

**MINUTES**  
**MIFFLIN COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING**  
**FEBRUARY 28, 2019**  
**MIFFLIN COUNTY COURTHOUSE, MEETING ROOM B – 3:30 P.M.**

**ATTENDANCE**

Members

Jason Cunningham  
Dan Dunmire  
Thomas Lake  
Dave Pennebaker  
Kay Semler  
Neal Shawver  
Jim Spendiff  
Kent Spicher  
Cyle Vogt

Other

Kevin Kodish, Commissioner  
Robert Postal, Commissioner  
Steve Dunkle, Commissioner  
Alyssa Burd, The Sentinel  
Walt Whitmer  
Shree Smith

Staff

Bill Gomes, Director  
Chastity Fultz, Office/Grants Manager

**Call to Order**

Kay Semler, Chair, called the meeting to order at 3:33 p.m.

According to the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, the alternate member, Cyle Vogt, will be able to vote since all members are not present.

**Approval of Meeting Minutes**

Jim Spendiff made a motion to approve the minutes from the January meeting. The motion was seconded by Neal Shawver. All members voted aye.

**Water for Agriculture Project and State Watershed Improvement Plan Phase 3 (WIP) Initiative**

Walt Whitmer, Ag Project Coordinator for Penn State University Department of Agricultural Economics, Sociology and Education shared information on two parallel projects in Pennsylvania. The first project is Water for Agriculture. This is a four-year collaborative project with partners University of Nebraska Lincoln, USDA Agricultural Research Service, Arizona State University, Penn State and USDA NIFA. This project brings together social science and biophysical researchers, Extension and local partners to support community-led initiatives to address the water and agriculture issues that matter most to them.

Goals of this project are to work in cooperation with and in service to five communities, two of which are located in Pennsylvania (Mifflin County and Potter-Tioga area), two in Nebraska and one in Arizona; assist these communities in addressing the water and agricultural issues that matter most to them; develop an evidence-based approach to stakeholder engagement; and assess what difference this approach makes and whether and how it can help these communities and others address critical water and agricultural issues.

The project is currently in its second year. A lot of planning occurred in the first year through interviews, data collection and discussions. Years two and three will have formal activities and efforts with the local leadership team consisting of 18 people made of a diverse group. Year four will contain a lot of post-assessment activities.

This initiative will utilize an in-depth strategic planning approach by engaging a local leadership team consisting of about 18 people and will include 12-18 months of formal activity. The Water for Agriculture initiative is a unique opportunity to develop a long-term vision and strategy for water and agriculture in the region by identifying the most critical needs and developing strategies and resources to address them. A robust survey of non-agricultural residents and producers/farmers will be conducted to determine their views on agriculture and water. The local leadership team will work together to participate in occasional evaluation efforts and seek to identify positive, forward looking and constructive solutions. The partners will provide coordination, facilitation, logistical and financial support. They will coordinate access to scientists, technical experts, data and information necessary. A formal organization meeting will be held in late March or early April. They hope to learn attitudes, trust, networks, collaborations etc. compared to what actually happens on the ground. Learning will take place through interviews, mail survey, meeting observations and periodic feedback. Approximately 29 interviews have already taken place. Questions will include what water and agriculture issues are important, what practices work and who do you trust.

The second project running parallel with the Water for Agriculture project is the State Watershed Improvement Plan Phase III (WIP III) is based on the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) requiring Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (PA-DEP) to meet certain benchmarks to improve the quality of the Chesapeake Bay. Phase III focuses on a local area planning effort. Targeted reductions in nitrogen and phosphorus pollutions were set by the EPA. Voluntary efforts include understanding the WIP and creating goals with the fear of regulation.

Four counties were selected for the Pilot Planning Process. They include Lancaster (who was responsible for 25% of the entire state's nitrogen reduction), York, Adams and Franklin Counties. Lancaster's focus was agriculture while York focused predominantly on stormwater and MS4 requirements. Some lessons were learned through the initial pilot process included: the need to reach out to other counties in the watershed, Countywide groups need more of a framework to get started (e.g. who to invite to the table, timing/schedules), the Community Clean Water Toolbox is too large for one document, coordination and technical staff resources will be key to successfully completing the rest of the countywide plans, need to give countywide groups sufficient time to complete the planning process, and implementation is just as important as planning.

