

**MINUTES**  
**MIFFLIN COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING**  
**SEPTEMBER 22, 2016**  
**MIFFLIN COUNTY COURTHOUSE, MEETING ROOM B – 3:30 P.M.**

**ATTENDANCE**

Members

Dan Dunmire  
Dave Pennebaker  
Tom Lake  
Neal Shawver  
Michele Bair

Other

Lauren Kershner, The Sentinel  
Lucas Parkes, The EADS Group  
Kevin Kodish, Mifflin County Commissioner  
Lisa Nancollas, Mifflin County Commissioner  
Steve Dunkle, Mifflin County Commissioner  
Robert Postal, MCIDC  
Eric Kann, Hawbaker

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 3:37 p.m.

**Record of Public Attendance**

Dan reminded everyone to sign the attendance sheet.

**Approval of Meeting Minutes**

Neal Shawver made a motion to approve the minutes from August's meeting. The motion was seconded by Michelle Bair. All members voted aye.

**Annual Economic Update**

Rob Postal, President of Mifflin County Industrial Development Corporation (MCIDC) presented the annual economic update of Mifflin County. Rob began by stating that the mission of MCIDC is the betterment of Mifflin County through promoting growth of employment and income. MCIDC owns multiple properties and is self-sustaining through revenue from rents and properties. Rob reviewed unemployment trends in the central region and Mifflin County as to how they compare with state and national rates. Rob also stated that Mifflin County is at a disadvantage when comparing educational attainment levels to the state. According to the information provided, 50% of the population in Mifflin County over the age of 25 is high school graduates. Rob explained that workers at First Quality do not make diapers; they are technicians who operate machines that make diapers. Employees have to know and understand the machine to make the product and they cannot be satisfied with graduating high school. This is where Mifflin County falls short. He believes specialized educational opportunities are essential and brought up the Mifflin County Academy of Science and Technology. The Academy has instituted new curriculum that should aid in this process. Rob also noted that the Amish population affects this data.

Rob next discussed what goes into the selection process for industries looking to locate in an area. He said site consultants look at the central region in general and not just individual counties. The region includes Centre, Mifflin, Union, Snyder, Northumberland, and Montour Counties. They review unemployment trends and educational attainment in the region. Rob receives emails from the Governor's Action Team Project Alert System that highlight possible development opportunities. The emails list the search criteria and Rob

has to move quickly, usually within 1-2 weeks, to submit proposals. He has to have a lot of background work prepared in advance to be able to respond adequately. Rob stated that the consultants requesting the proposals are looking for reasons to throw applicants out rather than keep them in.

MCIDC recently created a focus group for Central PA to look at opportunities and ways to respond to the requests for proposals from a regional perspective. This shows more diversity and a larger labor force. Once the consultants have developed a short list, they look at downtowns, tax rates and other specifics. Some things that make communities attractive are highways and available land and buildings. MCIDC enters the picture with available land and buildings.

MCIDC is currently pursuing a project to improve the industrial park, which contains 30 acres. Rob is looking at a \$700,000 loan to improve the site so that it will be shovel ready. Consultants would like to see a predesigned buildings as well as stormwater and utilities, curb cuts, and wetlands delineations. This is a risk because you do not know the company that may utilize the site. The consultants want to know all tax and utility incentives up front. They will not ask for this information later. Rob also stated that key infrastructure is assumed to be in place and this includes broadband internet.

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

Ten plans were submitted to the committee for review, all under Municipal Ordinance. They included Samuel and Sara Hostetler (*Armagh Township*); Centre Lime and Stone Company (*Brown Township*); Daniel and Franey Hostetler (*Brown Township*); Russell Pennington (*Burnham Borough*); Thomas and Rhonda Wagner (*Decatur Township*); Randall and Rita Gutshall (*Derry Township*); Roman and Salina Peachey (*Menno Township*); Penn Valley Christian Retreat (*Oliver Township*); Steven and Fannie Yoder (*Union Township*); and Smoker Property-Belleville Storage (*Union Township*).

Jim Lettiere chose to review Centre Lime and Stone Company and Penn Valley Christian Retreat plans in further detail as well as the Derry Heights plan, which was recently submitted for a final signature.

Bill Gomes explained that many reviews were conducted of the Primary Health Network (PHN) and Derry Heights plans and they are close to moving forward. When the Planning and Development Department was approached to sign off on the final plans for Derry Heights, some issues were discovered. Phase 1 of the Derry Heights plan was submitted in 2010 for review, but there are differences between the plan that was submitted then and the plan that was submitted for final signature. Due to the length of time that has passed and the substantial changes that have occurred since the original submission, Bill asked Eric Kann of Hawbaker to attend the meeting and address the concerns. The Planning Commission normally signs off on plans in Derry Township after the township signs. If the Planning Commission is agreeable to the updated version, the staff can sign the plans.

Eric Kann of Hawbaker noted that Burnham Properties (a.k.a., Derry Heights) had a plan in motion and Hawbaker helped move things forward for the proposed movie theatre and Hampton Inn/restaurant. Hawbaker built the roads and several utilities. After a long pause in activity, PHN approached Burnham Properties and asked to subdivide six acres where the theatre was originally proposed, which was lot 5. He submitted the subdivision and PHN portions of the plan. As part of security requirements, proceeds from the sale of lot 5 are placed in escrow. He believes the plans can now be recorded. The plan submitted for signature has removed the theatre and hotel/restaurant. There is also a note that all future development will require the submitting of a land development plan.

Neal Shawver questioned if all requirements were met from the initial review, including potential for full development and working with PennDOT on roads and traffic studies including the on/off ramps of 322. Eric noted that the traffic study was completed in the original phase and recommendations are going forward, including the light at Ferguson Valley Road and Freedom Avenue. PennDOT is realigning the on/off ramps.

