

**MINUTES**  
**MIFFLIN COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING**  
**JANUARY 24, 2019**  
**MIFFLIN COUNTY COURTHOUSE, MEETING ROOM B – 3:30 P.M.**

**ATTENDANCE**

Members

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

Other

Kevin Kodish, Commissioner  
Robert Postal, Commissioner  
Steve Dunkle, Commissioner  
Alyssa Burd, The Sentinel  
Jane Sheffield  
Jim Laird, Laird LA  
Bob Thomas, AIA, CT&C  
Jenny Landis  
Sheree Smith  
Kyle Bodtorf  
Ron Booher, PLS  
Jim Zubler  
Representative John Hershey

Staff

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

**Call to Order**

Kay Semler, Chair, called the meeting to order at 3:35 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.

Kay then turned over the meeting to Bill Gomes for reorganization and election of officers.

**Reorganization – Election of Officers**

As provided for in the Mifflin County Planning Commission Bylaws, Bill Gomes opened the floor for nominations of 2019 officers, beginning with the Commission Chair. Jim Spendiff made the motion for Kay Semler to continue serving as Chair, which was seconded by Neal Shawver and unanimously approved. Kay Semler then made the motion for Dan Dunmire to continue as Vice Chair, which was seconded by Jim Spendiff, with all voting in favor. A final motion was made by Jim Spendiff for Neal Shawver to continue in the role of secretary and seconded by Dan Dunmire with all voting in favor. Following the election of officers, the meeting was turned back over to the Planning Commission Chair.

**Approval of Meeting Minutes**

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

**Main Line Canal Greenway Trail Feasibility Study**

Kay welcomed Jane Sheffield, James Laird and Robert Thomas and turned the meeting over to them to present their feasibility study on the Main Line Canal Greenway Trail. Jane Sheffield, Executive Director of the Allegheny Ridge Corporation, has been working on the Main Line Canal Greenway for a long time. The consultant team has been working on the alignment of the 9/11 National Memorial Trail with the Main Line Canal Greenway Trail between Johnstown and Harrisburg. The Allegheny Ridge Corporation worked on

developing the trails that were accessible. Water trail maps and interpretative signage were developed along with access points along the Juniata River. As the communities are connected, it will become a longer trail experience and will be a multiuse trail that will enhance visitation into the communities.

Robert Thomas, Partner of Campbell Thomas & Co., has worked closely with Jim Laird, Landscape Architect/Land Planner of Laird Recreation and Land Planning, LLC on many long distance trails. Mr. Laird and Mr. Thomas both serve on the Board of Advisors for the 9/11 National Memorial Trail. Mr. Thomas shared the results of the feasibility study and the plans for the next steps, including implementation. The plan also describes the process they went through in developing the proposed trail. The study reviewed Huntingdon and Mifflin Counties simultaneously in order to develop the trail. Different corridors were studied, including the old canal and towpath, Kishacoquillas Valley, Ferguson Valley and Route 103. Previous appropriate reports and studies were reviewed. Interviews demonstrated the importance of connecting old canal towns by making them trail towns. Existing and historic railroads were looked at along with maps of historic Indian trails and highways. Major spines and loops were also reviewed along with historic sites and 9/11 sites. They reviewed existing major hiking and bicycle routes along with canoe/kayak guides.

Key outcomes from research and analysis, interviews, stakeholder meetings and public meetings demonstrated that the trail should stay close to the original corridor and the Juniata River. It should incorporate river access and connect downtowns. The trail should prioritize economic development potential and serve both residents and tourist traffic.

An interim and preferred alignment of the trail was selected and based off of the information that was gathered and presented in the study. The interim trail alignment is largely on back roads and will utilize signage. Some discussion has taken place with some of the property owners along the route. The 9/11 trail committee will notify counties with opportunities to fund and they will support segments with a 15-20 year implementation timeframe. Maintenance, operation management alternatives were reviewed. Counties and different townships operate differently and considerations for trail maintenance and management will vary.

The report and link is available and will be forwarded to Bill and he can share this with the rest of the group. Bill also submitted a list of comments based on his review of the draft study, but has not received a response back. Mr. Thomas will resend his responses to Bill.

Jane Sheffield noted that the 9/11 trail has continually evolved since the original plan was developed. The 9/11 trail has had an Executive Director for approximately two years. DCNR has recently funded a circuit rider position for the 9/11 trail that is being handled by Somerset County in order to connect the Allegheny passage to Johnstown. Ms. Sheffield added that the feasibility study makes recommendations, including how to proceed from this study into getting into more concrete engineer and planning to actually make connections as opportunities arise in the phasing of the trail. They are looking at the upcoming grant rounds from the state level to look at more specific engineering projects and to gain personnel to make this trail happen.

Jim Laird attended the ribbon cutting ceremony of the Juniata River Trail and is excited to see the economic development opportunities related to the trail.

The GIS department prepared maps of the segments of the trail in Mifflin County to be incorporated into the appendices of the study. Dan Dunmire referenced a map that lists Ryde on the wrong side of the river and added that the proposed trail does not actually go through the Village of Ryde. He also questioned whether they were looking for a local sponsor and project manager to seek funding for trail implementation. Mr. Thomas is hoping it will be similar to the Appalachian Trail, which is a good model, and is maintained locally. Each section of the trail applies for funding in coordination with the others. The state is looking to close gaps in the major trails across the Commonwealth.

Dan also noted that the study claims the trail development for the Mifflin County Portion will cost \$12 million. He questions how realistic these numbers are considering the ¾ mile trail recently constructed at a cost of \$500,000. There are many physical barriers that will be expensive to overcome, if not impossible. Mr. Thomas used comparable figures from other trails and tow path restoration projects. He also added that the costs are not escalated for future construction.

Mr. Thomas concluded by stating often people comment when studies are over that the consultants go home and forget about it. Because Ms. Sheffield, Mr. Laird and himself are on the board of the 9/11 trail, this is their passion.

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

Two guests were introduced, the first being Representative John Hershey and the second Mrs. Smith who is a post graduate of Rutgers University and is new to the area. Mrs. Smith is trying to learn the area and development trends.

Eleven plans were submitted to the committee for review, ten under Municipal Ordinance and one under County Ordinance. The plans under Municipal Ordinance included Dilliard Realty Storage (*Armagh Township*), Philips Ultrasound, Inc. Building Addition (*Armagh Township*), Shank, Bonnie K., Sunderland, Mark A. & Duane Scot (*Armagh Township*), Kish Bank Operations Center (*Brown Township*), Hartzler, Benjamin B. & Jenette M. (*Brown Township*), Heeter, Beverly L. (*Decatur Township*), Peachey, Norman I. & Sadie A. (*Menno Township*), K&C Realty Development, LLC (*Union Township*) and Zook Masonry (*Union Township*). The plan under County Ordinance was Stryker, Gary & Marlene (Bratton Township).

