

**MINUTES**  
**MIFFLIN COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING**  
**NOVEMBER 19, 2015**  
**MIFFLIN COUNTY COURTHOUSE, MEETING ROOM B – 3:30 P.M.**

**ATTENDANCE**

Members

Dan Dunmire  
Tyler Gum  
Dave Pennebaker  
Jim Spendiff  
Kay Semler  
Kent Spicher  
Michele Bair  
Thomas Lake

Staff

Bill Gomes, Director  
James Lettiere, CD Administrator/Assistant Director  
Chastity Fultz, Office/Grants Manager

Other

Lauren Kershner, The Sentinel  
Laura Simonetti, GIS  
Don Kiel, SEDA-COG  
Lisa Nancollas, Commissioner Elect  
Robert Postal, MCIDC  
Lucas Parkes, The EADS Group  
Chad Stafford  
Bill Sarge  
Christopher Simone

**Call to Order**

Dan Dunmire, Chair, called the meeting to order at 3:33 p.m.

**Record of Public Attendance**

Dan reminded everyone to sign the attendance sheet.

**Approval of Meeting Minutes**

It was noted that under the record of attendance for October's meeting, the name Kent Smith should have been Kent Spicher. Jim Spendiff made a motion to accept the minutes from October's meeting with the correction to Kent Spicher's name. The motion was seconded by Tyler Gum. All members voted aye.

Dan noted our guests as Laura Simonetti, Rob Postal, Lisa Nancollas and Lucas Parkes.

**SEDA-COG Natural Gas Utilization Study**

Don Kiel of SEDA-COG presented the Regional Gas Utilization Initiative Project, which focuses on Centre, Clinton and Mifflin Counties. Don presented a map showing the location of shale gas in the eastern United States. He noted that there are many unconventional wells that tap into the Marcellus shale, which go very deep, in Pennsylvania. These wells are mostly in the northern and southwestern parts of Pennsylvania. He presented the "donut hole" map which showed the low number of residential customers with access to natural gas in central Pennsylvania compared to the rest of the state. The main purpose of the project is to improve access to natural gas to residents and businesses in the three county area. The project objectives are to provide new long-term opportunities for supporting our region's economic growth and energy needs, better utilize natural gas as a source of power, and expansion of existing natural gas infrastructure.

The project initially started in Centre, Clinton and Mifflin Counties and is funded by the US Department of Economic Development Administration. A kickoff meeting was held November 17<sup>th</sup> to expand the project to the remaining eight counties in the SEDA-COG area. The project began in September 2013, although most progress occurred in 2014. They are hoping to have the project completed by December, although it won't be the end.

There was a structured process to identify targeted investment areas. A feasibility study was performed to identify where the natural gas areas are located, look at costs and levels of usage and how the gas gets delivered. The original discussion examined ten potential areas, which was reduced to three priority areas. Don reviewed the priority targeted areas, which include the Mifflin County Industrial Park, Standard Steel and the US 322/Burnham interchange and would provide new service and/or expand existing service. Further review also revealed the US 322/Milroy interchange, Pleasant Acres East and Freedom Avenue areas as other target investment areas. However, after additional review, the Milroy interchange appears to be more conducive to the virtual pipeline.

The final results also estimate potential costs of service of a virtual pipeline pad where that approach may be appropriate. The general rule is that it costs about \$1 million per mile for a new pipeline to serve a neighborhood.

They have been working with the gas companies who have been cooperative, but the gas companies do not like to share the location of gas lines. The gas companies are currently spending a lot of money replacing old pipelines. Don also noted that gas companies are regulated and cannot just expand anywhere they wish.

Don explained virtual pipelines as a potential opportunity. He said that currently some companies, such as Compass, will construct a compression station and then deliver the gas to clients by truck. They then build a smaller pad as a decompression station for industry. They do not currently build these for residential areas, but may be able to in the future.

Under Phase 1, they identified targeted areas for all three counties and how they can best be supported, including an organizational structure. SEDA-COG retained a utility law lawyer with extensive experience in utility law, electric law and natural gas law to determine the supporting legal infrastructure. It was determined that a nonprofit cooperative is the preferred approach as the next step. SEDA-COG is in the process of talking to the three counties involved in phase one to establish a nonprofit cooperative. Phase one grant funding currently is in place and should be enough to cover the establishment of the nonprofit cooperative. This does not imply that the county has to put money in at this time. There is enough funding to do the paperwork to establish the nonprofit cooperative. There are several options available in establishing and maintaining the nonprofit cooperative.

Don noted that there is not a lot of local funding for these options, but there are federal and state funds available. He also said that the larger the area and more voices involved, more funding may be available.

Don reviewed how to establish a nonprofit cooperative. He noted that the startup phase is about \$50,000, which would come from SEDA-COG and possibly some grants. The maintenance phase funding could come from grants and/or loans. He said counties could potentially contribute, but does not expect this for the majority of the funding.

A follow-up meeting will occur on December 10 in Bellefonte as Centre, Clinton and Mifflin Counties wanted more time to discuss the nonprofit cooperative internally. Invitations will be sent. If there is enough support for a nonprofit cooperative, they have passed along model language for endorsement of establishing a nonprofit cooperative. The commissioners need to vote on this. The endorsement does not imply that any funding will be contributed by the county at this point. Summary notes from the last meeting are available from the Planning Commission.

Dave Pennebaker asked if we sign on, what are we obligated to? Don responded, "Not much." This would be used to for eligibility to apply for funding and does not approve dedicating any funding. Don said that we could pull out. Dave also asked if there would be potential matching funds required. Don said there could be and could include in-kind services.

Jim Lettiere asked if this project was on parallel track with the governor's energy task force or if it was independent. Don said it is on track with the task force. There are twelve workgroups in the pipeline task force and he is on the workforce and economic development task force. A draft report is out now for public comment.

Jim Spendiff asked how additional gas lines will impact Mifflin County. Don said there would be no direct impact at this time regarding pipelines, but there may be indirect impact with new compression stations. A lot of proposed pipelines are in the eastern part of the state. He also noted that the industry is changing quickly.

