granville Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, Section 6.302.a.14)

*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 Granville 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 Granville Township Planning Commission. Plan approval should be contingent upon receiving an approval from DEP following the filing of this form.

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

Other Comments:

1. All abutters, including Tax Map numbers, should be shown on the plan. (See Granville Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, Section 6.302.a.16)
2. The Deed Book and Page Number of the property should be provided on the plan. (See Granville Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, Section 6.302.a.3)
3. All significant man-made features within 50' of the property should be shown on the plan (i.e. Railroad Tracks, Power and Telephone Lines, etc.). See Granville Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, Section 6.302.a.10.
4. The proposed lot lines are not at primarily right angles at the rear of the proposed Lot 1. The proposal seems curious since it does not even extend to the existing lane on the residual property. Clarification as to the lot configuration should be made.
5. Property boundary information, including distances and bearings, should be shown on the plan for the residual lot. If survey data is not available, this information could be supplied via a metes and bounds description of the property deed on an inset map. (See Granville Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, Sections 6.302.a.5, 7, 9 & 12)
6. Property owner information should be supplied on the plan. (See Granville Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, Section 6.302.a.3)

**Name of Plan:** McVeytown United Methodist Charge

**File Number:** 2009-10-006

**Tax Map #:** 10-00-312/315/310/311

**Municipality:** McVeytown Borough

**Applicant Name:** McVeytown United Methodist Charge

**Land Owner Name:** McVeytown United Methodist Charge

**Plan Preparer:** Wright Land Surveying

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

Plan Summary: This plan proposes to create Lot Addition A from the McVeytown United Methodist Charge to the McVeytown United Methodist Church. Lot 1, the residual, has an existing house. Also, part of Church Alley is being relocated as shown. Lot Addition A along with the abandoned part of Church Alley are to be combined into one deed and tax parcel with all three existing separate tracts currently owned by the McVeytown United Methodist Church.

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)

*Setback Lines* - Though setback information is provided in the plan notes, the setback lines should be shown on the plan as prescribed in the Mifflin County Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Section 7.302. A10).

*Right-of Way Widths* - The right-of-way width for Dull Street does not meet the road provisions of the County's Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance. Since the parcel has the potential for future development, road improvements should be considered prior to further development. At a minimum additional right of way should be provided by the applicant as a condition if there is future development along this road.

*Cartway Widths* - The cartway width of all streets and alleys should be shown on the plan (Mifflin County Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, Section 7.202. A11). \*This has been shown on the revised plan dated 10/17/09. The cartway width for Dull Street does not meet the road provisions of the County's Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance. Since the parcel has the potential for future development, road improvements should be considered prior to further development. At a minimum additional 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.

\*According to the surveyor, there are no known deed restrictions or easements.

*DEP Sewage Planning Module* - The plan, as presented, will have to allow for lots involved to be non-building lots. At the time of the Land Development plan being prepared, a DEP public sewage mailer may have to be filed if additional capacity is required. The Land Development plan will have to include public water and sewage lines on the plan. (See Mifflin County Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, Section 7.302.A.11)

*Lot Addition* - A lot addition statement should be noted on the plan stating the following on the plan: "Lot # \_\_\_ consisting of \_\_\_ acres is to be added onto land owned by \_\_\_\_\_. Lot # \_\_\_ is a lot addition and shall become an integral part of the

property owned by \_\_\_\_\_. Lot # \_\_\_ is not a building lot and cannot be maintained or developed as a separate individual lot.” (See Mifflin County Subdivision Ordinance Section 7.302.A.22 \*This has been shown on the revised plan dated 10/17/09.

Other Comments:

1. Owner information on the plan contains an error and this information should be corrected. \*This has been corrected on the revised plan dated 10/17/09.
2. The site location map should list its scale. \*This has been shown on the revised plan dated 10/17/09.
3. Has a quit claim been filed for Church Alley traversing the property? If so, appropriate deed book and page information or instrument number should be provided. \*According to the surveyor, this deed has not yet been filed. A draft of this deed should be submitted and reviewed prior to the approval of this plan.
4. Is the entirety of the residual lot, Lot 1, part of T.M. 10-00-312, or is a portion of it part of T.M. 10-00-315? Please confirm. \*According to the surveyor, the tax map is in error and the entirety of the residual lot is part of T.M. 10-00-312.
5. The total acreage of all combined Lot Additions to the church should be provided on the plan. \*This has been shown on the revised plan dated 10/17/09 for Lot Addition A. Acreage information still remains for all individual tracts except for the remainder of T.M. 10-00-312. The plan acreage should be clarified.
6. Additional information about the relocated Alley should be provided. Is the alley to be paved? Is the alley to be dedicated to the Borough? Who will maintain the Alley? Will it continue to be known as Church Alley? Street naming should be coordinated with the Mifflin County GIS Department. Considering the relocated alley is only 25' from the preexisting alley abutting the Fuhrer property, will the existing alley be vacated? \*According to the surveyor, the alley is not to be dedicated at this time. A maintenance agreement should be established to ensure maintenance of the relocated alley. It is unknown what will happen to the preexisting alley abutting the Fuhrer property and will be up to the Borough and landowner how to handle that particular situation. The Planning Commission strongly recommends that this situation be resolved.
7. Taking into account the zoning variance hearing that was held for the church and all the development that is being proposed, a Land Development plan will be required. It will be important to show what is being demolished, what is being constructed, and the proposed traffic circulation. Also, all zoning variances that have been granted should be provided. \*According to a representative of the church, a Land Development plan will be prepared in the future. No development shall occur until a Land Development plan has been prepared. This subdivision plan should reference the variances that have been approved for the church properties, but detailed information associated with the variances will need to be supplied with the Land Development plan.
8. A Developers Agreement will likely be required at the time of the submission of the Land Development plan to ensure that the relocated alley will be built.

