

**MINUTES**  
**MIFFLIN COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING**  
**FEBRUARY 22, 2018**  
**MIFFLIN COUNTY COURTHOUSE, MEETING ROOM B – 3:30 P.M.**

**ATTENDANCE**

Members

Michele Bair  
Jason Cunningham  
Dan Dunmire  
Dave Pannebaker  
Neal Shawver  
Jim Spendiff

Cyle Vogt

Staff

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

Other

Jim Saylor, SEDA-COG  
Michelle Brummer, Gannett Fleming  
Steve Dunkle, Mifflin County Commissioner  
Alyssa Burd, The Sentinel  
Kelly Shutes, Derry Township  
Dave Filson, Derry Township Planning Commission  
via teleconference  
Adam Claar, The EADS Group  
via teleconference  
Mike Lefevre, Geisinger  
via teleconference  
Nancy Craig, Mifflin County School District  
via teleconference  
Tom Zurat, PennDOT  
via teleconference  
Carey Mullins, PennDOT  
via teleconference

**Call to Order**

Dan Dunmire, Vice Chair, called the meeting to order at 3:35 p.m.

**Record of Public Attendance**

Dan reminded everyone to sign the attendance sheet.

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 Michelle Bair. All members voted aye.

**Electric Avenue-Mill Road Intersection Improvement Study**

Dan Dunmire introduced Michelle Brummer of Gannett Fleming who presented the Electric Avenue-Mill Road Intersection Improvement Study. This study began in late August of 2017. The Electric Avenue-Mill Road intersection has been a location of concern for quite some time. The 2014 Comprehensive Plan looked at this intersection among several others and recommended it for further review. Although there have been few crashes and no fatalities since 1997, there are frequent near-misses. The purpose of this study was to look at practical ways to address the intersection with relatively low cost, high benefit options before there is a severe crash or fatality. One of the study objectives was to look at a practical, low cost improvement. The study initially looked at Mill Road and later, the Electric Avenue corridor. The EADS Group was the lead engineer of the study. Throughout the process, many people were engaged, including the Planning Office, Derry Township, Lewistown Borough, SEDA-COG, PennDOT, Penelec, and public outreach. Current information was collected on traffic. Preliminary

improvement options were reviewed, ranked and presented to the public. The overall ideas of the report have been agreed to by the committee with minimal language changes to the report itself.

Ms. Brummer reviewed the study's key findings and proposed improvement alternatives. Closure of Mill Road was quickly ruled out due to public sentiment, including concern for first responders. The final three alternatives all included improvements to the ramp, including pavement markings and signage since this was raised at the public meetings. Alternative #1 restricts left turns from Mill Road with signage and a partial concrete island. Alternative #2 restricts left turns from Mill Road and channelizes and offsets left turns along Electric Avenue. This alternative was unconventional and might be confusing to drivers. Alternative #3 restricts left turns to and from Mill Road with signage and a concrete island. A ramp realignment alternative was also considered as a long-term solution that could be paired with either Alternative #1 or #3. The next step for a ramp realignment is a point of access (POA) study. The second public meeting produced many suggestions on ramp alternatives, but these suggestions would be multimillion dollar projects. This study, however, was focused on Mill Road and Electric Avenue and not redesigning the interchange.

The committee concluded that enhanced signage, operational improvements (restrict left turns) and minor physical improvements could be phased with evaluation to determine whether the next level of improvement is needed. The committee ranked their recommendations, which first included working with PennDOT to provide the traffic control improvements to the ramp to include pavement markings, moving the stop sign and stop bar, and a flashing beacon light. Further pursuit of funding and programming of intersection improvements to restrict left turns to and from Mill Road, which is Alternative #3, was the second recommendation. The committee also encouraged targeted police enforcement of this area. The fourth recommendation was to recommend relocation of the "All traffic must turn right" sign within the McDonald's parking lot. This was an incidental finding of the study as a safety consideration, but at this time a response from McDonald's would be voluntary. The last recommendation was to share the conceptual ramp realignment alternative for PennDOT's action on a point of access study and any future improvement.

The smaller ramp improvements would cost approximately \$7,000 with additional minimal engineering costs. PennDOT could be asked to help with this. Liquid fuel funds could also help with this. Alternative #3 is estimated to cost \$209,061, including engineering. Pennsylvania multimodal funds that are tied to two different grant agencies could be used to help pay for this option.

Jim Spendiff questioned if there was any consideration for a roundabout in this area. Ms. Brummer responded that this option may have been brought up, but it did not get serious or developmental attention. Adam Claar of The EADS Group added that there are too many complications to construct a roundabout in this area due to the businesses and close proximity of traffic signals at Ort Valley and Third Street.

Bill Gomes added that the proposal from the committee was suggested to proceed with the limited ramp improvements through the County while applying for a multimodal application to restrict left turns in and out of Mill Road as described in Alternative #3. The rest of the information gathered in the study will be shared with PennDOT. Dave Filson added that the recommendations could be phased in stages depending on PennDOT's reception of some of the possibilities listed. Some recommendations may take longer to pursue and find funding.

Kelly Shutes submitted a letter from Derry Township Supervisors since they were asked to approve the study. The supervisors thoroughly reviewed the study and attended some of the public meetings. The only concern is the last recommendation asking for further studies to realign the ramp. She reminded

everyone that Mill Road and the ramp belong to PennDOT. The township does not wish to pursue any further studies related to the ramp. They do like Alternative #3 and the short-term ramp improvements. The supervisors do not think it is fiscally responsible to further evaluate the ramp, even for PennDOT. They do not feel there are enough safety issues to warrant further reviews that may not go anywhere. The supervisors did approve the study with the noted concerns. Bill will have the letter inserted into the Appendices of the report.

Dave Filson added that every suggestion is limited due to funding. He stressed that if the conceptual suggestion is not shared, we will not know PennDOT's position and whether there is funding available to support the recommendation. The recommendations do not financially obligate anyone to actually implement the recommendation. The committee left the door open for PennDOT to review the ramp realignment and possibly suggest any funding sources. Mike Lefevre of Geisinger also stated that sharing the conceptual alternative is not a big deal and does not mean anyone has to do anything. Cyle Vogt added that this study does not bind anyone, but sharing the information is worthwhile.