The widening of Ferguson Valley Road is part of the overall plans, but may not be part of this phase. Eric also noted that stormwater facilities are installed and functional.

Jim Lettiere received an email response and questioned if all structures had been removed from the plans. Eric indicated they had been removed. Bill Gomes feels that most of the language corrections have been made, but is asking for follow-up with PennDOT. SEDA-COG has also indicated PennDOT should be made aware of the changes to the project. Neal Shawver asked if PennDOT needs to approve the plans. Eric Kann indicated they do not since Ferguson Valley Road is a township road. He said an updated traffic study has not been completed because PHN will generate far less traffic than the original proposal of a movie theatre and restaurant. Eric questioned if Bill's contact with PennDOT is sufficient. He also said that PHN is doing a lot to help the development to move forward and is in real danger of falling through. He feels that if someone approaches PennDOT at this point and they require a traffic study, no one will have the money to pay for it and the project will fall through. Rob Postal noted that if groundbreaking does not occur with the PHN project, there will be severe penalties that could jeopardize the project. If someone starts asking PennDOT, with good intentions, they could ask to see a traffic study, which takes money and time and the project will go away. Rob asked if PennDOT should be notified or are we asking for comment or review. PennDOT does not have jurisdiction over this project. Rob did note that PHN has its own project plans and any future development will require a land development plan. The traffic study will be updated if PHN presents phase 2 or if there is any other development.

Further discussion ensued as to who should contact PennDOT. Bill does not feel it is his job to contact them, but rather Hawbaker should make the contact. Rob does not feel it is anyone's job to contact PennDOT. Eric has already talked to PennDOT in June and traded maps with Karen Michael.

Dan Dunmire asked for a motion to allow the plan to be signed and accept the amended plan with conditions outlined and to add a comment that PennDOT would be notified with the changes in the development. Dave Pennebaker made the motion and Michelle Bair seconded the motion.

Jim then reviewed the Centre Lime and Stone Company plan in Brown Township. This plan is located behind the Sheetz store and reconfigures four lots. According to Eric Kann of Hawbaker, there are provisions to ensure a road is constructed when a land development plan is submitted for the proposed asphalt plant and PennDOT building. The Hawbaker representative has agreed to this at the Subdivision Review Committee. There is no financial guarantee for the road construction at this time. Betsy Dupuis will represent Hawbaker and take care of public hearings. Eric will address the comments.

The last plan reviewed was the Penn Valley Christian Retreat plan in Oliver Township. The plan proposes to construct a second hotel, which will be very similar to the current hotel. Jim received revised plans and would like additional time to review the responses and revisions.

Dave Pennebaker motioned to accept the comments of the ten plans under municipal ordinance while allowing Jim Lettiere to have additional time to review the responses on the Penn Valley Christian Retreat plan. Neal Shawver seconded the motion. All members voted aye.

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

Name of Plan: Hostetler, Samuel Y. & Sara N.  
File Number: 2016-09-004  
Tax Map #: 12-06-0101A/0103  
Municipality: Armagh Township  
Applicant Name: Hostetler, Samuel Y. & Sara N.  
Land Owner Name: Hostetler, Samuel Y. & Sara N.  
Plan Preparer: Wright Land Surveying

**Plan Summary:**

This plan proposes to create Lot Addition A with no new dwelling proposed. The residual tract, Lot 1, has an existing residence and is farmland with no development proposed.

**Administrative**

This property was last subdivided in December of 2015 creating Lot 2 similar to what was shown in 2008.

**Subdivision Information**

As mentioned in December of 2015 property boundary information should be shown for the entire property, including the residual property (Lot 1). If survey data is not available, this information could be supplied via the deed description and could be shown on an inset map. (Armagh Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance Sections 6.302.a5, a7, a9 and a12)

**Clean & Green / Agriculture**

As stated in Note #4, the property is in an Agricultural Security Area.

**Soils**

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

**Right-of Way Widths**

What is the right-of-way and cartway widths for the driveway for Lot 1?

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

**Cartway Widths**

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

**Private Street / Shared Driveway**

Will the driveway serving Lot 1 also serve the Christ Yoder Property (T.M. 12-06-0101C)? If so, a shared driveway agreement needs to be in place and if so, will the driveway need to be named?

\*The Wright Surveying Representative stated the driveway does not need to be named.

**Deed Restrictions and Easements**

Deed restrictions and easements associated with the property, if any, should be provided in accordance with Sections 6.302. a6 and 6.302. b7 of the Armagh Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance.

\*The Wright Surveying Representative stated there are no deed restrictions or easements.

**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**

The plan should list all existing water and sewer service for Lot 1 and should also be shown for Lot A. (See Sections 6.202. a.10. and 3.213. a. of the Armagh Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance)

**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 Lot A. If survey data is not available, this information could be supplied via the deed description and could be shown on an inset map. (Armagh Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance Sections 6.302. a5 and a7)

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

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

Name of Plan: Centre Lime & Stone Company, Inc.  
File Number: 2016-09-001  
Tax Map #: 14-01-106BB/Lot #1  
Municipality: Brown Township  
Applicant Name: Centre Lime & Stone Company, Inc.  
Land Owner Name: Centre Lime & Stone Company, Inc.  
Plan Preparer: Hawbaker Engineering, LLC

**Plan Summary:**

No Narrative provided.

**Administrative**

Is the landowner's signature an authorized representative of Centre Lime and Stone Company?  
The property was previously reviewed in 2007, 2013 and 2014.

**Basic Plan Information**

A plan narrative should be placed on the plan and there should be a brief description stating the purpose of the project in accordance with the Brown Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, (Article 7 Section 7.302 A.1.).

