

MINUTES
MIFFLIN COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING
THURSDAY, DECEMBER 18, 2014
MIFFLIN COUNTY COURTHOUSE, MEETING ROOM B – 3:30 P.M.

ATTENDANCE

Members

Michelle Bair
Dan Dunmire
Tyler Gum
Dave Pennebaker
Kay Semler
Neal Shawver
Jim Spendiff
Kent Spicher

Staff

Bill Gomes, Director
Jim Lettiere, CD Administrator / Assistant Director
Nicole Singer, Grant / Office Manager

Others

Lucas Parkes

Call to Order

Dan Dunmire, Chair, called the meeting to order at 3:32.

Record of Public Attendance

Dan reminded everyone to sign the attendance sheet.

Approval of Meeting Minutes

Jim Spendiff made a motion to accept the minutes from November's meeting. The motion was seconded by Kay Semler. All members voted aye.

Subdivision and Land Development Review Committee Report

Jim Lettiere stated the Subdivision and Land Development Review Committee reviewed five (5) applications on December 11, 2014. Four of the applications were under Municipal Ordinance and one was under County Ordinance. Municipal ordinance included Jonathan D. Hostetler (*Armagh Township*), Blossom Hill Revised Plan, John E. Short Jr, and Pamela F. and Scott Wagner (*Derry Township*). The county ordinance was Harry W and Edna Oberholtzer (*Bratton Township*). Jim reviewed two plans with the Planning Commission.

The first plan that was reviewed was the Blossom Hill Revised Plan in Derry Township. This project was designed and approved several years ago (2006) under the Township's Planned Residential Development (PRD) Ordinance with a Master Plan and Pre-Final Plan for the entire property which entailed approximately 148 acres. Over the years, there have been plan amendments to change the types of dwelling units, generally to reduce the number of originally approved townhouses and duplex units to single family homes in response to market demands. Based upon the modest historical housing demand, DGB (owners of Blossom Hill) is proposing to scale back the overall project to include 99 dwelling units on approximately 40 acres of the overall property and the remaining undeveloped land to be sold to an adjoining land owner for agricultural use. Additionally, a plan for a community center was designed for lot 1. However, according to the developer, based on input from residents, a community center is no longer desired and lot 1 is contemplated to be Open Space with potential park amenities provided per guidance from the residents.

There were an extensive number of comments for this plan. The main concerns are the plan refers to a demolition which needs to be clearer, setbacks being met due to the zoning of some of the lots being part of the Health Care Zoning District, right-of-way widths being consistent with the PRD, and have right-of-ways been dedicated and accepted by the township. Furthermore, the plan appears to meet the general provisions of a major change to the existing Master plan, but a public hearing is still required in the PRD ordinance before a change can occur. However, there still is a question if this is still a PRD or now a conventional subdivision? The township engineer was also contacted and is okay with a waiver request for the radius of the cul-de-sac.

Bill gave the Planning Commission some additional information as he was in attendance at the Derry Township Planning meeting. Discussion was held among members of the Mifflin County Planning

Commission. Jim Spendiff asked if the Health Zoning District would allow for animals since Mr. Glick (adjoining farmer) would like to purchase the additional land for farming. Dan commented if there is an issue Mr. Glick would need to get a variance or change in zoning from the Health Zone. He questioned why there was going to be a public hearing, which is part of the PRD requirements. Neal brought up a concern about are the residents of Blossom Hill still getting what they were promised when they purchased and built as part of the PDR and he was concerned about Lot 25 and the sight visibility at the intersection with Green Avenue.

There was no further discussion of the plan.

The second plan discussed was the one under the County Ordinance in Bratton Township for Harry and Edna Orberholtzer. This plan is to create Lot 2 of 34.346 acres for agricultural use, from the land Tax Parcel 13-04-0140. Lot 1, the +/- 55 acre remainder, is in agricultural / residential use. The main concern with this plan is property boundary information should be shown for the entire property, including the residual property of Lot1. If survey data is not available, this information could be provided via the deed description and could be shown on an insert map. The surveyor indicated his client did not wish to have the entire property surveyed. Additionally, he indicated he will not provide any acreage figure that is from a non-surveyed source, due to the likelihood of other parties using this information as a legal description. At the December 11, 2014, Subdivision and Land Development Review Committee meeting, it was agreed that a waiver request to this provision should be submitted to the County for consideration, or a disclaimer statement be added to the plan.