Bill will ask the Commissioners to approve the study at their next meeting on March 1<sup>st</sup> and thanked the Mill Road committee members for their time and efforts.

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

Six plans were submitted to the committee for review, five under Municipal Ordinance and one under County Ordinance. The five plans under Municipal Ordinance included D.L. King Transport Land Development (*Armagh Township*); Peachey, Marlin J. Land Development (*Brown Township*); AgChoice Farm Credit (*Brown Township*); Waters Edge Campground (*Derry Township*); and Matthew R. & Rebecca S. Swarey (*Union Township*). The plan under County Ordinance was Dale D. & Rose M. Vaughan (*Wayne Township*).

Jim Lettiere reviewed four plans in further detail, including the D.L. King Transport Land Development plan. Jim received updated comments and these were shared with the Planning Commission. This project involves the construction of a 24' x 100' (2,400 s.f.) semi-truck maintenance and repair facility along with an adjoining 35' x 100' (3,500 s.f.) supporting office area. Jim's concern with this plan is the land disturbance issue. Land disturbance greater than one acre requires an NPDES permit. Floyd Ciccolini of the Mifflin County Conservation District cautioned the engineer that he has the authority to shut the job down if the earth disturbance exceeds one acre. The engineer subsequently reduced the potential disturbance from 0.8914 acres to 0.7662 acres. Neal Shawver questioned the future expansion shown on the plans and what is the stop mechanism to prevent future expansions. Jim Lettiere responded that the plan narrative states that future expansions require separate submission for approval. Dan Dunmire stated that the law looks at the life of the project. Phasing is allowed to a point, but DEP may come back and take a look at it. Bill questioned if a comment could be added that future development will require an NPDES permit. Dan said this cannot be added as a comment since he is still stating less than one acre. Moving equipment and staging area is included as part of the overall earth disturbance. Dan also added that the original development at the Milroy Business Center was covered under an NPDES permit, which was renewed once or twice. However, since nothing happened with the land, the owner did not continue to renew the permit since he does not want the responsibility. The individual lot owners are now responsible for permitting. Dan asked if Commerce Drive was a township road, to which Jim replied that it is.

Jim then reviewed the AgChoice Farm Credit plan in Brown Township. He also asked for extra time to review the email transmittal he has received in response to the Subdivision Review Committee's comments. This plan proposes to develop a credit union building with related parking and stormwater accommodations. This plan is near the Sheetz in Brown Township and Jim will remove the comment under Sewage Service that states "Will sewer service be provided by Union Township?" This parcel was rezoned from industrial to commercial highway, but left Kerstetter Drive as industrial zoning, creating split zoning in the same parcel. Prior to the zoning hearing, the Planning Department recommended against this decision to the township.

Jim will correct the comment that references the Township Zoning Administrator to reflect the correct title of Township Zoning Officer. Dan questioned the area of disturbance, since it is not listed on the plan. Jim will add the comment, "Please indicate area of disturbance." Jim Spendiff also questioned why they need a retaining wall. Cyle Vogt asked if they have to screen the dumpster. Jim Lettiere responded that he is not sure if it is a requirement, but will add the question as a comment.

The third plan Jim reviewed was the Waters Edge Campground in Derry Township. Jim noted that Derry Township and the Township Solicitor required the filing of this plan. The purpose of this plan is to illustrate the current conditions and improvements of the property, listings of any previous approvals/permit related to land use ordinances and to place a plan on record at the Mifflin County Recorder of Deeds office. There are no site improvements proposed by this plan. The plan does not show the cartway or right-of-way widths. The Zoning Hearing Board, based on a recommendation from the Township Engineer, required removal of a structure (a pirate ship play area) from the 100-year flood plain.

The last plan reviewed was the Marlin J. Peachey Land Development plan for a hog farm in Brown Township. The owner is proposing to construct a new finishing barn, gravel areas, access drive and infiltration basin. One concern of this plan is whether or not the well would be sufficient for the hogs and if the hog farm will have an adverse impact on the surrounding water. Dan thought one hog needs 10 gallons of water per day and this plan proposes 4,000 hogs. Jim has not received a written response to the comments. Dan added that the CAFO is pending with DEP.

Neal Shawver made a motion to accept the comments of the five plans under municipal ordinance while allowing Jim Lettiere additional time to review the response to the AgChoice Farm Credit plan. Tom Lake seconded the motion. All members voted aye.

Neal Shawver made a motion to conditionally approve the comments of the Dale D. & Rose M. Vaughan plan in Wayne Township under the county ordinance. Dave Pannebaker seconded the motion. All members voted aye.

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

Name of Plan: D.L. King Transport Land Development  
File Number: 2018-02-001  
Tax Map #: 12-02-0209-000  
Municipality: Armagh Township  
Applicant Name: King, Daniel L.  
Land Owner Name: King, Daniel L.  
Plan Preparer: Thomas H. Metz Engineering, Inc.

#### **Plan Summary:**

The project involves the construction of a 24' x 100' (2,400 s.f.) semi-truck maintenance and repair facility along with an adjoining 35' x 100' (3,500 s.f.) supporting office area. A proposed bituminous parking lot and access drive with the main drive thru being of 24 feet width with internal circulation drives being 25 feet for a total of 23,968.441 s.f. Total impervious area is 29,868.441 (0.6857 acres). Total area of disturbance is 33,371.31 s.f. (0.7662 acres). Existing and land use for the past 50 years is agriculture to 100%. Stormwater facilities consisting of an existing swale and an existing stormwater basin have been previously designed to maintain the required differential runoff per Mifflin County Zoning Ordinance per the recent subdivision plan conducted by Accadia, State College, PA on plan titled Armagh Business Center Final Subdivision Plan of Phase 1. It shall be the sole responsibility of the owner to operate and maintain the stormwater facility and all associated stormwater control structures and devices. Armagh Township and Mifflin County shall have the right to enter the property at a reasonable hour to inspect the stormwater facility. Location of a future expansion 65' x 100' adjoining repair facility is indicated on the plan. Construction of the expansion will require separate submission for approval. (Mifflin County does not have a Zoning Ordinance)

\*One asterisk represents comments generated by the Subdivision and Land Development Review Committee meeting on February 15, 2018 and revised plans and a response letter to the County's preliminary comments from Thomas H. Metz dated February 14, 2018.