Rob Postal asked if Don expects all eleven counties to decide before they can proceed to establish the cooperative and what is the date the decisions need to be made. Don noted that if they go beyond January, they may lose funding currently available from the original contract with EDA. Right now they need all three counties (Centre, Clinton and Mifflin) to proceed with the nonprofit cooperative. Bill stated that he has the draft and asked if he should forward this to the commissioner's office now. Don said he does need to do this and that there is no financial commitment at this time.

Jim Lettiere asked if the cost of \$1 million/mile includes retrofitting. Don said no. He said there may be programs available to convert existing infrastructure, such as appliances for residential customers. He also noted that in order to make a workable project, they need about 50% of residents to sign onto the program and participation will increase as the project goes along.

Lisa Nancollas noted that Don said there could potentially be greater scrutiny from the PUC and asked if would it be worse than Act 129 (legislation intended to help residents and businesses save money by reducing electric consumption). Don said no. The PUC just needs to be satisfied that the entity is a bona fide cooperative. The legal expert thinks everything is okay to be considered a cooperative and not a regulated utility. Lisa also asked with the fracking and truck traffic, how would we be affected with truck traffic? Don noted that if it is extending regular underground pipes, there would be no difference in truck traffic. With virtual pipelines, the implication of truck traffic depends on where they are delivering and that they would be proactive to meet local needs and minimize impact. Virtual pipeline locations will focus at this time on industries.

#### **Subdivision and Land Development Review Committee Report**

Nine plans were presented to the committee for review. There was one (1) plan under county ordinance (Christopher F. & Sally J. Simone, Bratton Township) and eight (8) under municipal ordinance (Boomer Ranches DS, LLC, Brown Township; LaRu Centre, LLC, Brown Township; Carol A. Baker, Granville Township; Union Township, Union Township; Benjamin Z. & Martha E. Peachey, Union Township; John F. Smoker, Union Township; Smoker Property - Belleville Storage, Union Township; and Central PA Clinic - Paul Morton, Union Township). Jim noted that the Carol A. Baker plan from Granville Township was withdrawn for this month and will be resubmitted next month. Three plans were reviewed in fuller detail.

The first plan reviewed was the Simone plan in Bratton Township, which is under the county's ordinance. Jim noted that Bill Sarge has made most of the corrections asked for in the comments. There is a waiver request being submitted due to the minimum lot size of one-half acre. Jim noted that there needs to be a reason for hardship to justify the waive request. Reasons were listed on the form submitted. There are two lots involved. One lot which would be just under the ½ acre minimum while the other would only be a ¼ of an acre. The larger lot would be a railroad observation stand and the smaller lot or residue would be a residential lot. This desire for a residential lot is why the applicant did not want to combine the residue lot as suggested by the Subdivision Review Committee. Bill Sarge noted that there is a sewer tap and existing well to the one lot, but there is no residence on the smaller lot. Jim read some of the provisions for the waiver request. Bill Gomes does not want to set a precedent on the ¼ acre lot size if the waiver is granted. It was

noted that the rental area is the front lot, which was the old post office, consisting of about ½ an acre. There are separate wells on each lot. They would like to separate the business property from the private property. Dan entertained a motion to approve the waiver request on both lots. Jim Spendiff made the motion and Tom Lake seconded the motion. All members voted aye. There were no further comments on the subdivision review and Dan entertained a motion to approve the comments on the subdivision. Kay Semler made the motion to approve the comments and Dave Pennebaker seconded the motion. All members voted aye.

The second plan reviewed was the Smoker Storage Unit plan in Union Township. Chad Stafford presented the plan and submitted updated plans. He noted that there has been a lot of development on this property over the past 20 years. Mr. Smoker was approached by the municipality, specifically the zoning officer Mr. Buchanan, and was told that he needed a land development plan submitted to document the nonconforming uses on his land and the facilities in existence today, as well as the expanded uses. The owner built two concrete pads in order to put more storage units in place. Chad noted that the existing greenhouse will be demolished and a new building will be placed here. New storage units will also be built. On the opposite side of the road, a new large barn will be built for storage and a barn and shed will be removed. A large stormwater basin is being installed. Notes 6 and 9 on the plan have been updated. Chad has generally addressed the County comments with the updated plans. Bill questioned the location of lot three. Chad noted that they missed this in the updated plans and will clarify this to match Bill Wright's plan for the subdivision portion. Bill Wright created a subdivision plan for this property and called it lot two, but Chad discussed this with Mr. Wright to change the label to lot three since there was an earlier subdivision plan from this spring creating a second lot. He noted that they are only subdividing 10 acres, but there are a total of 12 acres involved. Chad has no problems making any changes to the plans. The township has not looked at the plans, but they have no issues. Chad suggested to the township to wait for the County Planning Commission review before they act on the plan. There is no reason to rush the plans and suggested the township approve the plan in January. Chad wants to satisfy the County before the township approves this. Bill Gomes noted that any motion needs to be caveated based upon Jim Lettiere's review of Chad's recent plan revisions.

The last plan reviewed was the Central PA Clinic. Chad Stafford presented this plan as well. Chad noted that the name has not changed yet and that the property is still in John Smoker's name. He noted that this is a clinic for Amish and Mennonites and they have a similar facility in Strasburg. The clinic will research genetic testing in the Amish/Jewish/Mennonite community. They are building a clinic here because we have one of the largest Amish/Mennonite communities in Pennsylvania. Chad shared that the first level of the clinic will be for dentistry and laboratory/research work. The second level will be the clinic and the upper level will be for meeting rooms. A separate building will be developed in about five years in phase two and the bottom level of the building will be an adult daycare and the upper level will be a maternity ward. Chad said they did a stormwater provision for the entire plan, even the future parking and building. Water and sewer extensions will be placed to tie into existing fire hydrant. He also stated that he clarified the notes. Bill noted that even though phase II is noted on the plan, it will still need to be submitted once they are ready to develop the second phase. Lisa Nancollas questioned the language of clinic and hospital on the plans and who the clients would be. Chad noted that they will see everyone in the clinic. He also stated that phase two is a daycare and not a hospital. The only overnight stay will be at the maternity ward in the second phase. This is not truly a hospital. No surgeries will be performed here. The clinic will be similar to a MedExpress. Bill again noted that any motion needs to be caveated based upon Jim's review of Chad's recent plan revisions.

