MARYSVILLE BOROUGH PLANNING COMMISSION
WORK SESSION
MARCH 22, 2011

The work session began at 6:45 pm

MEMBERS PRESENT
Jennifer Brock, Chair
Art Vaitl
Stephanie Stoner
Chris Albright
Lou Simonetti

1. Article 5 – SALDO.

Ms. Brock stated that she will obtain an electronic copy of the Lancaster County Model SALDO so that the revisions that have been discussed to date can be incorporated. The Borough Engineer needs to review the road specifications and make a recommendation in order to complete the review of Sections 8, 9 and 10 of the Lancaster County SALDO. The model ordinance had a rating system where different road construction materials are rated. The rating must equal a design number. The Borough Engineer felt that this type of rating system tends to promote the use of more gravel.

Ms. Hardman stated that the Borough Engineer prefers a specific standard instead of the rating system.

Mr. Vaitl asked what chapter would be reviewed after the design standards are completed.

Ms. Brock stated that once Section 8, 9 and 10 has been combined into one chapter. The revisions will be given to the entire Planning Commission for review and comment.

Mr. Simonetti asked who determined what ordinance or model SALDO was to be used to amend the Borough's SALDO.

Ms. Brock stated that Tri County Planning Commission recommended that the Borough use the Lancaster County model SALDO as a guide to revise the Borough's SALDO.

Mrs. Stoner stated that she was assigned the water, sewer and carbonate rock section to review.

Ms. Brock stated that Article 4 has been completed. Article 4 specifies what must be on a plan and the plan submission guidelines. A check list was prepared as part of the review for Article 4. A check list was also prepared for the current ordinance.

Ms. Brock stated that Article 6 is assurances, Article 7 is supplement requirements. There are areas of the Borough where there can be new development but most of the Borough is infill development.

Mr. Simonetti stated that there are buildings in the Borough that can be removed for infill development specifically the building in the square that is leaning.

Mrs. Stoner stated that she does not think there are carbonate rocks in the Borough.

Ms. Brock stated that supplemental tests and studies for historical and cultural resources, aquifer study, parks and open space plan, hydrogeologic report, traffic impact studies is a chapter that needs reviewed.

Ms. Hardman stated that in order to require fees and land dedication for parks, a detailed study must be prepared.

Ms. Brock asked what was the status of the Zoning Ordinance editing.

Mrs. Simonetti stated that the revisions to the Zoning Ordinance are a work in progress.

Mrs. Stoner stated the well ordinance revisions are now on pdf. All the changes that have been discussed have been incorporated. The well ordinance was proposed to regulate the installation of geo thermal wells.

Mrs. Simonetti asked if the ordinance requires inspection of the well installation.

Ms. Brock stated that the well ordinance was a result of the presentation done by the Well Drilling Association. They have been trying to get a state wide ordinance adopted.

Mrs. Stoner stated that the well ordinance does treat a geo thermal well the same as a drinking water well. Both would need inspection of construction.

Mrs. Simonetti asked if there would be well testing similar to the required by the OLDS ordinance which requires an inspection every three years.

Mrs. Stoner stated that since the ordinance is requiring casing, seal and grout the only entry is at the top of the well. A sanitary well cap is also required. She does not think a routine inspection would be necessary.

Mr. Vaitl stated that drilling of geo-thermal wells is not as common. Trenching wells are more cost effective.

Mrs. Stoner stated that there are a lot of lots in Marysville which are not big enough for well trenching.

Mrs. Simonetti asked if well trenching will contaminate the ground water.

Mrs. Stoner that the water that would be contaminated is down deep so trenching would not affect it.

Mrs. Simonetti asked if geotextile is laid down in the trench first.

Mr. Vaitl stated that the antifreeze that is used is biodegradable and breaks down.

Mrs. Stoner stated that the antifreeze used is food grade.

