

MINUTES
MIFFLIN COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING
FEBRUARY 25, 2016
MIFFLIN COUNTY COURTHOUSE, MEETING ROOM B – 3:30 P.M.

ATTENDANCE

Members

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

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
Brad Kerstetter, Juniata County Planning
Lincoln Kaufman, Snyder County Planning
Deborah Bargo, Mayor of Lewistown
Mark Colussy, Huntingdon County Planning
David Morrison, Modern Transit Partnership
Mark Spada, Western Pennsylvanians for Passenger Rail
Bradley Jones, Immediate Passed Chair Modern Transit Partnership
Julie Shade, Executive Director Modern Transit Partnership
Lucinda Beattie, Pittsburgh Downtown Partnership

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

Michele Bair provided clarification to the minutes on page 5, second paragraph regarding the Thomas Miller Jr. plan of Granville Township. The statement of “She stated DEP is opposed to Granville’s moratorium to hook up public sewer” should read “She stated DEP imposed the moratorium to hook up public sewer.” Jim Spendiff made a motion to approve the minutes from January’s meeting with this revision. The motion was seconded by Dave Pennebaker. All members voted aye.

Expanded Passenger Rail Service

Rob Postal had sent an email to Bill stating that Modern Transit Partnership was interested in making a presentation to expand passenger rail service from Harrisburg to Pittsburgh. Rob felt that since the Planning Commission was interested in this, it would be a good forum for the presentation.

Julie Shade, Executive Director of Modern Transit Partnership attended the meeting to raise interest and awareness to expand passenger rail service. She explained that Modern Transit Partnership is a nonprofit organization whose mission is to promote and improve transportation in south central Pennsylvania. They would like to expand passenger rail service from Harrisburg to Pittsburgh, which only has one trip per day going each direction.

Julie turned the presentation over to Bradley Jones, Immediate Passed Chair of Modern Transit Partnership. Passenger rail service is vibrant from Harrisburg to Philadelphia with 14 trips per day. West of Harrisburg has limited passenger rail service. They are trying to find partners and team members to try to improve passenger rail service. The Board of Directors met with Governor Wolf as a candidate and he felt Abe Lincoln had better train service than we do in Pennsylvania. There are challenges for rail service to go west. An event will be held May 17th from noon to 1:30 at the Harrisburg train station in order to educate and promote train service west and connectivity to the east.

Lucinda Beattie, board member of Western Pennsylvanians for Passenger Rail and Vice President of Transportation at Pittsburgh Downtown Partnership, was next to share her thoughts. Pittsburgh is currently isolated from a transportation perspective. She shared a feasibility study conducted two years ago and some excerpts of endorsements of the study by members of the community in the Pittsburgh area. She would like to see two more trips added to give a choice of times. Her goal is to increase mobility options. Transportation choices within 500 miles of Pittsburgh are car and train. There are no direct flights from Pittsburgh to Harrisburg. Bus service is very limited. In the 1960s, there were 12 daily trains. There were two daily trains until 2005 when the Broadway Limited, which was the long distance train between New York and Chicago, was eliminated. Now there is only one train. The route of the Pennsylvanian connects New York and Chicago and is one of Amtrak's highly valued routes.

Some of the challenges of expanding rail service include the complete difference of what service is like east of Harrisburg versus west of Harrisburg. East of Harrisburg is an Amtrak rail system, while west of Harrisburg is Norfolk Southern, which is used heavily for freight. Rail service east of Harrisburg is faster due to electrification. Rail service west of Harrisburg is diesel and electrification is probably not a possibility. There are not enough tracks in areas west of Harrisburg. At some train stations, passengers can only get off/on on one side of the tracks. Also, there are mountains west of Harrisburg and east of Harrisburg is flat. A perceived issue is ridership. The population of western Pennsylvania is stagnant. Lucinda does not feel this is an issue because the capacity of ridership is high.

Even with only one train, ridership on the Pennsylvanian continues to grow. The Pennsylvanian has high on time performance and high utilized capacity as shown in the feasibility study she shared with the Commission. Up until 2013, there was no state support.

With a total of three trains, there could be an additional 190,000 riders, almost double current ridership. The Pennsylvanian is a route that the state DOT manages; therefore, the state is responsible for the difference between the amount of revenue raised by fares and Amtrak's operating cost. The cost to add 2-4 additional locomotives and 12-24 additional passenger cars would be \$37 million to \$75 million of capital investment, which the state would be responsible for. The state portion of costs would be \$10.5 million to \$12.8 million per year for the additional locomotives and passenger cars. When comparing to other transportation projects, this is not an extremely expensive proposition. This is a viable option for Pennsylvania. Virginia has a very active Amtrak state operated system. Major issues include dealing with Norfolk Southern, freight versus passenger use of the rails and the political will of communities and the state.