#### **Subdivision Information**

The Engineer, Land Surveyor and Geologist Registration Law Act of May 23, 1945 P.L. 913, No 367 (I. 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.

\*The proposed is a Land Development plan, not a subdivision plan. As referenced on Sheet Si-1, General Notes, Note #1, Property tract perimeter information is taken from a recent subdivision plan as conducted by Accadia, State College, PA on a previously approved plan titled Armagh Business Center, Final Subdivision Plan of Phase 1.

#### **Floodplain / Wetlands**

Based on the County's GIS files and plan note 9, the site is not located in the 100-year floodplain or a designated wetland.

#### **Soils**

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

\*Portions of this property are situated within prime farmland soils as indicated on both this and the previously "Approved" Subdivision and Land Development Plan as prepared by Accadia, State College, PA.

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

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

\*Commerce Drive right-of-way width and cartway width were established via previously approved subdivision plan as submitted by Accadia, State College, PA on a plan titled Armagh Business Center, Final Subdivision Plan and Phase 1 and does not pertain to this Land Development Plan.

#### **Cartway Widths**

Based upon the Armagh Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, the cartway width of Commerce Drive is substandard (Article 3, Table 1).

\*Commerce Drive right-of-way width and cartway width were established via previously approved subdivision plan as submitted by Accadia, State College, PA on a plan titled Armagh Business Center, Final Subdivision Plan and Phase 1 and does not pertain to this Land Development Plan.

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

As noted in general note 17, a municipal driveway permit is required, and a copy should be provided to the Armagh Township Supervisors.

\*Upon Armagh Township issuing the municipal HOP permit, Armagh Township shall keep a copy for their records.

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

According to the Engineer of Record, the site is governed under the covenants, conditions and restrictions for the Armagh Business Center recorded in Book 0468, page 3311. A copy must be provided in accordance with the Armagh Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Article 6, Section 6.202.a.18.)

\*As noted on Sheet Si-1, note #25 declaration of covenants, conditions, and restrictions for Armagh Business Center have previously been recorded on Book 0468, page 3311 to which Armagh Township received a copy during the previously approved subdivision plan referred to above.

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

If the project is to utilize public sewer and the estimated flows on the parcel are equivalent to two dwelling units or more, a DEP Component 3, or Exemption from Sewage Planning (Mailer), should be provided.

\*The sewage has previously been accommodated for all taps have been installed per "As-Built" drawings of the previous subdivision plan. Owner will be required to pay the tap-on fee.

#### **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).

\*All natural features are shown per Armagh Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, Article 6,

Section 6.2-2.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 Armagh Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, (Article 6, Section 6.202a.10).

\*All man made features are shown per Armagh Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, Article 6, Section 6.2-2.a.10

**Land Development**

It appears this development is governed under the declaration of covenants, conditions and restrictions for Armagh Business Center recorded in Book 0468, page 3311. One of the provisions is that driveways must be 25' from the property line unless driveway access is shared by two adjoining lots. Will this driveway be shared with any adjoining lot?

\*The proposed driveway (s) will not be a shared driveway. The proposed driveway as indicated via 25' radius shall be 25' from the property line.

Another provision is there is a thirty-five (35) foot green space setback from the property line for all areas fronting a proposed street. The plan does not appear to show a 35' green space along Commerce Drive.

\*Added "35' Green Space" text to the indicated building setback line per the declaration of covenants, conditions and restrictions for Armagh Business Center.

\*A member of the Review Committee pointed out this provision applies to a "proposed street". The plan does not propose a street, therefore, this provision may not be applicable and should be left at the discretion of the Armagh Township Supervisors.

**Other Comments:**

1. The Township Engineer should review the plan to ensure it meets the Township Stormwater Management Ordinance.

\*Plan has been submitted to the Armagh Township Engineer (EADS Group, Lucas Parkes)

2. General note 6 refers to parking areas per Mifflin County Zoning Ordinance. The County does not have a zoning ordinance. The County Subdivision Ordinance does have a recommended standard for a parking space but this would not apply to this development.

\*Revised general note 6 to correctly refer to the Mifflin County Subdivision Ordinance and added the term "recommended" being that it is a non-mandated recommendation.

3. It is not clear what the source of the parking standards are. Since the Township does not have commercial setback standards, we are assuming the developer is using the residential setback requirements. If so this should be noted.

\*Mifflin County SALDO Section 4.214A states that lot area for commercial, industrial, and institutional land uses shall be sufficient size to incorporate all design elements of this ordinance (parking, sewage disposal, water supply, landscaping etc.). At a minimum the lot size and setbacks shall correspond with those provisions for a single-family home. Therefore utilized Armagh Township SALDO 3.207. Table 2 (b) as noted on General note 8 which is the single-family requirements.

\*Please note Armagh Township SALDO 3.207. Table 2 (a) [there is no Table 2 (b)], are minimum lot standards for residential subdivisions not parking standards, although the explanation answers the question.

4. As indicated by the Mifflin County Conservation District, any equipment on staging areas would not be permitted outside the line of disturbance. There is the potential, if the area of disturbance exceeds one (1) acre or more, an NPDES permit will be required.

\*Per conversation with MCCD, the proposed land development plan has been reduced to avoid the potential of exceeding one (1) acre. Limits of disturbance are now 0.7662 acres as opposed to the previous 0.8914.

5. Has the Township required a development agreement for the project?

\*No

6. Only part of the proposed building dimensions are labeled and this should be shown.

\*The second dimension has been omitted from the plan for the purpose of minimizing "cluttered lines". The rectangular building area is provided along with one side dimension. It is therefore assumed to be understood.