Jim Lettiere reviewed the Stryker plan in Bratton Township in further detail. Jim has received updated plans and comments for this plan and shared them with the committee. The purpose of this plan is to subdivide from parcel T.M. # 13,03-0120AA Lot 2 (Subdivision recorded as Instrument # 2018-4128 page 2) proposed lot 3, lot 3 is a lot addition to T.M. 13,03-0116 in Bratton Township, Mifflin County. No new construction or improvements are going to be made at this time.

Ron Booher of Juniata Valley Land Surveying was in attendance and was able to respond to further questions. Mr. Booher confirmed the Renninger property has a well and a septic system. Neal Shawver noticed a cabin on the aerial photograph, but was not on the plan. He would like to see all man-made structures and access to them on the plan. Mr. Booher will add this to the plan. He also indicated that Mr. Renninger's signature is on the plan application as a single letter. Jim will remove this comment.

As a side note, Mr. Booher mentioned that he has been trying to contact Lucas Parkes of The EADS Group regarding the Donald Adams plan in Bratton Township. Mr. Parkes has not returned any calls or emails to Mr. Booher. Jim Lettiere will contact The EADS Group. Mr. Booher is concerned that he will not be able to get the work complete within the 90-day time frame. Mr. Lettier reminded him that he can request an extension.

Jim then reviewed the Kish Bank plan in Brown Township. Jim has not received revised plans because the engineer is waiting for Brown Township to review and comment on the plan. The project generally consists of the development/redevelopment of two adjacent lots. The existing Kish Bank branch office is proposed to be demolished and replaced with a fast food restaurant. The existing Kish Bank Financial Center is proposed to be converted into the new Kish Bank branch office. The lot previously home to the Dutch Country Restaurant is proposed to be the new site of the +/- 35,000 s.f. Kish Bank Operations Center. Jim is concerned with the parking that is proposed to be shared between the bank and fast food restaurant. Kay questioned why a new traffic study would be needed for the existing buildings. Jim responded that it is up to PennDOT whether they will conduct a traffic impact analysis.

Neal noticed that the existing entrance for the Dutch Country Inn is shown on the plan. A left hand turn from the site is still possible because the concrete in the middle of SR 655 does not extend to this point. He wanted to know if this should be further addressed in the comments. Bill is hoping to have the opportunity to add input to the traffic impact analysis process. Cyle Vogt questioned whether it would be beneficial to have better signage for no left turns from SR 655 into the access drive as well as a no left turn sign out of the existing access drive. Jim will add comments regarding no left turns in or out of the parcel for the existing Dutch Country Inn egress and ingress.

Jim noted that Philips Ultrasound provided revised plans and responded to all comments.

Kay then entertained a motion for the conditional approval of the Stryker plan under county ordinance in Bratton Township with the revisions as noted. A motion was made by Dan Dunmire and seconded by Jim Spendiff. All members voted aye.

Kay entertained a motion to accept the comments of the remaining ten plans under municipal ordinance with the revisions to the comments on the Kish Bank Operations plan. A motion was made by Tom Lake and Michele Bair seconded the motion. All members voted aye with Jason Cunningham abstaining from voting on the Kish Bank Operations plan.

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

Name of Plan: Dilliard Realty Storage  
File Number: 2019-01-003  
Tax Map #: 12-06-0611  
Municipality: Armagh Township  
Applicant Name: Dilliard, Michael F. Auction & Realty LLC  
Land Owner Name: Dilliard, Michael F. Auction & Realty LLC  
Plan Preparer: Thomas H. Metz Engineering, Inc.

#### **Plan Summary:**

Michael F. Dilliard of Michael F. Dilliard Auctions & Realty, LLC is proposing to construct three (3) new storage unit buildings on a vacant tract situated in Armagh Township, Mifflin County, Pennsylvania. The proposed structures: Building 'A', 30' x 140' (4,200 s.f.), Building 'B', 20' x 130' (2,600 s.f.) and Building 'C', 20' x 110' (2,200 s.f.) are all to be constructed on a vacant lot indicated as tax parcel 12,06-0611-,000 as indicated on the Mifflin County parcel viewing map. All disturbances for the proposed structures will be solely located on the proposed lot.

\*One asterisk represents comments generated at the January 17, 2019 Subdivision and Land Development Review Committee meeting.

#### **Basic Plan Information**

The tract map shows two Duchess Streets. The street north of Duchess Street is Royal Street. This should be corrected on sheet 1.

#### **Floodplain / Wetlands**

As noted in General Note 5 of sheet Si1-1 and according to the County GIS files, the subject parcel is not located in the 100-year floodplain.

The plan should note whether or not the site lies within a designated wetland in accordance with the Armagh Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Article 6, Sections 6.202.a.9. and 12.).

#### **Cartway Widths**

It appears based upon the Armagh Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, the cartway width of Duchess Street is substandard (Article 3, Table 1).

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

A municipal driveway permit is required, and a copy should be provided to Armagh Township Supervisors.

**Deed Restrictions and Easements**

According to the surveyor as noted in General Note 9, all known covenants and/or easements are shown.

**DEP Sewage Planning Module**

Since there is no proposed sewer associated with this project, does PA-DEP require any sewage planning module?

\*The Metz Engineering representative affirmed no sewage planning is required.

**Sewage Service**

Although sewer will not be provided for this project, the existing nearest sewer line should be shown on the plan in accordance with the Armagh Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Article 6, Section 6.202a.10).

\*The Metz Engineering representative indicated he will show the test pit and the water lateral locations.

**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 Armagh Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, (Article 6, Section 6.202.a.9).

\*The Metz Engineering representative indicated all are shown.

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 Armagh Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, (Article 6, Section 6.202.a.10).

\*The Metz Engineering representative indicated all are shown.

**Land Development**

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

\*The Metz Engineering representative indicated no.

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

\*The Metz Engineering representative indicated no.

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

**Other Comments:**

1. Has the Township Engineer reviewed this plan? If not, the plan should be reviewed by the engineer.

\*The Metz Engineering representative indicated Lucas Parks with the EADS Group is currently reviewing the plan.

2. Will the township require any type of financial security or development agreement?

\*The Metz Engineering representative indicated not at this time.

3. A notation on the plan should state travel lanes are one way around the building.

4. Parking notation #13 is confusing since the plan shows 3 regular parking spaces and 1 handicapped space. Note #11 is also confusing stating shared parking with tax parcel 16,01-0112K, which is only partially shown on the plan.

\*The Metz Engineering representative indicated he acknowledges this will need to be corrected. He also indicated there will not be any type of fencing around the facility or a gated entrance.