Proposed Lot #4 lists tax parcel numbers 14, 01-0106 and 14, 01-0106BB. The County GIS Files list tax parcel numbers 14, 01-0106F and 14,01-0160BB. This should be corrected.

**Floodplain / Wetlands**

As noted in Site Data 3, the subdivision is not within the one-hundred (100) year floodplain or designated wetlands.

**Topographic information**

Topographical contours at vertical intervals should be displayed on the plan in accordance the Brown Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, (Article 7 Section 7.302 A.26.).

**Soils**

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

**Right-of Way Widths**

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

\*According to the Hawbaker Engineering Representative, Sheetz Lane has been dedicated to the Township.

**Cartway Widths**

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

**PennDOT HOP / Municipal Driveway Permit**

Is there an existing HOP for access from State Route 655 to Sheetz Drive? If so, it should be provided in accordance with the Brown Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Article 7 Section 7.302 A.34.) A Clear Sight Triangle and Sight Distances should be shown on the plan for any new access onto a State Route.

**Private Street / Shared Driveway**

If Kerstetter Drive and Sheetz Drive are to be 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."

Kerstetter Drive is a private road that appears to end at the corner of tax parcel number 14,01-0106A. Are there plans to improve or extend this road to the cul-d-sac on Sheetz Drive? If so, appropriate supporting information (i.e. the length(s), curve(s), tangent(s), angle(s), right of way width, cartway width, and if applicable, a road profile) should be provided on the plan in accordance with the Brown Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Article 7 Section 7.302 A.8.).

\*According to the Hawbaker Engineering representative, there are no plans to extend Kerstetter Drive but he will list the right-of-way.

**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 7.302 B.7.).

\*The Hawbaker Engineering representative stated easements are shown on the plan.

**DEP Sewage Planning Module**

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

**Sewage Service**

The location of the sanitary sewer lines should be shown on the plan in accordance with the Brown Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Article 7, Sections 7.302 A.11. and 23.).

**Water Service**

The water supply location should be noted on the plan as prescribed in the Brown Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Article 7, Section 7.302 A.23.). If the water source is off site, there should be evidence of an easement and right-of-way agreement on record and so noted on the plan. This information is particularly important if the water supply serves more than one household. The surveyor will note both are off site and make reference to easement/right-of-way agreements on record.

**Features**

All significant man-made features, including water and sewer lines, petroleum lines, electric poles, telephone lines, fire hydrants, dumps, railroad tracks, buildings, 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 7.302 A.23.). The Sheetz and the Eastgate buildings are in place and should be shown on the plan.

**Other Comments:**

1. What assurance will the Township have that the fifty (50) foot access easement will be constructed to allow access to the proposed lots in this subdivision?

\*According to the Hawbaker Engineering Representative, a statement will be placed on the plan providing a security agreement will be in place to assure the road installation for the 1,500 feet along Sheetz Lane.

2. Has the Township Engineer reviewed this plan?

3. At the time of this submittal we requested a copy of the prior recorded subdivision plan to better see what subdivision lines and tracts were being eliminated or changed and we have not received this information as part of our review.

\*The Hawbaker Engineering representative provided a copy of the prior recorded subdivision plan at the September 15, 2016 Subdivision and Land Development Review Committee meeting.

4. In order for proposed lots 1-4 to have access a road will have to be built not only a twenty-five (25) access easement. Road profiles need to be provided if Sheetz Lane is to be extended and that information needs to be reviewed by the Township Engineer to ensure the road will meet Township road standards.

\*According to the Hawbaker Engineering Representative, road information will be provided when a land development plan is submitted.

5. The proposed twenty-five (25) foot access easement does not meet the Township Road Standards.

\*According to the Hawbaker Engineering Representative, 50 feet is available and will clearly note this on the plan.

\*The Hawbaker Engineering representative indicated he will attempt to provide written responses to our comments and have updated plans by Thursday, September 22, 2016.

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

Name of Plan: Hostetler, Daniel E. & Franey J.

File Number: 2016-09-007

Tax Map #: 14-03-0101

Municipality: Brown Township

Applicant Name: Hostetler, Daniel E. & Franey J.

Land Owner Name: Hostetler, Daniel E. & Franey J.

Plan Preparer: Wright Land Surveying

**Plan Summary:**

This plan proposes to create Lot 2 and Lot Addition A. Lot 2 has an existing single-family residence served by a privy and private water source. No new development is being proposed for Lot 2. Lot

Addition A is being added to Lot A. The residual tract, Lot 1, has an existing residence with no new development proposed.

**Basic Plan Information**

Please clarify the purpose of Lot 2 since it already has a separate tax parcel number.

\*The Wright Surveying Representative stated Lot 2 is a correction to the 2009 Subdivision.

The plan narrative should be clearer that Lot 2 is being established as an official lot instead of a segment of the original lot (T.M. 14-03-0101) that became an orphan lot by the action of Lot A.

**Administrative**

This plan was last subdivided in 1997 but not recorded until 2009. At that time, there was a parcel B with a lot addition (parcel A) and two residue tracts C and D.

The application should also list T.M. 14-03-0101C and 14-03-0101A.

**Subdivision Information**

Property boundary information should be shown for the entire property, including the residual property (Lot 1). If survey data is not available, this information could be supplied via the deed description and could be shown on an inset map. (Brown Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance Sections 7.302 A5, A7 and A9)

**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.

**Floodplain / Wetlands**

As stated in Note #4, a portion of the property is within the 100 year floodplain. However, the plan only shows the floodplain for Lot 2 and does not show it cross into the James Dalton property and Lot 1.

**Soils**

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

**Setback Lines**

The side and rear yard setback for property without public water and sewer is incorrect. It should be 25 feet and 40 feet respectively. The setback lines on the plan need to be adjusted.

**Right-of Way Widths**

Primary access to Lot 2 and Lot A appears to be from SR 4001 (Woodland Road).

