

MARYSVILLE BOROUGH PLANNING COMMISSION  
WORK SESSION  
October 22, 2013

**1. Parks & Recreation Planning Committee Scheduling.**

Mrs. Stoner stated that the Parks and Recreation Planning Committee meeting date and time need to be established.

Mrs. Simonetti stated that Mrs. Knight can meet after 5:15pm or after; Mr. Zimmerman can meet after 4:30 pm and cannot meet on the third Tuesday of each month; Mrs. Stoner can meet after 4:00 pm and cannot meet on Mondays or the first Tuesday; Ms. Brock can meet after 5:00 pm and cannot meet on Wednesdays.

It was the consensus of those present to set the date of the first Thursday of each month at 5:00 pm for the Parks and Recreation Planning Committee meeting.

Mrs. Simonetti stated that the committee is made up of three Borough Council members and three Planning Commission members to develop a strategy for financing and drafting a Parks and Recreation plan for the SALDO.

**2. SALDO Summary**

Mrs. Stoner stated that Part 2 – Definitions were discussed at the last meeting. The issue of font and size needs to be determined. There are two different fonts and sizes in the packet for review which are Times New Roman –font, size 12 or Cambria – font, size 11.

It was the consensus of those present to use Cambria font with size 11.

Mrs. Stoner stated that at the last meeting the review of Part 2 was only the odd numbered pages. Part 2 provided in the packets have the changes that were discussed. There were a lot of changes due to the program that capitalized words that should not have been capitalized.

Mrs. Stoner stated that there was also an editorial question regarding whether the word being defined should be all caps and bold. It was the consensus of those present to have the word being defined in all caps but not in bold.

Ms. Hardman stated that Section 22-201.10 Undefined Terms should reference the Illustrated Book of Development Definitions by Harvey s. Moskowitz and Carl G. Lindbloom.

Mrs. Stoner stated that the Illustrated Book of Development Definitions will be added as the first reference and the Webster's unabridged dictionary will be the second reference.

Mr. Vaitl stated that on page 5 “constiguous” should be spelled “contiguous”.

Mrs. Simonetti stated that on page 5 Designated Growth Area the word “at” in the fourth sentence should be removed and on page 3 BMP’S should be BMPS.

Mrs. Stoner stated that on page 7, Floodplain, line five “cany” should be “carry”.

Ms. Hardman stated that the floodplain definition should be the same definition that is in the FEMA regulations.

Ms. Brock asked if MPC was defined.

Mr. Vaitl stated that MPC is defined as Act 247 on page 2.

Ms. Brock stated that page 21 in the definition of Phases – PMPC should be MPC.

Mrs. Simonetti stated that Environmentally Sensitive Areas – “slows” should be “slopes.”

Mrs. Stoner stated that the first sentence at the top of page 8 “pati” should be changed to “part”.

Mrs. Stoner stated that the definition “General Building Area” should be deleted because it is not useful to the Borough because it states presently undeveloped land within a borough growth area.

Mrs. Simonetti stated that this definition could be applicable to the Kirwan family acreage.

Mrs. Stoner stated that the definition might have been applicable if there was a growth area in the Borough.

Mrs. Stoner stated that the definition of Historic Feature on page 8.B. add “by” in front of Historical; change “Perry History to Perry Historians”.

Mrs. Simonetti stated that the definition of Historic Feature on page 8 A. change “Nation” to “National”.

Mrs. Simonetti stated that the definition of Governing Body on page 8 should be defined as the Marysville Borough Council.

Mrs. Stoner questioned the use of “opening year” in the definition of Horizon Year on page 8

Ms. Brock stated that “build out and occupancy” should mean when the development is done.

Mrs. Stoner stated that Horizon Year means when everything is done.

Mr. Finnerty stated that Horizon Year is provided for financial security.

Ms. Brock stated that anticipated conclusion should be used instead of anticipated opening.

Mr. Finnerty asked how the term was used in the ordinance.

Ms. Brock stated that Horizon Year is the completion year.

Mr. Finnerty stated that the Horizon Year is the projected completion year.