**Armagh Township (Municipal Ordinance)**

Name of Plan: Philips Ultrasound, Inc. Building Addition

File Number: 2019-01-005

Tax Map #: 12-02-0106A; 12-02-01020C

Municipality: Armagh Township  
Applicant Name: Philips Ultrasound, Inc.  
Land Owner Name: Philips Ultrasound, Inc.  
Plan Preparer: Stahl Sheaffer Engineering, LLC

**Plan Summary:**

The project proposes four building additions, internal building renovations, parking lot expansion, truck dock and driveway addition, and associated stormwater management facilities. The project also includes a lot addition subdivision.

\*One asterisk represents comments generated at the January 17, 2019 Subdivision and Land Development Review Committee meeting.

\*\*Two asterisks represents written responses from Stahl Sheaffer Engineering, LLC dated January 23, 2019, a revised cover sheet and a site lighting plan.

**Administrative**

A 9,910 square foot building addition to the facility was reviewed by the Mifflin County Planning Commission on August 24, 2017 and on June 23, 2016 for a 9,600 square foot building addition.

**Basic Plan Information**

It would be helpful if a plan narrative is placed on the plan and a brief description stating the purpose of the project. The existing and proposed conditions located in the post construction management narrative would be suitable.

\*\*The plan narrative has been placed on the cover sheet under general notes.

The existing conditions narrative states in part "an existing 62,832 square foot building" while the proposed conditions states in part "involves the construction of four building additions to the existing 71,189 square foot building." Sheet C101 shows a 62,832 square foot building. Please clarify which figure is correct.

\*\*The existing building footprint is 72,684 square feet. This has been updated in areas on the plan and narrative where it was incorrectly referenced.

**Subdivision Information**

Note 7 under site data on sheet C100 states in part "lot 2 shall be incorporated into the deed for Philips Ultrasound." As a result of the lot addition subdivision, a new deed will need to be prepared and recorded.

\*\*A new deed will be prepared and the plan will be signed and sealed by a professional land surveyor. 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.

\*\*A new deed will be prepared and the plan will be signed and sealed by a professional land surveyor.

**Floodplain / Wetlands**

As noted in general note 5 on sheet C100 and based on GIS data, the site is not situated in the 100-year floodplain. Also, as noted in site data 12 on sheet C100 and based on County GIS data, the site is not located in a designated wetland.

**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.

**Setback Lines**

Although there are no established building setback lines for commercial buildings, at a minimum the setbacks for single-family residential served with public sewer and water should be listed and utilized in accordance with the Armagh Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Article 6, Section 6.302a.11).

\*\*We have inquired with the Mifflin County Planning Department to determine where the setback information can be referenced. (The Mifflin County Planning and Development Department responded by indicating "you are correct that Armagh Township does not have zoning, however, we encourage at a minimum that the setbacks established

for single-family homes depending on the availability of public sewer and water be followed. These provisions are located in the Armagh Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Article 3 Table 2").

**Right-of-Way Widths**

Based upon the Armagh Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, the right-of-way width of Echo Drive should be shown on the plan (Article 6, Section 6.302a.11).

\*\*Echo Drive is a private driveway, therefore does not have a right-of-way associated with the drive.

**Cartway Widths**

The cartway width of Echo Drive should be shown on the plan in accordance with the Armagh Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, (Article 6, Section 6.202a.11).

What is the cartway width of the new driveway?

\*\*The cartway width of the existing driveway (Echo Drive) has been added to the site plan. The width of the proposed driveway is also included on the site and grading plans.

**PennDOT HOP / Municipal Driveway Permit**

A PennDOT Highway Occupancy Permit (HOP) is required as prescribed in the Municipalities Planning Code (Section 508 (6)) and in the Mifflin County Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Section 4.208 C). A copy of the permit should be provided to the Armagh Township Supervisors. This is for the new driveway onto SR 322.

**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, Sections 6.202a.18 and 6.302a.6. and b.7.)

\*\*The are no known deed or easement restrictions with the property.

**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 owner and Engineer are engaging with the Brown Township Municipal Authority to complete the planning module requirements and submit to DEP.

**Sewage Service**

A letter from the municipality acknowledging availability of public sewer should be submitted to the Armagh Township Supervisors.

\*\*The owner and Engineer are engaged with the Brown Township Municipal Authority to obtain the sewer service availability letter.

**Water Service**

A letter from the Municipal Authority of the Borough of Lewistown acknowledging availability of public water should be submitted to the Armagh Township Supervisors.

\*\*The owner and Engineer are engaged with the MABL to obtain the water service availability letter.

**Lot Addition**

The total amount of acres after the lot consolidation should be noted on the plan.

\*\*The total acreage of the new lot (Lot 1R) has been added to the plan.

There seems to be reference to the creating of lot 1R on sheet C100 and then on sheet C101.1. with the total acres and the total acres should be included on sheet 1.

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 \_\_\_\_\_.

\*\*The requested statement has been added to the plan, as well as the statement "The combination of lots 1 and 2 will create lot 1R, consisting of 31.10 acres owned by Philips Ultrasound, Inc.

**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 Armagh Township

Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, (Article 6, Section 6.202a.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 Armagh Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, (Article 6, Section 6.202a.10).

\*\*All natural and manmade features are shown on the plan.

#### **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.

\*\*Armagh Township has suggested we contact Milroy Volunteer Fire Co. to determine if reviews are conducted for land development plans. The Fire Company was contacted and a message was left on 1/22/2019.

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

\*\*A building permit has been applied for, but not yet received for this project.

Is there a lighting plan?

\*\*A lighting plan (digital) is included with the plan resubmission. It has also been provided to the Township Engineer.

Has the Township Engineer reviewed the road profiles and new driveway onto SR 322?

\*\*The Township Engineer has received the plans and the plan review is underway.

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

\*\*A building permit has been applied for, but not yet received for this project.

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

What is the total area of disturbance? If it is an acre or greater, then an NPDES permit is required. The applicant should contact the Mifflin County Conservation District. The total area of disturbance should be shown on the plan.

\*The Mifflin County Conservation District representative indicated his office received an application for an individual NPDES permit.

\*\*The total area of disturbance is 9.8 acres. An individual NPDES permit has been submitted to the MCCD. The total area of disturbance is shown on the C105 Erosion and Sediment Control Plan.

#### **Other Comments:**

1. Has the township required the developer/owner to enter into a development agreement in accordance with Article 7, Section 7.400 of the Armagh Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance?

\*\*The Township has not yet required the Developer, Owner to enter into a developer agreement but the review is still ongoing. We contacted the Township and have not received guidance on the agreement to date, but will comply as requested.

2. Has the Township Engineer reviewed this project, including assurance the plan meets the Township's Stormwater Ordinance? If so, are there written comments available?

\*\*The Township Engineer is currently reviewing the plan.

3. The plan is difficult to review since the lines and notes are almost all in grey.

\*\*The difficulty in reading the plan is noted-the plans were plotted by an outside source and appear to have been plotted lighter than our typical plans. We will adjust for future submissions.

4. A Planning Commission representative asked whether there will be additional employees as a result of the office addition.