Based upon the Brown Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, the right-of-way width for Draft Horse Lane should be shown on the plan. (Section 7.302. A6).

**Cartway Widths**

The cartway width for Tenant Lane and Draft Horse Lane should be shown on the plan (Brown Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, Section 7.302. A11).

**PennDOT HOP / Municipal Driveway Permit**

The plan calls for a HOP if required.

**Private Street / Shared Driveway**

It appears that Tenant Lane will serve the Dalton property (T.M. 14-03-0102A) and the Hostetler property (T.M. 14-03-0103C). If so, a shared maintenance agreement should be in place. If a private street is proposed, the following note shall be included on the plan: "The owners of lots \_\_\_\_\_ agree and understand that " \_\_\_\_\_ Road" is a private road and as such are responsible for the maintenance, care, improvements, and snow removal at their own diligence and expense. Further, if at any time in the future, the property owners adjacent to this road desire to dedicate said road to Municipal ownership, then such owners shall be required at their own expense to improve said road to meet the public road and street specifications of the Municipality in case at such time. The maintenance and use of said private road shall be in accordance with the private road maintenance and use agreement recorded in Deed Book \_\_\_\_\_ Page \_\_\_\_\_ of the Mifflin County Recorder of Deeds Office." (See Brown Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, Section 4.204.B.1.c)

\*The Wright Surveying Representative stated Tenant Lane will primarily serve Lot 2 but not the Dalton property. It will also serve some adjoining parcels. A signed driveway agreement should be in place for Lot 2 since it serves multiple parcels.

Is Tenant Lane owned by any one property owner and if so does the deed allow for others to use the lane?

**Deed Restrictions and Easements**

Deed restrictions and easements associated with the property, if any, should be provided in accordance with Sections 7.302. A6 and 7.302. B7 of the Brown Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance.

\*The Wright Surveying Representative stated there are no deed restrictions or easements.

**DEP Sewage Planning Module**

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

**Sewage Service**

On-lot sewer service for Lot 1 and Lot A should be shown on the plan (Section 7.302. A23 of the Brown Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance).

**Water Service**

The water supply location for Lot 1, Lot A and Lot 2 should be noted on the plan as prescribed in the Brown Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Sections 7.302. A23 and 4.211A). If the water source is off site, there should be evidence of an easement and right-of-way agreement on record and so noted on the plan. This information is particularly important if the water supply serves more than one household. The surveyor will note both are off site and make reference to easement/right-of-way agreements on record.

**Features**

All significant man-made features, including buildings, 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. (Brown Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, Section 7.302. A23)

**Other Comments:**

1. Tenant Lane crosses into Lot 2 and should be labeled on the plan.
2. Does Lot A meet the Township Zoning Ordinance width requirement of 150 feet in an Agricultural Zone?
3. There is an unnamed stream crossing Lot A. Is there a name for the stream and a floodplain associated with it?

\*The Wright Surveying Representative states that this is an unnamed tributary linked to Tea Creek and a note will be placed on the plan. There is no designated floodplain for this stream.

***Burnham Borough (Municipal Ordinance)***

Name of Plan: Pennington, Russell E.  
File Number: 2016-09-002  
Tax Map #: 08-12-0124/0125  
Municipality: Burnham Borough  
Applicant Name: Pennington, Russell E.  
Land Owner Name: Pennington, Russell E.  
Plan Preparer: Sarge Engineering and Surveying

**Plan Summary:**

The purpose of this plan is to consolidate two adjoining lots owned by Russell E. Pennington. 414 1st Avenue, Tax Parcel 08, 12-0124, will become part of 412 1st Avenue, Tax Parcel 08, 12-0125. The new combined Parcel will contain 0.230 acres.

**Subdivision Information**

The plan should make reference to lot numbers 1 and 2 or A and B instead of using the tax parcel number in identifying this lot consolidation.

\*The Sarge Surveying and Engineering representative submitted revised plans dated September 14, 2016 that identifies the lots as A and B.

**Setback Lines**

Note #7 indicates existing non-conforming structures within the setbacks.

**Right-of Way Widths**

There is an unnamed alley behind the two lots. Is there a name for the alley? Also, since it only has a 10 foot cartway, is this a one-way alley?

\*The Sarge Surveying and Engineering representative submitted revised plans dated September 14, 2016 that lists Penny Lane as the Alley name.

**PennDOT HOP / Municipal Driveway Permit**

Where is the driveway opening for the existing house?



\*The driveway location for the existing house was not depicted on the September 14, 2016 revised plans and there remains a question as to whether the existing house is attached to the row homes.

**Deed Restrictions and Easements**

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

**Lot Addition**

A Lot Addition plan normally has an inset map. Note #1 on the plan provides lot consolidation language yet makes reference to T.M. 08-12-0125-0111. The "0111" is incorrect.

\*The September 14, 2016 revised plans references the correct tax parcel number in note: #1.

**Features**

All significant man made features should be shown including buildings that adjoining the subject parcels. Based on aerials, there appears to be a house connecting to the house on T.M. 08-12- 0125 yet the plan only shows a line extension. This needs to be clearer on the plan. (See Section 402.3. L of the Burnham Borough Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance)

**Other Comments:**

1. T.M. 08-12-0124 previously had a house on it.
2. It appears that an attached building should be noted on T.M. 08, 12-0125.

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

Name of Plan: Wagner, Thomas H. & Rhonda L.

File Number: 2016-09-005

Tax Map #: 15-13-0120

Municipality: Decatur Township

Applicant Name: Wagner, Thomas H. & Rhonda L.

Land Owner Name: Wagner, Thomas H. & Rhonda L.