**Name of Plan: Bowersox, Robert E.**

**Tax Map #: 19-12-107A**

**Applicant Name: Bowersox, Robert E.**

**Plan Preparer: Sarge Engineering and Surveying**

Action Taken: The County provides comments only.

Plan Summary: The purpose of this plan is to create Lot 2 for existing single family residential use. Lot 1, the residual tract, is also in existing single family residential use.

Review Comments (List from Review Committee):

Soils - As mentioned on the plan and according to the County GIS files, some portion of this property appears to have prime farmland soils. (MeB)

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

Cartway Widths - The cartway width for Judge Road and Hidden Acres Lane 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.

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 plan shows the property lines being 40' from the Andrews and Snook properties. The plan does not specifically indicate who owns the property occupying the 40' Right-of-Way between the properties. As shown on the plan, it appears that this area is owned by Steve Stimely. Please confirm and clarify on the plan. \*According to the surveyor, the right-of-way is owned by Steve Stimely.
2. Lots 1 and 2 should be added to note 8 on the plan.

**Name of Plan: Turpin, Ruth E.**  
**Tax Map #: 21-06-116B**  
**Applicant Name: Turpin, Ruth E.**

**File Number: 2009-10-004**  
**Municipality: Wayne Township (County Ordinance)**  
**Land Owner Name: Turpin, Ruth E.**

**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:** No narrative provided.

**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)

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

**Cartway Widths -** The cartway width for Bice Lane and Ferguson Valley Road does not meet the road provisions of the County's Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance. Since the parcel has the potential for future development, road improvements should be considered prior to further development. At a minimum additional 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 in Wayne Township, and a copy should be provided to the County Planning Commission. \*According to the surveyor, the driveway already exists.

**Street Names -** Street names for all abutting roads should be shown on the plan (Bice Lane and Ferguson Valley Road). See Section 7.302.A.14 of the Mifflin County Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance.

**Deed Restrictions and Easements -** Deed restrictions and easements associated with the property, if any, should be provided in accordance with Sections 7.302. 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 "Component 1 Sewage Facilities Planning Module" should be submitted to the Mifflin County Planning Commission. Plan approval is contingent upon receiving an approval from DEP following the filing of this form.

**Signature Blocks on Plan -** The Mifflin County Planning Commission review certificate should be changed to a standard "Approved by the Mifflin County Planning Commission" block.

**Other Comments:**

1. Plan Note 1 should be replaced by a plan narrative, which should be a brief description stating the purpose of the project. (See section 7.302.A.1 of the Mifflin County Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance) \*This has been corrected on the revised plan dated 10/16/09.
2. All abutters deed book and page numbers should be shown on the plan. (See section 7.302.A.17 of the Mifflin County Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance) \*This has been corrected on the revised plan dated 10/16/09.
3. Only two (2) plans were submitted. The Mifflin County Planning Commission requests at least three (3) plans be submitted for review. \*Three revised plans have been submitted.
4. The scale of the location map is at 1" = 2500'. The scale should not be at more than 1" = 2000'. (See section 7.202.A.14 of the Mifflin County Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance) \*This has been corrected on the revised plan dated 10/16/09.

**Name of Plan: Fisher, K. Wade**  
**Tax Map #: 21-06-115FA**  
**Applicant Name: Fisher, K. Wade**

**File Number: 2009-10-007**  
**Municipality: Wayne Township (County Ordinance)**  
**Land Owner Name: Fisher, K. Wade**

**Plan Preparer: Wright Land Surveying**

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

**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. Lot 1, the residual, was previously approved for a single-family residence in 2001 as part of the Virginia M. Oswald Subdivision recorded in Map Book 20, page 263.

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

**Floodplain -** The property lies within the 100-year floodplain, as the plan indicates. Future development in this area should be discouraged.

**Soils -** According to the County GIS files, some portion of this property appears to have prime farmland soils. (KrB, 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 -** The right-of-way width for T-328, Ferguson Valley Road, and the private Right-of-Way do not meet the road provisions of the County's Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance. Since the parcel has the potential for

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

Cartway Widths - The cartway width T-328, Ferguson Valley Road, does not meet the road provisions of the County's Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance. Since the parcel has the potential for future development, road improvements should be considered prior to further development. At a minimum additional right of way should be provided by the applicant as a condition if there is future development along this road.