A revised plan was submitted with a disclaimer statement. Bill, however, stated that past practice is that a waiver had to be submitted. He asked also if there should be some research done on what the deed information provides since the surveyor states there is no metes and bounds information.

There was discussion held by the members of the Planning Commission that asked if Jim Lettiere would be able to research the deed and that a waiver should be submitted along with the disclaimer statement. Neal Shawver made a motion to table this plan until further information is obtained. A second to the motion was made by Tyler Gum. Dan called for a vote. The vote passed with all members voting aye.

Dan asked for a motion to accept the review comments for four plans under municipal ordinance with two additional comments added to the Blossom Hill Revised Plan. A motion was made by Jim Spendiff and seconded by Kent Spicher. All members voted aye and motion passed.

Subdivision and Land Development Municipal Reports

Armagh Township

Name of Plan: Hostetler, Jonathan D.

File Number: 2014-12-002

Tax Map #: 12-05-0107A

Municipality: Armagh Township (Municipal Ordinance)

Applicant Name: Hostetler, Jonathan D.

Land Owner Name: Hostetler, Jonathan D.

Plan Preparer: Wright Land Surveying

Plan Summary:

This plan proposes to change the use of the Hostetler property to include single family residence served by on-lot sewage disposal and a private well.

Administrative

The tax parcel number on the application is the adjoining property to the north not the subject property. The County's GIS files lists the property owned by Douglas and Carolyn Parson as tax parcel number 12,05- 0107C, not 12,05-1107A.

Clean & Green / Agriculture

As noted in Note 4, 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

Suitability considerations should be made for this plan. It appears, according to County GIS information, that there are steep slopes (grades over 15%) on the southern most sections of the site and development in these areas should be discouraged.

Soils

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

Right-of Way Widths

Based upon the Armagh Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, the right-of-way width of Salem Road is substandard (Table 1).

Cartway Widths

Based upon the Armagh Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, the cartway width of Salem Road is substandard (Table 1).

Private Street / Shared Driveway

What are the right-of-way and cartway widths of the existing driveway? Armagh Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance Article 6 Section 6.202.a. 11.)

*At the December 11, 2014 Subdivision and Land Development Review Committee meeting the Surveyor stated he will add this information to the plan.

Deed Restrictions and Easements

Deed restrictions and easements associated with the property, if any, should be provided in accordance with the Armagh Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Article 6. Section 6.202.a. 18.).

*At the December 11, 2014 Subdivision and Land Development Review Committee meeting the Surveyor stated there are none.

DEP Sewage Planning Module

A copy of the DEP Component 1 Sewage Facilities Planning Module should be submitted to the Armagh Township Supervisors.

Features

All significant natural features, including swales, ditches, trees, water courses, sinkholes, rock out-cropping, etc. should be shown on the plan. Armagh Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, (Article 6 Section 6.202 a.9. and 10.)

Other Comments:

1. What will the remaining undeveloped property be used for?
2. Are there plans for further subdivision and consideration of the expanded use of the private driveway?

*At the December 11, 2014 Subdivision and Land Development Review Committee meeting the Surveyor stated Mr. Hostetler purchased the property through a public sale, without having a percolation test done. The intent is to construct the home and keep the orchid.

Bratton Township

Name of Plan: Oberholtzer, Harry W. & Edna H.

File Number: 2014-12-005

Tax Map #: 13-04-0140

Municipality: Bratton Township (County Ordinance)

Applicant Name: Oberholtzer, Harry W. & Edna H.

Land Owner Name: Oberholtzer, Harry W. & Edna H.

Plan Preparer: Sarge Engineering and Surveying

Plan Summary:

The purpose of this plan is to create Lot 2, of 34.346 acres for agricultural use, from the land of Harry W. and Edna H. Oberholtzer, Tax Parcel 13-04-0140. Lot 1, the +/- 55 acre remainder, is in agricultural/residential use.

