

**MINUTES**  
**MIFFLIN COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING**  
**MAY 26, 2016**  
**MIFFLIN COUNTY COURTHOUSE, MEETING ROOM B – 3:30 P.M.**

**ATTENDANCE**

Members

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

Other

Lauren Kershner, The Sentinel  
Lucas Parkes, The EADS Group  
Stephen Dunkle, Mifflin County Commissioner  
Lisa Nancollas, Mifflin County Commissioner  
Kevin Kodish, Mifflin County Commissioner

Staff

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

**Call to Order**

Dan Dunmire, Chair, called the meeting to order at 3:36 p.m.

**Record of Public Attendance**

Dan reminded everyone to sign the attendance sheet.

**Approval of Meeting Minutes**

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

**Chesapeake Bay Program Reboot**

Dan Dunmire gave a presentation as to how changes to the Chesapeake Bay Program could affect the local Mifflin County Conservation District office. The Chesapeake Bay is the largest estuary in the United States and at one time, the most productive. The bay supported industry to harvest oysters and blue crabs. Back in the 1960s and 1970s, fisheries started to collapse as water problems surfaced with the Chesapeake Bay. The bay received too much sediment and was overloaded with nutrients of various sources, such as sewage treatment, on-lot septic, run off from agricultural land and urban stormwater. By 1985, the bay was going downhill fast. The surrounding six states and the District of Columbia formed a consortium to address the problems. Pennsylvania is the largest contributor to the sediment and nutrient problem with over half of the watershed located in Pennsylvania.

Since 1985, over \$4 billion was invested in Pennsylvania to clean up the agriculture side. Almost 34,000 farms are located in the Chesapeake Bay watershed. States set 10-year reduction goals, but were never able to attain those goals. There is more urban stormwater affecting the watershed due to urban growth.

In December 2010, the United States Environmental Protection Agency took over the bay cleanup effort and established a Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL), which was a pollution diet for the bay. Limits were set as to

how much sediment can pass through to the bay with a 25% reduction in nitrogen, 24% reduction in phosphorous and a 20% reduction in sediment. The target date to achieve these reductions is 2025, but by 2017, 60% of the goals must be reached as measured by best measurement practices. Pennsylvania is not achieving the set milestones. While we are on track to reduce phosphorous levels, we are behind on reducing nitrogen and sediment levels. The EPA warned at the beginning of the program that if a state was not meeting the goals at the end of a two-year interval, they would provide enhanced oversight. If goals were still not being met in another two years, backstop measures would be added to include withholding of federal funds and more direct EPA involvement with enforcement and permitting decisions. Pennsylvania has slipped into the category of backstop measures being required due to runoff from agriculture and urban stormwater. From 1985 through 2013, there has been a 25% reduction in phosphorous, 6% reduction in nitrogen and a 15% reduction in sediment.

The reboot of the Chesapeake Bay program will enforce existing agricultural erosion and sediment plans as well as manure management plans. Approximately 10% of farms were to be inspected each year for the existence of these plans. Unfortunately, this did not happen due to the Department of Environmental Protection being understaffed. Only 2% of the farms were actually inspected. DEP is now looking to the Conservation District Offices to perform the inspections.

By shifting the Conservation District Offices focus to agricultural compliance, this could jeopardize the trust that has been built based on providing assistance rather than enforcement. Under this new plan, the Conservation District Office could be looked at as the first face seen when dealing with compliance and enforcement issues. This role is not one that the Conservation District is happy with. They have until the end of June to let DEP know if they will participate. Of the 43 counties in the watershed, only a few have committed, including Clinton and Lancaster Counties. York, Franklin, Luzerne and Northumberland Counties have decided to not participate. Dan does not know how his board will vote and noted that they will probably wait until the last minute to decide.

Michelle Bair asked if the program reboot was related to a letter sewage treatments received many years ago. Dan stated it is related. Many plants were able to reduce nutrients; however, some larger urban plants are still being scrutinized.

Bill Gomes stated that Mifflin County has been proactive by adopting a stormwater management plan. Dan shared that MS4 (Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System) communities, which must meet population density thresholds of which none are in Mifflin County, require more than our plan. The EPA has increased inspection. Dan feels that in order to be more proactive, we would need to adopt something more comparable to what is found in an MS4 plan.