Mark Spada of Western Pennsylvanians for Passenger Rail shared additional information. The Pennsylvanian has one of the highest utilization rates, which is very important. If there were three trains per day, riders could have their choice of travel time. Bus service is also limited and Mark noted that Huntingdon does not have a bus stop. He noted that there is an ability to have access to Wi-Fi on the train. It takes 5 hours for rail service from Harrisburg to Pittsburgh with stops in Lewistown, Huntingdon, Tyrone, Altoona, Johnstown, Latrobe, Greensburg, and Pittsburgh. They want to keep all stops.

Mark Colussy of Huntingdon County proposed another challenge as the hostile takeover by Canadian Pacific of Norfolk Southern and how this would affect the rail service west of Harrisburg. Amtrak would have no say

in the upkeep of the rails. Lucinda said that this is a relatively recent attempt as of November 2015 and that the organization has not talked about the hostile takeover issue.

Mark Spada said that there could be increased success due to cooperation with the state and Norfolk Southern. It could help passenger and freight service. Switch and station improvements would benefit both passenger and freight service. Julie suggested improvements to the rail line and stations could be done incrementally by local communities. She encouraged everyone to become familiar with the feasibility study to see what would be doable in the area.

Dave suggested coordination with other organizations such as CATA and historical aspects. Lucinda feels public transit agencies are ideal to encourage coordination with shuttles and trains.

Mark Spada recently met with Johnstown Area Historical Society to discuss rehabilitating their train station. Middletown is getting a new station with a shuttle to Harrisburg International Airport and a direct walkway connection to the Penn State campus. PennDOT is taking a very active role in refurbishing stations and becoming the owner of many train stations, which may be owned by Amtrak. Mayor Bargo suggested throughway service to coordinate buses and trains with one ticket. Bill addressed the need for ADA improvements at our station. Lucinda said this is part of PennDOT's role in refurbishing stations.

Subdivision and Land Development Review Committee Report

Five plans were presented to the committee for review. They were all under municipal ordinance (Reedsville Holiday Inn Express, Brown Township; Old Carriage Crossing, Phase 3, Brown Township; Steven J. Stimely, Derry Township; Michael A. & Lisa D. Bowers, Granville Township; and Aaron D. & Tia M. McLucas, Granville Township). Two plans were reviewed in fuller detail.

The first plan reviewed was in Brown Township, the Holiday Inn Express. The comments were read. A conversation by cell phone occurred with an engineer at PennTerra, who was not the Project Manager, at the Subdivision Review Committee meeting to discuss these plans and the Old Carriage Crossing plan. PennTerra also had been asked to come to the Subdivision Review Meeting to discuss the plans. They did not come to the meeting, which is why a phone call took place at the Review Committee meeting.

The second plan reviewed was also in Brown Township, Old Carriage Crossing Phase 3. This project is directly north of the first plan reviewed. Jim read the comments. There are garages associated with the townhomes. Two off-street parking spaces will be provided per unit. This was not provided in writing. There is a lot line going through the duplexes, which raised the question of whether they meet the township's frontage and lot width requirements. Depending on the township interpretation, it may require a variance. Regarding a buffer around the infiltration basin, the consultant felt this would be an attractive nuisance if they put any type of screening around the basin. No response or revised plans have been received on either plan. The comment of a traffic study being recommended on both plans based on the township ordinance for both projects was raised. Both projects are in close proximity to each other, so the cumulative effect of traffic should be considered. The Sheetz project, which is close by, was mentioned and did require a traffic study. It could be used to be a basis for an updated traffic analysis.

Dave shared a concern with the western portion of the Old Carriage Crossing project involving an 18 foot right-of-way. If they want to open the back lot in the future, according to the drawing, it will cut off one lane of an existing roadway. Bill said when it was discussed with Penn Terra, they said it was for safety. He said if the issue is to make this a neighborhood, a cul-de-sac makes more sense in this area. He is not clear why they want to do a through street. (A response letter on the projects was submitted after the meeting.)

Revised comments were provided for the Stimely application in Derry Township. All but one comment was addressed.

Kent Spicher motioned to accept the comments of the five plans under municipal ordinance. Tyler Gum seconded the motion. All members voted aye.

Subdivision and Land Development Municipal Reports

Brown Township (Municipal Ordinance)

Name of Plan: Reedsville Holiday Inn Express
File Number: 2016-02-001
Tax Map #: 14-01-0107AA
Municipality: Brown Township
Applicant Name: Happy Holiday, LLC
Land Owner Name: Happy Holiday, LLC
Plan Preparer: PennTerra Engineering, Inc.