The workgroup must now determine how to complete the planning process in the remaining counties either with a watershed-wide approach or a staged approach. If it is rolled out on a tiered approach, Mifflin County is Tier 3 and would kick off in October 2019. If it is rolled out in a watershed-wide approach, it will kick off in July 2019. Nothing is mandated yet, however, the DEP has to submit the PA Statewide WIP Plan to the EPA by April 20, 2019 to establish the targets and benchmarks. It is uncertain what any repercussions will be for those counties who do nothing beyond the planning process.

Bill is currently looking at updating the Stormwater Management Plan in an effort to address the WIP Plan. Mr. Whitmer thinks this plan will work along with the Water for Agriculture Plan. This combination would put Mifflin County ahead of the process. Dan Dunmire cautioned Bill that the problem with the existing Stormwater Management Plan was that some people felt it was too strict and some municipalities would not adopt it. Bill is looking ahead and hoping to prevent becoming an MS4 community.

A member questioned why Mifflin County was selected for the Water for Agriculture project. Mr. Whitmer explained that each area has different agricultural environments and different water issues and they are hoping to learn from each region. Mr. Whitmer is also impressed with and close to Mifflin County and had an influence on the selection.

Dan added that the Phase 3 WIP involves much more than agriculture. It also includes sewage treatment, onlot septic, and over fertilizing as many contributors. Sewage treatment plants already spent billions of

dollars in upgrades to reach their targeted reductions. Mr. Whitmer added that the survey for the Water for Agriculture project will hopefully serve both projects.

There has been a constant monitoring upstream and downstream of the Bay. Considerable improvements were made until 2018, which was largely in part due to weather. Weather events can cause drastic changes to water quality.

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

Three plans were submitted to the committee for review, all under Municipal Ordinance. The plans included Bonnie K. Shank and Mark A. & Duane Scot Sunderland (*Armagh Township*), Richard E. & Jana D. Parthemer (*Decatur Township*), and Gospel Light Fellowship Mennonite Church (*Oliver Township*).

Bill Gomes reviewed the Gospel Light Fellowship Mennonite Church plan in Oliver Township in further detail. Updated plans have been received and updated comments for this plan were shared with the committee. Gospel Light Fellowship Mennonite Church is planning to construct an addition to the existing church, adding additional parking and associated stormwater management and site improvements. The only further discussion pertained to the last comment, "What is the building area directly east of the existing two-story church? Is this part of the new construction or part of the existing two-story church?" This was the only comment not addressed by the engineer. A comment will be added asking the engineer to respond to these questions.

Bill went on to review the Bonnie K. Shank and Mark A. & Duane Scot Sunderland in Armagh Township. This subdivision was reviewed by the Mifflin County Planning Commission on January 24, 2019. It was determined after the January 24, 2019 Mifflin County Planning Commission meeting, the property owner wished to have the acreage of Lot 4 changed from 1.05 acres to 1.00 acres. The reason the acreage was reduced, is because of the provisions of the Clean and Green Program. Clean and Green precludes the subdivision and sale of land two acres or greater within one year. This acreage change necessitated the need to file a revised plan. There was no further discussion.

Kay entertained a motion to accept the comments of the three plans under municipal ordinance with the additional comment on the Gospel Light Fellowship Mennonite Church plan. A motion was made by Dan Dunmire and Jim Spendiff seconded the motion. All members voted aye.

### **Armagh Township (*Municipal Ordinance*)**

Name of Plan: Shank, Bonnie K, Sunderland, Mark and Duane Scott  
File Number: 2019-02-003  
Tax Map #: 12-16104P; 12-16-104T  
Municipality: Armagh Township  
Applicant Name: Shank, Bonnie K, Sunderland, Mark and Duane Scott  
Land Owner Name: Shank, Bonnie K, Sunderland, Mark and Duane Scott  
Plan Preparer: Wright Land Surveying

#### **Plan Summary:**

This plan proposes to create Lot 3 & 4 and Lot Additions A & B. Lots 3 & 4 are for existing recreational use only. Lot 4 has an existing cabin served by on-lot sewage disposal. Lots 3 & 4 currently have no water service. Lot 1, residual tract, has an existing cabin served by a privy and no water service and shall be for recreational use only. Lot 2, residual tract, has an existing cabin served by a privy and no water service. Lot Additions A & B shall be added onto Lots A & B, respectively. No new development is being proposed by this plan.