Kent Spicher asked how previously inspected farms would be handled under the new rules. Dan stated that larger operations, concentrated animal operations (CAO) and concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFO) are currently required to have a nutrient management plan and are inspected on a regular basis. Due to this, they will not be on the list of inspections.

Jim Spendiff questioned if Mifflin County is able to estimate its contribution to the sediment and nutrient runoff. Dan stated this is based on animal numbers and land use and not actual runoff. Conservation practices currently in use are factored in as well. Mifflin County ranks 13<sup>th</sup> in nitrogen delivered to the bay, 18<sup>th</sup> in phosphorous and 16<sup>th</sup> in sediment. Lancaster County is at the top of the list in all areas.

Last year's report on the bay was the best in years at an overall C-. There is more submerged aquatic vegetation and an abundance of life in the bay. Fisheries have come back as well as blue crab. Oysters remain at only 2% of historical abundance.

**Subdivision and Land Development Review Committee Report**

Jim Lettiere presented six plans to the committee for review. They were all under municipal ordinance (William S. Peters III, *Armagh Township*; Jeffrey M. Shawver, *Decatur Township*; William M. Steele II, *Granville Township*; James. A & Sonja A. Smith Sr., *Granville Township*; Republic Development Corp., *Granville Township*; and Mary Dorothy Aurand, *Granville Township*;). Jim reviewed two plans in further detail.

The first plan reviewed was Jeffrey Shawver in Decatur Township. The project involves the subdivision of one lot from the lands of Jeffrey Shawver. No further discussion ensued upon Jim’s reading of the comments for the plan.

The second plan reviewed was William Steele II in Granville Township. This plan proposes to create Lot Addition A to be added onto Lot A. No further discussion ensued upon Jim’s reading of the comments for the plan.

Tom Lake motioned to accept the comments of the six plans under municipal ordinance to include the revised comments for the William Peters plan provided by Bill Sarge. Tyler Gum seconded the motion. All members voted aye.

**Subdivision and Land Development Municipal Reports**

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

Name of Plan: Peters III, William S.  
File Number: 2016-05-001  
Tax Map #: 12,22-0103/12,01-0133  
Municipality: Armagh Township  
Applicant Name: Peters III, William S.  
Land Owner Name: Peters III, William S.  
Plan Preparer: Sarge Engineering and Surveying

**Plan Summary:**

The purpose of this plan is to add Lot A, of 0.354 acres, to the land of Michael F. Dilliard and Kristi I. Rittenhouse, Tax Parcel 12, 01-0133, from the land of William S. Peters, III, Tax Parcel 12, 22-0103.

**Subdivision Information**

The total acreage for the Dilliard/Rittenhouse property with the lot addition is shown but no property dimensions are provided. This information should be provided in accordance with (Article 6 Section 6.202 a.5., a.9., and a.12. and 6.302 a.7.) of the Armagh Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance.

\*The May 20, 2016 revised plan shows the property dimensions for the Dilliard/Rittenhouse property.

**Right-of Way Widths**

Based upon the Armagh Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, the right-of-way widths of North Main Street and Ryan’s Circle are substandard (Table 1).

**Cartway Widths**

Based upon the Armagh Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, the cartway widths of North Main Street and Ryan’s Circle are substandard (Table 1).

**Private Street / Shared Driveway**

Assuming Ryan’s Circle is a shared private drive, 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 May 20, 2016 revised plans in note 7. contain the shared driveway language.

**Deed Restrictions and Easements**

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

\*The Sarge Surveying and Engineering representative stated there are none.

**DEP Sewage Planning Module**

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

\*The Sarge Surveying and Engineering representative provided a copy of the DEP form.

**Water and Sewage Service**

Is there public water and sewer provided to T.M. 12-01-0133? If it is private or public it should be noted on the plan.

\*The May 20, 2016 revised plans in note 9. mentions both utilities serves this area.

**Signature Blocks on Plan**

The County Planning Commission Signature Block needs to be corrected. There should be a line for plan tracking number and a line for Chairman or designated representative.

\*The May 20, 2016 revised plans has the correct County Planning Commission's Review Certificate.