Plan Summary:

Happy Holiday, LLC, is planning an 83-room hotel and a 200-seat restaurant with associated parking and utilities on Tax Parcel 14-01-0107A in Brown Township, Mifflin County. The entrance to the site is off of Carriage House Lane, approximately 560 feet south of the intersection of Carriage House Lane with Tillbury Lane. Sanitary sewer service is provided by the Brown Township Municipal Authority and water is provided by the Lewistown Borough Municipal Authority.

Basic Plan Information

The abutting five (5) parcels immediately west of the subject parcel do not contain the correct tax parcel numbers and should be labeled in accordance with the Brown Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Article 7 Section 7.302 A. 17.).

Basic Plan Information

Other than the subject parcel, the tax parcel number labels on the plan are missing the zero digit before the last three numbers. Please add these digits to the tax parcel numbers. The absence of the zeros creates inaccuracies within our plan tracking software.

A plan narrative should be placed on the plan and 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 7.302A.1.).

Subdivision Information

The subject parcel was subdivided from tax parcel 14,-01-0107A immediately north of this parcel. The Mifflin County Planning Commission reviewed the subdivision on August 22, 2015. The subject parcel contains 6.727 acres.

Floodplain / Wetlands

As noted in Project Note 3, of sheet 3 of 17, on the record plan, the property is not located within the one hundred (100) year floodplain.

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 (Article 7 Section 7.202 A.11.), the right-of-way width of Happy Valley Drive should be shown on the plan. Also, Happy Valley Drive should be labeled on the plan.

Cartway Widths

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

Private Street / Shared Driveway

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

Since Happy Valle Drive is a paper street/drive, 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.

If Happy Valley Drive will be used by more than one party a shared driveway agreement should be 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."

DEP Sewage Planning Module

If the project is to utilize public sewer, a DEP Component 3, or Exemption from Sewage Planning (Mailer), should be provided.

Sewage Service

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

Water Service

A letter from the municipal water authority acknowledging availability of public water should be submitted to the Brown Township Planning Commission.

Zoning

Other than tax parcel 14,01-0505, the four parcels directly west of this development previously zoned R-3 Suburban Residential District, have been rezoning approval to (CH) Commercial Highway District by the Township on February 15, 2016.

Land Development

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

If a private street i.e., Happy Valley Drive, is proposed, the plan should be reviewed by the Brown Township Engineer.

The size of the parking stalls should be noted on the plan.

As part of the traffic circulation plan, the driveway width needs to be shown on sheet 3 not just sheet 4, to insure adequacy of two-way travel and back up accommodation for car parking.

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

E & S / Stormwater

If this development proposes earth disturbance greater than one (1) acre, then an NPDES Permit is required through the Mifflin County Conservation District.

If this development proposes greater than five thousand (5,000) square feet of earth disturbance, and Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan is required.

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

If the adjoining four (4) lots to the west are included as part of this development, and were not part of the submitted NPDES permit, a major revision to the NPDES permit will be required?

Other Comments:

1. In accordance with the Brown Township Zoning Ordinance Article XV Hotel G. the applicant shall furnish a traffic study based upon the expected number of vehicle trips generated from the proposed use and the current traffic volumes. On roads connecting the site with arterial roads. Such study shall comply with the Brown Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance and identify any resulting traffic congestion or safety problems as well as mitigation measures.
2. If this development generates fifty (50) or more new peak hour trips or three hundred (300) trips per day, the applicant shall provide studies and reports in accordance with the requirements of (Article 4 Section 4.216.) of the Brown Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance.
3. If the principal building exceeds forty (40) feet in height, each required setback must be increased in width one (1) foot for each additional foot of height over forty (40) feet. Although it appears the setbacks can be met, the front side and rear yards should be increased by six (6) feet each and labeled accordingly on Sheet 3 of the record plan. This provision is in accordance with the Brown Township Zoning Ordinance (Article XV Hotel D.). Although this is noted in the project notes, it is not clear on the plan.
4. There appears to be one free standing sign at the northeast corner of the property. What height and material will it be constructed of?
5. Where will the dumpster be located for the future restaurant? This should be depicted on the plan.

6. Has the Township required a Development Agreement and Financial Security as required herein and in Article 8 in accordance with the Brown Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Article 7 Section 7.302 B.9.).