Plan Preparer: Wright Land Surveying

**Plan Summary:**

This plan proposes to create Lot Additions A, B, C, D and E to be added respectively to Lots A, B, C, D and E. No new development is proposed for any of these Lots. The residual tract, Lot 1, has no new development proposed.

**Basic Plan Information**

All abutters should be shown on the plan, including tax map numbers 15-13-0113C, 15-13-0113B and 15-13-0114A. (Decatur Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, Section 6.302. a.16 )

**Subdivision Information**

Property boundary information should be shown for the entire property, including the residual property (Lot 1). If survey data is not available, this information could be supplied via the deed description and could be shown on an inset map. (Decatur Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance Sections 6.302. A.5., A.7., A9 and A.12.)

**Soils**

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

**PennDOT HOP / Municipal Driveway Permit**

The plan should note that if there are new proposed driveways for access to Summit Road that a PennDOT Highway Occupancy Permit will be required as prescribed under Section 508 (6) of the PA Municipalities Planning Code.

\*The Wright Surveying Representative stated there are no plans for a new driveways, but an HOP statement will be placed on the plan.

**Deed Restrictions and Easements**

Deed restrictions and easements associated with the property, if any, should be provided in accordance with Sections 6.302.A6 and 6.302.B7 of the Decatur Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance.

\*The Wright Surveying Representative stated there are no deed restrictions or easements on the plan.

**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**

The on-lot water and sewer service for Lot 1 should be shown. Also the on-lot septic system for Lot C should be on the plan. (Sections 6.202.2A and 302.m1 of the Decatur Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance)

\*The Wright Surveying Representative stated that Lot 1 is vacant.

**Features**

All significant man-made features, including buildings, 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. This includes Lot 1. (Decatur Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, Section 6.202A.10.)

**Other Comments:**

There appears to be an unnamed stream crossing Lot C. Is there a name for this stream? Is there a floodplain associated with this stream?

\*The Wright Surveying Representative stated this is an unnamed tributary linked to Jacks Creek and a note will be placed on the plan. There is no designated floodplain for this stream.

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

Name of Plan: Gutshall, Randall H. & Rita M.

File Number: 2016-09-006

Tax Map #: 16-44-0120/0157

Municipality: Derry Township

Applicant Name: Gutshall, Randall H. & Rita M.

Land Owner Name: Gutshall, Randall H. & Rita 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, has an existing residence with no new development proposed.

**Soils**

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

**Setback Lines**

Some existing buildings are within the front setback of Lot 1 and rear setback for Lot A.

**PennDOT HOP / Municipal Driveway Permit**

The plan should note that if a new driveway is proposed, a PennDOT Highway Occupancy Permit is required as provided for in the Municipalities Planning Code (Section 508 (6) ).

\*The Wright Surveying Representative stated there is no new access to SR 522 but he will put an HOP note on the plan.

**Deed Restrictions and Easements**

Deed restrictions and easements associated with the property, if any, should be provided in accordance with Sections 403.2 and 403.5 of the Derry Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance.

\*The Wright Surveying Representative stated there are no deed restrictions but there is a sewer easement.

**DEP Sewage Planning Module**

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

**Sewage Service**

Based on the sewer easement the property appears to be served by public sewer and sewer lines should be noted on the plan.

**Water Service**

The water supply location should be noted on the plan as prescribed in the Derry Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Section 403.2x). If the water source is off site, there should be evidence of an easement and right-of-way agreement on record and so noted on the plan. This information is particularly important if the

water supply serves more than one household. The surveyor will note both are off site and make reference to easement/right-of-way agreements on record.

**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. (Derry Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, Section 402.2J)

**Other Comments:**

1. There is an unnamed stream on the plan.

\*The Wright Surveying Representative states that this is an unnamed tributary linked to Jacks Creek and a note will be placed on the plan. There is no designated floodplain for this stream.

***Menno Township (Municipal Ordinance)***

Name of Plan: Peachey, Roman A. & Salina M.

File Number: 2016-09-003

Tax Map #: 18-04-0107

Municipality: Menno Township

Applicant Name: Peachey, Roman A. & Salina M.

Land Owner Name: Peachey, Roman A. & Salina M.

Plan Preparer: Wright Land Surveying

**Plan Summary:**

This plan proposes to create Lot 2. Lot 2 has an existing single-family residence served by on-lot sewage disposal and private water source with no new development proposed. The residual tract, Lot 1, has an existing residence with no new development proposed.

**Basic Plan Information**

Access to Lot 2 is by the way of a private road system without a direct connection to a public road. Road access appears to be by way of Rolling Hill Lane which is a private road as well as the access point to Mill Road that changes from a public road to a private road at the curve of the road.

\*The Wright Surveying Representative agreed to delineate where Mill Road changes from a public street to a private street.

**Administrative**

This property was last subdivided in June of 2015 with lot addition A being created. How does Lot A relate to the proposed subdivision?

\*The Wright Surveying Representative stated this subdivision has no impact on Lot A. This proposed lot is south of Lot A.

The subdivision application form should be signed by the municipality.

**Subdivision Information**

The boundary for "L7" is not listed on the inset plan.

**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.

**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 hydric soils. Hydric soils can indicate the presence of wetlands. The hydric soils information should be shown on the plan.

**Right-of Way Widths**

What is the right-of-way width for Mill Road where it connects with Rolling Hill Lane?

Based upon the Menno Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, the right-of-way width for Rolling Hill Lane is substandard (Table 1).

**Cartway Widths**

The cartway widths for Mill Road and Rolling Hill Lane should be shown on the plan (Menno Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, Section 6.202. a.11).  
Based on the GIS Aerials of the site, both roads appear to be substandard.

**PennDOT HOP / Municipal Driveway Permit**

Is there a proposed driveway location for Lot 2?

\*The Wright Surveying Representative stated there is an existing driveway and will show it on the plan.