**Lot Addition**

A lot addition is considered a consolidation and therefore, results in the creation of two new lot configurations. Lot consolidation meets the definition of a subdivision according to the Municipalities Planning Code. Under these circumstances new deeds must be developed as part of the property transfer process and adequate information must be available in order to develop an accurate property description. The parent and recipient lots will still meet the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance requirements. Property boundary information should be shown for the entire property. Currently, no boundary information is provided for the Dilliard/Rittenhouse Property or T.M. 12-01-0133. 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 Armagh Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance Sections 6.202. a.5., a.9. and a.12.)

\*The May 20, 2016 revised plans shows the property dimensions for the Dilliard/Rittenhouse property.

**Features**

All significant man-made features, including water and sewer lines, petroleum lines, electric poles, telephone lines, fire hydrants, dumps, railroad tracks, fence lines, historic features, culverts, etc. should be shown on the plan in accordance with the Armagh Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, (Part 6 Section 6.202. a.10.)

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

Name of Plan: Shawver, Jeffrey M.  
File Number: 2016-05-006  
Tax Map #: 15-09-0100  
Municipality: Decatur Township  
Applicant Name: Shawver, Jeffrey M.  
Land Owner Name: Shawver, Jeffrey M.  
Plan Preparer: Taptich Engineering and Surveying

**Plan Summary:**

This project involves the subdivision of one (1) lot from the lands of Jeffrey M. Shawver. Lot #1 is presently vacant and is intended to be a stand alone lot. Access to Lot #1 will be via the proposed 50' right-of-way off of Shawver Road. The residue currently houses a single family residential dwelling and associated agricultural outbuildings. There are no improvements proposed to the residue at this time.

**Basic Plan Information**

The abutter, Kenneth Shreffler, Jr., has the wrong tax parcel number. It should be T.M. 15-09-0103B and not T.M. 15-09-0130B.

**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.

**Floodplain / Wetlands**

According to County GIS information, a portion of the residue lies within the 100-year floodplain, and the flood plain should be delineated on the plan. Future development in this area should be discouraged.

**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 should be discouraged.

**Soils**

According to the County GIS files, a portion of the residue appears to have hydric soils. Hydric soils can indicate the presence of wetlands. The hydric soils information should be shown on the plan.

**Setback Lines**

The setback lines should be shown on the plan as prescribed in the Decatur Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Part 6 Section 603.2 A.10.).

**Right-of Way Widths**

Access to Lot 1 is being proposed by a right-of-way granted by the Shawvers. Will this be a recorded instrument that will be recorded with the plan? This needs to be done to ensure the property is not land locked.

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

**Cartway Widths**

What will the cartway be for the proposed right-of-way to serve Lot 1? It will be almost 400 feet long and it should be clear on the plan who is responsible for opening and maintaining this right-of-way.

Based upon the Decatur Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, the cartway width for Shawver Road is substandard (Table 1).

**PennDOT HOP / Municipal Driveway Permit**

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

**Private Street / Shared Driveway**

Will the proposed right-of-way to Lot 1 be shared with the Shawvers? If so, a shared driveway agreement needs to be in place.

**Deed Restrictions and Easements**

Deed restrictions and easements associated with the property, if any, should be provided in accordance with (Part 6 Sections 603. 2.A. (6) and 603. 2.B. (7) of the Decatur Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance.

**DEP Sewage Planning Module**

There are no provisions shown for Lot 1 to be developed. Since there are no plans shown for on-lot water and sewer, a land development plan will need to be provided that shows access to on-lot water and sewer service before development takes place.

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

**Water & Sewage Service**

On-lot water and sewer service for the residue tract should be shown on the plan.

**Features**

All significant man-made features, including water and sewer lines, petroleum lines, electric poles, telephone lines, fire hydrants, dumps, railroad tracks, fence lines, historic features, culverts, etc. should be shown on the plan in accordance with the Decatur Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, (Part 6 Section 602. 2.A. (10)).

**Other Comments:**

1. Frontage for Lot 1 will only be by the way of a proposed 50 foot right-of-way that needs to be granted by the Shawvers. The lot frontage or width should be 125 feet.

**Granville Township (Municipal Ordinance)**

Name of Plan: Steele II, William M.

File Number: 2016-05-002

Tax Map #: 17-09-0103/17-09-0103B  
Municipality: Granville Township  
Applicant Name: Steele II, William M.  
Land Owner Name: Steele II, William M.  
Plan Preparer: Wright Land Surveying

**Plan Summary:**

This plan proposes to create Lot Addition A to be added onto Lot A. The residual tract, Lot 1, is agricultural with no new development proposed.