7. Will this development include the proposed restaurant? Although the narrative that was submitted separately from the plan shows a future restaurant, it is greyed out, as if the developer is unsure about this. If the restaurant is part of the plan, it should clearly be identified as such, with clear delineation of parking and traffic circulation. If not, the plan should state it will be presented on a future land development plan.

8. There is a proposal not shown for abutting lots to the west recently rezoned for future parking. Will this be shown in a revised final plan? If so, will landscaping be considered to offset concerns of the neighboring residential properties?

Brown Township (Municipal Ordinance)

Name of Plan: Old Carriage Crossing, Phase 3

File Number: 2016-02-005

Tax Map #: 14-01-0107A

Municipality: Brown Township

Applicant Name: Watson, Tyler, M.J.

Land Owner Name: Watson, Tyler, M.J.

Plan Preparer: PennTerra Engineering, Inc.

Plan Summary:

The purpose of this plan is to extend Tilbury Lane 400 linear feet to a cul-de-sac, and construct a private drive with ten (10) parking stalls, subdivide tax parcel 14,01-0107A into fifteen (15) lots. Lots 1-14 will be duplex (two-family or semi-detached) lots, for the construction of seven (7) duplexes totaling fourteen (14) units. Lot 15 will be developed by constructing five (5) townhomes, as twenty-four (24) single-family attached dwelling units on 6.845 acres.

Basic Plan Information

The tax parcel number for One Happy Holiday LLC parcel immediately south of the subject parcel lists the incorrect tax parcel as 14-01-107A while it should be 14,01-0107AA-000.

Basic Plan Information

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

Subdivision Information

The subject parcel was subdivided from tax parcel 14-01-0107AA. The Mifflin County Planning Commission reviewed the subdivision on August 22, 2015. The subject parcel contains 6.845 acres before this proposed fifteen (15) lot subdivision. This was recorded on September 22, 2015.

Floodplain / Wetlands

As noted in Project Notes 3., of sheet 4 the record plan the parcel is not located within the one-hundred (100) year floodplain.

Soils

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

Setback Lines

Although it appears the setback lines for each lot are identified on the record plan sheet 4, the legend does not depict the setback symbol.

Right-of Way Widths

Based upon the Brown Township Road Ordinance, (Part 4 Section 41 A.) the right-of-way width of the private drive is substandard. Since it appears , Tilbury Lane will be extended approximately 400 linear feet to form a cul-de-sac, it would be helpful to identify the new extended right-of-way portion on Sheet 4 of the record plan, in relation to end portion of existing Tilbury Lane.

Cartway Widths

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

Private Street / Shared Driveway

If a private street is proposed, the plan should be reviewed by the Brown Township Engineer. All private drives that are used by more than one party should have a shared driveway agreement in place in accordance with the Brown Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Article 4 Section 4.204 B. 1.c.). 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 a private drive, 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.

DEP Sewage Planning Module

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

Sewage Service

A letter from the municipality acknowledging availability of public sewer to serve the proposed development should be submitted to the Brown Township Planning Commission.

Water Service

A letter from the municipal water authority acknowledging availability of public water to serve the proposed development should be submitted to the Brown Township Planning Commission.

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 Brown Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Article 7 Section 7.202 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 Brown Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, (Article 7 Section 7.302 A.29.).

Land Development

In accordance with Brown Township's Zoning Ordinance, Article XVII, Section 1703 residential uses requires 2 offstreet spaces per unit. The plans show ten (10) off-street parking spaces for 24 units contained in five townhouses. This leaves a shortage of 38 off-street parking spaces, unless the off-street parking is provided as garages for each townhome. A variance may be required? If so, this should be a condition for plan approval. The applicant should consult the local Fire Marshall to see if new fire hydrants will be required and included with the plan submission.

E & S / Stormwater

If one (1) acre or more of earth disturbance is part of this project, an NPDES is required. The applicant should contact the Mifflin County Conservation District.

If earth disturbance is 5,000 sq. ft. or greater, an Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan is required through the Mifflin County Conservation District.

Other Comments:

1. There is no information regarding the traffic impact this development will have on the immediate right-of-ways, and cumulatively with the new Sheetz, the proposed Reedsville Holiday Inn Express and the surrounding development.
2. In accordance with the Brown Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Article 4 Section 4.216) all residential developments or subdivisions containing twenty (20) or more dwelling units or residential lots that generate fifty (50) or more new peak hour trips or three-hundred (300) total trips per day, shall provide a Traffic Impact Study. A traffic analysis should be submitted as part of this plan to address and demonstrate the AM & PM peak trips per day and its impact to the surrounding development.
3. The ten (10) parking spaces must contain one (1) handicapped accessible space in accordance with the Brown Township Zoning Ordinance (Article XVII Section 1704 6.B.). The plan does not show a handicapped space. There are no dimensions for the proposed ten (10) parking spaces for the 5 townhouses. The parking stalls should be clearly shown on the plan.
4. Why is a private drive (which is substandard i.e., and eighteen (18) foot right-of-way) being connected onto Whipple Tree Lane? Why can't sole access be from Tilbury Lane and the creation of a cul-de-sac can be situated at the proposed connection onto Whipple Tree Lane? This would appear to be a more logical design so as to prevent through traffic onto Whipple Tree Lane and Sleigh Run.
5. Are the off-street parking spaces for the duplex units proposed to be part of each driveway?