There was no further review of any other plans. Dan entertained a motion to approve the comments of the seven municipal plans and that the three plans involving the Smoker property would have contingent approval based upon Jim reviewing the latest plans. Jim Spendiff made this motion and Dave Pennebaker second the motion.

## **Subdivision and Land Development Municipal Reports**

### ***Bratton Township (County Ordinance)***

Name of Plan: Simone, Christopher F. & Sally J.  
File Number: 2015-11-001  
Tax Map #: 13-09-0200/0200/B  
Municipality: Bratton Township  
Applicant Name: Simone, Christopher F. & Sally J.  
Land Owner Name: Simone, Christopher F. & Sally J.  
Plan Preparer: Sarge Engineering and Surveying

#### **Plan Summary:**

The purpose of this plan is to create Lot 1, of 0.475 acres, for use as a private railroad observation park. Lot 1 is composed of part of tax parcel 13, 19-0200 and part of tax parcel 13, 19-0200B.

#### **Soils**

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

#### **Setback Lines**

The existing house is within the front yard setback and is existing non-conforming.

#### **Right-of Way Widths**

Is right-of-way information available for the Norfolk Southern Railway Line?

\*The Sarge Engineering and Surveying representative stated this information is very difficult to obtain.

Based upon the Mifflin County Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Article 4, Section 4.204 F.), the right-of-way width for Shearer Lane is substandard.

#### **Cartway Widths**

Based upon the Mifflin County Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Article 4 Section 4.204 F.), the cartway width for Shearer Lane is substandard.

#### **PennDOT HOP / Municipal Driveway Permit**

Plan Note #6 states a Highway Occupancy Permit may be required.

#### **Private Street / Shared Driveway**

Shearer Lane appears to serve several residents. All private drives that are used by more than one party shall have a shared driveway agreement in place. An agreement for the private right-of-way should be noted on the plan. The agreement should include the following: "The owners of lots \_\_\_\_, which have a common driveway, agree and understand this is a shared driveway, and as such are responsible for maintenance, care, improvements, and snow removal at their own diligence and expense. The maintenance and use of said shared driveways shall be included in the deeds as said lots are sold." (See Mifflin County Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, Section 4.205.G.4.c)

#### **Deed Restrictions and Easements**

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

#### **DEP Sewage Planning Module**

The proposed lot has access to public sewer, but if the purpose is to develop a park then plans should state Lot 1 is a non-building lot.

\* The Sarge Engineering and Surveying representative indicated Lot 1 is a non-residential lot and not a nonbuilding lot.

#### **Water Service**

No on-lot water system is proposed for Lot 1 which is okay as long as this is a non-building lot.

#### **Other Comments:**

1. The minimum lot size for single-family use serviced with only public sewer is 0.5 acres Mifflin County Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, (Article 4, Table 1). The applicant has requested a waiver from Ordinance Section 4.205 A and Table 1 to create Lot 1 and to reduce the size of T.M. Parcel 13-09-0200 to .267 acres. New Lot 1 will become .475 which is just under the .5 acre minimum where public sewer is available. The question remains if the owners have plans to make Lot 1 a buildable lot. Otherwise, the plan should list Lot 1 as a non-building lot. However, the reduction in size of T.M. Parcel 13-09-0200 does create an enhanced substandard lot with the potential to be sold as a building lot. Instead, since T.M. Parcels 13-09-0200 and 13-09-0200B are both owned by Christopher and Sally Simone, we recommend that these two lots be merged into one lot.

\*The Sarge Engineering and Surveying representative indicated the owner does not want to combine the lots

because one is commercial and the other residential. The owner's intent may be to build a residence on the residual.

2. Since the subdivision is proposing a park, is this to be dedicated to the Township for public use, or is Lot 1 solely to observe activity on the rail line by the current property owner?

\*The Sarge Engineering and Surveying representative stated this is solely a private railroad observation park.

### ***Brown Township (Municipal Ordinance)***

Name of Plan: Boomer Ranches DS, LLC

File Number: 2015-11-004

Tax Map #: 14-03-0109

Municipality: Brown Township

Applicant Name: Boomer Ranches DS, LLC - Vincent Minenini

Land Owner Name: Boomer Ranches DS, LLC - Vincent Minenini

Plan Preparer: Wright Land Surveying

#### **Plan Summary:**

This plan proposes to subdivide Lot 155 into two parcels along the common boundary wall of the duplex. This property was previously approved for such use as recorded in Map Book 22, page 204.

#### **Basic Plan Information**

One abutter does not show up on the plan for Thomas Clapper, T.M. 14-03-0410G.

#### **Subdivision Information**

Is the result of this subdivision to create two semi-detached, single-family dwelling units?

\*The Wright Surveying representative stated yes.

#### **Setback Lines**

The rear setback should be 25 feet not 30 feet.

#### **PennDOT HOP / Municipal Driveway Permit**

Was the proposed driveway location reviewed by the Township Roadmaster.

\*The Wright Surveying representative stated he was unsure and the driveways are existing.

#### **Deed Restrictions and Easements**

Note #5 mentioned covenants and deed restrictions. Copies should be provided in accordance with the Brown Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Article 7 Section 7.302 B. 7.).

#### **DEP Sewage Planning Module**

There is already water and sewer serving the property.

#### **Features**

All significant man-made features, including water and sewer lines, petroleum lines, electric poles, telephone lines, fire hydrants, dumps, railroad tracks, fence lines, historic features, culverts, etc. should be shown on the plan in accordance with the Brown Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, (Article 7 Section 7.302 A.23.).

### ***Brown Township (Municipal Ordinance)***

Name of Plan: LaRu Centre, LLC

File Number: 2015-11-006

Tax Map #: 14-03-0109A

Municipality: Brown Township

Applicant Name: LaRu Centre, LLC

Land Owner Name: LaRu Centre, LLC

Plan Preparer: Wright Land Surveying

#### **Plan Summary:**

This plan proposes to create Lot 6 for a single or two family residence to be served by public sewer and water. Lots 2 and 3 were previously approved in 2013. The residual tract, Lot 1, has an existing building with no new development proposed.