Mrs. Stoner stated that “anticipated opening” should be replaced with “projected completion” and remove “assuming full build out and occupancy” and replace with including construction of required improvements”.

Ms. Brock stated that Improvement on page 9, fourth line add a comma between walkway and recreational.

Ms. Brock stated that in the definition of Improvement, Public, borough should be capitalized in two places.

Ms. Hardman stated that Indigenous Specices should be spelled Indigenous Species”.

Mrs. Simonetti stated that Invasive Specices should be spelled Invasive Species.

Mrs. Stoner stated that the use of the word “effect” should be checked in definition of Improvement, Public to see if it should be “affect”.

Ms. Hardman stated that the definition of Land Development should be the same as the MPC. Section C.2. should not include (Optional-not to cumulatively exceed            square feet).

Mrs. Simonetti asked if accessory building should be defined.

Ms. Brock stated that it is defined as building, accessory.

Mrs. Stoner stated that the definition of Landowner is not worded very well.

Mr. Finnerty stated that landowner is defined in the MPC.

Mrs. Simonetti stated that page 2, #9 should remove comma after time and after performed in the first sentence. Also in sentence three “in” should be changed to “is”.

MARYSVILLE BOROUGH PLANNING COMMISSION  
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES  
MARCH 23, 2010

**CALL TO ORDER.** The meeting was called to order at 7:30 pm

**1. ROLL CALL:**

**MEMBERS PRESENT**

Stephanie Stoner, Chairman  
Jennifer Brock  
Art Vaitl

Robert Zimmerman

**STAFF PRESENT:**

Janet Hardman, Code Enforcement Officer  
Jason Finnerty, Tri County Regional Planning Commission

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Ann Simonetti, Borough Council

**2. MINUTES:**

**a. September 24, 2013 Minutes**

MOTION: Mr. Vaitl moved, seconded by Ms. Brock to approve the minutes as submitted. The motion passed unanimously.

**3. PUBLIC COMMENT.**

Mrs. Simonetti stated that the Fire Ladies Auxiliary is selling peanuts for \$5 and cashews for \$10. The Halloween parade was a great success.

**4. NEW BUSINESS.**

**a. SALDO:**

**Appendices** - Mrs. Stoner stated that the Appendices were completed at the last meeting.

**Part 3** – Mrs. Stoner stated that Part 3 is Administration and is only six pages. This can be discussed at the next meeting.

**Part 6** – Mrs. Stoner stated that Part 6 is Assurance of Completion and is 12 pages. This can be discussed at the next meeting.

Ms. Brock stated that Ms. Mohr, a previous member on the Planning Commission, offered to draft language for the purpose and intent section for the General Provisions in Part 1.

Mr. Finnerty stated that the purpose and intent section is the framing for why the Part is in place.

**b. Zoning Ordinances/Chapter 27 (2007):**

**Part 14 Development Standards**

**Part 15 Performance Standards**

Mrs. Stoner stated that Part 14 and Part 15 will be reviewed when the SALDO is completed.

**c. Well Ordinance.**

Mrs. Stoner stated that the well ordinance ties into the SALDO.

#### **d. Grant Opportunities**

Mrs. Stoner stated that grant opportunities was left on the agenda because Mrs. Simonetti was going to look into a Small Watershed Grant.

Mrs. Simonetti stated that when the Small Watershed Grant was discussed it was close to the deadline. The Borough does not meet all of the criteria. The grant did not work out because it did not seem appropriate.

Mrs. Simonetti stated that at the Perry County Council of Governments meeting last night, October 21, 2013, Senator Bob Regola was present to discuss Penn Strategies which is an organization whose whole purpose is to find grants.

Mr. Finnerty stated that Tri County Regional Planning Commission can be used to look for grants too because it was included in the contract. He will need a lot of information up front to apply for a grant. They can look at competitive grants that DCED has available.

Mrs. Stoner stated that Tri County Regional Planning Commission could help the Park and Recreation Committee find a grant for the Park and Recreation plan.

Mr. Finnerty stated that some grants are difficult because they require a match.