Action Taken:

The Planning Commission unanimously voted to table the application until a date certain of January 22, 2015 and is requiring a waiver request to the Mifflin County Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Article 7 Sections 7.302.A.5, and A.).

Additionally the Planning Commission requested that the deed be researched by staff of the Planning and Development Department to ascertain there are no metes and bounds description of the property. There were concerns regarding only having the disclaimer on the plan regarding the acreage for the residual tract.

Review Comments (List from Review Committee):

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. Mifflin County Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, (Article 7 Sections 7.302.A.5, A.7 and A.9).

*The Surveyor indicated his client did not wish to have the entire property surveyed. Additionally he indicated he will not provide any acreage figure that is from a non-surveyed source, due to the likelihood of other parties using this information as a legal description. At the December 11, 2014 Subdivision and Land Development Review Committee meeting, it was agreed that a waiver request to this provision should be submitted to the County for consideration, or a disclaimer statement be added to the plan.

Clean & Green / Agriculture

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.

*The Surveyor provided revised plans on 12/10/2014 that includes a note about clean and green.

Floodplain / Wetlands

The plan notes that a portion of the residual tract is in the floodplain. Is it possible for this to be shown on the inset plan?

*The Surveyor provided revised plans on 12/10/2014 that includes a notation of the areas that are in in the floodplain.

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.

* At the December 11, 2014 Subdivision and Land Development Review Committee meeting it was agreed that these statements should be added to the plan.

Right-of Way Widths

The right-of-way and cart-way widths for Short Road should be shown on the plan Mifflin County Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Article 7, Section 7.202 A.11.).

*The Surveyor provided revised plans on 12/10/2014 that includes the right-of-way and cart-way widths. The right-of-way widths of Carlisle Gap Road and Red Shale Lane do not meet the road provisions of the Mifflin County Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Article 4 Section 4.204.F.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

Based upon the Mifflin County Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, the cartway width Carlisle Gap Road is substandard (Article 4 Section 4.204 F). Carlisle Gap Road only has a 16 foot cartway, which is difficult for two-way traffic. Are there plans for future development?

*The Surveyor provided revised plans on 12/10/2014 that includes a notation that Carlisle Gap Road has a 18 foot cart-way width.

PennDOT HOP / Municipal Driveway Permit

Note #6 on the plan should be updated as follows: 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.

*The Surveyor provided revised plans on 12/10/2014 that includes this language.

Deed Restrictions and Easements

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

DEP Sewage Planning Module

A copy of the DEP "Request for Planning Waiver and Non-Building Declaration" form has been provided.

Signature Blocks on Plan

The signature block for the County is incorrect since this plan falls under the County Subdivision Ordinance. The signature block for Bratton Township should only be a review signoff.

*The Surveyor provided revised plans on 12/10/2014 that includes the correct County and Township signature blocks.

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. The structures north of Red Shale Lane should be shown on the plan Mifflin County Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, (Article 7 Section 7.302.A.20.).

*The Surveyor provided revised plans on 12/10/2014 that shows the structures north of Red Shale Lane.

Derry Township

Name of Plan: Short, Jr., John E.

File Number: 2014-12-003

Tax Map #: 16-19-0616/16-19-0617

Municipality: Derry Township (Municipal Ordinance)

Applicant Name: Short, Jr., John E.

Land Owner Name: Short, Jr., John E.

Plan Preparer: Wright Land Surveying

Plan Summary:

This plan proposes to consolidate two parcels into one lot. No new building or earth disturbance are proposed as part of this Lot Consolidation Plan. These lots will be merged together and may not be conveyed separately thereof.

Review Comments (List from Review Committee):

Subdivision Information

There are two lots being merged so there should be a lot 1 and 2 on the plan Derry Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Part 4 Section 403.2 O.). Also, the lot consolidation statement only mentions Lot 1 and there are two lots which should be mentioned.

*At the December 11, 2014 Subdivision and Land Development Review Committee meeting the Wright Surveying representative indicated he will address this comment. It was also clarified that the adjoiner directly south is owned by the SEDA-COG Joint Rail Authority and this should be noted on the plan.