**Private Street / Shared Driveway**

The plan notes a private driveway agreement between lots 1 and 2.

**Deed Restrictions and Easements**

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

**DEP Sewage Planning Module**

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

**Water Service**

The plan only states a private water source for Lot 2 without the location. The water supply location should be noted on the plan as prescribed in the Menno Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Section 3.213.a). If the water source is off site, there should be evidence of an easement and right-of-way agreement on record and so noted on the plan. This information is particularly important if the water supply serves more than one household. The surveyor will note both are off site and make reference to easement/right-of-way agreements on record.

What is the water source for Lot 1?

\*The Wright Surveying Representative stated there is an off-site mountain water source.

**Features**

Are all buildings associated with Lot 1 shown on the plan? 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. (Menno Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, Section 6.202. a10 )

**Other Comments:**

1. Lot frontage appears to be along a 50 foot right-of-way that extends Rolling Hill Lane.

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

Name of Plan: Penn Valley Christian Retreat

File Number: 2016-09-009

Tax Map #: 19-11-0120

Municipality: Oliver Township

Applicant Name: Penn Valley Christian Retreat

Land Owner Name: Penn Valley Christian Retreat

Plan Preparer: PennTerra Engineering, Inc.

**Plan Summary:**

The Penn Valley Christian Retreat Development Project is to create a 'HOTEL', being 2,652 square feet, per floor-basement and two floors and 19 total units (including one Caretaker Unit) HOTEL-type residences for the Christian Center support of providing housing for conference center users. The HOTEL #2 will be very similar to the same HOTEL #1 that they currently have at the property. The development and new building is part of Tax Parcel 19-11-0120; which is a property +/- 100 acres in size.

The Penn Valley Christian Retreat is a "conference center" development including a conference center building, on-site residences, an existing "HOTEL"; a hotel-type resident housing for attendees of the conference or retreat property users. The proposed land development is the same with the addition of a second "HOTEL". All existing facilities are currently serviced by on-lot (water and sanitary sewage-as applicable) services and have natural gas and electric services (overhead) existing. Final utility arrangements will need to be undertaken for servicing the new Hotel with all existing utilities and the construction of a new on-lot sewage system.

\*\*The Penn Terra Engineering representative submitted written comments and revised plans on September 20, 2016 in response to the County's preliminary comments.

\*This will be a three-story building according to Penn Terra.

#### **Administrative**

The subdivision application form should be signed by the municipality.

\*According to Penn Terra a plan will be given to the Township Planning Commission on or about October 8 for review.

\*\*The Penn Terra Engineering representative stated a copy is given to the municipality and I've asked that they send to the County.

#### **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 Oliver Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Article 6 Section 6.202 a.5.).

\*According to Penn Terra survey boundaries will be provided by Wright Surveying. Also the project is under 1 acre and will not require an NPDES Permit.

\*\*The September 20, 2016 revised plans shows the boundary of the subject parcel, indicates the acreage and references the deed book and page number.

#### **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**

As noted in development project Note 3, and according to County GIS information, portions of the property lies within the 100-year floodplain.

\*According to Penn Terra a clarification note will be placed on the plan that there are no wetlands in the area to be developed.

\*\*The revised plan sheet 2 of 5 shows the streams but not the floodplains associated with the streams. According to County GIS information, a portion of the property lies within a designated wetland, and wetland information should be delineated on the plan. Future development in this area should be discouraged. The source of the County's wetland layer is from the National Wetlands Inventory Data.

\*\*The response from Penn Terra Engineering indicates they acknowledge and agree that no wetlands exist within the development area for the Hotel #2.

#### **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's GIS Files there appears to be considerably more soil types for the entire parcel compared to the soils legend listed on Sheets 2 and 3. Are the soil types listed on Sheet 2 and 3 only for the area to be developed for the Hotel #2?

\*\*The Penn Terra Engineering representative indicated the soil types listed are only for the area to be developed. According to the County GIS files, some portion of this property appears to have prime farmland soils. According to the County GIS files, some portion of this property appears to have hydric soils. Hydric soils can indicate the presence of wetlands. The hydric soils information should be shown on the plan.

\*According to Penn Terra the only soils listed are those in the area where development is proposed.

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

The right-of-way widths of Ferguson Valley Road, Penn Valley, Retreat Lane and Pond Place should be shown on the plan in accordance with the Oliver Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, (Article 6 Section 6.202 (a) 11.).

\*\*The Penn Terra Engineering representative provided the right-of way and cartway widths for Ferguson Valley Road and stated Penn Valley, Retreat Lane and Pond Place are private drives with no right-of-way.

**Cartway Widths**

The cartway widths of Ferguson Valley Road, Penn Valley, Retreat Lane and Pond Place should be shown on the plan in accordance with the Oliver Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, (Article 6 Section 6.202 (a) 11.).

\*\*The Penn Terra Engineering representative provided the cartway width for Ferguson Valley Road and stated Penn Valley, Retreat Lane and Pond Place are private drives with varying widths likely averaging 18 feet.

**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.

\*According to Penn Terra they will make an inquiry to PennDOT on HOP requirements.

**Private Street / Shared Driveway**

Does this plan involve any stream crossings or other floodway encroachments? The applicant should contact the Mifflin County Conservation District for more information.

\*\*The Penn Terra Engineering representative stated no.

**Deed Restrictions and Easements**

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

\*\*According to Penn Terra, there are no known deed restrictions or easements.

**DEP Sewage Planning Module**

A DEP Component 4B will be required per Wright Surveying and will add a note to this effect.

\*\*The Penn Terra Engineering representative indicated Mr. Wright will be providing proof of the DEP Component to the County and Township.

**Land Development**

How many total units are in the existing building?

\*\*According to Penn Terra there are 18 units plus a caretaker unit in Hotel #2.