**Topographic information**

Topographical contours at vertical intervals should be displayed on the plan in accordance with the Brown Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Article 7, Section 7.202A.6. and 7.302.A.26.).

**Soils**

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

**Right-of Way Widths**

Where is the proposed driveway opening onto Kish Road? This should be identified on the plan after consultation with the Township Road Master. Based upon the Brown Township Road Ordinance (Section 41), the right-of-way width of Kish Road is substandard.

**Cartway Widths**

Based upon the Brown Township Road Ordinance (Section 41), the cartway width of Kish Road is substandard.

**PennDOT HOP / Municipal Driveway Permit**

Is there a minimum distance requirement between the locations of the driveway for the residential use and the driveway for the Mount Nittany Medical Center?

**Deed Restrictions and Easements**

Deed restrictions and easements associated with the property, if any, should be provided in accordance with the Brown Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Article 7, Section 7.202A.13. and 18.).

**DEP Sewage Planning Module**

If the project is to utilize public sewer, a DEP Component 3, or Exemption from Sewage Planning (Mailer), should be provided.

**Sewage Service**

A letter from the municipality acknowledging availability of public sewer should be submitted to the Brown Township Planning Commission.

**Water Service**

A letter from the Municipal Authority of the Borough of Lewistown acknowledging availability of public water should be submitted to the Brown Township Planning Commission.

**Features**

All significant natural features, including swales, ditches, trees, water courses, sinkholes, rock out-cropping, etc. should be shown on the plan in accordance with the Brown Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Article 7, Section 7.302A.29.).

All significant man-made features, including water and sewer lines, petroleum lines, electric poles, telephone lines, fire hydrants, dumps, railroad tracks, fence lines, historic features, culverts, etc. should be shown on the plan in accordance with the Brown Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Article 7, Section 7.302A.23.).

**Other Comments:**

The plan should make reference to the allowance of a zero lot line for duplexes in accordance with the Brown Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Article 6, Section 604.1.B).

***Union Township (Municipal Ordinance)***

Name of Plan: Union Township  
File Number: 2015-11-002  
Tax Map #: 20-14-0221B/221/222  
Municipality: Union Township  
Applicant Name: Union Township  
Land Owner Name: Union Township  
Plan Preparer: Taptich Engineering and Surveying

**Plan Summary:**

This project involves the subdivision of four (4) lots from the lands of The Township of Union. Lot #1 is intended to be a stand alone lot that is currently served with public water as well as public sewer. Lot #2 is intended to be a stand alone lot that is currently served with public water as well as public sewer. Lot #3 is intended to be a non-building lot addition to the adjacent lands of The Township of Union (20-14-0221). Lot #4 is intended to be a non-building lot addition to the adjacent lands of The Township of Union (TM 20-14-0222).

**Basic Plan Information**

The tax parcel numbers on the plan are missing the zero digit before the last three numbers. Please add these digits to the tax parcel numbers. The absence of the zeros creates inaccuracies within our plan tracking software. The County GIS and Assessment files shows tax parcel number 20,14-0221 being owned by PAK Transport LLC, while the plan shows this parcel as being a lot addition as part of lot 3. All abutters should be shown on the plan, including tax map numbers in accordance with the Union Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, (Article IV Section 403.1.d.). It appears that proposed Lot #4-5 is being added to T.M. 20-14-022A which is not shown on the plan. Abutters along the southern boundary of T.M. 20-14-0221B are not shown.

**Floodplain / Wetlands**

According to County GIS information, the property lies within the 100-year floodplain, and the flood plain should be delineated on the plan. Future development in this area should be discouraged. Note #6 on the plan states no portion of the property is in the flood plain and that does not appear to be the case.

**Topographic information**

Topographical contours at vertical intervals should be displayed on the plan in accordance with the Union Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, (Article IV Section 402.1.g.).

**Soils**

There is no soil information on the plan.

According to the County GIS files, some portion of this property appears to have prime farmland soils. According to the County GIS files, some portion of this property appears to have hydric soils (HcB and HaB). Hydric soils can indicate the presence of wetlands. The hydric soils information should be shown on the plan.

**Setback Lines**

The setback lines should be shown on the plan as prescribed in the Union Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Article IV Section 402.2.g.).

**Right-of Way Widths**

Based upon the Union Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Article V Section 501.2.), the right-of-way width for South Kishacoquillas Street is substandard.

**PennDOT HOP / Municipal Driveway Permit**

If a new driveway is proposed, a driveway permit is required and a copy should be provided to the Union Township Planning Commission.

**Deed Restrictions and Easements**

Deed restrictions and easements associated with the property, if any, should be provided in accordance with (Article IV Section 402.2.b.) of the Union Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance.

**Sewage Service**

Public water and sewer lines should be shown on the plan in accordance with the Union Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Article IV. Section 402. 1.d.).

**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." This would be particularly helpful to see how lots 4 and 3 are connected to adjoining properties.

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 parent and recipient lots will still meet the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance requirements. Property boundary information should be shown for the entire property. Currently, no boundary information is provided for T.M. 20-14-0221 and 20-14-0222A. If survey data is not available, this information could be supplied via the deed description and could be shown on an inset map in accordance with the Union Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Article IV Section 402.1.a.).

**Features**

All significant man-made features, including water and sewer lines, petroleum lines, electric poles, telephone lines, fire hydrants, dumps, railroad tracks, fence lines, historic features, culverts, etc. should be shown on the plan in accordance with the Union Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, (Article IV Section 402.1.d.).

**Zoning**

Zoning information is incorrect which also affects the setbacks listed under Note #5. The correct zoning information for the parcels are Industrial, Village, Residential Suburban and they should be on the plan.



**Other Comments:**

1. Does the Township have plans to sell Lots 1 and 3?

***Union Township (Municipal Ordinance)***

Name of Plan: Peachey, Benjamin Z. & Martha E.  
File Number: 2015-11-005  
Tax Map #: 20-07-0119A  
Municipality: Union Township  
Applicant Name: Peachey, Benjamin Z. & Martha E.  
Land Owner Name: Peachey, Benjamin Z. & Martha E.  
Plan Preparer: Wright Land Surveying

**Plan Summary:**

This plan proposes to change the use of Lot A to include a second single-family residence to be served by onlot sewage disposal and private well.