\*\*This subdivision was reviewed by the Mifflin County Planning Commission on January 24, 2019. It was determined after the January 24, 2019 Mifflin County Planning Commission meeting, the property owner wished to have the acreage of Lot 4 changed from 1.05 acres to 1.00 acres. The reason the

acreage was reduced, is because of the provisions of the Clean and Green Program. Clean and Green precludes the subdivision and sale of land two acres or greater within one year. This acreage change necessitated the need to file a revised plan.

The Mifflin County Planning and Development Department received revised plans dated February 13, 2019. Pursuant to the review of the revised plans, the only difference between the plan dated January 4, 2019 and the revised plan dated February 13, 2019 is the change of acreage for lot 4 from 1.05 acres to 1.0 acres, and a label regarding the approximate location of the designated easement area for community on-lot sewage disposal. All other components within the subdivision remain unchanged.

**Subdivision Information**

Property boundary information should be shown for the entire property, including the residual property of Lot 2.

If survey data is not available, this information could be supplied via the deed description and could be shown on an inset map. (Armagh Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance Sections 6.302.a5, a9 and a12)

**Setback Lines**

The setback lines should be shown on the plan as prescribed in the Armagh Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Section 6.302.a10).

**Right-of-Way Widths**

Elmira Drive that is part of Lot B and is not fully shown, includes right-of-way and cartway information on the plan.

\*The Wright Surveying representative indicated Elmira Drive will be extinguished as part of this subdivision.

The plan appears to show several drives that are not named. Information on these drives should be shown on the plan. If they serve more than one property, they should be named.

\*The Wright Surveying representative stated there are no other drives within the subdivision plan.

Based upon the Armagh Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, the right-of-way width of Treaster Valley Road and Treaster Run is substandard (Article 3, Table 1).

**DEP Sewage Planning Module**

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

**Sewage Service**

Is the onlot sewage service on lots 2 and 3? If so, they need to be shown on the plan in accordance with the Armagh Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Section 6.202 a.10).

**Water Service**

The water supply location should be noted on the plan as prescribed in the Armagh Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Section 3.213). 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. None of these lots appear to have water.

**Decatur Township (*Municipal Ordinance*)**

Name of Plan: Parthemer, Richard E. & Jana D.

File Number: 2019-02-001

Tax Map #: 15-16-0103

Municipality: Decatur Township

Applicant Name: Parthemer, Richard E. & Jana D.

Land Owner Name: Parthemer, Richard E. & Jana D.

Plan Preparer: Sarge Engineering and Surveying

**Plan Summary:**

The purpose of this plan is to create Lot 2, of 24.324 acres, for agricultural use. Lot 1, the +/- 97.97 acre remainder, is in agricultural and existing single-family residential use.

**Administrative**

This tax parcel was previously reviewed in August 2011 by the Mifflin County Planning Commission to properly subdivide Lot 2, since it was not recorded and no deed was transferred.

\*One asterisk represents comments generated from revised plans dated February 11, 2019.

**Subdivision Information**

Property boundary information should be shown for the entire property, including the residual property. 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 Decatur Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Part 6 ss 22-602.A.(5) and 603.2.A.(5) and (6)).

\*Plan note 9 Disclaimer Statement indicates the deed for this property does not contain a complete metes and bounds description and contains exceptions; therefore, no property boundary information is available for the property map.

**Clean & Green / Agriculture**

As noted in Note 6, the parcel is enrolled in the Clean and Green program. The applicant or landowners should be aware rollback taxes can be applied in some subdivision situations, and if they have any questions, they should contact the Mifflin County Assessment Office for more information.

**Floodplain / Wetlands**

As noted in Notes 1 and 2 and based on the County's GIS files, the property is not located in the 100 year floodplain or designated wetland.

**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%), only on the residual land, on this 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. Prime farmland soils are identified by the US Department of Agriculture as soils having the best combination of physical and chemical characteristics for producing food, feed, forage, fiber and oilseed crops.