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

Name of Plan: Zook, John D & Hostetler, John J.E. & Barbara  
File Number: 2019-01-006  
Tax Map #: 12-09-0109D  
Municipality: Armagh Township  
Applicant Name: Zook, John D & Hostetler, John J.E. & Barbara  
Land Owner Name: Zook, John D & Hostetler, John J.E. & Barbara  
Plan Preparer: Wright Land Surveying

### **Plan Summary:**

This plan proposes to add a seasonal 512 sq. ft. cabin to be served by a privy to the property. The existing residence is served by a privy and a private water source.

\*One asterisk represents comments generated at the January 17, 2019 Subdivision and Land Development Review Committee meeting.

\*Planning staff indicated our office had discussions with a Township Official who indicated the structure has been either partially or completely constructed. He added there was a stop work order issued to the owner. It was suggested the project narrative be changed to reflect this is an after the fact land development application.

### **Administrative**

The property was last subdivided in 2012.

The plan should be labeled a land development plan and not a subdivision.

\*Planning staff noted the deed lists 1/2 the interest in the property in favor of John D. Zook, while the other half is in the interest of John J.E. and Barbara M. Hostetler. The signature of John D. Zook should be added to the application.

### **Basic Plan Information**

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

There appears to be one abutter with no information in the NE corner. The County GIS records show no information is available.

### **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.

### **Soils**

Note #2 identifies some hydric soils.

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

There is an unnamed lane that links to Havice Valley Road. The right-of-way/cartway width should be shown. Does this lane have a name? If so, it should be labeled on the plan.

\*The Wright Surveying representative indicated there is no right-of-way or cartway width.

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

### **Cartway Widths**

Based upon the Armagh Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, the cartway width of Havice Valley Road and Treaster Havice Valley Road are substandard (Table 1).

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

There are two existing driveway openings to the property.

**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 Wright Surveying representative indicated there is no shared driveway since it is all owned by the same people.

**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 (Sections 6.302a6 and 6.302.b7).

\*The Wright Surveying representative indicated there are none.

**DEP Sewage Planning Module**

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

**Water and Sewage Service**

All subdivisions are to be served by adequate water supply and sewage systems (Sections 3.213 and 6.202.a10 of the Armagh Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance). The plan does not show provisions for the existing shop, the existing house, or the proposed cabin.

**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 Armagh Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, (Section 6.202.a10).

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 Armagh Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, (Section 6.202.a9).

**Land Development**

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

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

**Other Comments:**

1. The Mifflin County Planning and Development Office indicated we received a complaint regarding this project from a nearby property owner. Armagh Township officials indicated the cabin is partially constructed and this is an after-the-fact land development project.
2. Planning staff recommended the project narrative should reflect the fact the structure is partially constructed versus a proposed land development project.
3. It is not clear how the proposed cabin will access the public road system. Please identify how access will be provided.

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

Name of Plan: Shank, Bonnie K., Sunderland, Mark A. & Duane Scot

File Number: 2019-01-007

Tax Map #: 12-16-0104P; 12-16-0104T

Municipality: Armagh Township

Applicant Name: Shank, Bonnie K., Sunderland, Mark A. & Duane Scot

Land Owner Name: Shank, Bonnie K., Sunderland, Mark A. & Duane Scot

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.

\*One asterisk represents comments generated at the January 17, 2019 Subdivision and Land Development Review Committee meeting.

**Administrative**

This property was subdivided in November 2004 and July 2018.

**Basic Plan Information**

One of the abutters, Steve Wallace, t.m. 12-16-0104TC is listed on tax records as Bonnie K. Shank and Mark Sunderland with a different tax parcel number, t.m. 12-16-0104T. Please verify this.

\*The Wright surveying representative indicated this property sold in August 2018 and the current owner has been verified by instrument number 2018-00302. The information on the survey is correct.

**Subdivision Information**

Note no. 1 stated Lot B was from a prior subdivision and not resurveyed.

Armagh Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Section 3.207, Table 1) requires a minimum of one acre for a single-family residence with public water and sewer. Lot 1 as the residue will now have .517 acres and will likely necessitate a waiver from Armagh Township.

\*The Wright Land Surveying representative indicated the Township is allowing less than one acre parcels, because there is a community sewage disposal area on one of the lots in the subdivision and he will add this to the plan.

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)

**Clean & Green / Agriculture**

Tax parcel 12,16-0104P 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.

As noted in Note 8, the property is in an Agricultural Security Area and should be noted on the plan.

**Floodplain / Wetlands**

As noted in Note 5, wetlands are present on Lot A.

As noted in Note 6 and according to County GIS information, the property lies within the 100-year floodplain. Future development in this area should be discouraged.

**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 is shown and listed in Note 7.

**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**

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).

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.

**Cartway Widths**

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

**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 (Sections 6.302a6 and 6.302b7).

\*The Wright Surveying representative stated other than the road easement there are no other easements or deed restrictions.

**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 on lot 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 6.202a10.

**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.

**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 Armagh Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, (Section 6.202.a9).

\*The Wright Surveying representative stated yes.

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 Armagh Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, (Section 6.202.a10).

\*The Wright Surveying representative stated yes.

**Other Comments:**

This property has been subdivided several times over the past few years. Are there further plans for additional subdivisions and at what point will the private roads need to be upgraded?

\*The Wright Surveying representative stated no further activity is proposed at this time and is unsure if any additional activity will occur.

**Bratton Township (County Ordinance)**

Name of Plan: Stryker, Gary & Marlene

File Number: 2019-01-008

Tax Map #: 13-03-0120AA; 13-03-0116

Municipality: Bratton Township

Applicant Name: Stryker, Gary & Marlene

Land Owner Name: Stryker, Gary & Marlene

Plan Preparer: Juniata Valley Land Surveying, Ron F. Booher, PLS

**Plan Summary:**

The purpose of this plan is to subdivide from parcel T.M. # 13,03-0120AA Lot 2 (Subdivision recorded as Instrument # 2018-4128 page 2) proposed lot 3, lot 3 is a lot addition to T.M. 13,03-0116 in Bratton Township, Mifflin County. No new construction or improvements are going to be made at this time; hence, a non-building waiver is proposed as Lot 3 will be for agricultural use. After subdivision, the gross acreage of 211.7320 acres less Lot 3 will result in Lot 2 = 188.2835 acres and Lot 3 = 23.4485 acres.

\*One asterisk represents comments generated at the January 17, 2019 Subdivision and Land Development Review Committee meeting.

\*\*Two asterisks represent written responses dated January 16, 2019 and revised plans provided January 22, 2019 by the Booher Land Surveying representative.

\*\*\*Three asterisks represents comments generated at January 24, 2019 Mifflin County Planning Commission meeting.

#### **Administrative**

The narrative is not correct. This proposal involves taking a portion of the Stryker property (t.m. 13-03-0120AA) and adding it to the Renninger property (13-03-0116).