**Basic Plan Information**

The tax parcel numbers on the plan are missing the zero digit before the last three numbers. Please add these digits to the tax parcel numbers. The absence of the zeros creates inaccuracies within our plan tracking software. The missing zeros are for the Smoker property and the abutters.

**Floodplain / Wetlands**

Little Kish Creek is not identified on the plan and should be in accordance with the Union Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Article IV Section 402.1.e.).

**Soils**

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

**Setback Lines**

The existing house is in the rear yard setback and is existing non-conforming.

**Right-of Way Widths**

Based upon the Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Article IV Section 402.2.a.), the right-of-way width for BM Drive should be shown on the plan.

Based upon the Union Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Article V section 501.2.), the right-of-way width for Front Mountain Road is substandard.

**Cartway Widths**

The cartway width for BM Drive should be shown on the plan in accordance with Union Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, (Article IV, Section 402.2.a.).

Based upon the Union Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Article V Section 501.2.), the cartway width for Front Mountain Road is substandard.

**Private Street / Shared Driveway**

BM Drive appears to be a 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."

\*The Wright Surveying representative indicated BM drive will not be shared but will be all under the same ownership.

**Deed Restrictions and Easements**

Deed restrictions and easements associated with the property, if any, should be provided in accordance with (Article IV Section 402.2.b.) of the Union 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 Union Township Planning Commission.

**Sewage Service**

Will there be a shared on-lot sewer service for both houses? If so, is there a shared easement or agreement in place?

\*The Wright Surveying representative stated both homes will share the on-lot sewer service, and no agreement will be in place since it will be under the same ownership.

**Water Service**

A well is shown for the existing house. Will this also serve the proposed house and if so will there be an easement or agreement for shared use?

\*The Wright Surveying representative stated both homes will share the well, and no agreement will be in place since it will be under the same ownership.

**Other Comments:**

1. Will BM Drive also provide an access to the proposed clinic?

\*The Wright Surveying representative indicated no.

***Union Township (Municipal Ordinance)***

Name of Plan: Smoker, John F.

File Number: 2015-11-007

Tax Map #: 20-07-0119

Municipality: Union Township

Applicant Name: Smoker, John F.

Land Owner Name: Smoker, John F.

Plan Preparer: Wright Land Surveying

**Plan Summary:**

This plan proposes to create Lot 2 with the existing buildings as shown. No new development is being proposed as part of this subdivision. A land development plan is being submitted separately and must be approved before any new construction takes place. The residual tract, Lot 1, has three existing residences with no new development proposed.

**Basic Plan Information**

A North arrow should be on the plan in accordance with the Union Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, (Article IV Section 402. 2.I.).

**Subdivision Information**

Property boundary information should be shown for the entire property, including the residual property (Lot 1). If survey data is not available, this information could be supplied via the deed description and could be shown on an inset map in accordance with the Union Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Article IV Section 402.2.g.).

\*The PennTerra representative indicated he will coordinate with the Wright Surveying representative to change Lot number 2 to Lot number 3 so as to avoid confusion with Lot 2 as recorded for the Central Pa Clinic.

**Soils**

According to the County GIS files, some portion of this property appears to have prime farmland soils. According to the County GIS files, some portion of this property appears to have hydric soils. Hydric soils can indicate the presence of wetlands. The hydric soils information should be shown on the plan in accordance with the Union Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Article IV Section 400. 4.).

**Setback Lines**

The property is zoned Industrial and in accordance with the Union Township Zoning Ordinance (Article XI Section 1101.2.A.) the setbacks listed on note 3. are incorrect.

In accordance with the Union Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, (Article III Section 307. Special Yard Regulations, 4.), buffer yard provisions apply since the subject parcel abuts a Residential Suburban District.

**Right-of Way Widths**

Based upon the Union Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, the right-of-way widths for Kishacoquillas Street and front Mountain Road should be shown on the plan in accordance with the Union Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Article IV Section 402.2.a). Both Kishacoquillas Street and Front Mountain Road should be properly identified on the plan and not just on the inset map.

**Cartway Widths**

The cartway widths for Kishacoquillas Street and Front Mountain Road should be shown on the plan in accordance with the Union Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, (Article IV Section 402.2.a).

**Deed Restrictions and Easements**

Deed restrictions and easements associated with the property, if any, should be provided in accordance with the

Union Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Article IV Section 402.2.b.) .

**DEP Sewage Planning Module**

A copy of the DEP "Request for Planning Waiver and Non-Building Declaration" form needs to be provided.

**Sewage Service**

Are the existing structures served by septic or public sewer? The locations of the sewer service should be noted on the plan including Lot 1 in accordance with the Union Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Section 402.1.d.).

**Water Service**

The water supply location for lots 1 and 2 should be noted on the plan as prescribed in the Union Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Article IV, Section 402.1.d.). 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. The surveyor will note both are off site and make reference to easement/right-of-way agreements on record.

**Features**

All significant natural features, including swales, ditches, trees, water courses, sinkholes, rock out-cropping, etc. should be shown on the plan, in accordance with the Union Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, (Article IV Section 402.)

All significant man-made features, including water and sewer lines, petroleum lines, electric poles, telephone lines, fire hydrants, dumps, railroad tracks, fence lines, historic features, culverts, etc. should be shown on the plan, in accordance with the Union Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, (Article IV Section 402.1.d.)

**Other Comments:**

1. What exactly is the proposed 20' easement for north of the mobile home?

\*The Wright Surveying representative said it is a private access easement.

2. Since this subdivision is related to two separate land development plans, what is the basis to file a separate subdivision plan rather than combining it with the land development plans?

\*The Penn Terra representative indicated he did not want to take away work that was previously completed by Wright Surveying.

3. The plan shows a sewer easement. Does it serve lots 1 and 2?

***Union Township (Municipal Ordinance)***

Name of Plan: Smoker Property - Belleville Storage

File Number: 2015-11-008

Tax Map #: 20-07-0119

Municipality: Union Township

Applicant Name: Smoker Property - Belleville Storage

Land Owner Name: Smoker Property - Belleville Storage

Plan Preparer: PennTerra Engineering, Inc.