According to the County GIS files, some portion of this property appears to have hydric soils on Lot 2. Hydric soils can indicate the presence of wetlands. The hydric soils information should be shown on the plan.

**Right-of-Way Widths**

Based upon the Decatur Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Part 6 ss 22-602.A.(11)), the right-of-way width of McCormick Lane and SR 522 N should be shown on the plan.

McCormick Lane should be labeled on the plan.

Based on the Decatur Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Part 3 ss 22-302.D. Table 1), the right-of-way width of Summit Ridge Lane is substandard.

**Cartway Widths**

Based upon the Decatur Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Part 3 ss 22-302.D. Table 1), the cartway width of Summit Ridge Lane is substandard.

The cartway widths of McCormick Lane and SR 522 N should be shown on the plan in accordance with the Decatur Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, (Part 6 ss 22-602.A.(11)).

**PennDOT HOP / Municipal Driveway Permit**

A notation about the requirement stating: Any access via a State Highway to lots shown on this subdivision plan will require the issuance of a PennDOT Highway Occupancy Permit (HOP). PennDOT regulations provide that a Highway Occupancy Permit is required prior to constructing, altering or exceeding the permitted capacity for any access connected onto a State Highway. A Highway Occupancy Permit is also required prior to altering the existing pattern or flow of surface drainage or directing additional surface drainage onto or into the highway right-of-way or highway facilities. Approval of this plan neither implies nor guarantees permit approval by PennDOT.

\*The revised plans contain the PennDOT HOP language in note 8.

**Private Street / Shared Driveway**

Is either McCormick Lane or Summit Ridge Lane used by more than one party? If so, 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."

**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.

**Sewage Service**

The existing sewage system for the house on Lot 1, the remainder, should be shown in accordance with the Decatur Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, (Section 22-602.2A(10)).

Since there is no septic testing for Lot 2, the plan should note that any future development will require septic testing and a land development plan.

\*The revised plans in note 10., indicate any future development will require sewage testing and a land development plan.

**Water Service**

The existing well for the house on Lot 1, the remainder, should be shown in accordance with the Decatur Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, (Section 22-302.M(1)).

**Features**

Are all natural features shown? If not, 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 Decatur Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, (Part 6 ss 22-602.A.(9)).

Are all man-made features shown? If not, 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 Decatur Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, (Part 6 ss 22-602.2.A.(10)).

**Oliver Township (*Municipal Ordinance*)**

Name of Plan: Gospel Light Fellowship Mennonite Church

File Number: 2019-02-002

Tax Map #: 19-07-0109C

Municipality: Oliver Township

Applicant Name: Stoltzfus, Matt

Land Owner Name: Gospel Light Fellowship Mennonite Church

Plan Preparer: The EADS Group, Inc.-Lucas Parkes

**Plan Summary:**

Gospel Light Fellowship Mennonite Church is planning to construct an addition to the existing church, adding additional parking and associated stormwater management and site improvements.

\*One asterisk represents written responses from Lucas Parks P.E., in a letter dated February 27, 2019 to the Mifflin County Planning Commission.

\*\*Two asterisks represents comments generated at the February 28, 2019 Mifflin County Planning Commission meeting.

**Subdivision Information**

The Engineer, Land Surveyor and Geologist Registration Law Act of May 23, 1945 P.L. 913, No 367 (L. 63 Section 2.e states in part a professional engineer may not practice land surveying, unless licensed and registered as a professional land surveyor, as defined and set forth in this act; however, a professional engineer may perform engineering land surveys, however, tract perimeter surveys shall be the function of the "Professional Land Surveyor". Prior to recordation a professional land surveyors seal must be affixed to the plan. It is acknowledged in General Project Note Q that the topographical and boundary survey was provided by Bill Wright.

\*So noted.

**Floodplain / Wetlands**

As noted in General Project Note K and County GIS files, the majority of the parcel is not located in the 100-year floodplain. A small sliver of the parcel is in the 100-year floodplain and should be shown on the plan, in accordance with the Oliver Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Article IV, Section 402.5.d). General Project Note L notes there may be wetlands on the parcel, but the project will not impact any likely wetland areas. The likely wetland areas should be noted on the plan.

\*The 100 year floodplain boundary has been included on the revised plan. An official wetland study has not been completed for the property; however, based upon our field investigation there are no potential wetland areas located on the property.