6. Will the extension of Tilbury Lane be dedicated and accepted by the Township? Will the private drive be dedicated and accepted by the Township?
7. Has the Township required a development agreement and financial security as part of this development, in accordance with the Brown Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Article 7 Section 7.302 B.9.)?
8. Is there is any proposed signage for this development? If so, it should be depicted on the plan.
9. There does not appear to be provisions for dumpsters on Lot 15, although on Sheet 9 of 16, there are specifications for a dumpster pad and screening, the size and locations appear to be missing on the record plan Sheet 4.
10. Since Project Note 10 refers that Lots 1-2, 3-4, 5-6, 7-8, 9-10, 11-12 and 13-14 may be consolidated on a single deed and developed as a single family lot, this appears contrary to the proposal to develop duplexes on fourteen (14) lots.
11. Are there any plans to buffer the multi-family development on Lot 15 from the existing single-family homes developed on Tilbury Lane? Providing a landscape buffer might offset any concerns from neighboring properties.
12. It appears the proposed infiltration basin #1 will not be screened by fencing or a vegetative buffer. Please confirm.
13. What will the height be for the duplexes and the townhouses?
14. There are dusk to dawn lights proposed for each duplex unit and each multi-family townhomes, as provided on the record plan sheet 4.
15. It appears the minimum lot width in the R-3 Suburban Residential District for duplexes is seventy (70) feet, in accordance with the Township Zoning Ordinance (Article VII Section 704 1.A.). Since each duplex unit is divided by a lot line, this may require a variance. Please defer to the Township Zoning Officer for a determination regarding this comment.
16. Are there off-street parking spaces provided for each townhome i.e., garages, in addition to the ten (10) parking stalls shown on sheet 4 the record plan? If so, they should be labeled off street parking for each town home on sheet 4.

Derry Township (Municipal Ordinance)

Name of Plan: Stimely, Steven J.
 File Number: 2016-02-004
 Tax Map #: 16-01-0112I
 Municipality: Derry Township
 Applicant Name: Stimely, Steven J.
 Land Owner Name: Stimely, Steven J.
 Plan Preparer: Tuscarora Land Surveying

Plan Summary:

This proposes a lot addition from the lands of Steven J. Stimely to the lands of Timothy A. Parson.
 *Revised plans dated February 23, 2016 were provided in response to the County's preliminary comments and the comments have been updated accordingly.

Subdivision Information

The subdivision reviewed by the Mifflin County Planning Commission May 22, 2014 showed the subdivision of land to create four (4) lots. Lot 1, the remainder consisting of 19.144 acres, Lot 2 consisting of 4.010 acres, Lot B was a lot addition of 4.592 acres to a parcel containing 5.941 acres totaling 10.533 acres and lot addition A consisting of 1.886 acres to be added to a parcel consisting of 8.513 acres totaling 10.399 acres. Most likely this lot configuration isn't displayed on the GIS Aerial Files because new deeds were not created because the lots have not sold. However, this plan does not appear to have taken the recorded subdivision (recorded on June 4, 2014) into consideration. Please clarify if the last recorded plan is still applicable.

*The representative of Tuscarora Land Surveying stated the above referenced subdivision is applicable and was taken into account while subdividing the subject parcel.

Floodplain / Wetlands

According to County GIS information, the Timothy A. Parson parcel Tax Parcel 16, 01-0112A is partially within the 100-year floodplain, and the flood plain should be delineated on the plan. Future development in this area should

be discouraged in accordance with the Derry Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Part 4 Section 402. 2.I.)

*The February 23, 2016 revised plans shows the location of the 100 year floodplain on tax parcel 16,-01-0112A.

Soils

The soil type of ORF should be identified as a soil type on the plan, since County GIS Files show this soil type on the residue parcel.

*The February 23, 2016 revised plans shows this soil type on the plan. According to the County GIS files, some portion of Tax Parcel 16, 01-0112A 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

Based on GIS Aerial Files the Residue Lot 1 owned by Steven J. and Karen D. Stimely has frontage along Nolan Drive and this should be depicted on the plan so as to prevent creating a land locked parcel. What will the frontage be for the residual?