Mrs. Simonetti stated that the match can be leverage money for the State or County.

Mr. Finnerty stated that he is working toward getting municipalities to commit to a small buy in for the preparation of the County Comprehensive plan for municipalities to use as their Comprehensive Plan. The County Comprehensive plan will include sub regional plans.

Mrs. Simonetti stated that the buy in for comprehensive plan preparation can be discussed at the next Perry County Council of Government's meeting.

Ms. Brock stated that Marysville's Comprehensive Plan is due to be updated. If Marysville Borough contributed to the County plan, Marysville would not have to hire a consultant to prepare a comprehensive plan which would be very cost effective for the Borough.

Mr. Finnerty stated that a regional comprehensive plan is a strategic planning approach. A lot of volunteers will be needed. He envisions taking the top five issues and tackling them through recommendations.

Mrs. Stoner asked if there would be a risk for urbanized areas like Marysville being similar to another municipality.

Mr. Finnerty stated that the regional comprehensive plan will cover from Rye Township to Watts and New Buffalo.

Mrs. Simonetti stated that multi-municipal involvement is necessary.

Mrs. Stoner stated it is time for Marysville to adopt a new comprehensive plan.

Mr. Finnerty stated that if a municipality can adopt a plan using the regional plan, the next update would be easier.

Mrs. Simonetti stated that Marysville is budgeting now for next year. The cost of the previous comprehensive plan could be a comparison.

Mrs. Stoner stated that she wants to try a different approach with the next comprehensive plan update.

Ms. Brock stated that since the Perry County Planning Commission doesn't have anything on paper yet, would it be appropriate for the Planning Commission to send a memorandum to Borough Council recommending the proposal as the best way for Marysville to do a plan.

Mr. Finnerty stated that he will send a letter tomorrow regarding requests for funds.

Mr. Finnerty stated what better way would a municipality have to adopt sections of the county plan to stay consistent.

Ms. Brock stated that the corridor communities will be on the same page with the same voice in approaching PennDOT and others for a much stronger voice than an individual municipality.

Mr. Finnerty stated that the comprehensive plan must be the public's voice. He will need volumes of participation.

Mrs. Simonetti stated that funding request should be recommended to Borough Council now indicating the savings involved.

Mr. Finnerty stated that it is clear there will be a savings.

Mrs. Simonetti stated that some municipalities don't have a comprehensive plan or zoning.

Mr. Finnerty stated that the plan will not come at a good time for some municipalities that have just finished updating their comprehensive plan.

Mrs. Simonetti asked about a shared municipal grant.

Mr. Finnerty stated that he is not anticipating a shared municipal grant but they are applying for MAP funding.

Mrs. Simonetti asked if the survey that was previously requested asking for five issues in the community have anything to do with the plan.

Mr. Finnerty stated that the survey was for transportation to look at corridor usage and area of connection.

MOTION: Ms. Brock moved, seconded by Mr. Vaitl to recommend to Borough Council that they seriously consider becoming a partner in the update process of the regional comprehensive

plan in conjunction with and participating with the Perry County Planning Commission to combine efforts for a cost savings to the Borough in updating the Marysville Borough Comprehensive Plan.

## **5. GENERAL ANNOUNCEMENTS.**

### **a. Rockville Estates update**

Mrs. Stoner stated the Yingst Homes is starting to do logging again behind the homes on Ridgeview Drive and Caroline Street. The area of the logging is also being done where the drainage basins are to be and the berm behind the houses on Ridgeview Drive.

Mrs. Stoner stated that she obtained the meeting minutes from the August, 2012 meeting with the Borough, PennDot and Yingst Homes regarding the removal of the 55 and older restriction.

Ms. Brock asked if an amended plan removing the 55 and older restriction will need to be filed.

Mrs. Stoner stated that Borough Council approved the change to the plan.

Mrs. Simonetti stated that PennDot indicated that they were never in favor of the age restriction.

Mrs. Stoner stated that PennDot was concerned about the trips in and out of the development.

Mr. Finnerty asked who the Borough Engineer was at the time that reviewed the original Traffic Impact Study (TIS).