Floodplain / Wetlands

According to the GIS files, a small portion of the rear of the property appears to be in the floodplain.

Topographic information

Topographical contours at vertical intervals should be displayed on the plan Derry Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, (Article 4 Section 402.2 G). The applicant could request a waiver since this is a lotmerger.

*At the December 11, 2014 Subdivision and Land Development Review Committee meeting the Wright Surveying represented indicated he will address this comment.

Right-of Way Widths

Based upon the Derry Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Article 4 (Section 403.2 G.)), the right-of-way width of Electric Avenue (SR 1005), should be shown on the plan. The plan only lists variable rightof- way.

*At the December 11, 2014 Subdivision and Land Development Review Committee meeting the Wright Surveying represented indicated he will address this comment.

Cartway Widths

Based upon the Derry Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Article 4 (Section 403.2 G.)), the cart-way width of Electric Avenue (SR 1005) should be shown on the plan.

*At the December 11, 2014 Subdivision and Land Development Review Committee meeting the Wright Surveying represented indicated he will address this comment.

PennDOT HOP / Municipal Driveway Permit

Since this enters onto a state highway, is there an existing Highway Occupancy Permit (HOP) and if so it should be noted on the plan. Otherwise, a statement about the HOP for future driveways should be noted on the plan.

Deed Restrictions and Easements

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

*At the December 11, 2014 Subdivision and Land Development Review Committee meeting the Wright Surveying represented indicated there are none.

DEP Sewage Planning Module

The property is already served by public water and sewer.

Name of Plan: Berrier, Pamela F. & Wagner, R. Scott

File Number: 2014-12-004

Tax Map #: 16-27-0609/16-27-0610

Municipality: Derry Township (Municipal Ordinance)

Applicant Name: Berrier, Pamela F. & R. Scott Wagner

Land Owner Name: Berrier, Pamela F. & R. Scott Wagner

Plan Preparer: Sarge Engineering and Surveying

Plan Summary:

The purpose of this plan is to consolidate two adjoining lots owned by Pamela F. Berrier and R. Scott Wagner. Lot 53, Tax Parcel 16-27-0609, will be joined with Lot 54, Tax Parcel 16-27-0610. The new combined parcel will contain 0.771 acres.

Review Comments (List from Review Committee):

Administrative

The landowner's signature needs to be on the subdivision application form. Only Mr. Wagner has signed but not Ms. Berrier.

*The Sarge Surveying representative indicated he will secure Ms. Berrier's signature.

Subdivision Information

The total amount of acreage for each lot being subdivided should be shown on the plan, Derry Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, (Part 4 Section 402. 2. N.) The plan only shows combined acreage after consolidation.

*The Surveyor provided revised plans on 12/10/2014 that includes this information.

Right-of Way Widths

Based upon the Derry Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Part 5 Section 504. 2.), the rightof- way width of Parkview Avenue is substandard.

Cartway Widths

Based upon the Derry Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Part 5 Section 504.2.), the cartway width of Parkview Avenue is substandard. The cartway is only 16 feet wide, which appears inadequate for two-way vehicular traffic.

PennDOT HOP / Municipal Driveway Permit

A municipal driveway permit is required, and a copy should be provided to the Derry Township Planning Commission.

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 property has access to public water and sewer, but this would be new service since there is a proposed house.

Sewage Service

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

*The Sarge Surveying representative indicated the letter is forthcoming and will be provided to the County.

Water Service

A letter from the municipal water authority acknowledging availability of public water should be submitted to the Derry Township Planning Commission, Derry Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Part 4 Section 403. 2. X.).

*The Sarge Surveying representative indicated the letter is forthcoming and will be provided to the County.

Name of Plan: Blossom Hill Revised Plan

File Number: 2014-12-001

Tax Map #: 16-11-0100E

Municipality: Derry Township

Plan Preparer: EADS Group, Inc.