*The February 23, 2016 revised plans shows the frontage as being 59.25 feet.

Based upon the Derry Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, the right-of-way width of Nolan Drive is substandard (Part 5 Section 504. 2.).

Cartway Widths

Based upon the Derry Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, the cartway width of Nolan Drive is substandard.

DEP Sewage Planning Module

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

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 Derry Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, (Part 4 Section 402. 2.I.)

Other Comments:

1. The Mifflin County signature block is not correct. There should be a line for plan tracking number and a line for Chairman or designated representative.

*The February 23, 2016 revised plans contains the correct County signature block.

2. In accordance with the Derry Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Article 4 section 402.2.J.) all significant man made features should be shown on the plan.

3. No further development should take place on lot 1 without improvements to Nolan Drive.

Granville Township (Municipal Ordinance)

Name of Plan: Bowers, Michael A. & Lisa D.

File Number: 2016-02-002

Tax Map #: 17-16-0100H

Municipality: Granville Township

Applicant Name: Bowers, Michael A. & Lisa D.

Land Owner Name: Bowers, Michael A. & Lisa D.

Plan Preparer: Frederick Seibert & Asso., Ron Skutch

Plan Summary:

The purpose of this plan is to add 2.74 acres from the remaining lands of Bowers to Lot 1 that was created through subdivision in 2009. The lot addition will be called lot 1A.

*The Surveyor provided written responses to the County's preliminary comments in a memo dated February 17, 2016. Additionally, three revised subdivision plans dated February 17, 2016 were also submitted pursuant to the County's preliminary comments.

Administrative

Only two plans were submitted and three should be provided to the County for review. The property was last subdivided in 2009 creating a 7.28 acre lot. It is unclear if a deed was developed to create this lot in 2009 since no parcel shows up in GIS or Assessment Records.

*Based on the Surveyor's February 17, 2016 memo, a deed was created and recorded at Instrument #2009-006579. Three revised plans dated February 17, 2016 were submitted on February 18, 2016.

Basic Plan Information

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

*Based on the Surveyor's February 17, 2016 memo the zero digits have been added to the plans, however, the revised plans dated the same do not contain the zero digit before the last three numbers.

The plan narrative is inadequate and does not clearly describe what is occurring. The plan mentions a lot 1 and a parcel A, but this narrative only lists acreage to be added to lot 1.

*The February 17, 2016 memo and revised plans state the purpose of this plan is to add 2.74 acres from the remaining lands of Bowers to Lot 1 that was created through subdivision in 2009. The lot addition will be called lot 1A.

The plan does not identify the tax parcel number (17,16-0100H) that is involved with this subdivision. This should be labeled on the plan, in accordance with the Granville Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Article 6 Section 6.302 a.13.)

*The February 17, 2016 memo and revised plans state the tax map parcel number has been identified on the plan view and in the title block.

The abutters for Parcel 1 are not fully indicated. Property owner and/or applicant information should be provided on the plan in accordance with the Granville Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, (Article 6 Section 6.302 a.16.).

*Based on the surveyor's February 17, 2016 memo the abutters have been added to the insert map on the revised plans.

Subdivision Information

Information on Parcel 1 as opposed to Lot 1 should be shown. 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 Granville Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Article 6 Sections 6.302 a.5., 7., 9. and 12.).

*The February 17, 2016 memo and revised plans indicate the information for Parcel 1 (remaining lands of Bowers) is shown on the plat. The entire residual is shown on the insert map.

The County GIS and Assessment files shows this parcel as 272.4 acres of land. It is not clear how the residual land after the lot addition is 83.9+/- acres given the parcel size as 272.4 acres and the acreage after the lot addition.

*The February 17, 2016 memo and revised plans state the total acreage for parcel 0100H is 272.4 acres prior to the lot addition. The lot addition will remove 2.74 acres from parcel 0100H and add it to lot 1. The proposed remaining lands after the lot addition will be 269.64 acres.

Clean & Green / Agriculture

When this parcel was reviewed for subdivision in 2009, the clean and green tax issue was identified within the County's comments.

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.

*The February 17, 2016 memo and revised plans state the purpose of this lot addition is to bring the plan into compliance with the Clean and Green program.

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.

*The February 17, 201 memo and revised plans note that the slopes are greater than 15%. The purpose of this lot addition is to add land to lot 1 to bring it up to clean and green standards. No additional development is being proposed by this plan.

Setback Lines

The setback lines should be shown on the plan in accordance with the Granville Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Article 6 Section 6.302 a.10.).