7. Are there letters from the water and sewer authorities' acknowledging the availability of both utilities?

\*Addressed in DEP Sewage Planning Module response above.

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

Name of Plan: Peachey, Marlin J. Land Development  
File Number: 2018-02-003  
Tax Map #: 14-08-0100A-000  
Municipality: Brown Township  
Applicant Name: Peachey, Marlin J.  
Land Owner Name: Peachey, Leon A. & Elsie R.  
Plan Preparer: G. D. Keener, LLC/G. David Keener, PE

#### **Plan Summary:**

The Owner is proposing to construct a new finishing barn, gravel areas, access drive and infiltration basin at 328 Coffee Run Road, Brown Township, Reedsville, PA 17084. The total lot size is approximately 118.6 acres and is an agricultural use. Proposed land use is agricultural. The total disturbed area is 7.6 acres and 116,741 square feet (2.68 acres) of new impervious area will be added. The improvements and impervious coverage will be managed by an infiltration basin which has been sized to provide volume and rate control.

\*One asterisk represents comments generated from the February 15, 2018 Subdivision and Land Development Review Committee meeting and responses from Mr. Keener the Engineering representative. Mr. Keener indicated he plans on providing written responses to the preliminary comments, then wait until after the Brown Township Planning Commission meeting on February 22, 2018 prior to making revisions to the plan.

\*\*Two asterisks represent written responses based on the February 15, 2018 letter from G. David Keener, P.E.

#### **Basic Plan Information**

The tax parcel numbers for all abutters are missing the first two digits, which should be 14. These numbers should be affixed to the plan.

\*\*These comments will be addressed by the applicant on the final plan.

A plan narrative should be placed on the plan and there should be a brief description stating the purpose of the project. It is not clear what the land development project consists of, although there is a statement under zoning relative to the special exception approval for an intensive agriculture use and a brief statement within the Post Construction Stormwater Management Report. (See Article 7 Section 7.302. A.1. of the Brown Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance).

#### **Subdivision Information**

The Engineer, Land Surveyor and Geologist Registration Law Act of May 23, 1945 P.L. 913, No 367 (I. 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 deed plotting of the farm has been provided. The drawings include an engineering land survey which will be sealed by the project engineer. A waiver of this requirement may be required.

#### **Clean & Green / Agriculture**

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

\*\*Acknowledged.

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 general note 16 and in accordance with the County's GIS files, none of the improvements are located in the 100-year floodplain or a designated wetland. Although portions of the residue are within the floodplain.

\*\*Acknowledged.

**Topographic information**

A small portion of the site outside of the proposed development has steep slopes (grades over 15%). Future development in these areas is discouraged.

\*\*Acknowledged.

**Soils**

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

\*\*Acknowledged.

According to the County GIS files, some portions of this property outside of the proposed development appear to have hydric soils. Hydric soils can indicate the presence of wetlands. The hydric soils information should be shown on the plan.

**Setback Lines**

In accordance with the Brown Township Zoning Ordinance, the minimum lot area in the Agricultural District for parcels without public water and public sewer is 60,000 square feet, or 1.378 acres, not 50 acres as noted under zoning on sheet number one.

\*\*The note will be revised accordingly.

**Right-of-Way Widths**

Based upon the Brown Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, (Part 4, Section 41), the right-of-way width of Coffee Run is substandard.

\*\*Acknowledged.

**Private Street / Shared Driveway**

Will the access driveway be 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."

\*\*There will be no shared driveway proposed.

**Deed Restrictions and Easements**

Deed restrictions and easements associated with the property, if any, should be provided in accordance with Brown Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Article 7, Section 7.302B.7).

\*\*Acknowledged.

**DEP Sewage Planning Module**

A DEP Component 2 Form should be provided.

\*\*No additional sewage flows.

**Sewage Service**

Are the probe areas potential designations for on lot septic? If not, will there be on lot septic? If so, the test pits should be shown in accordance with the Brown Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Article 7, Section 7.302A.23).

\*\*The probes were shown for the stormwater infiltration only.

**Water Service**

Will the existing well provide water for all of the existing and new buildings?

\*A Subdivision and Land Development Review Committee representative had concerns regarding the capacity of the proposed well not only serve the animals but the potential impact on surrounding water supplies. It was not conclusive as to how many gallons of water per day would be necessary to operate the facility. Mr. Keener indicated he will look further into this and provide this information, and assured the Committee the farmer will



ensure there are adequate water supplies for the facility and it would not adversely impact surrounding water supplies.

\*\*A new well is proposed for the proposed barn.

#### **Signature Blocks on Plan**

The signature block for the Mifflin County Planning Commission is not accurate. A copy of the certificate language can be emailed to the Engineer of Record.

\*\*Acknowledged.

#### **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 blocked area on sheet 2 appears to be existing buildings.

\*\*Acknowledged.

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).

#### **Land Development**

The parking areas and drive lanes do not appear to be on the plan. Can the development meet the parking requirements of the Township Zoning Ordinance?

Are there outside lighting provisions?

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

How will agricultural vehicles maneuver on the site? A traffic circulation diagram should be included with this plan submission to verify adequate site circulation.

\*\*Additional information will be provided as requested.

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

As noted in general note 21, an erosion and sediment control plan and an NPDES permit have been submitted to the County Conservation District.

\*\*Acknowledged.

#### **Other Comments:**

1. Has an odor management plan been submitted and approved by the PA Conservation Commission?

\*\*Yes.

2. Does this facility meet the provisions of a Concentrated Animal Feeding Operation (CAFO)? If so, has a permit been issued by the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (PA-DEP)?

\*\*Yes. The permit application has been submitted.

3. Has the Township Engineer reviewed the plan regarding stormwater management? If not, it should be reviewed by the Township Engineer.

\*\*Acknowledged.

4. How many swine heads will there be?

\*\*4,800. Based on information provided by farmers on other projects, the typical water usage is approximately 3 gallons per day per head.

5. The plan should have an insert map to clearly show where the proposed 7.6 acre site is situated on the lot.

\*\*Acknowledged.