**Plan Summary:**

The Smoker Land Development Project is developed to document the many existing uses and buildings on the property. There exists ten (10) existing or proposed storage buildings, one (1) agricultural produce sales building, and five (5) residential homes on 12.33 acres of land subdivided by the William Wright subdivision plan dated October 28, 2015. The combined total square footage of all the buildings on the site after build out will be 77,726 square feet. A detailed breakdown for each building's size is contained in the development building summary on sheet 3 of 12 of the subject land development plans. All existing facilities are currently serviced by on-lot water and sanitary sewage-as applicable and natural gas and electric services (overhead) existing. Final utility arrangements will need to be undertaken for servicing (specifically) electric service to the four new storage buildings.

**Administrative**

An appropriate amount of plans should be submitted for review. The Mifflin County Planning Commission requests at least three (3) plans be submitted for review. Only two sets were submitted.

\*The Penn Terra Engineering representative indicated he provided a third plan on November 12, 2015.

The project narrative partially states that the development land is Lot 2 as identified on the concurrently submitted and under review plan of subdivision prepared by William Wright. This subdivision was submitted separately not concurrently with this land development plan. On sheet 3 of 12 under B. a. it states the Development Area is

\*\*\*acres. Please clarify.

### **Subdivision Information**

In regards to sheet 2, since this land development is coming from lot 1 is this a new lot and lot dimension information should be available for lot 1. The plans are calling this lot 2 and land for the clinic is also listed as Lot

2. This is confusing since the clinic property was subdivided earlier in the year. In regards to sheet 3, Lot 3 should be labeled on the Smoker plan and on the residual where the three homes are located should be created as a separate lot. This should also be changed on the subdivision plan for the same property.

\*\*The November 19, 2015 revised plans indicate the change of the lot numbering on Sheet 3 of 12 on the tract map, however, as of December 14, 2015 the County did not receive a revised subdivision plan showing the same change in lot numbering.

### **Floodplain / Wetlands**

Sheet 3 of 12 Development Project Note 7 states "Floodplain Note: The property...effective August 16, 2006". Please clarify or amend this note.

\*The Penn Terra Engineering representative acknowledged this and indicated the revised plans will reflect the correct language.

### **Soils**

According to the County GIS files, some portion of this property appears to have hydric soils. Hydric soils can indicate the presence of wetlands. The hydric soils information should be shown on the plan. According to the County GIS files, some portion of this property appears to have prime farmland soils. (HcB and HaB)

### **Setback Lines**

On sheet 3 of 12 Zoning Regulations, it states from residential district line - 25 feet (not applicable for this development property). This site abuts the residential suburban and residential agriculture districts. In accordance with the Union Township Zoning Ordinance (Article III, Section 307.4A), a twenty (20) foot buffer yard is required in an industrial district where it abuts a residential district.

\*The Penn Terra Engineering representative stated this will be discussed with the Township Zoning Officer. He also added that he wasn't sure if this applies considering the location of the development lands to the zoned differently lands. They are depicting a 15' buffer yard along the stream.

\*\*As of December 14, 2015 the County has not received clarification regarding the setbacks and the November 19, 2015 revised plans do not show a twenty (20) foot setback.

### **Right-of Way Widths**

Based upon the Union Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, the right-of-way width of Kishacoquillas Street is substandard (Article V, Section 501.2).

### **Cartway Widths**

Based upon the Union Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, the cartway width of Kishacoquillas Street is substandard (Article V, Section 501.2).

### **PennDOT HOP / Municipal Driveway Permit**

A municipal driveway permit for any new access from Kishacoquillas Street is required, and a copy should be provided to the Union Township Planning Commission.

\*The Penn Terra representative indicated no new access is planned they all exist.

### **Private Street / 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."

\*The Penn Terra Engineering representative indicated that if the Township Zoning Officer requires this it will be added to the plan.

### **Deed Restrictions and Easements**

Deed restrictions and easements associated with the property, if any, should be provided in accordance with the Union Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance. (Article IV, Sections 402.1.b and 402.2.b)

\*The Penn Terra representative indicated none that they are aware of.

### **DEP Sewage Planning Module**

If the project is to utilize public sewer, a DEP Component 3, or Exemption from Sewage Planning (Mailer), should be provided.

\*The Penn Terra representative indicated no public sewer is planned.

### **Sewage Service**

A letter from the Union Township Municipal Authority acknowledging availability of public sewer should be submitted to the Union Township Planning Commission.

### **Water Service**

The water supply location should be noted on the plan as prescribed in the Union Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Article IV, Section 403.2.c). 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. The surveyor will note both are off site and make reference to easement/right-of-way agreements on record.

\*The Penn Terra representative indicated he will coordinate with Bill Wright for proof of location of water wells/private services.

### **Features**

There is an outside wood furnace in front of the two existing greenhouses to be demolished. This should be depicted on the existing conditions sheet 2 of 12 in accordance with the, Union Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Article IV, Section 402.e).

\*The Penn Terra representative stated he will depict this on the revised plans.

\*\*The November 19, 2015 revised plans do not depict the existence of the wood furnace on sheet 2 of 12 named existing conditions plan.

### **Land Development**

What are the AM and PM peak hour generation trips for this project and has a traffic analysis been completed to take into account the cumulative traffic impact this project will have with the development of the medical clinic?

\*The Penn Terra representative indicated that he will provide a letter regarding the potential traffic from the existing buildings.

\*\*The Penn Terra representative provided a traffic impact analysis letter dated November 16, 2015.

The applicant should consult the local Fire Marshall to see if new fire hydrants will be required and included with the plan submission.

\*The Penn Terra representative stated there is no public water at the site; so there is no possible way to add a hydrant unless specific pumps and water source was guaranteed to be available.

### **E & S / Stormwater**

The stormwater plan should be reviewed by the Union Township Engineer.

\*The Penn Terra representative indicated he will coordinate with Mr. Taptich next week regarding his review.

If this project involves greater than (one) 1 acre of earth disturbance, an NPDES permit will be required. The applicant should contact the Mifflin County Conservation District.

\*The Penn Terra representative indicated this will be submitted next week to the Mifflin County Planning Commission along with the E and S plans.

\*\*The County received an Erosion and Sedimentation control plan dated November 2, 2015. It's not clear if the NPDES permit has been submitted to the Mifflin County Conservation District.