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

\*\*The Penn Terra Engineering representative indicated the applicant and/or his Architect will reach out to the Fire Marshall/Chief locally regarding fire hydrants/hose bibs, etc....

**E & S / Stormwater**

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

\*\*The Penn Terra Engineering representative indicated the EADS Group is reviewing.

**Other Comments:**

1. Will this additional facility adversely impact traffic onto Ferguson Valley Road?

\*\*The Penn Terra Engineering representative indicated no. Traffic will be less onto Ferguson Valley Road as the Hotel #2 will house 18 units on site that had previously had to go to offsite hotels or housing.

2. Is there an existing PennDOT Highway Occupancy Permit? If so, will this additional facility require reviewed by PennDOT for the additional traffic?

\*\*The Penn Terra Engineering representative does not believe so. As referenced above a request will be made to PennDOT to verify that an HOP is not required for the existing driveway. Traffic will be less with the addition of Hotel #2 as it will house 18 parties that would have had to leave the site for off property housing before the construction of Hotel #2.

\*Penn Terra will check with PennDOT on this.

3. Is there proposed on-site or off-site signage associated with this facility? If so, it should be depicted on the plan.

\*According to Penn Terra, there are no planned signage other than building identification signage.

4. Has the Township required a Development Agreement?

\*According to Penn Terra this has not been requested yet.

5. Access to Ferguson Valley Road should be depicted on the plan.

\*\*Access to Ferguson Valley Road is shown on Sheet 2 of the revised plans.

6. Other than parking, what is the purpose of the drive that is perpendicular to the new building?

\*\*The Penn Terra representative stated only parking.

\*According to Penn Terra, spaces are for the care taker and other staff.

7. Please clarify Note 2. d. on the number of parking spaces, since this number does not match the number of new parking spaces provided.

\*\*The Penn Terra Engineering representative indicated the existing parking lot in front of the Conference Center and dimensions of approximately 230 feet on the high side and 280 feet on the low side of the site. This allows 53 cars to park there. They also use the baseball field for the overflow parking. A Google map was provided that verifies this.

\*According to Penn Terra, this will be clarified.

8. Where are the remaining existing parking spaces on the site?

\*\*A Google map was provided showing the existing parking.

9. Does the existing building include the Hotel and Conference Center?

\*\*The Penn Terra Engineering representative indicated yes and other structures on the property.

\*Penn Terra will label the existing hotel and size and provide information on the conference center.

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

Name of Plan: Yoder, Steven I. & Fannie E.

File Number: 2016-09-008

Tax Map #: 20-07-0131C

Municipality: Union Township

Applicant Name: Yoder, Steven I. & Fannie E.

Land Owner Name: Yoder, Steven I. & Fannie E.

Plan Preparer: Wright Land Surveying

#### **Plan Summary:**

This plan proposes to create Lot 2 and Lot Addition A. Lot 2 is for a single-family residence to be served by onlot sewage disposal and private well. Lot Addition A is to be added onto Lot A. The residual tract, Lot 1, is agricultural with no new development proposed.

#### **Basic Plan Information**

All abutters should be shown on the plan, including tax map numbers 20-07-0132, 20-07-0124AA, 20-06-124A and 20-07-0131. (Union Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, Section 403.1d)

#### **Subdivision Information**

Property boundary information should be shown for the entire property, including the residual property (Lot 1). If survey data is not available, this information could be supplied via the deed description and could be shown on an inset map. (Union Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance Section 402.1a)

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

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

**Floodplain / Wetlands**

There are no floodplains associated with Lot 2 or Lot A, but there are with Lot 1. The floodplain should be shown on the inset map.

**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.

**Setback Lines**

The setbacks are only listed for the R A District and not the R L District and should be noted.

**Right-of Way Widths**

Based upon the Union Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, the right-of-way width for S. Dry House Road is substandard (Section 501.2).

Based upon the Union Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, the right-of-way width for Kish Creek Lane should be shown on the plan. (Section 402.2).

The "existing Farm Lane" is Garrett Lane and should be so labeled on the plan and include the right-of-way and cartway.

**Cartway Widths**

The cartway width for Kish Creek Lane should be shown on the plan (Union Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, Section 402.2).

Based upon the Union Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, the cartway width for South Dryhouse Road is substandard (Section 501.2 ).

**PennDOT HOP / Municipal Driveway Permit**

Plan Note #6 states municipal driveway permit is required, and a copy should be provided to the Union Township Planning Commission.

**Deed Restrictions and Easements**

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

\*The Wright Surveying Representative stated there are no known deed restrictions or easements.

**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**

The plan should provide on-site water and sewer information for Lot 1 and if applicable to Lot A (Section 402.1d of the Union Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance).

\*The Wright Surveying Representative stated Lot 1 and Lot A are vacant land with no water or sewer.

**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 402.1d )

**Zoning**

The property appears to be in two zoning districts, Residential Agriculture and Residential Limited, and not just Residential Agriculture. The plan should delineate where zoning districts change.

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

Name of Plan: Smoker Property - Belleville Storage

File Number: 2016-09-010

Tax Map #: 20-07-0119

Municipality: Union Township

Applicant Name: Smoker, John F.



Land Owner Name: Smoker, John F.  
Plan Preparer: PennTerra Engineering, Inc.

**Plan Summary:**

This plan proposes to create Lot 2 and Lot 3 with the existing buildings as shown. No new development is being proposed as part of this Subdivision. A Land Development Plan is being submitted separately and must be approved before any new construction takes place. The residual tract, Lot 1 is agricultural only with no new development proposed. This plan was previously submitted and reviewed by the Mifflin County Planning Commission on November 19, 2015. Subsequent to this the Union Township Supervisors denied this project. Therefore, it has been resubmitted as a previously reviewed plan. Previous review comments from the initial review that have not been satisfactorily addressed have been included with this review.