6. The applicant's designer is apparently using an aerial overlay for sheet 3 and it is difficult to read or fully determine what is on the site. A clear plan layout should be provided for an easier review of the plan. This same statement would apply to sheet 8.

7. Were there any conditions associated with the Zoning Hearing Board approval for the special exception?

\*\*No.

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

Name of Plan: AgChoice Farm Credit  
File Number: 2018-02-006  
Tax Map #: 14-01-0106-000  
Municipality: Brown Township  
Applicant Name: AgChoice Farm Credit  
Land Owner Name: Unique, Inc.  
Plan Preparer: PennTerra Engineering, Inc.

#### **Plan Summary:**

This plan proposes to develop a credit union building with related parking and stormwater.

\*One asterisk represents written responses in a letter dated February 22, 2018 from Mark A. Magrecki, RLA with Penn Terra Engineering.

\*\*Two asterisks represent the County's responses to the February 22, 2018 letter.

#### **Administrative**

The County's Assessment, GIS files and Recorder of Deeds Office list the current owner as Unique Inc. A representative from AgChoice Farm Credit signed as the landowner. Has there been a recent deed to transfer the property from Unique to AgChoice? If not, the property owner Unique will need to sign the application. Will AgChoice be purchasing the land as equitable owner?

\*Agchoice is the equitable owner of the parcel and has it under contract. We will obtain a signature from Unique Inc. on the application and forward this to the County.

#### **Basic Plan Information**

This parcel involved previous subdivision and land development plans in 2007, 2008, 2013, 2014 and 2015 for storage units, Sheetz's, and a PennDOT maintenance facility.

The abutters David R. Kerstetter and Valley LLC Gateway Self Storage are not depicted and should be in accordance with the Brown Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Article 7, Section 7.302A.17).

\*The land of David Kerstetter tax parcel 14,01-0106C is located on the existing conditions plan, sheet 2. We have updated the plan to include Valley LLC Gateway Self Storage as an adjoiner.

#### **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.

\*All required professional seals shall be on the plan prior to recordation. This shall include the professional land surveyor seal.

#### **Floodplain / Wetlands**

As noted in general note 7 and according to the County GIS files, the property is not within the 100-year floodplain and not within a designated wetland.

\*Noted.

#### **Soils**

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

\*Noted.

**Setback Lines**

The retaining wall along the eastern portion of the parking lot may be considered a structure as defined in the Brown Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Article II definitions). If the Township Zoning Administrator determines the wall as a structure, it currently does not meet the front yard setback of twenty-five (25) feet. This may require a dimensional variance.

\*The Brown Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Article II definitions) has no definition for "wall", "structure", "front yard" or "yard". The origin of this comment is unclear. A Brown Township review is pending. The issue shall be addressed if the Township makes the comment.

\*\*The County acknowledges reference to the Township's SALDO was incorrect. A structure, yard and front yards are defined in the Brown Township Zoning Ordinance (Article II Section 201). The County encourages the Township Zoning Officer to make a determination regarding this comment.

**Right-of-Way Widths**

Based upon the Brown Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, the right-of-way widths of Sheetz and Kerstetter Drives should be shown on the plan (Article 7, Section 7.202A.11). Kerstetter Drive should be labeled on the plan.

\*All applicable public road dimensions are applied to Sheetz Drive. Kerstetter Drive is a private drive not dedicated to the Township and not intended for public use. The Brown Township Subdivision and Land Ordinance provided no right-of-way dimensions associated to private drives.

\*\*The Brown Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Article 7, Section 7.202A.11) states all existing streets on or adjacent to the tract, including name, right-of-way width and pavement width. A street is defined in the Brown Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Article 2 Section 2.200) which states in part "streets includes avenue, boulevard, road, highway, freeway, parkway, lane viaduct, and any other ways used or intended to be used by vehicular traffic or pedestrians whether public or private, but shall not include an alley".

**Cartway Widths**

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

\*All applicable public road dimensions are applied to Sheetz Drive only.

\*\*The Brown Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Article 7, Section 7.202A.11) states all existing streets on or adjacent to the tract, including name, right-of-way width and pavement width. A street is defined in the Brown Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Article 2 Section 2.200) which states in part "streets includes avenue, boulevard, road, highway, freeway, parkway, lane viaduct, and any other ways used or intended to be used by vehicular traffic or pedestrians whether public or private, but shall not include an alley".

**Private Street / Shared Driveway**

It appears Sheetz Drive will be shared for this project and the existing Sheetz convenience store. 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."

\*Sheetz Drive is no longer a private drive. Attached to this letter is the Zoning Amendment dated February 5, 2018 amending the Industrial Zoning District and dedication of Sheetz Drive to Brown Township.

**Street Names**

This building will need to be assigned an address through the GIS (Mapping Department). There is a fee associated with this process.

\*Noted.

**Deed Restrictions and Easements**

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

\*General Note #9 on the cover sheet addresses no known deed restrictions or easements associated with the property and references Instrument #2015-3874.

**DEP Sewage Planning Module**

If the project is to utilize public sewer with flows on the lot of 2 equivalent dwelling units (EDUs) or more, a DEP Component 3, or Exemption from Sewage Planning (Mailer), should be provided.

\*Noted, an exemption request for sewage planning is pending.

#### **Sewage Service**

Has the Brown Township Sewer Authority issued a will serve letter for the project?

\*A sewer capacity request for 90GPD was mailed on February 5, 2108 and a signed capacity request was received on February 16, 2018. A copy is attached to this letter.

The plan references the Union Township Municipal Authority. Will sewer service be provided by Union Township?

\*All references to Union Township have been revised to Brown Township

Has the Municipal Authority of the Borough of Lewistown (MABL) issued a will serve letter?

\*A water capacity letter was mailed February 5, 2018 confirmation pending.

#### **Signature Blocks on Plan**

The Township Certification mentions the Township of Granville while it should be the Township of Brown.

\*The cover sheet has been reviewed and all signature blocks are revised to read "Brown Township".

#### **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).

\*All natural and manmade features are represented on the plans.

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).