**Soils**

According to the County GIS files, some portion of this property appears to have prime farmland soils. Prime farmland soils are identified by the US Department of Agriculture as soils having the best combination of physical and chemical characteristics for producing food, feed, forage, fiber and oilseed crops.

\*The soils information will be provided on the revised plans.

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.

Soil information should be shown on the plan in accordance with the Oliver Township Subdivision Ordinance (Article IV, Section 402.5.b).

**Setback Lines**

The setback lines listed in the site data on the first sheet do not correspond to those listed in the Oliver Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Article V, Section 507, Table V-4: Lot Design Standards). Based on lot design standards for single-family without public water and sewer, the setbacks are 40' for the front, 20' for the sides, and 30' for the rear.

\*The most recently adopted Oliver Township SALDO provided setbacks for non-commercial development which requires setbacks of 50' front, 40' side, and 50' rear.

**Right-of-Way Widths**

Based upon the Oliver Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Article V, Section 504, Table V-1), the right-of-way width of Little Brick Road is substandard.

\*So noted.

There is an unnamed lane southeast and adjacent to the church site. The right-of-way width, if one exists, should be noted on the plan in accordance with the Oliver Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Article IV, Section 402.4.1).

\*The cartway width for the private driveway will be provided on the revised plan.

**Cartway Widths**

Based upon the Oliver Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Article V, Section 504, Table V-1), the cartway width of Little Brick Road is substandard.

There is an unnamed lane southeast and adjacent to the church site. The cartway width, if one exists, should be noted on the plan in accordance with the Oliver Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Article IV, Section 402.4.1).

\*The cartway width for the private driveway will be provided on the revised plan

**Private Street / Shared Driveway**

Is the private drive adjacent to the church parcel shared by more than one party? If so, 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 private drive is owned by another party and is not part of the church property.

**Deed Restrictions and Easements**

As noted in General Note O, according to the engineer, there are no known deed restrictions or easements associated with the property.

\*Correct.

### **DEP Sewage Planning Module**

Based on discussions with the engineer for The EADS Group, it appears the sewage planning module was approved by PA-DEP through Bill Wright. If so, please provide evidence of this approval.

\*The DEP sewage planning module will be provided with the revised plan.

### **Features**

Are all man-made features shown? If not, 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 Oliver Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, (Article IV, Section 402.6.b).

\*All significant man-made features are shown on the revised plan.

Are all natural features shown? If not, 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 Oliver Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, (Article IV, Section 402.5.c.,d.,e. and f.).

\*All significant natural features are shown on the revised plan.

### **Zoning**

General Note A refers to the Oliver Township Zoning Ordinance. Oliver Township does not have zoning. This reference should be removed.

\*General note A will be removed with the revised plan.

### **Land Development**

What is the area of earth disturbance? This should be noted on the plan. If earth disturbance is between 5,000 square feet and less than one acre, an Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan is required. As noted in Note N, earth disturbance of one acre or more will require an NPDES Permit through the Mifflin County Conservation District.

\*The proposed earth disturbance will be less than one acre for the project and will be outlined in the E and S plan in the revised plans.

The square footage of the building (proposed and existing) should be on the plan.

\*The square footage of the building will be provided on the revised plan.

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

\*Public water does not exist in this part of Oliver Township.

To your knowledge has a building permit application been submitted to the appropriate permitting agency for this project?

\*No, a building permit application has not been submitted at this time.

To your knowledge has a building permit been issued for this project?

\*No, a building permit has not been issued at this time.

### **Other Comments:**

1. Based on a discussion with The EADS Group Inc. engineer, a portion of the existing building is to be demolished and a single-story, 7,060 square foot addition will be constructed. There will be a covered drive area between the proposed landscape area and the addition. This should be labeled on the plan.

\*The existing and proposed buildings and associated drive areas will be labeled on the revised plan.

2. Based on a discussion with The EADS Group Inc. engineer, a variance was granted for setback relief for the building. This information should be explained on the plan. What are the setbacks for the project?

\*A copy of the approved variance will be submitted with the revised plans and will show the project setbacks.



3. Will the Township require onsite street lighting? If so, the lighting should be labeled on the plan.

\*We do not anticipate the use of onsite lighting for this project; however, they will be depicted on the revised plan if required by the Township.