*The February 17, 2016 memo and revised plans show the setbacks on the plan.

Right-of Way Widths

Based upon the Granville Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Article 6 Section 6.302 a.6.), the right-of-way widths of Hawstone and Risky Roads should be shown on the plan.

*The February 16, 2016 memo and revised plans state and show the right-of-ways for Hawstone and Risky Road.

Cartway Widths

The cartway widths of Hawstone and Risky Roads should be shown on the plan, in accordance with Granville Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, (Article 6 Section 6.302 a.11.).

*The February 17, 2016 memo and revised plans state and show the existing cartway widths.

PennDOT HOP / Municipal Driveway Permit

If a new driveway opening is being considered for this parcel, an HOP is required and statement placed on the plan. 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.

*The February 17, 2016 memo and revised plans state that there are no new driveways proposed.

Deed Restrictions and Easements

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

*The February 17, 2016 memo and revised plans state all restrictions have been added to the plan.

DEP Sewage Planning Module

Although a DEP form has been provided, a DEP Request for Planning Waiver and Non Building Declaration should be on the plan.

*The February 17, 2016 memo and revised plan state and show the DEP request for planning waiver and nonbuilding declaration.

Water and Sewage Service

The plan shows no evidence of on-lot water or sewer service and a waiver for this has been requested by the applicant. If further development is proposed and meets the definition of land development, as defined in the Granville Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Article 8 Section 8.218) then a land development plan should be submitted.

Signature Blocks on Plan

The plan does not have the correct Mifflin County signature block in the signature section and based on past discussion with the Township, this may need to be further modified.

*The February 17, 2016 memo and revised plans state and show the Township's acknowledgement that the plan has been submitted to the Mifflin County Planning Commission for review in accordance with the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code.

Lot Addition

A lot addition plan should include an inset map. An inset map is a general location map of sufficient size and detail for the Commission to readily determine geographically where the subdivision, or lot addition, is proposed.

*The February 17, 2016 memo and revised plans state and show a an insert map has been added to the plan showing the entire property and abutting property owners.

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

"Lot # ___ consisting of ___ acres is to be added onto land owned by _____. Lot # ___ is a lot addition and shall become an integral part of the property owned by _____. Lot # ___ is not a building lot and cannot be maintained or developed as a separate individual lot."

*The February 17, 2016 memo and revised plans state and show a lot addition statement has been added to the plans.

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

*The February 17, 2016 memo and revised plans state and show all man-made features on the plan.

Other Comments:

1. For recording purposes and the assessment office, the applicant will need to place this on a larger sheet, 24 x 36 instead of 18 x 24.

*The February 17, 2016 memo and revised plan state and show the size as being 24"x36".

2. The Recorder of Deeds Office requires a minimum of 2 plans be recorded.

Granville Township (Municipal Ordinance)

Name of Plan: McLucas, Aaron D. & Tia M.

File Number: 2016-02-003

Tax Map #: 17-16-0100A/17-16-0100AI

Municipality: Granville Township

Applicant Name: McLucas, Aaron D. & Tia M.

Land Owner Name: McLucas, Aaron D. & Tia M.

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

Plan Summary:

The purpose of this plan is a lot addition from T.M. 17-16-0100B of 6.255 acres to Tract 2 of T.M. # 17-16-0100AI. The total acreage of T.M. # 17-16-0100AI with addition is 20.8790 acres. The residue of T.M. 17-16-0100B is 3.762 acres. The lot addition and tracts 1 and 2 will be combined on one deed.

*The Booher Surveying representative submitted three revised plans dated February 18, 2016 in response to the County's preliminary comments.

Basic Plan Information

The project narrative does not clearly portray what is occurring since the proposal shows the creation of lot 1 which is the new version of T.M. 17-16-0100B and lot 2. The lot addition should be noted.

*The revised plans includes the lot addition within the project narrative.

Administrative

This parcel was last subdivided in March of 2009 involving the Spigelmyer's that involved consolidating deeds for various parcels into a single tract.

Subdivision Information

The project application lists the lots being impacted as T.M. 17-16-0100AI, and T.M. 17-16-0100A and not T.M. 17-16-0100B which should be included. If T.M. 17-16-0100A is included, boundary information for T.M. 17-16-0100A should be provided, in accordance with the Granville Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Article 6 Section 6.202 a.5. and 6.302 a.5.)

*The Booher Surveying representative stated tax parcel 17-16-0100A is not part of this subdivision.

Topographic information

Topographical contours at vertical intervals should be displayed on the plan, not only on the insert map depicting the soils types, in accordance with the Granville Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, (Article 6 Section 6.202. a.7.).