### **Other Comments:**

1. Has the Township Zoning Officer determined which structures are existing non-conforming uses and if the proposed development uses are consistent with the Industrial Zoning District?

\*The Penn Terra representative stated not yet.

2. Is there a landscaping plan proposed? If so, it should be depicted on the plan. Sheet 3 of 20, Note 10 refers to all required landscaping shall be permanently maintained by the landowner.

\*The Penn Terra representative indicated they will remove the word "required".

\*\* The November 19, 2015 revised plans contains the words "required landscaping" under general notes 10. On sheet 3 of 12.

3. Has there been any outreach to the residents of Belleville to discuss this and the Belleville Storage Land Development plan?

\*The Penn Terra representative indicated not to his knowledge.

4. Did the Township Engineer review the project and if so, are there or will there be a written response by the Engineer to the Developer?

### ***Union Township (Municipal Ordinance)***

Name of Plan: Central PA Clinic - Paul Morton

File Number: 2015-11-009

Tax Map #: 20-07-0119 Lot 2

Municipality: Union Township

Applicant Name: Central PA Clinic - Paul Morton

Land Owner Name: Smoker, John F.

Plan Preparer: PennTerra Engineering, Inc.

**Plan Summary:**

This project proposes the construction of a new Medical Clinic (Hospital) with parking, access drives and storm water management. The project is called the Central Pennsylvania Clinic. This will be a medical home for special children and adults. The first phase design and development is currently detailed and a Master Plan for build-out with the addition of a birthing center and adult medical day care are ultimately intended. The development is on Lot 2 as identified on the plan of subdivision of John F. Smoker and Naomi K. Smoker, prepared by William Wright (the Smoker Subdivision), as recorded in instrument number 2015-2680. Lot 2 is a six acre tract of land that is currently/recently used for agricultural purposes. Utility services will include the extension of a private sanitary sewage force main system from the project site, across South Kishacoquillas Street across other properties of John Smoker to a gravity sanitary collection system. This gravity system will be dedicated to the Union Township Municipal Authority (UTMA). A water main will be extended to an existing end-main run of the Municipal Authority of the Borough of Lewistown (MABL). Electric is along both municipal roadways and extended for service for the project. Heat and cooling for the building will likely be achieved by a geothermal well field system. Access for the project shall be from both T-468 South Kishacoquillas Street and T-437 Front Mountain Road, with building access for specific patient needs at either level. Horse drawn buggy sheds/barns will be built with the development to meet the needs of the users of the facility.

**Soils**

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

According to the County GIS files, some portion of this property appears to have hydric soils. Hydric soils can indicate the presence of wetlands. The hydric soils information should be shown on the plan. (Pe and Ma)

\*The Penn Terra representative stated there are not wetlands.

**Right-of Way Widths**

Based upon the Union Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Article V, Section 501.2), the right-of-way widths of Kishacoquillas Street and Front Mountain Road are substandard.

**Cartway Widths**

Based upon the Union Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Article V Section 501.2.) , the cartway widths of Kishacoquillas Street and Front Mountain Road are substandard.

**PennDOT HOP / Municipal Driveway Permit**

A municipal driveway permit will be required for access to South Kishacoquillas Street and Front Mountain Road, and a copy should be provided to the Union Township Planning Commission.

\*The Penn Terra representative stated this will be submitted after the plans are reviewed by the Township Planning Commission.

**Deed Restrictions and Easements**

Deed restrictions and easements associated with the property, if any, should be provided in accordance with the Union Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Article IV, Section 402.2.b).

\*The Penn Terra representative said none are known.

**DEP Sewage Planning Module**

If the project is to utilize public sewer, a DEP Component 3, or Exemption from Sewage Planning (Mailer), should be provided.

\*The Penn Terra representative indicated sewage planning has to process with the UTMA. A will serve letter will be provided upon receipt to County Planning, the Township and DEP (as applicable).

\*\*As of December 14, 2015 the County did not receive a copy of the will serve letter.

**Sewage Service**

A letter from the UTMA acknowledging availability of public sewer should be submitted to the Union Township Planning Commission.

**Water Service**

A letter from the Municipal Authority of the Borough of Lewistown (MABL) acknowledging availability of public water should be submitted to the Union Township Planning Commission.

\*The Penn Terra representative indicated he met with MABL and their engineer on November 11, 2015 to finalize water and next week will update water routing and request the will serve letter as well as make the official Service Extension Application.

\*\*As of December 14, 2015 the County did not receive a copy of the will serve letter.

**Land Development**

The applicant should consult the local Fire Marshall to see if new fire hydrants will be required and included with the plan submission.

\*The Penn Terra representative indicated this will occur after the Architect has designed the fire suppression system in the building in greater detail.

## **E & S / Stormwater**

The stormwater plan should be reviewed by the Union Township Engineer.

\*The Penn Terra representative indicated it was submitted but there has not been any detailed discussion with Mr. Taptich. Penn Terra will reach out to him next week.

If this project involves greater than one (1) acre of earth disturbance, an NPDES permit will be required. The applicant should contact the Mifflin County Conservation District.

\*The Penn Terra representative said an NPDES permit application will be submitted to the Mifflin County Conservation District next week after they finalize the water re-routing plan/details.

If earth disturbance involves between 5,000 square feet and one (1) acre, an erosion and sedimentation plan will be required.

\*\*The County received an erosion and sedimentation control plan dated November 2, 2015.

## **Other**

1. What are the AM and PM peak generation trips associated with this project and has a traffic analysis been completed to take into account the Belleville Storage Land Development as a cumulative traffic impact to surrounding development? Has the Township Engineer reviewed the traffic letter from Penn Terra Engineering?

\*The Penn Terra representative said no these are two separate projects. They will need to discuss with Union Township if the Smoker Development requires any type of Traffic Impact Analysis.

\*\*The County received a traffic impact analysis letter dated August 5, 2015.

2. Will this project adversely impact BM Drive located directly east of this project?

\*The Penn Terra representative does not believe it will and traffic for the development will be minimal.

3. Is there a landscaping plan proposed? If so, it should be depicted on the plan. Sheet 3 of 20, Note 10 refers to all required landscaping shall be permanently maintained by the landowner.