**Administrative**

This lot was last subdivided in August of 2003.

**Subdivision Information**

Property boundary information should be shown for the entire property, including the residual property. If survey data is not available, this information could be supplied via the deed description and could be shown on an inset map in accordance with the Granville Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Article 6 Sections 6.302. a.5., a.7. and a.9.)

**Clean & Green / Agriculture**

As noted in note 4. lot 1 is enrolled in the Clean and Green program. The applicant or landowners should be aware rollback taxes can be applied in some subdivision situations, and if they have any questions, they should contact the Mifflin County Assessment Office for more information.

**Topographic information**

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

**Right-of Way Widths**

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

**Cartway Widths**

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

**PennDOT HOP / Municipal Driveway Permit**

If a new access is proposed or anticipated along SR 4013 (Ferguson Valley Road), a PennDOT Highway Occupancy Statement should be placed on the plan.

**Private Street / Shared Driveway**

It appears that Steele Drive is shared by T.M. 17-09-0103A, T.M. 17-09-0103 and 17-09-0115. 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 (Article 6 Sections 6.302. a.6. and 6.302. b.7.) of the Granville Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance.

**DEP Sewage Planning Module**

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

**Water & Sewage Service**

Is there private water and sewer service on lot 1? If so, it should be noted on the plan.

**Features**

All significant man-made features, including water and sewer lines, petroleum lines, electric poles, telephone lines, fire hydrants, dumps, railroad tracks, fence lines, historic features, culverts, etc. should be shown on the plan in accordance with the Granville Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, (Article 6 Section 6.202 a.10.).

**Other Comments:**

1. This plan appears to correct a lot consolidation that was tied to the Clean and Green Program that at one time created T.M. 17-09-0103B.

## **Granville Township (Municipal Ordinance)**

Name of Plan: Smith Sr, James A. & Sonja A.  
File Number: 2016-05-003  
Tax Map #: 17-08-0114  
Municipality: Granville Township  
Applicant Name: Smith Sr, James A. & Sonja A.  
Land Owner Name: Smith Sr, James A. & Sonja A.  
Plan Preparer: Wright Land Surveying

### **Plan Summary:**

This plan proposes to create Lot 2 for a single-family residence to be served by public sewer and a private well. The residual tract, Lot 1, has an existing residence with no new development proposed.

### **Basic Plan Information**

All abutters should be shown on the plan, including tax map numbers in accordance with the Granville Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, (Article 6 Section 6.202 a.16.). The abutters having tax parcel numbers 17,08-0113, 17,08-0113B, 17,08-0119, 17,08-0140 and 17,08-0141 are not labeled on the plan.

### **Subdivision Information**

Property boundary information should be shown for the entire property, including the residual property. If survey data is not available, this information could be supplied via the deed description and could be shown on an inset map in accordance with the Granville Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Article 6 Sections 6.202 5. and 6.302 a.5., 7. , and 9.)

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

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

### **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 should be discouraged.

### **Soils**

According to the County GIS files, some portion of this property appears to have prime farmland soils. The prime farmland soil type is LaB.

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

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

Based upon the Granville Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, the right-of-way width of Snooks Hill Road should be shown on the plan. (Article 6 Section 6.202 2.11.)

### **Cartway Widths**

The cartway width of Snooks Hill Road and the private right-of-way should be shown on the plan in accordance with Granville Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, (Article 6 Section 6.202 a.11.).

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

As noted in Note 7, a PennDOT Highway Occupancy Permit (HOP) is required as prescribed in the Municipalities Planning Code . A copy of the permit should be provided to the Granville Township Planning Commission. Is there an existing PennDOT HOP for access to the existing residence? If so, the permit number should be referenced on the plan.

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

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

**Street Names**

If multiple parties are to use the proposed fifty (50) foot right-of-way, the roadway will need to be named. Street names are to be coordinated with the County GIS (Mapping) Department. There is a fee associated with the street naming.

**Deed Restrictions and Easements**

Deed restrictions and easements associated with the property, if any, should be provided in accordance with (Article 6 Sections 6.202 a.18. and 6.302 b.7.) of the Granville Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance.