Setback Lines

It would be helpful if the setbacks were listed in the general notes.

*The revised plans under Site Data lists the setbacks.

Right-of Way Widths

Based upon the Granville Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Article 6 Section 6.302 a.6.), the right-of-way width for Route 333 or Hawstone Road should be shown on the plan.

*The revised plans show the right-of-way width for SR 333.

Cartway Widths

The cartway width for Route 333 or Hawstone Road should be shown on the plan in accordance with the Granville Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, (Article 6 Section 6.302. a.1.).

*The revised plans show the cart-way width for SR 333.

PennDOT HOP / Municipal Driveway Permit

If any new openings are proposed, the plan should state, 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 7 Sections 7.302. a.6. and 7.302. b.7.) of the Granville Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance.

*The Surveyor of record indicated he is not aware of any 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.

Lot Addition

A lot addition plan should include an inset map. An inset map is a general location map of sufficient size and detail for the Commission to readily determine geographically where the subdivision, or lot addition, is proposed.

*The revised plans shows a lot addition insert map.

Other Comments:

1. The applicant only submitted two plans for the County to review and there should be three copies for the County Planning Commission.

*The revised plans dated February 18, 2016 and submitted to our office contains three plans.

2. With this lot addition, are there plans to expand the existing sawmill on T.M. 17-16-0100AI?

*The Surveyor of record stated there are no plans at this time to expand the sawmill.

Public Comment

None

Penn State/Comprehensive Plan Follow-up

Bill has shared emails with the Planning Commission as a follow-up after the meeting with Penn State on February 12th. About 18-20 people, including the Commissioners, Bill and Lauren Kershner, attended the meeting along with 10-12 Penn State people. He was under the impression there would be follow-up from the meeting. Most of the meeting was spent listening to Penn State's presentation.

Bill has also followed up on the internet issue. He has received responses from eight townships and one pending regarding internet service in their townships. The internet service varies around the county. One comment stated that excessive water affects service as well. There are pockets of issues in Oliver, Bratton and Derry Townships in particular. Menno Township has problems with internet connectivity as well as Havice Valley in Armagh Township and the Decatur Township building itself has no high speed internet. A letter of interest was sent by the county hoping to improve internet service through a program that would be linked with SEDA-COG. Penn State has not responded yet if they would become involved.

The Penn State Advisory Committee has welcomed Planning Commission members to come to the next meetings of March 11th at 10 a.m. and April 1st at 10 a.m. They would like to tie in support to the Ag Extension office and lobby Harrisburg on March 9th for full funding.

Bill also sent a follow-up request for a copy of the Marketing Study conducted by Penn State with no response. Lauren Kershner of the Sentinel has not received any of the information she was promised from the earlier meeting at Penn State either.

Other Business or Comments

Mifflin County School District

Kay, Dan and Bill met with Jim Estep and Steve Schaaf to discuss concerns and perceptions of the School District that came out of the Housing Summit with negative connotations. They were aware of these issues and are working on a public relations campaign to advertise accomplishments of the school district and the area in general. They want to partner with the Planning Commission. They also identified the AP courses as important to maintain as well as the connection with the Mifflin County Academy of Science and Technology. Bill invited Mr. Estep and Dan Potutschnig to the March Planning Commission meeting and they will present an overall view of what is happening at both schools. If anyone would like to attend their local advisory board meeting on May 5th, please get back to Bill.

Monument Square Phase V

Bill and Greg Elliott of EADS will be presenting the Monument Square Phase V project to SEDA-COG Friday, February 26th. A decision will be made by June 1st. We are competing in our area with one other project in the SEDA-COG region, but over 100 other projects across the state are under consideration.

Boat Launch

Bill spoke to the National Park Service who emailed DCNR expressing concern with not getting the DEP permit in a timely manner as they have already granted an extension of the project through December 31, 2016. It could be mid-May until the permit is issued, which could put the project in jeopardy for this year. Since that time, Bill has spoken with someone at a higher level at the PA Department of Conservation and Natural Resources (DCNR) and they are well aware of our concerns. Lucas Parkes has sent a copy of a permit request for a submerged license agreement to DEP that is also required. Dain Davis thinks we are near the end of the process. DCNR feels they do not have to take 93 days to review the permit request. Without the two grants, the project is not whole. The DCNR grant expires in 2017. NPS will not guarantee another extension.

Annual Dinner

Invitations for the Annual Dinner will be mailed on Friday, February 26th.

Directory

The County Directory is almost ready to go to publication.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 5:06 p.m. upon a motion by Tyler Gum.