PennDOT HOP/Municipal Driveway Permits - If a new driveway opening is being created, a municipal driveway permit is required in Wayne Township, and a copy should be provided to the County Planning Commission.

Shared Driveway - Is the existing driveway shown between Lot 1 and the Oswald property (T.M. 21-8-115F) to be shared? All private drives that are used by more than one party should have a shared driveway agreement in place. A shared driveway agreement for the private right-of-way should be noted on the plan. An agreement for the private right-of-way 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 parties are to use a private drive, the roadway will 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 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 "Component 1 Sewage Facilities Planning Module" should be submitted to the Mifflin County Planning Commission. Plan approval is contingent upon receiving an approval from DEP following the filing of this form.

Other Comments:

1. Tax assessment records indicate the property owner as Rachel Oswald. Please confirm.

2. The property, as shown, will not meet the road frontage requirements of the County Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance. Why can't the proposed lot be subdivided off of Ferguson Valley road instead of creating a private right-of-way? If this was agricultural land, it may qualify as a flag lot.

\*A variance request was submitted on 10/22/09 for this provision. The Planning Commission approved the variance request on 10/22/09.

**Name of Plan: Snyder, Betty J., Estate**

**Tax Map #: 21-09-122A/122B/122BA**

**Applicant Name: Snyder, Betty J., Estate**

**Plan Preparer: Wright Land Surveying**

**File Number: 2009-10-008**

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

**Land Owner Name: Snyder, Betty J., Estate**

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. A Variance request has also been approved for Road Frontage.

Plan Summary: Lot Addition A is a lot addition and shall become an integral part of the property owned by the Price's. Lot addition A is not a building lot and cannot be maintained or developed as a separate individual lot. This plan proposes to create Lot 2 on 2.000 acres with an existing house, well and on-lot system. Soils testing was completed by the Township SEO to designate a replacement area if ever needed. Also, a 9.208 acre lot addition is proposed to the Randall F. & Lawanda S. Price property. This will make their property a total of 10.000 acres which will allow them to enroll in the Clean and Green tax program. Lot 1, the residual tract, of +/- 44.5 acres will remain agricultural use only. Access to both Lot 1 & 2 will be along the existing right-of-way which will be increased to 50' for these properties. No new development is proposed.

Review Comments (List from Review Committee):

Clean and Green Program - The parcels T.M. 21-9-122A and 21-9-122B are 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. (AbB, MrB) Considering septic testing has occurred on proposed Lot 2, soils information should be shown on the plan. (Mifflin County Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, Section 7.302. A10)

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

Cartway Widths - The cartway width for Snyder Estate does not meet the road provisions of the County's Subdivision Ordinance. Since the parcel has the potential for future development, road improvements should be considered prior to further development. At a minimum additional right of way should be provided by the applicant as a condition if there is future development along this road.

Deed Restrictions and Easements - Deed restrictions and easements associated with the property, if any, should be provided in accordance with Sections 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 "Component 1 Sewage Facilities Planning Module" should be submitted to the Mifflin County Planning Commission. Plan approval is contingent upon receiving an approval from DEP following the filing of this form.

Other Comments:

1. It does not appear that Lot 2 meets the road frontage requirement of the Mifflin County Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Table 1). \*A waiver was requested for this requirement on 10/22/09. The Planning Commission approved the waiver request for this requirement on 10/22/09.
2. What is the surface type of the private drive, Snyder Estate?
3. Based on County GIS records, the private drive, Snyder Estate, does not appear to touch Lot 2 or the residual lot. The plan proposes creating new 50' Rights-of-way to these two lots. However, the right of way along the remainder of the drive should be increased so variable rights-of-way do not exist. \*According to the surveyor, the entirety of Snyder Estate will be a 30' right-of-way width, and will require a waiver. Keeping the road at 30' may discourage further development and would further reinforce the need to meet private road standards and the requirements of the ordinance for both the width of the right-of-way and the cartway if further development should occur. However, it may be harder to obtain an increased right-of-way in the future if 50' is not required at this time. \*\*The Planning Commission is requiring that all of Snyder estate, as well as all proposed rights-of-way, be 50' in width.
4. This private road has the potential to serve several additional lots in the future. No further development for any owners of lot will be allowed to occur unless the private drive, Snyder Estate, is brought to private road standards and be subject to County Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance requirements. \*This plan is being submitted as a non-building plan. No development is intended.
5. A note should be placed on the plan stating: "Any future subdivision activity or development along Snyder Estate will require the entirety of Snyder Estate to be brought up to Private Road standards and meet the requirements of the Mifflin County Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance."

**Item #6 – Public Comment**

There was no public comment.

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

- Bill Gomes reported that the Hazard Mitigation Steering Committee will meet as part of the November Planning Commission meeting to begin the evaluation process for the Hazard Mitigation Plan. Phil Lucas will make a presentation at this time. Requests for information on existing projects and any new projects are being sent to the municipalities.
- Bill mentioned that a subdivision for Brown Township was brought in for signature that had not been submitted to the Planning Commission for review.

The meeting adjourned at 5:23 p.m. upon a motion by Brent Miller that was seconded by Neal Shawver.

mjs