\*\*The revised plan narrative was corrected to reflect the lot addition from tax parcel 13,03-0120AA to the Renninger property, tax parcel 13,03-0116.

The property was last subdivided in September 2018, which was an update to a plan presented in January 2018.

\*Planning staff noted the Booher Land Surveying representative provided preliminary responses to the County's preliminary comments.

#### **Subdivision Information**

The area directly east of the Nichole D. Elder property, tax parcel 13,03-0118-000 should be identified on the plan. This area appears to be part of tax parcel 13,03-0120AA.

#### **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.

#### **Topographic information**

Topography information is not on the plan, but can be exempt when the proposal is a lot addition.

#### **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.

#### **Setback Lines**

The setback lines should be shown on the plan as prescribed in the Mifflin County Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Section 7.302. A10). It is a little unclear the setbacks as shown on the plan.

\*\*The revised plans show the setback lines.

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

Since Lot 3 is being added to the Renninger property, how do they access the public street system?

\*\*The Booher Land Surveying representative indicated the Renninger parcel has a Lane on the north portion of the property to Licking Creek Drive. This information must be shown on the plan.

Based upon the Mifflin County Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, the right-of-way width of Licking Creek Road is substandard (Section 4.204 F).

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

Deed restrictions and easements associated with the property, if any, should be provided in accordance with Sections 7.302.A.6 and 7.302.B.7 of the Mifflin County Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance.

\*\*The Booher Land Surveying representative indicated the only easement is the 350" Pennsylvania power lines as noted on the plan.

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

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

#### **Water and Sewage Service**

There is no on lot water or sewage information for any of the lots. There is a Note 5 about future development will require a land development plan.

\*\*The Booher Land Surveying representative noted there is no water or sewer or testing on lot 3 and the Renninger parcel has a cabin but it's uncertain if water or sewer is there.

\*\*\*The Booher Land Surveying representative indicated the Renninger property is served with a well and septic system.

#### **Lot Addition**

A lot addition plan should include an inset map. An inset map is a general location map of sufficient size and detail for the Commission to readily determine geographically where the subdivision, or lot addition, is proposed. (See Mifflin County Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, Section 7.302.A.24)

A lot addition statement should be noted on the plan stating the following on the plan:

"Lot # \_\_\_ consisting of \_\_\_ acres is to be added onto land owned by \_\_\_\_\_. Lot # \_\_\_ is a lot addition and shall become an integral part of the property owned by \_\_\_\_\_. Lot # \_\_\_ is not a building lot and cannot be maintained or developed as a separate individual lot." (See Mifflin County Subdivision Ordinance Section 7.302.A.22)

\*\*The revised plans have a lot addition statement on the plan.

#### **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. (Mifflin County Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, Section 7.302.A.26.)

\*\*\*The Booher Land Surveying representative stated all are shown.

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. (Mifflin County Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, Section 7.302.A.20)

\*\*\*The Booher Land Surveying representative stated all are shown. However, a Planning Commission member stated the cabin on the Renninger property is not shown and should be.

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

Name of Plan: Kish Bank Operations Center

File Number: 2019-01-002

Tax Map #: 14-01-115B; 14-01-115C

Municipality: Brown Township

Applicant Name: Kish Bank

Land Owner Name: Kish Bank

Plan Preparer: Herbert, Rowland & Grubic, Inc.

#### **Plan Summary:**

The project generally consists of the development/redevelopment of two adjacent lots. The existing Kish Bank branch office is proposed to be demolished and replaced with a fast food restaurant. The existing Kish Bank Financial Center is proposed to be converted into the new Kish Bank branch office. The lot previously home to the Dutch Country Restaurant is proposed to be the new site of the +/- 35,000 s.f. Kish Bank Operations Center. Associated with the project is infrastructure such as site grading, access drives, stormwater management facilities, erosion and sediment controls, water/sewer/electric/natural gas utilities, etc.

\*One asterisk represents comments generated at the January 17, 2019 Subdivision and Land Development Review Committee meeting.

#### **Administrative**

There is an authorized signature for Kish Bank. However, the signature of William Hayes, the parent parcel of tax parcel 14,01-0115 is not on the application. Is the signature of the landowner representing both Kish Bank and the William Hayes property?

\*The signature for William Hayes must be provided.

**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 plan should have a narrative description explaining the intent of the project in accordance with the Brown Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Article 7, Section 7.302A.1).

**Subdivision Information**

Based on County Assessment and GIS records, tax parcel 14,01-0115C contains 1.81 acres, while the deed indicates 2.0831 acres excepting out land taken by the Commonwealth of PA by eminent domain in January 1997. The County's GIS and assessment records show tax parcel 14,01-0115 having 100.33 acres. The deed for tax parcel 14,01-0115 shows a total of 201 acres excepting out land for the Reedsville Fire Company, Kish Bank and the Valley Observer Corporation. It appears 1.596 acres is being taken from tax parcel 14,01-0115 as a lot addition subdivision to be added to Lot 1. The acreages of County files do not appear consistent with the acreage displayed on sheet 6 of 20.

The deed for tax parcel 14,01-0115B (DB 181 Pg 237) shows 1.160 acres while the plan shows this area as Lot A having 1.04 acres. Also, the deed for tax parcel 14,01-0115B (DB 236 Pg 549) shows a total of one (1) acre. There appears to be some question about the 0.19 acres situated between Lot A and Lot B which is being conveyed to Lot B. Overall, the subdivision acres appear inconsistent with the County Assessment, GIS records and deeds from the Recorder of Deeds Office.

The Planning and Development Office is not indicating the acreage figures are incorrect, only that there appears to be inconsistencies with County records. These parcels throughout the years also appear to have been part of eminent domain proceedings by PennDOT, thus perhaps complicating the acreage figures through the years.

Property boundary information should be provided for the entire property including the residual lot 2, in accordance with the Brown Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Article 7 Sections 7.302 A.5.,A.7. and A.9.).

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.

**Clean & Green / Agriculture**

Tax parcel 14,01-0115-000 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**

Based on County GIS files and general notes 14 and 15, there are no wetlands or floodplains associated with the parcels for this project.

**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.

**Setback Lines**

The C-H Commercial Highway District has a 25' side yard setback. Assuming Gateway Drive is the front of the financial branch office building, it appears the structure is in the side yard setback. A decision whether a variance is required or whether it is possible to reorient the building should be discussed with the Township Zoning Officer.

**Right-of-Way Widths**

Based upon the Brown Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, the right-of-way width of SR 0322 should be shown on the plan (Article 7, Section 7.202A.11).

Based upon the Brown Township Road Ordinance, the right-of-way width of Gateway Drive is substandard (Part 4, Section 41).

The private access drives A and B appear to have s 35 foot easement or right-of-way and a 24 foot cartway.

\*The Kish Bank representative indicated it is an easement not a right-of-way.

**Cartway Widths**

The cartway width of SR 0322 should be shown on the plan in accordance with the Brown Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, (Article 7, Section 7.202A.11).