**DEP Sewage Planning Module**

Since this subdivision proposes a connection to the public sewer system, please confirm if any sewage planning requirements apply.

**Features**

All significant man-made features, including water and sewer lines, petroleum lines, electric poles, telephone lines, fire hydrants, dumps, railroad tracks, fence lines, historic features, culverts, etc. should be shown on the plan in accordance with the Granville Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, (Article 6 Section 6.202 a.10.).

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

Based on the GIS aerial, it appears there may be other uses on the residual other than an existing residence, since there appears to be multiple vehicles in the middle portion of the residual. Is this portion of the land served by public water and sewer? Please confirm.

**Other Comments:**

1. In accordance with the Granville Township Zoning Ordinance (Article 4 Section 4.606 and Schedule V) two (2) off street parking spaces will be required for the proposed single-family residence.
2. Since it appears this lot will have only fifty (50) feet of road frontage, does this conflict with the Granville Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance or the Zoning Code?
3. Who will own and maintain the fifty (50) foot right-of-way?

***Granville Township (Municipal Ordinance)***

Name of Plan: Republic Development Corp.  
 File Number: 2016-05-004  
 Tax Map #: 17-11-0327/17-11-0329  
 Municipality: Granville Township  
 Applicant Name: Republic Development Corp.  
 Land Owner Name: Republic Development Corp.  
 Plan Preparer: Tuscarora Land Surveying

**Plan Summary:**

This plan proposes a lot addition (LOT ADDITION 1-A) from the lands of Republic Development Corp. (T.M. 17-11-0329) to other lands of Republic Development Corp. (T.M. 17-11-0327).

**Administrative**

Is the signature on the application a representative of Republic Development?

\*The Tuscarora Land Surveying representative indicated the signature is that of the Secretary/Treasurer of the Republic Development Corporation.

**Basic Plan Information**

The abutters having tax parcel numbers 17,31-0201 and are not shown on the plan, and should be, in accordance with the Granville Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Article 6 Section 6.202 a.16. and 6.302 a.17.)

\*The May 18, 2016 revised plans shows the correct tax parcel numbers.

**Subdivision Information**

Based on the County GIS aerials, access to this multi-family residential development appears to be from Peace Drive. This access drive opening should be depicted on the plan.

\*The May 18, 2016 revised plans shows the access drive opening.

#### **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 should be discouraged.

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

Based upon the Granville Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, the right-of-way width of Cherry Street should be shown on the plan. (Article 6 Section 6.202 a.11.)

\*The May 18, 2016 revised plans shows the right-of-way of Cherry Street.

The right-of-way width of Cherry Drive is substandard based on the Granville Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance Table 1.

#### **Cartway Widths**

The cartway width of Cherry Street should be shown on the plan in accordance with the Granville Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, (Article 6 Section 6.202 2.11.).

\*The May 18, 2016 revised plans shows the cartway width of Cherry Street.

The cartway width of Cherry Street is substandard based on the Granville Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance Table 1.

#### **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**

Based on plan Note 3, according to the surveyor, there are no known deed restrictions or easements associated with the property.

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

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

#### **Sewage Service**

If public sewer serves this parcel, the location of the sewer line should be included on the plan in accordance with the Granville Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Article 6 Section 6.202 10.).

\*The May 18, 2016 revised plans shows the location of the sewer line.

#### **Water Service**

If public water serves this parcel, the location of the water line should be included on the plan in accordance with the Granville Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Article 6 Section 6.202 10.).

\*The May 18, 2016 revised plans shows the location of the water line.

#### **Features**

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

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

\*The Tuscarora Land Surveying representative indicated a waiver to this provision will be requested.

#### **Other Comments:**

1. As a result of this lot addition, if there is a proposal for two or more residential or non-residential buildings on this parcel, a land development plan will be required in accordance with (Article 5 Section 5.100 and Article 8 Section 8.218) of the Granville Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance.

**Granville Township (Municipal Ordinance)**

Name of Plan: Aurand, Mary Dorothy  
File Number: 2016-05-005  
Tax Map #: 17-10-0123  
Municipality: Granville Township  
Applicant Name: Aurand, Mary Dorothy  
Land Owner Name: Aurand, Mary Dorothy  
Plan Preparer: Tuscarora Land Surveying

**Plan Summary:**

This plan proposes a subdivision of a single lot (LOT 1-Residue) from the lands of M. Dorothy Aurand. LOT 1 -Residue contains an existing dwelling with an on-lot sewage disposal system and individual water supply.