4. In accordance with the Oliver Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Article V, Section 509.B.1.), since the proposed and existing parking spaces about Little Brick Road, a landscaped strip shall be provided along the entire street right-of-way line and/or property line.

\*A landscape buffer will be provided along Little Brick Road on the revised plan.

5. A driveway permit will be required from the Township for the new access to the proposed and existing parking areas.

\*A driveway permit has been submitted to the Township for the proposed access drive.

6. Has the Township required any landscaping in accordance with the Oliver Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Article V, Section 520)?

\*Landscaping will be provided on the revised plan in accordance with the Township Ordinance.

7. Are there elevation drawings available?

\*The elevation drawings will be provided with the revised plan.

8. The parking space dimensions, as depicted on drawing C-3, are 9 feet by 19 feet, while the Oliver Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance requires a dimension of 9 feet by 20 feet (Article V, Section 509.8). Will the Township accept this? This should also be shown on sheet 2.

\*The parking spaces will be increased to 20 feet in length with the revised plans.

9. What are the anticipated vehicle trips per day and the vehicle trips during the peak morning and afternoon activity?

\*The anticipated vehicle trips will be provided with the revised plan. The use of the property is not changing with the project; therefore, the owner does not anticipate an increase in vehicular activity.

10. Will the Township require sidewalks for this project? If so, they should be depicted on the plan.

\*We do not anticipate the need for sidewalks for this project; however, they will be depicted on the revised plans if required by the Township.

11. In accordance with the Oliver Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Article V, Section 511.C), a 100-foot clear sight triangle shall be provided for the new access drive. This should be shown on drawing no. C-2.

\*A clear sight triangle will be provided on the revised plan.

12. Does the traffic circulation go around the building? If so, that should be shown.

\*The traffic circulation does not go around the building.

13. There appears to be an existing shed within the rear setback.

\*The existing shed will be removed with the proposed project.

14. What is the building area directly east of the existing two-story church? Is this part of the new construction or part of the existing two-story church?

\*\*It appears item 14. was not addressed in the February 27, 2019 written response from Lucas Parkes, P.E. This item should be addressed either in writing or on the revised plan prior to final approval.

### **Public Comment**

None

### **Other Business or Comments**

Statement of Financial Interests forms were handed out and are due by May 1<sup>st</sup>.

The Annual Dinner will be held April 4<sup>th</sup> at the Penn Valley Christian Retreat.

A discussion ensued regarding the title of the comment pages for the subdivisions. These pages are presented to the Planning Commission on behalf of the Subdivision and Land Development Review Committee.

Bill attended the Lewistown Borough Council meeting on February 11<sup>th</sup> to discuss two projects. The first project was the expansion of the Juniata River Trail, or the S. H. Rothermel Trail. The Borough Council agreed to maintain the trail extension if it is approved for additional funding, but will not put money towards the project. Dan Dunmire asked if Bill would be submitting a DCNR application for this trail. Bill will be working on this along with a DCED application. He also participated in a conference call regarding the Fire Academy property. Legislative approval is required to grant an easement for the trail across this property. An easement is also required to cross the Juniata Concrete Co. property. An MOU has been approved with the Lewistown Borough to maintain the trail as the County does not want this responsibility. DCNR also encouraged Bill to look at other matching alternatives besides DCED.

The second project Bill discussed at the Council meeting was a feasibility study tied to the Open Space Plan that will explore a link between Victory Park, Rec Park and Kish Park with a possible link to the Stone Arch Bridge. The County, Parks and Rec Council, and Derry Township are contributing towards the study along with a RecTAP Grant application. The Borough was asked to contribute, but there were some issues. The study will take approximately four months and will look on the ground to see if the connections will work.

The Internet Advisory Committee meeting was cancelled this month due to weather. Bill became aware of the Rural Broadband Cooperative in Mill Creek, Huntingdon County. This Coop is erecting a 120-foot tower on Stone Mountain with a line of site of the entire length of SR 655 in Big Valley. All work completed to date has been done with donations.

**Next Month:** The Mifflin County School District and The Academy will make a presentation at the next meeting.

### **Adjournment**

Upon no further discussion, the meeting adjourned at 4:41 p.m. upon a motion by Neal Shawver.