\*All natural and manmade features are represented on the plans.

#### **Zoning**

A portion of the parcel and portions of Sheetz Drive were recently rezoned from Industrial to C-H Commercial Highway. Sheets 2-7 inclusive refer to industrial zoning on the parcel, which should be eliminated from the plan. Kerstetter Drive, which is part of the subject parcel has industrial zoning and should be designated as such.

\*The zoning line is revised as noted. The zoning addendum is attached to this letter. See response under heading, Private Street/Shared Driveway

#### **Land Development**

There should be a notation on the plan that all future designated building additions that meet the definition of land development as defined in the Brown Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance Article 2 require the filing of a land development plan.

\*General note 10 is added to the cover sheet stating this matter.

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

\*Acknowledged.

Is there any lighting associated with the parking lot?

\*Sheet 6 titled lighting plan illustrates the light totals casted into the parking lot. The lighting plan meets the Brown Township required standard.

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

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

\*Noted, a Township review is pending.

It is not clear if the area of disturbance is greater than one acre. If land disturbance is greater than one acre, an NPDES permit is required.

\*Acknowledged.

**Other Comments:**

1. The off-street parking requirement in accordance with the Brown Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance requires one space per every 250 square feet of gross floor area. The gross square footage of the building is 7,829 square feet. The requirement is 32 spaces. The plan provides 38, exceeding the minimum standard. This figure was determined through a manual count of spaces provided.

\*Acknowledged.

2. The plan site data on sheet 1 should include information on the number of parking spaces being created.

\*A parking data chart is provided on the cover sheet.

3. It would be helpful if the plan narrative provided a little more detail of the project.

\*Acknowledged.

4. The square footage of the building at a minimum should be shown on sheet 3 of the plan.

\*The building square footage is noted on the Layout Plan, Sheet 3.

5. Since this lot incorporates Kerstetter Drive, will Kerstetter Drive be used for the Ag Choice Farm Credit facility? If so, there should be a shared drive or private street agreement in place for its use and maintenance. If there an easement agreement in place for tax parcels 14,-01-0106A and 14,-01-0106C to use Kerstetter Drive this should be noted on the plan.

\*Kerstetter Drive is a private driveway not proposed for Township dedication and not proposed for use by AgChoice. The applicant has no intention, now or in the future, to connect the private drive with Sheetz Drive.

\*\*The letter references changes made to the plan, however, the County has not received revised plans as of February 27, 2018, therefore, the County can not verify the validity of whether these revisions have been made.

**Derry Township (*Municipal Ordinance*)**

Name of Plan: Waters Edge Campground

File Number: 2018-02-002

Tax Map #: 16-36-0112-000; 16-36-0112A-000; 16-36-0404-000

Municipality: Derry Township

Applicant Name: Tate, Jeffery L. & Connie E.

Land Owner Name: Tate, Jeffery L. & Connie E.

Plan Preparer: ELA Group, Inc.

**Plan Summary:**

The purpose of this plan is to illustrate the current conditions and improvements of the property, listings of any previous approvals/permit related to land use ordinances and to place a plan on record at the Mifflin County Recorder of Deeds office. There are no site improvements proposed by this plan.

PROJECT BACKGROUND Waters Edge Campground is located on the south side of State Route 22 (approximately at the on/off ramps to the four lane section) and bounded by the Juniata River. This project was first reviewed by Derry Township in 2009. The adjoining properties include a generally vacant commercial parcel on the west side and vacant lands of PennDOT on the east side. The subject site is comprised of two parcels that total approximately 18.8 acres and is within the General Commercial (GC) zoning district.

Over the past several years, the campground site has undergone several planning and design initiatives with multiple consulting firms, including filing of a Land Development Plan in 2009 which was never formally approved or recorded. Over the years, several variances were approved by the Township Zoning Hearing Board to allow the campground and other setback issues. In recent years, ELA Group, Inc. has been engaged by the landowner to obtain sanitary sewer permits for two 2,500 gallon holding tanks (Permit Nos. 2003490 and 2003491), a driveway permit from PennDOT (HOP No. 0223366) and zoning variances.

The Land Development Plan filed by another firm in 2009 was not able to be approved due to the lack of a sanitary sewer disposal solution. Attempts to find an area on site suitable for an on-lot system

were not successful and the only available resolution was to obtain holding tank permits. The holding tank permits were restricted to 15 campsites per tank for a total of 30 campsites. Although there are more than 30 campsites developed in the campground, only 30 sites may be active at one time.

The Township is requiring that a Land Development Plan be approved and placed on record at the Mifflin County courthouse. Due to the restrictions of the number of active campsites per the holding tank permits, the Final Land Development Plan filed on January 31, 2018 basically illustrates the current condition of the campground. There are no improvements proposed as part of this Land Development Plan, beyond minor campsite modifications (reduction of campsites that encroach beyond the property line near the Juniata River and access drive on the western side) per the Zoning Hearing Board decision of June 27, 2017. The Land Development Plan includes a graphical illustration of potential campground development; however, until additional sanitary sewer disposal provisions and permits are obtained, no additional development can occur.

In addition to the filing of the Final Land Development Plan, Derry Township is requiring the project to proceed through a Conditional Use application and hearing which is to be concurrent with the Land Development Plan process.

\*One asterisk represents written responses from the ELA Group representative and a telephone conversation with the ELA Group representative held during the February 15, 2018 Subdivision and Land Development Review Committee meeting.

\*\*Two asterisks represent the County's responses to the written responses.

#### **Basic Plan Information**

The abutters for Snedeker Realty are showing the incorrect tax parcel number. Where is t.m. 16,36-0404?

\*Snedeker tax number is correct, just not the typical format. Parcel 16,36-0404 is the strip along the river and is labeled on the plan. Narrative can be added to the plan. Tax parcel 16,36-0112A provides the access from Route 22 to the other parcels. The format for the Snedeker parcel will be corrected on revised plans.

A plan narrative should be placed on the plan and there should be a brief description stating the purpose of the project. The plan only has note one, which may be similar to a narrative.

Is tax parcel 16,36-0112A part of the land development plan?