Sheet 6 of 20 states SR 0655 has a variable cartway width. The range of the cartway should be shown on the plan in accordance with the Brown Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, (Article 7, Section 7.202A.11).

**PennDOT HOP / Municipal Driveway Permit**

If there is any existing HOP permit for the existing access points onto SR 0655, they should be listed on the plan.

A Clear Sight Triangle and Sight Distances should be shown on the plan for any new access onto a State Route.

A notation about the requirement stating: Any new 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 HRG representative indicated there will be a pre-scoping meeting with PennDOT regarding the HOP permit. It was mentioned the County should be extended an invitation to this meeting.

**Private Street / Shared Driveway**

Is there a shared driveway agreement in place for Gateway Drive and access drives A and B? If not, 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 HRG representative indicated there is a shared driveway agreement in place for these drives.

**Deed Restrictions and Easements**

According to survey Note 7 on sheet 5 of 20, there are no known deed restrictions or easements associated with the property.

**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 Brown Township Municipal Authority 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 (MABL) acknowledging availability of public water should be submitted to the Brown Township Planning Commission.

**Signature Blocks on Plan**

The Mifflin County Review Certificate should have one line stating "Plan Tracking Number" and one stating "Chairman or Designated Representative".

**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 Brown Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, (Article 7, Section 7.302A.29).

\*The HRG representative indicated all are shown.

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 Brown Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, (Article 7, Section 7.302A.23).

\*The HRG representative indicated all are shown.

**Land Development**

Sheet 2 of 20 uses parking requirements for office, business, or professional for the restaurant. The Township's

Zoning Ordinance (Article XVII, Section 1703) stipulates one parking space for every two seats plus one per employee on largest shift. This parking requirement is a subcomponent of the restaurant use. How many seats are proposed for the fast food restaurant?

\*The HRG representative indicated there are 30 seats and 5 employees on the largest shift.

The plan does not show lighting provisions as required in the Brown Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Article 4 Section 4.203 J).

Has the Township required a developers agreement to ensure all components of the project are installed?

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

\*The HRG representative indicated no.

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

\*The HRG representative indicated no.

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

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

What is the total area of earth disturbance? This should be shown on the plan. If this plan proposes an acre or more of earth disturbance, an NPDES permit is required.

\*The HRD representative indicated 5.83 acres of land will be disturbed. He indicated the NPDES permit will be submitted soon. The Mifflin County Conservation District Representative stated HRG and his staff had a preconstruction meeting and it will be an individual NPDES permit.

Has the Township Engineer reviewed the plan for compliance with the Township's stormwater management provisions?

\*The HRG representative indicated the Township Engineer has reviewed the plan and provided comments and they can provide his comments to the Planning and Development Department.

#### **Other Comments:**

1. There does not appear to be any documentation regarding traffic. If this development will generate 50 or more peak hour trips or 300 total trips per day, a traffic impact study is required in accordance with the Brown Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Article 4, Section 4.216). Will the LOS levels for SR 0655 or 0322 be impacted as a result of this land development?

2. There is no landscape plan.

3. Has there been any consultation with the residential development across State Route 0655 regarding the potential impacts to their residences, traffic and noise?

\*The KISH Bank representative indicated they will be making a presentation to the Mifflin County Industrial Development Corporation soon and there will be public meetings with the Township in order to disclose the details for this project.

4. Sheet 2 mentions a proposed future expansion of 12, 000 square feet, which is not shown on the plan. Will a second land development plan be submitted in the future?

\*The HRG representative stated the 12,000 square foot addition will be completed as a separate land development plan at a later time.

5. Sheet 2 calls for 157 required parking spaces for the proposed operations center, yet the parking provided for calls for 136 spaces. The plan appears to comply. The applicant can merge the parking from the three commercial uses together to come up with 201 spaces. The parking for the fast food restaurant needs to be accounted for separately since it will not likely accommodate bank customers. How will this be addressed?

6. The proposed operations center calls for a lot coverage of 70.8% while the Township's Zoning Ordinance allows a maximum of 70%. How will this be accommodated unless the applicant will be requesting a zoning variance.

7. Will dumpsters be provided for the restaurant and bank buildings? If so, they should be shown on the plan including any type of screening material.

\*The HRG representative indicated there is an area noted for a dumpster pad for the fast food restaurant and the financial buildings will shred their paper, however, there will be a dumpster for other generated waste.

\*The HRG representative indicated he will provide written responses to the County's preliminary comments.

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

Name of Plan: Hartzler, Benjamin B. & Jenette M.

File Number: 2019-01-011

Tax Map #: 14-10-0102; 14-10-0102A

Municipality: Brown Township

Applicant Name: Hartzler, Benjamin B. & Jenette M.

Land Owner Name: Hartzler, Benjamin B. & Jenette M.

Plan Preparer: Taptich Engineering and Surveying

#### **Plan Summary:**

This project involves the consolidation of two existing tax parcels (14-10-0102 and 14-10-0102A). This consolidated lot will be improved with a proposed warehouse (material storage) building. This 60' x 80' structure will utilize public water and on lot sewage (both existing onsite). Access to this proposed structure will be via the existing access developed off of Green Lane. The current improvements include an existing single family residential dwelling. This structure will remain, unchanged.

#### **Administrative**

The landowner's signature needs to be on the subdivision application form. Although there is a signature on the applicant line, it appears that the signature is someone other than the landowner.

The narrative should indicate the plan also involves land development, although there is mention that a 60'x 80' structure is proposed.

#### **Basic Plan Information**

All abutters should be shown on the plan, including tax map numbers in accordance with the Brown Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Article 7, Section 7.302A.17).

#### **Subdivision Information**

Instrument 2009-000001, which is a deed for tax parcel 14,10-0102 and 14,10-0102A, shows two parcels. Parcel No. 1 contains 1.436 acres while parcel No. 2 shows 0.276, totaling 1.712 acres. The plan does not show any of the acreage and the application indicates a total area of 2.10 acres. This should be clarified since the acreages don't match the deeded acres.

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

#### **Floodplain / Wetlands**

According to County GIS information and as indicated in Note 4, the property does not lie within the 100-year floodplain.

According to County GIS information and as indicated in Note 3, the property does not lie within a designated wetland.

#### **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.

Since a building lot is proposed, soil information should be shown on the plan in accordance with the Brown Township Subdivision Ordinance (Article 7, Section 7.302A.10).

**Setback Lines**

It appears the front of the proposed building will be within the front setback. The Zoning Officer should determine if this will require a variance or can the structure be reoriented to meet the setback?

**Cartway Widths**

Based upon the Brown Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Part 4, Section 41), the cartway width of Green Lane is substandard.

**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.

Has the Township Road master approved the access drive from Green Lane?

The plan notes access to the warehouse will be from the existing access developed off Green Lane. The plan should show the location of the drive from Green Lane.