**Subdivision Information**

Property boundary information should be shown for the entire property, including the residual property. If survey data is not available, this information could be supplied via the deed description and could be shown on an inset map in accordance with the Granville Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Article 6 Sections 6.302 a.5., a.7., a.9. and a.12.)

\*The Tuscarora Land Surveying representative submitted a waiver request to this provision.

**Clean & Green / Agriculture**

As noted in plan 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.

**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 should be discouraged. (OpD,EiD)

**Soils**

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

**Setback Lines**

The setbacks for the side and rear are not correct for the Agricultural Residential Zone. Side yards are 10 feet and combined 25 feet for a single family residence as opposed to 40 feet total for both sides. The rear setback is 20 feet not 35 feet. The setback lines on the plan need to be rechecked.

\*The setback distances have been corrected on the plan.

**Right-of Way Widths**

Ferguson Valley Road and Sand Ridge Road are both listed as State roads.

**PennDOT HOP / Municipal Driveway Permit**

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

\*The May 18, 2016 revised plans in plan note 8. makes reference to this provision.

A PennDOT Highway Occupancy Permit (HOP) is required as prescribed in the Municipalities Planning Code (Section 508 (6)). A copy of the permit should be provided to the Granville Township Planning Commission.

**Deed Restrictions and Easements**

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

\*The Tuscarora Land Surveying representative stated there are none.

**DEP Sewage Planning Module**

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

**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. (Granville Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, Section 6.202 . A10 )

**Zoning**

Zoning information is incorrect. It should be Agricultural Residential instead of Agricultural.

\*The May 18, 2016 revised plans lists the correct zoning designation.

**Public Comment**

None

**Other Business or Comments****Internet**

Bill Gomes is continuing to work on ways to improve internet service in the County. He is trying to set up a meeting with various providers and is coordinating this with the Commissioner's Office.

**Subdivision Fees**

Subdivision fees were discussed at last month's meeting with no consensus. A meeting was held with the Subdivision Review Committee on May 6<sup>th</sup>. The committee devised a new fee schedule and this was submitted to the Commissioners, who did not seem supportive of the proposed fees. Bill then developed a compromise proposal that would come somewhere in the middle of the Commissioners' proposal and the Subdivision Review Committee's proposals, but support is split on this alternative. The Commissioners have indicated informally that they will accept the compromise proposal. It is also clear from our review of past time sheets that the proposed fees do not charge more than costs to review plan submissions. Kay Semler asked what the Commissioners will do if the Planning Commission does not vote on the fee proposals, or if they vote on a fee schedule, will they accept it. Although the Commissioners were no longer in the room for this part of the discussion, Bill thought they would accept the compromise proposal. Bill does not know what the Commissioners will do if the Planning Commission does not act on the fee proposal. Jim Spendiff indicated that the Subdivision Review Committee made a recommendation and it is up to the Commissioners to accept it or reject it. Some members echoed his thoughts. A few members indicated that they would not support the proposed compromise fee schedule. One member questioned if the Planning Commission accepted the compromise proposal whether there was any assurance the Commissioners would not change it.

Bill prefers the Planning Commission to either take no action or go forward with the compromise. Neal stated that he wished the Commissioners were present for the discussion. Dan Dunmire agrees that the Planning Commission cannot keep negotiating fees. Bill shared how awkward things were, particularly without the Commissioners present for this discussion. Dave Pennebaker reiterated that the Planning Commission has done what the Commissioners asked and it is up to the Commissioners to decide what to do now.

The Planning Commission asked the minutes to reflect that they provided a fee option presented by the Subdivision Review Committee to the Commissioners and it is now up to the Commissioners to take action.

**Comprehensive Plan**

Bill presented a list of potential projects that could be implemented from the Comprehensive Plan. He noted that the Economic Development project would be more costly than the Housing Summit and would probably take two years to implement. Bill has reached out to Rob Postal of MCIDC to solicit his opinion on this option.

**June Meeting**

Karen Michael will be providing a transportation update at the June meeting. She was recently promoted to the District Director of District II.

**Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 4:51 p.m. with nothing else to discuss to the good of the cause.