Land Owner Name: DGB Properties, LP *

Applicant Name: ELA Group, Inc. c/o Matthew R. Harlow

Plan Summary:

The project was designed and approved under the Township's Planned Residential Development (PRD) Ordinance with a Master Plan and Pre-Final Master Plan for the entire property which entailed approximately 148 acres. The Master Plan, approved in 2006 envisioned a residential community with 383 mixed dwelling types (townhouse, duplex and single family) spanned over four phases. In 2007, Phase 1 Final Subdivision was approved which included 85 dwelling units. All streets and utility infrastructure in Phase 1 was constructed. Over the years, there have been plans approved to change the types of dwelling units, generally to reduce the original townhouse and duplex units to single family in response to market demands. Currently, 48 dwelling units have been constructed which is an average of less than seven (7) units per year. Based upon the modest historical housing demand, DGB is proposing to scale back the overall project to include 99 dwelling units on approximately 40 acres of the overall property. The remaining undeveloped land is to be sold to an adjoining land owner for agricultural use. Additionally, a plan for a community center was designed and approved on Lot 1 (corner of Geisinger Lane and Green Avenue to serve the residents. Based upon resident input, a community center is no longer desired and Lot 1 is contemplated to be Open Space with potential park like amenities provided per guidance from the residents.

Review Comments (List from Review Committee):

Administrative

The Re-Plot Plan submitted in June 2014 contained a signature of a DGB Properties, LP representative, and should be part of the subject application. The landowner's signature needs to be on the subdivision application form.

Basic Plan Information

The tax parcel numbers on the application and the labels 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 name of the registered surveyor and/or Engineer responsible for the plan should be on the plan, including an appropriate registered professional's seal. There is no surveyor or engineer seal. (Derry Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance Part 4 Section 403.2.E.)

Subdivision Information

The development data on sheet 1 of 10 indicates thirty-three (33) lots, and the project narrative indicates an overall development of ninety-nine (99) dwelling units. The lot line adjustments show a total of twenty lots. This should be clearer and explained more succinctly in the project narrative.

There are references to a demolition plan. What exactly is being demolished? This needs to be clearer.

Setback Lines

Within the site data section of Sheet 1 of 10 it appears the building setbacks used are for the High Density Residential Zone (HDR) of which are applicable to Lots 14, 15, 17, 18, 19, 20, 23, 24, 25, 26, 33, 34, 31, 32, 29, 30. However, the rear setback within the HDR Zone is twenty (20) feet. Lots 141 and 142 are located in the Health Care Zoning District and the setbacks with that Zone would be applicable to these lots and should be noted on the plan Derry Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Part 4 Section 403.2.K.).

Right-of Way Widths

Are the right-of-way widths consistent with those approved through the Planned Residential Development Ordinance?

Cartway Widths

Are the cartway widths consistent with those approved through the Planned Residential Development Ordinance?

Private Street / Shared Driveway

Have any existing rights-of-ways been dedicated and accepted by the Township? Which proposed streets are to be offered to the Township for dedication as stated on Sheet 1 of 10 under Project Narrative Statement Homeowners Association.

Signature Blocks on Plan

There should be a signature block area for the Recorder of Deeds of Mifflin County. 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.

A signature block should be on the plan acknowledging the review of for the municipal planning commission.

A signature block should be on the plan acknowledging the approval of the municipality.

Other Comments:

1. This appears to meet the general provisions of a major change to the existing Master Plan based on information from the Township's Planned Residential Development Ordinance. However, is this still a PRD or now a conventional subdivision?
2. The Healthcare zone does not provide for single-family housing.
3. The Township Engineer should review this plan and provide comments and a recommendation in regards to the radius of the cul-de-sac turn-around areas waivers.
4. What are the anticipated construction times for this Revised Master Plan? Will this be wholly contingent on pre-sales of the lots?
5. The cemetery is not marked on the plan and should be since this is controlled by the County.
6. Sheet #1 mentions the PennDOT Highway Occupancy Permit (HOP) requirement but there is an existing HOP for the entrance and it should be noted.
7. The project narrative states the Community Center has been removed, yet there is no documentation this has been accepted by the Homeowners Association. What types of uses are feasible for lot 1 with this change?
8. The plan should clearly identify where the previously approved phases were to take place and that this will be extinguished.
9. The plan should show the area and acreage of property to be transferred to Mr. Glick. Will this be a lot merger with Mr. Glick?
10. Are there still provisions for a walkway along Green Avenue Extended?
11. Sheet 3 lists 61 existing lots and 46 proposed lots or 107 total lots, yet Sheet 1 in the narrative lists 99. Please clarify this. Also, on Sheet 3, it would be helpful if the developer could use a hatch symbol over those lots that have been developed, to better show what is new and what is proposed.
12. If the Planned Residential Development (PRD) was extinguished can the undeveloped lots meet the existing zoning standards, including lot frontage and setback requirements?
13. At the December 18, 2014 Mifflin County Planning Commission meeting, there was a concern expressed regarding a clear sight visibility triangle, at the intersection of Green Avenue Extension and lot number 25.
14. At the December 18, 2014 Mifflin County Planning Commission meeting, there was a concern expressed regarding the use of lot 79 for farm animals to graze.

* A representative from the ELA Group and Berks Homes were present during the December 11, 2014

Subdivision and Land Development Review Committee meeting and indicated they will respond to all County comments. Upon receipt of their responses the County's comments will be updated.

CDBG / HOME Program Update

Jim Lettiere gave an update to the Planning Commission on the status of projects for the CDBG / HOME Program. He informed the commission of the total funding for the HOME Program and that the contract project expiration date is September 21, 2016. Currently with the additional funding, 2 homes are under contract, 1 house in the bidding process, 4 homes in the inspection / work write-up phase.

An update was given on the projects selected from Brown, Derry and Mifflin County for the 2014 CDBG money. The application was submitted on November 21 for the county's three projects. Jim Spendiff asked if there were any projects that would not be completed and Jim Lettiere informed him the 2013 Mount Union Borough Authority for Country Club Drive and Front Road due to the survey results. Derry Township's projects for 2014 are Mifflin Juniata Dental Clinic, Habitat for Humanity, 522 North Water Line Extension Project, Road Resurfacing and Stormwater Management on Pinewood Road, Sawmill Road, and Rosemont

Avenue. Brown Township's projects for 2014 are Demolition of Blighted Structure on Franklin Street and Roadway Improvements to East and West Railroad Street. Applications for the townships will be submitted to DCED on or before January 3, 2015.

In addition to the update, Jim gave a clarification of what the HOME program was for new members of the commission. During his explanation, he voiced a concern that radon testing should be performed on the houses up for rehab. A discussion was held by the Planning Commission and a motion was made by Dave Pennebaker and seconded by Jim Spendiff to start radon testing for future rehab houses under the HOME Program.

Public Comment

None

Other Business

Bill informed the Planning Commission that the Mifflin County Commissioners approved three projects to receive Act 13 funding. The three projects are Brown Township – Reedsville Playground Pedestrian Walking Track, Rothrock Playground Authority – Building Rehabilitation and Borough of Lewistown – New playground equipment.

Bill also spoke about an issue that has arisen with the Derry Township Dog Park. A flyer has been sent out by the Juniata Valley Chamber of Commerce to form a Friends of the Dog Park group to help with the support and maintenance of the dog park.

A handout was given to the Planning Commission with a list of trails that were discussed in the Juniata/Mifflin Counties Greenway, Open Space and Rural Recreation Plan. One of the trails is one that links Blossom Hill to downtown Lewistown. Bill has spoken to Ann Toole and Greg Elliott to see about the possibility of this trail due to the proximity of an existing sidewalk network at the day care center to Blossom Hill and from the Lewistown Intermediate School to the downtown area. The concern of this trail is the bridge near O'Hesson Manor. Due to the dip in the road, this part of the trail could be dangerous. A suggestion was to add a jersey barrier, but the Commission was not sure this is feasible either. Other points of discussion were whether the area could be widened, if this is the best area and where would people park to use this trail. Bill informed the Commission that this was just one possible trail to consider and that they should review the list of other trails for future consideration.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 4:47 p.m. upon a motion by Tyler Gum that was seconded by Michelle Bair.