#### **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.

\*All survey data boundary and topographical features was performed by others and has been provided to ELA Group, Inc. (ELA). ELA will consult with the other to obtain any survey certifications as may be required.

Property boundary information should be shown for the entire property, including the residual property. (Derry Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance Section 403.2F) This property was surveyed previously and this information should be on the plan.

#### **Floodplain / Wetlands**

Note 3 mentions the property is in the floodplain and flood hazard demarcation is on the plan.

\*Noted, no response required.

#### **Soils**

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

\*Noted, no response required.

#### **Setback Lines**

A Zoning Hearing Board meeting was held in 2017 providing a variance for rear setback and existing access drive location.

\*Noted, no response required.

**Right-of-Way Widths**

Based upon the Derry Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, the right-of-way widths of Muskee Drive, Bull Frog Boulevard, Box Turtle Lane, Snapping Turtle Lane, Blue Heron Lane, Rock Bass Lane and King Fisher Lane should be shown on the plan (Section 403.2G).

\*It is our understanding that all of these are internal access drives and not streets even though the county has included names in the GIS mapping. Therefore, there is no requirement for a right-of-way.

\*\*The Derry Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance Part 2 Section 202. defines street as "includes street, avenue, boulevard, road, highway, freeway, parkway, lane, alley, viaduct or any other ways used or intended to be used for vehicular traffic or pedestrians, whether public or private". We are unaware of any exceptions to labeling and showing the right-of-way and cartway widths for campground drives or lanes even though they are private.

**Cartway Widths**

Section 311.1.5 of the Derry Township Zoning Ordinance provides for the minimum access drive width requirements. For a normal street, the cartway width is 24 feet, but for this type of facility, they need to be at least 12 to 15 feet with 15 feet recommended if trucks will be using the road.

\*These access drives are gravel and variable in width. To our knowledge, there are no issues with widths or maneuverability by the campground patrons. Many of the RV/trailers stay long term for the camping season and typical traffic in the site is passenger vehicles.

The cartway widths of Muskee Drive, Bull Frog Boulevard, Box Turtle Lane, Snapping Turtle Lane, Blue Heron Lane, Rock Bass Lane and King Fisher Lane should be shown on the plan (Derry Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, Section 403.2G).

\*\*The Derry Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance Part 2 Section 202. defines street as "includes street, avenue, boulevard, road, highway, freeway, parkway, lane, alley, viaduct or any other ways used or intended to be used for vehicular traffic or pedestrians, whether public or private". We are unaware of any exceptions to labeling and showing the right-of-way and cartway widths for campground drives or lanes even though they are private.

**PennDOT HOP / Municipal Driveway Permit**

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

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 Derry Township Planning Commission. Based on discussions with the developer, an HOP permit was issued and this information should be provided on the plan.

\*The Highway Occupancy permit number will be added to the plan.

**Private Street / Shared Driveway**

Note 6 provides that the road maintenance is the responsibility of the property owners.

\*Noted, no response required.

**Street Names**

The County GIS files list Muskee Drive, Bull Frog Boulevard, Box Turtle Lane, Snapping Turtle Lane, Blue Heron Lane, King Fisher Lane, and Rock Bass Lane. These should all be on the plan.

\*The access drive names will be added to the plan as requested.

**Deed Restrictions and Easements**

Deed restrictions and easements associated with the property, if any, should be provided in accordance with Sections 403.2.H and 403.7 of the Derry Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance.

\*To our knowledge there are no deed restrictions.

**DEP Sewage Planning Module**

A subdivision proposing more than 10 lots from the parent parcel is considered a major subdivision. A DEP Component 2 Form should be provided.

\*This is not a subdivision plan and there are not lots being proposed. DEP planning was previously done prior to the owner obtaining holding tank permits. The approval consists of two (2) 2,500 gallon PA-DEP approved holding tanks for 30 campsites.

**Features**

All significant natural features, including swales, ditches, trees, water courses, sinkholes, rock out-cropping, etc. should be shown on the plan. (Derry Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, Section 402.2I).

\*To our knowledge the only natural features not shown are the trees and vegetation masses. This was done for plan clarity as the site is well covered in tree masses.

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. (Derry Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, Section 403.2G).

**Zoning**

The Zoning Hearing Board on June 27, 2017 also approved existing structures in the floodplain with one exception.

\*Noted, no response required.

**Land Development**

Will there be lighting on the site considering the number of units? (See Section 411.14 of the Derry Township Zoning Ordinance). Are there provisions for fire suppression? Is there an emergency evaluation plan in place since the site is in a floodplain and a copy provided to the County Emergency Management Office?

Parking provisions should be indicated on the plan. There are several parking areas not labeled on the plan and the number of parking spaces is not defined. Please provide. See Section 411.3 of the Derry Township Zoning Ordinance.

If a private street is proposed, the plan should be reviewed by the Derry Township Engineer.

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

\*The plan reflects the current conditions of the campground which has been "operating" in this fashion for many years. There are no improvements proposed as part of this plan. There is an evacuation plan in place and provided to all patrons.

**E & S / Stormwater**

Stormwater drainage provisions should be included with the plan submission. The stormwater plan should be reviewed by the Derry Township Engineer.

\*Awaiting response from the Township engineer on the review of this plan.

**Other Comments:**

1. It is unclear that the plan as presented can meet Section 411 of the Township Zoning Ordinance.

--In particular, Section 411.3 on campsites being 1,500 sq. ft. since the lot sizes are not shown.

--It is also unclear about sewage and garbage collection provisions in Section 411.7 and there is only note 5 about the number of sites that can be used.

--Is there an office as provided for under Section 411.12 of the Township Zoning Ordinance?

\*Sewage is provided in holding tanks. Our understanding there is no regular garbage collection. There is no formal office. It is our understanding that all camp sites are reserved privately with the owner.

2. The site data section on sheet 1 needs to be more complete by listing the number of teepees, tents and camper sites as well as the average dimension of each lot.