**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, Sections 7.302B.7 and 7.302A.6).

**DEP Sewage Planning Module**

Since the existing on lot septic will be used, will PA DEP sewage planning modules be applicable?

Will the existing septic system service both the house and the warehouse?

**Water Service**

The water supply location should be noted on the plan as prescribed in the Brown Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Article 7, Sections 7.202A.10 and 7.302A.23).

**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.” in accordance with the Brown Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Article 7, Section 7.302.A.25).

**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 Brown Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, (Article 7, Section 7.302A.29).

It appears there are numerous structures on tax parcel 14,10-0102A that are not shown on the plan and should.

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).

**Land Development**

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

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

A traffic circulation diagram should be included with this plan submission to verify adequate site circulation.

Will there be any exterior lighting?

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

Parking provisions should be indicated on the plan as provided for in the Brown Township Zoning Ordinance.

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

Name of Plan: Heeter, Beverly L.

File Number: 2019-01-010

Tax Map #: 20-12-021; 20-12-024

Municipality: Decatur Township

Applicant Name: Heeter, Beverly L.

Land Owner Name: Heeter, Beverly L.

Plan Preparer: Wright Land Surveying

### **Plan Summary:**

This plan proposes to create Lot 2 and Lot Addition A. Lot 2 is for existing sylvacultural/recreational use. Lot Addition A is to be added onto Lot A and become an integral part thereof. Lot A is currently vacant woodland. The residual tract, Lot 1, is currently vacant woodland. No new development is being proposed by this plan.

\*One asterisk represents comments generated at the January 17, 2019 Subdivision and Land Development Review Committee meeting.

### **Administrative**

This plan is partially in Snyder County. Since there is no review stamp on the plan, have they been presented a copy of the plan?

### **Basic Plan Information**

The plan only provides Snyder County tax parcel numbers, but no Mifflin County tax parcel numbers for the portion of the parcel in Mifflin County.

\*The Wright Surveying representative indicated he will add the Mifflin County numbers.

### **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. (Decatur Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance Sections 603.2A (5), (9), (12))

How many acres are in Mifflin County?

### **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.

### **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 this site and development in these areas should be discouraged.

### **Soils**

There is no soil information on the plan since no construction is proposed.

### **Setback Lines**

The setback lines should be shown on the plan as prescribed in the Decatur Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Section 603.2A (10)).

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

Paul Heeter Lane is a private lane that supposedly connects with the public road system, Parthemer Road. This connection to the public road system should be shown on the plan.

### **Cartway Widths**

Based upon the Decatur Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, the cartway width of Paul Heeter Lane is substandard (Part 3, Table 1).

The cartway width of Paul Heeter Lane is only 12 feet wide and does not meet the road provisions of the Decatur Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Part 3, Table 1). Since the parcel has the potential for future development, road improvements should be considered prior to further development. At a minimum additional cartway should be provided by the applicant as a condition if there is future development along this road.

**Private Street / Shared Driveway**

The plan makes note of Deed Book 2012-2022. Aside from the right-of-way, does this deed provide for a private maintenance agreement for the road if multiple parties use the road? If not, one should be in place.

\*The Wright Surveying representative indicated he will provide a copy of the maintenance agreement.

**Deed Restrictions and Easements**

Deed restrictions and easements associated with the property, if any, should be provided in accordance with the Decatur Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance. (Sections 603.2A (6) and 603.2B (7))

\*The Wright Surveying representative indicated there are none.

**DEP Sewage Planning Module**

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

**Water and Sewage Service**

There are not provisions for on site water and sewage shown for Lot 1, 2 or Lot A. If they are present, they should be displayed on the plan. If not, the plan should state that a land development plan would be required prior to any further development. See Decatur Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, Section 602.2.A. (10).

\*The Wright Surveying representative stated there is no water or sewer present and he will add the statement regarding future development will require land development.

**Signature Blocks on Plan**

A signature block should be on the plan acknowledging the review and approval by West Beaver Township and Snyder County.

\*The Wright Surveying representative stated a Township signature block is not required only Snyder County's.

**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 Decatur Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, (Section 602.2A (10)).

\*The Wright Surveying representative stated all are shown.

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, (Section 602.2A (9)).

\*The Wright Surveying representative stated all are shown.

**Menno Township (Municipal Ordinance)**

Name of Plan: Peachey, Norman I. & Sadie A.

File Number: 2019-01-009

Tax Map #: 18-09-0112

Municipality: Menno Township

Applicant Name: Peachey, Norman I. & Sadie A.

Land Owner Name: Peachey, Norman I. & Sadie A.

Plan Preparer: Wright Land Surveying

**Plan Summary:**

This plan proposes to create Lot 2 for a single-family residence to be served by on-lot sewage disposal and private well. The residual tract, Lot 1, has two existing residences with no new development proposed.

**Administrative**

The subdivision application form should be signed by the municipality.

**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. (Menno Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance Sections 6.302.a6, a9 and a12)

**Clean & Green / Agriculture**

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

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.

**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. Hydric soils can indicate the presence of wetlands. Note 2 lists the hydric soils associated with the plan.

**Right-of-Way Widths**

Based upon the Menno Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, the right-of-way width of Front Mountain Road is substandard (Section 3, Table 1).

**Cartway Widths**

Based upon the Menno Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, the cartway width of Front Mountain Road is substandard (Section 3, Table 1).

**PennDOT HOP / Municipal Driveway Permit**

Note 4 calls for a municipal driveway permit.

**Deed Restrictions and Easements**

Deed restrictions and easements associated with the property, if any, should be provided in accordance with the Menno Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance. (Sections 6.302.a.6. and 6.302.b.7.).

\*The Wright Surveying representative indicated there are none.

**DEP Sewage Planning Module**

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

**Water Service**

Lot 1 shows one well servicing one of the existing houses. Does that same well serve the second house? If not, the well location should be noted on the plan.

\*The Wright Surveying representative indicated the well serves the second home and the barn.

**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 Menno Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, (Section 6.302.a9).

\*The Wright Surveying representative indicated all are shown.

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 Menno Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, (Section 6.302.10 )

\*The Wright Surveying representative indicated all are shown.

**Land Development**

A building permit will be required for the proposed house prior to construction.

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

Name of Plan: K&C Realty Development, LLC

File Number: 2019-01-001

Tax Map #: 20-14-0107, 0108, 0109, 0110, 0101, 0106  
Municipality: Union Township  
Applicant Name: K&C Realty Development, LLC  
Land Owner Name: K&C Realty Development, LLC  
Plan Preparer: Wright Land Surveying

**Plan Summary:**

This plan proposes to create Lot 2. Lot 2 has an existing single-family residence served by public sewer and public water. No new development is being proposed by this plan.

\*One asterisk represents comments generated at the January 17, 2019 Subdivision and Land Development Review Committee meeting.

**Basic Plan Information**

Based on discussions with the Wright Surveying representative and information from the Recorder of Deeds Office, there appears to be four (4) recorded deeds for the subject parcels. These were recorded on October 11, 2018, September 5, 2018, August 29, 2018 and December 12, 2018.