Mrs. Simonetti stated that Benatec originally reviewed the TIS.

Mrs. Stoner stated that the Highway Occupancy Permit approval by PennDot took years. She is concerned because the amendment to the plan to remove the 55 and over age restriction was a planning decision and the Planning Commission was not consulted. Was there a change in the traffic at the entrance? There was also a reference to a traffic light at the entrance.

Mr. Finnerty stated that the level of service on the road is also an issue.

Ms. Brock stated that the level of service was a major concern.

Mr. Vaitl stated that the TIS originally required another traffic light.

Mrs. Simonetti stated for every 75 homes, the TIS can be reviewed again. School buses were mentioned as making a left turn and coming around the mountain.

Mr. Finnerty stated that when the day comes, the school district should consider a route.

Mrs. Stoner stated that traffic was addressed in the TIS that came out on Ridgeview Drive to exit onto Rt. 11/15. There were some issues that came to light that she feels the Planning Commission and Borough Engineer should have been involved with.

Mr. Finnerty asked if Borough Council treated the removal of the 55 and older age restriction as an amendment.

Mrs. Stoner stated that she thinks the developer called the meeting with PennDOT because PennDOT said they already issued the HOP.

Mr. Finnerty asked if the age restriction requirement was on the plan.

Mrs. Stoner pulled out the Rockview Estates plan and the plan was reviewed. The age restriction requirement was on the plan. The requirement for the age restriction was not motivated by the Borough.

Mrs. Stoner stated that the plan was done in 2006 and last revised in 2012.

Mr. Vaitl stated that the traffic count was not revised.

Mrs. Stoner asked how the age restriction would be enforced.

Ms. Hardman stated age restricted communities must follow Federal guidelines which are very restrictive.

Mr. Finnerty recommended that the Borough Solicitor be consulted regarding the change in the plan. The approval of the plan is ultimately Borough Council's decision. There was a plan that was recently recorded. Mr. Finnerty stated that anytime there is a change in the plan before final it must go through the review process. Other phases of the plan can be revisited.

Mrs. Simonetti stated that the recorded plan could be reviewed.

Mrs. Stoner asked if the decision was weakened since the amendment did not go before the Planning Commission.

Mr. Finnerty stated that is a legal decision.

Mrs. Simonetti stated that the traffic engineer and the engineer for the project changed during the process.

Mrs. Stoner stated that the concern is that the TIS were not reviewed.

Mr. Vaitl stated his concern was whether or not a protocol was set by going directly to Borough Council instead of to the Planning Commission for a recommendation and then to Borough Council.

Mrs. Simonetti stated that it was her impression that the developer went to PennDOT and PennDOT stated that Borough Council's action was required.

Ms. Brock stated that the age restriction was a major part of the plan and was brought up continuously which was a major change that occurred without review.

Mrs. Stoner stated that she will try to find out what transpired and report back to the Planning Commission. She has a copy of the August 9, 2013 PennDOT meeting minutes which includes the TIS.

## **6. NEW BUSINESS.**

### **A. Planning Webinar**

Mrs. Stoner stated that for \$25 you can listen to five sessions which is very economical. If anyone is interested, the webinar can be set up at the Borough building. The webinar is on Wednesday's at 12:00 noon or 7:00 pm. The webinars are done by Penn State Ag Extension. Mrs. Stoner will email everyone the schedule.

Mr. Finnerty stated that Tri County Regional Planning Commission also has webinars on a big screen during the day.

## **7. REPORT ON BOROUGH COUNCIL MEETING (Next Council Meeting November 12, 2013).**

Mrs. Simonetti stated that the only thing she has to report is that the sewer/maintenance staff are unionizing with the teamsters.

## **8. ADJOURNMENT/NEXT SPECIAL MEETING DATE 11/13/13 @ 6:30pm/NEXT REGULAR MEETING 12/11/13 @ 7:30 pm, WORK SESSION @ 6:30 pm.**

MOTION: Ms. Brock moved, seconded by Mr. Zimmerman to adjourn the meeting at 8:45 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Janet Hardman,  
Code Enforcement Officer