**Basic Plan Information**

The name of the registered surveyor responsible for the subdivision plan should be on the plan, including an appropriate registered professional's seal in accordance with the Union Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Article IV Section 403.1.e.)  
The abutter tax parcel 20,07-0119B owned by A Medical Home for Special Central PA Clinic is not listed as an abutter in accordance with the Union Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Article IV 403. 1.d.).

**Administrative**

The subdivision application form should be signed by the municipality.  
Payment of the processing fee should be submitted prior to any review activity. The fee is \$100 for a previously reviewed subdivision and \$100 for a previously approved land development plan, totaling \$200.00.  
The landowner's signature needs to be on the subdivision application form.

**Floodplain / Wetlands**

As noted in development project Note 6, according to County GIS information, a portion of the property lies within the 100-year floodplain.

**Soils**

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

**Setback Lines**

On sheet 4 of 12 Zoning Regulations, e.b. it states from residential district line-25 feet (not applicable for this development property). This site abuts the residential suburban and residential agriculture districts. In accordance with the Union Township Zoning Ordinance (Article III, Section 307.4A), a twenty (20) foot buffer yard is required in an industrial district where it abuts a residential district.

\*The Penn Terra Engineering representative stated this will be discussed with the Township Zoning Officer. He also added that he wasn't sure if this applies, considering the location of the development lands to the lands that are not zoned industrial. They are depicting a 15' buffer yard along the stream.

\*\*As of December 14, 2015 the County has not received clarification regarding the setbacks and the November 19, 2015 revised plans do not show a twenty (20) foot setback.

\*\*\*Has this been verified with the Township Zoning Officer? This needs to be ascertained.

\*\*\*\*According to Penn Terra, he will check with the zoning officer.

Based upon the Union Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, the right-of-way width of Kishacoquillas Street is substandard (Article V, Section 501.2).  
Kishacoquillas Street should be labeled on the subdivision plan sheet 2.

**Cartway Widths**

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

**PennDOT HOP / Municipal Driveway Permit**

Any new access from Kishacoquillas Street will require a municipal driveway permit, and a copy should be provided to the Union Township Planning Commission.

**Private Street / Shared Driveway**

All private drives that are used by more than one party should have a shared driveway agreement in place. An agreement for the private right-of-way should be noted on the plan stating: "The owners of lots \_\_\_\_, which have a common driveway, agree and understand this is a shared driveway, and as such are responsible for maintenance,

care, improvements, and snow removal at their own diligence and expense. The maintenance and use of said shared driveways shall be included in the deeds as said lots are sold."

\*The Penn Terra Engineering representative indicated that if the Township Zoning Officer requires this it will be added to the plan.

\*\*\*Has the Zoning Officer made a determination regarding this?

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

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

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

Please confirm that since all habitable structures are serviced by on-lot septic system, no sewage planning module is required by PA DEP.

#### **Sewage Service**

Project development within Note 8 indicates all areas within this subdivision and land development plan use private wells and on-lot septic systems. It is not clear why there are twenty (20') sanitary sewer easements. Is this in the event the Smokers or future owners decide to connect to the public sewer system?

\*The Penn Terra Engineering representative stated the entire project area will be served with public sewer provided by the Union Township Municipal Authority.

It does not appear that the on lot sewer septic system is labeled on the plan and it should be, in accordance with the Union Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Article IV Section 403. 2. c.).

\*According to Penn Terra sewer information is on a supplemental plan and they will show sewer lines on the subdivision plan. Public sewer to service entire site.

#### **Water Service**

The water supply location should be noted on the plan as prescribed in the Union Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Article IV, Section 403. 2.c). If the water source is off site, there should be evidence of an easement and right-of-way agreement on record and so noted on the plan. This information is particularly important if the water supply serves more than one household. The surveyor will note both are off site and make reference to easement/right-of-way agreements on record.

\*According to Penn Terra on Sheet 2 of the subdivision plan a well house is shown.

#### **Features**

There is an outside wood furnace in front of the two existing greenhouses to be demolished. This should be depicted on the existing conditions sheet 3 of 12 in accordance with the, Union Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Article IV, Section 402.e).

\*The Penn Terra representative stated he will depict this on the revised plans.

\*\*The November 19, 2015 revised plans do not depict the existence of the wood furnace on sheet 3 of 12, the existing conditions plan.

\*\*\*The September 2, 2016 revised plans do not depict the existence of the wood furnace on Sheet 3 of 12.

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

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

#### **Other Comments:**

1. Has the Township Zoning Officer determined which structures are existing non-conforming uses and if the proposed development uses are consistent with the Industrial Zoning District?

\*The Penn Terra Engineering Representative will check with the Township Engineer.

\*\*An NPDES Permit is under review at the Conservation District.

#### **Public Comment**

None

#### **Other Business or Comments**

The CDBG Advisory Committee recently met to review the seven projects submitted in August. The committee discussed funding four of the seven projects. The second CDBG hearing will be held October 7<sup>th</sup>. Individual resolutions will be adopted at each municipality with the county adopting their resolution November 17<sup>th</sup>.

CDBG recently received a state competitive grant for \$750,000 for the McVeytown sewer project. CDBG also received a HOME grant in the amount of \$500,000.

The Juniata River Boat Launch construction continues. The planks are currently on backorder. Lucas Parkes of The EADS Group is to be discussing the opposite side of the road with DEP to determine if a permit is needed to construct a parking area.

A potential enforcement issue recently surfaced upon discovering that Riverside Greenhouse seems to have had construction take place with no evidence of a signed permit, stormwater plan or land development plan.

**Adjournment**

Upon no further discussion, the meeting adjourned at 5:20 p.m. upon a motion by Dave Pennebaker.