Tax parcels 20,14-0101-000, 20,14-0110-000; and 20,14-0109-000 all have separate acreages attached for each parcel and are not being combined as depicted on the insert map. The narrative does not clearly depict the intent of this lot addition subdivision and it should.

The narrative needs to be clarified and include provisions for lot 1 and how portions of it are being used to create 2.

All abutters should be shown on the plan, including tax map numbers. (Union Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, Article IV, Section SS403.1.d).

**Subdivision Information**

The creation of lot 2 appears to combine tax parcels 20,14-0107-000 and 20,14-0106-000. If this is the intent, the lot line separating both should be shown as being extinguished. Since there appears to be two lot additions, the lot addition language should be added to the plan.

Property boundary information should be shown for the entire property including the residual, lot 1 in accordance with the Union Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Article IV Section 402.1. a.).

The lot consolidation symbol should be removed from the insert map. This appears to tie all the parcels together which is not the intent.

**Floodplain / Wetlands**

According to Note 4 and County GIS information, the property is not located within a designated wetland.

According to Note 4 and County GIS information, the property is not located within the 100-year floodplain.

**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**

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.

**Setback Lines**

It appears the existing house is within the building setback and can be considered an existing non-conforming structure.

**Right-of-Way Widths**

Based upon the Union Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, the right-of-way width of South Kishacoquillas Street Township Road 468 is substandard (Article V, Section 501.2).

**Cartway Widths**

Based upon the Union Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, the cartway width of South Kishacoquillas Street Township Road 468 is substandard (Article V, Section 501.2).

**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.

**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 Wright Surveying representative indicated there are none.

**DEP Sewage Planning Module**

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

**Sewage Service**

The sewer line should be shown on the plan in accordance with the Union Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Article IV, Section 402.1.d).

**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 402.1.d).

**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 Union Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, (Article IV, Section 402.1.e).

\*The Wright Surveying representative indicated all are shown.

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 Union Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, (Article IV, Section 402.1.d).

\*The Wright Surveying representative indicated all are shown.

**Union Township (Municipal Ordinance)**

Name of Plan: Zook Masonry  
File Number: 2019-01-004  
Tax Map #: 20-13-0317  
Municipality: Union Township  
Applicant Name: Zook, John L. & Allyson J.  
Land Owner Name: Zook, John L. & Allyson J.  
Plan Preparer: Wright Land Surveying

**Plan Summary:**

John L. and Allyson J. Zook (owners of Zook's Masonry) are proposing to construct a new storage building on a semi-pervious area of their tract situated in Union Township, Mifflin County, Pennsylvania. The proposed structures, 60' x 120; (7,200 s.f.), is to be constructed over an existing parking lot area of tax parcel 2013-0317-,000 as indicated on the Mifflin County parcel viewing map. All disturbances for the proposed structures will be solely located on the proposed lot. All boundaries and features are shown on the "existing conditions plan, as surveyed by William Wright P.L.S. of Wright Surveying (Bearing title of "Subdivision Plan for John L. and Allyson J. Zook", dated December 21st, 2018). The development is proposing onsite stormwater facilities (recharge trench) as well as the construction of a perimeter retaining wall along portions of the southwesterly and southeasterly property line of the site. The stormwater facilities have been designed to comply with municipal and county ordinances. No water or sewerage services are necessary for the proposed development. The only utilities necessary for the facility will be underground electric service for lighting or vehicles.

The minor subdivision plan proposes to create Lot Addition B3 to be added onto Lot B and for a 7,200 sq. ft. quonset hut to be added to Lot B. The residual tract, Lot A, has an existing residence served by public sewer and public water with no new development proposed.

\*One asterisk represents comments generated at the January 17, 2019 Subdivision and Land Development Review Committee meeting.

**Administrative**

These tax parcels involved two minor subdivisions, lot additions, which were reviewed by the Mifflin County Planning Commission on November 29, 2018.

**Floodplain / Wetlands**

According to County GIS files and Notes 3 and 4 on the subdivision plan prepared by William Wright, no wetlands or floodplains are mapped on these parcels.

**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.

**Setback Lines**

As noted in General Note 6 of Sheet Si1-2 for the land development portion of this project, the existing office building is within the side yard setback and can be considered existing nonconforming.

**PennDOT HOP / Municipal Driveway Permit**

It is acknowledged in Note 5 on Sheet Si 1-1 that the driveways shown are existing and will not require any improvements or alterations; therefore, no PennDOT permitting is required.

A Clear Sight Triangle and Sight Distances should be shown on the plan for any new access onto a State Route.

A notation about the requirement stating: Any new 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.

**Deed Restrictions and Easements**

As noted in General Note 8 on sheet Si1-2 all known covenants and easements are shown.

**DEP Sewage Planning Module**

Please confirm or deny that no sewage planning is required for this project.

\*The Metz Engineering representative indicated none is required.

**Sewage Service**

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

The existing sewer lines are shown along SR 655 but would service be available if required?

\*The Metz Engineering representative stated the existing building is served by public sewer and sewer service is not needed for the storage facility.

**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 existing water lines are shown along SR 655 but would service be available if required?

**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."

**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.

\*The Metz Engineering representative stated all are shown.

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.

\*The Metz Engineering representative stated all are shown.

Is there a fire hydrant near the property?

\*The Metz Engineering representative stated there is a hydrant within 500 feet of this facility near the intersection of Mechanic Street and SR 655.

**Land Development**

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

\*The Metz Engineering representative stated no.

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

\*The Metz Engineering representative stated no.

A traffic circulation diagram should be included with this plan submission to verify adequate site circulation. Parking provisions need to be clarified and updated. Note #10 calls for 26 spaces required based on 5,200 square feet, yet the new building is 7,200 square feet. Please confirm the correct number of spaces. It is also not clear what the square footage of the existing building is and what parking is required there.

**E & S / Stormwater**

Has the Township Engineer reviewed this project?

\*The Metz Engineering representative indicated Dan Taptich has reviewed the plan.

**Public Comment**

None

**Other Business or Comments**

Bill is looking to extend the Juniata River Trail. The Visitor's Bureau has authorized a contribution towards the professional services. There is a short time window to complete the two grant applications needed to fund the trail. The applications will be due in April and May. Bill is looking for additional funding for engineering and permitting fees.

The Parks and Recreation Council wants to explore a feasibility study that would study a connection between Victory Park, Rec Park and Kish Park. The study would also review a connection between Victory Park and the Stone Arch Bridge

Bill has secured Rick Vilello to speak at the annual dinner on April 4<sup>th</sup>. He is the Deputy Secretary for Community Affairs and Development at DCED and former Mayor of Lock Haven.

**Adjournment**

Upon no further discussion, the meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m. upon a motion by Michele Bair, which was seconded by Neal Shawver.