\*The Penn Terra representative said a separate landscaping plan will be produced but has not been created yet.

A copy will be provided to the County once developed.

\*\*As of December 14, 2015 the County did not receive a copy of the landscape plan.

4. What type, size and material will the sign(s) be constructed of? The signs should comply with the Union Township Zoning Ordinance (Article IV).

\*The Penn Terra representative indicated they were not certain yet and likely just a wood sign (to be developed by the Architect/Owner) will comply with Union Township Zoning Ordinances.

5. Is there a minimum distance from the center line of Kishacoquillas Street to the center line of the driveway opening on Front Mountain Road? If so, does this distance meet those provisions?

\*The Penn Terra representative indicated the distance is 150 feet and they need to review this with the Township Zoning Officer.

6. Will any buffering and/or screening be part of this project, particularly along the eastern and southern property lines so as to screen the use from residential homes?

\*\*As of December 14, 2015 the County did not receive a copy of the landscape plan.

\*The Penn Terra representative said any/all screening will be identified on the Landscaping Plan (to be developed/created).

7. Has there been any outreach to the residents of Belleville to discuss this and the Belleville Storage Land Development projects?

\*The Penn Terra representative said the community is aware of this project.

8. Will there be any provisions to dispose of horse waste at the horse and buggy buildings for sanitary purposes?

\*The Penn Terra representative will need to ask the Developer.

9. Did the Township Engineer review the project and if so, are there, or will there be a written response by the Engineer to the Developer?

\*The Penn Terra representative indicated not yet it was submitted but there has not been any detailed discussion with Mr. Taptich. They will reach out to him next week.

10. What is the anticipated time schedule for the development of Phase I and the Master Plan?

\*The Penn Terra representative indicated Phase I begins construction in the Spring of 2016; occupied by the Fall of 2016. The birthing center and adult day care likely in the following five years.

11. General Note 8 on sheet 3 of 20 refers to potential sink holes and procedural steps that will be followed in the event sinkholes or other unsuitable subsurface conditions are encountered during construction. Has there been any environmental review/assessment of the site for its suitability for this project at this time?

\*The Penn Terra representative said this is a "cookie cutter" note that Penn Terra always provides and CMT Laboratories will evaluate all subsurface conditions with/through the Architect. No concerns exist.

12. It is not clear where onsite, if any, the fire hydrants will be located. Please indicate which sheet number(s) they are depicted on.

\*The Penn Terra representative said the re-routed water extension will show one new off-site and one new onsite fire hydrant.

#### SHEET 3

1. Lot 2 referred to under 1C, but also in Smoker plan.

\*The Penn Terra representative said that is correct.

2. Note 2C says hospital allowed by right in an industrial zone. Has Union Township confirmed this?

\*The Penn Terra representative stated yes The Township Zoning Officer and he have agreed to this verbally.

3. Note 2D mentions building area under phase 1 as 6,565 square feet. If this is the size of the building, it should be displayed on the plan.

\*The Penn Terra representative said final building areas will be confirmed by the Architect and then Penn Terra will provide building area's on the plans.

\*\*Although note 2.d. on sheet 3 of 20 notes the square footage for phase I and the master plan building area, it is not displayed on the plan.

#### SHEET 4

1. Driveway width should be clearly marked.

\*The Penn Terra representative indicated to refer to Sheet 5, layout, radius' and site distance information identified.

2. Horse buggy stalls should be labeled as they are on Sheet 3.

3. Proposed Phase 2 is mentioned and the plan should clearly state a land development plan will be required for it so as not to assume the proposed phase is being approved. Also, it appears that some of the parking is showing up for Phase 2 on this plan.

\*The Penn Terra representative said a note will be added.

\*\*The November 19, 2015 revised plans plan sheet 3 of 20 the record plan does not contain this language.

4. Is the entrance at the covered walkway?

\*The Penn Terra representative said yes.

5. Is there is a driveway drop off area? If so, it should be noted on this plan. Currently drop off is only depicted on sheets.

\*The Penn Terra representative indicated a note will be added.

\*\*The November 19, 2015 revised plans do not show the drop off area on sheet 3 of 20 the record plan.

6. Is there information on sidewalk widths?

\*The Penn Terra representative indicated a note will be added.

\*\*The November 19, 2015 revised plans does not show the width of the sidewalks on sheet 3 of 20 the record plan.

7. Will there be a separate area for medical waste?

\*The Penn Terra representative said none shown, Penn Terra will find out how this is handled; likely a procedure/standard that medical facilities use will be an internal operations/process.

8. Has the stormwater management plan been completed in accordance with the Kish Stormwater Management Ordinance?

\*The Penn Terra representative said yes.

#### **Public Comment**

Lucas Parkes shared that his office has scheduled a holiday open house on December 18<sup>th</sup> from 11 a.m. – 6 p.m. Everyone is welcome to attend.

#### **Other Business or Comments**

Bill Gomes congratulated Kay Semler and Michele Bair on being appointed to serve another term.

The Housing Summit was held on October 29<sup>th</sup> with about 40 people in attendance. Kay Semler was the sole Planning Commission representative in attendance. Kay felt it was a very interesting meeting. She explained that the purpose of the meeting was to affirm the Planning Commission priority for a housing study that is consistent with the comprehensive plan. However, the meeting took a different direction than what we thought. Bill received a preliminary report on the summit from Gannett Fleming this afternoon and will share it after reviewing it. He asked for Kay's input as well.



Bill noted that a handout was given to the committee members that shows what other counties are doing with subdivisions as well as some best practices.

A letter was shared with the Commission regarding a proposed Hackenberry Project. Bill received a call a month ago regarding a proposed poultry barn in Wayne Township questioning what they needed to do in order to proceed. The township office called today to see where things were at, but the Planning and Development office has not received anything and Dan's office has not seen anything either.

Next year's Planning Commission calendar was handed out for review. The only correction was to change the Annual Dinner to April 7<sup>th</sup>.

Dan asked Lucas what the status was on the completeness review of the small permit for the boat launch. Bill said that Dain said it is under review and we should be receiving a letter of completeness soon.

The next meeting will be held December 17<sup>th</sup> at 3:30 p.m.

**Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 5:22 p.m. upon a motion by Tyler Gum.