\*There are 38 existing camp sites shown on the plan, of which one is a tee-pee. Any of the camp sites up to 30 being active at one time can either be used by an RV/trailer or a tent. There is no delineating currently.

3. Other than several parking areas, the plan mentions one spot per campsite, but that is not clearly shown.

\*The parking is informal; however, there is sufficient area available for more than 30 spaces.

4. The driveway access from SR 22/322 appears to cross t.m. 16-36-0112A. Is there an easement for this crossing?

\*There is no easement to our knowledge. He may grant himself an easement.

5. Are there 38 camp sites proposed or combination of tent sites? Please clarify and indicate on the plan.



\*Everything illustrates on Sheet 1 is existing. Plan note 5. explains this arrangement.

6. Sheet 1 is the site plan, but it is unclear why sheet 2 is even shown since it states a conceptual plan. Unless the applicant is requesting a review of this conceptual plan, it should be presented as a separate proposal at a later time. The focus should be to get the main campground into compliance.

\*The conceptual information was provided based upon previous discussion with the Township. This sheet can be eliminated if requested by the Township.

7. Please verify why there is a need for a conditional use approval for this project as mentioned in the narrative. The Township Zoning Ordinance Section 411 requires conditional use approval for campgrounds located in the R Rural and F Forest Zoning Districts. These parcels are zoned General Commercial.

\*ELA's understanding and interpretation of this ordinance is the same as stated, however, the Township Solicitor has indicated that a conditional use is required.

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

Name of Plan: Swarey, Matthew R. & Rebecca S.

File Number: 2018-02-004

Tax Map #: 20-01-0107BA

Municipality: Union Township

Applicant Name: Swarey, Matthew R. & Rebecca S.

Land Owner Name: Swarey, Matthew R. & Rebecca S.

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. This property was previously approved for 2 single-family residences by a plan recorded in Instrument # 2013-6113. The residual tract, Lot 1, has an existing residence with no new development proposed.

#### **Administrative**

It appears in 2013 tax parcel 20,-01-0107B was subdivided to create lot 2 for two single-family residences and lot 1 was the residue. Since then lot 2 sold and was assigned tax parcel 20,-01-0107BA, while lot 1 retained tax parcel 20-01-0107B. The proposed subdivision is to create lot 2 for one single-family residence on tax parcel 20,-01-0107BA. Please confirm.

#### **Basic Plan Information**

The plan and application list the wrong tax parcel number. It should be t.m. 20-01-0107BA, not 21-01-0107BA.

#### **Clean & Green / Agriculture**

As noted in Note 7, 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. Note 6 mentions hydric soils, which should be noted on the plan with soil information.

#### **Setback Lines**

What is considered the front setback since the lot is an extension to a private road, Swamp Hollow Drive?

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

Based on GIS maps, Swamp Hollow Drive is a private drive that connects with the William Swarey property (t.m. 20-01-0107B) and now appears to be extended to East Back Mountain Road. The new extension shows a proposed 50 foot right-of-way, but does that right-of-way also extend to the existing house on lot 1 that adjoins proposed lot 2?

#### **Cartway Widths**

Based upon the Union Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, the cartway width of Swamp Hollow Drive is substandard (Section 501.2). This is not adequate for two-way traffic. Can the cartway be widened?

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

Note 4 calls for a Highway Occupancy Permit that will be required to extend Swamp Hollow Drive to East Back Mountain Road.

**Private Street / Shared Driveway**

It appears Swamp Hollow Drive will be used by more than one property owner. Will the neighboring properties also use this road? 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**

Deed restrictions and easements associated with the property, if any, should be provided in accordance with Sections 402.2a and 401.1 of the Union Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance.

**DEP Sewage Planning Module**

It appears sewage facilities planning has been approved by permit number Z159148 for the new home on lot 2. Please confirm.

**Features**

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

**Other Comments:**

There is no clear road frontage other than the proposed road frontage on East Back Mountain Road. Are there provisions to construct the driveway extension to meet the existing Swamp Hollow Drive?

**Wayne Township (County Ordinance)**

Name of Plan: Vaughan, Dale D. & Rose M.

File Number: 2018-02-005

Tax Map #: 21-09-0117

Municipality: Wayne Township

Applicant Name: Vaughan, Dale D. & Rose M.

Land Owner Name: Vaughan, Dale D. & Rose M.

Plan Preparer: Wright Land Surveying

**Plan Summary:**

This plan proposes to create Lot Addition A to be added onto Lot 2 and become an integral part thereof. Lot 2 was previously approved May 5, 2003 and recorded in Plan Book 22 page 9, but has not yet been deeded off of Lot 1. Lots 1 & 2 each have an existing residence served by on-lot sewage disposal and private well. No new development is being proposed.

**Administrative**

The property was last subdivided in May of 2003.

**Clean & Green / Agriculture**

As noted in Note 5, 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.

**Right-of-Way Widths**

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

**Cartway Widths**

Based upon the Mifflin County Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Article 4 Section 4.204 F.), the cartway width of Ferguson Valley Road is substandard.

**PennDOT HOP / Municipal Driveway Permit**

Plan Note 7 mentions township driveway permits are required for any new access, and currently there are individual driveways for lots 1 and 2.

**Deed Restrictions and Easements**

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

**DEP Sewage Planning Module**

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

**Features**

There appears to be another building on the site based on GIS data. 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 Mifflin County Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, (Article 7 Section 7.302.A.20.).

**Public Comment**

None

**Other Business or Comments**

The invitations for the annual dinner have been mailed.

The statements of financial interest are due May 1<sup>st</sup>.

Bill asked the Planning Commission to consider providing support for the Electric Avenue/Mill Road Intersection Improvement study. Dave Pannebaker wanted to know why the project would be separated into different projects rather than doing everything at once, questioning why spend money in one area and then tear it up with another portion of the project. Cost considerations were the basis for a phased approach. Bill also noted that the chances of a ramp realignment are slim. No action was taken on this item.

**Next Month**

The next meeting will be held March 22<sup>nd</sup>.

**Adjournment**

Upon no further discussion, the meeting adjourned at 4:59 p.m. upon a motion by Dave Pannebaker.