MARYSVILLE BOROUGH PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
MARCH 22, 2011

CALL TO ORDER. The meeting began at 7:30 pm

MEMBERS PRESENT
Jennifer Brock, Chair
Art Vaitl
Stephanie Stoner
Chris Albright
Lou Simonetti

STAFF PRESENT:
Janet Hardman, Code Enforcement Officer

OTHERS PRESENT:
Ann Simonetti, Borough Council

1. MINUTES:

a. February 22, 2011 Minutes

Page3, paragraph 3, add phrase to end of sentence, "*although he had an HOP allowing the third entrance from Ridgeview Drive."*

Page 4, 4.a, 4th paragraph, BTS stands for Base Transceiver Station.

Discussion:

Mrs. Simonetti stated that she had some minor editorial changes such as "barb fence" should be "barbed fence".

Mr. Vaitl stated that in the T-Mobile conditional use discussion, Mr. Andrew stated that barbed wire would not be on the fence, but it was on the plan.

Mr. Simonetti stated that barbed wire is currently on the fence. What is the issue with barbed wire?

Ms. Brock stated that she thinks people feel invaded by barbed wire on a fence.

Mrs. Simonetti stated that as a matter of clarification, the Shentel conditional use application was the first to be reviewed and they had indicated barbed wire on the fence so the T-Mobile application did not need to address it.

Ms. Brock stated that the discussion came up because barbed wire was on the plan. It needs to be determined who put the barbed wire on the fence. She thinks that Norfolk Southern may have installed the barbed wire since they own the fence.

Mr. Simonetti asked who owned the tower.

Ms. Brock stated that Norfolk Southern owns the tower. Norfolk Southern occupies the top of the tower at 195', Shentel occupies the tower at 185' and T-Mobile occupies the tower at 175'.

Mrs. Stoner explained the entire tower issue to the two new members. The owner of the property, Norfolk Southern Railroad, requested a variance from the zoning ordinance requirement of 20' in order to have a communication tower at 195'. The Zoning Hearing Board granted the variance with the condition that commercial antennas were not to be permitted. The commercial cell phone companies then requested a variance from the Zoning Hearing Board's condition of approval for Norfolk Southern. The Zoning Hearing Board granted that variance to allow the commercial antennas with the condition that a conditional use be approved by the Planning Commission and Borough Council. Conditional use applications were first submitted by Shentel and the Planning Commission recommended approval of the request with a number of conditions as follows: 1. Liability insurance is provided to the Borough in accordance with Section 27-1114.C(4). 2 At no time shall the number of antennas exceed three. 3. The antennas shall be connected at 175' on the tower. 4. The antennas are installed with flush mounts. 5. No lighting shall be permitted except during maintenance activities. 6. Technical information on signal strength relative to FCC exposure guidelines at the most exposed house considering absolute distance both east and west is provided to Borough Council. 7. That if the antennas or the tower is painted, everything shall be painted the same color or as close as possible. 8. The road improvement requirement of Section 27-1114.C.3(b)(6) is waived. Then T-Mobile submitted a request for a conditional use and the Planning Commission recommended approval of it with the same conditions.

Ms. Brock stated that as part of the review process, documents submitted revealed that an agreement had already been signed between Norfolk Southern and Shentel before approval was obtained.

Mrs. Stoner stated that once the Zoning Hearing Board granted relief, the Planning Commission had to accept the conditions.

Mr. Simonetti stated that there is a new type of system for cell phone companies that will be available in a year that is called Light Radial.

Mrs. Stoner asked if the new system uses lower profile antennas.

Ms. Brock stated that the demand is getting bigger and bigger.

Mr. Simonetti stated that the new system would not be as unsightly as antennas. The cable fiber optics is not required.

Mr. Vaitl stated that the antennas that were permitted to be on the tower are 3/8" in thickness and are flushed mounted. They will not be able to be seen.

Mr. Simonetti asked if the antennas are painted.

Ms. Brock stated that the antennas will be painted white from the factory. The condition was that if anything was painted, everything will be coordinated.

Mr. Simonetti stated that the antennas are aluminum and the tower is galvanized steel.

MOTION: Mr.Vaitl moved, seconded by Mr. Albright to approve the minutes as amended. The motion passed unanimously.

2. PUBLIC COMMENT.

a. Mrs. Simonetti stated that Perry Human Services is having a bowling fundraiser this Saturday.
b. Mrs. Simonetti stated that the Borough Council appointed Mr. Albright and Mr. Simonetti to fill the vacant positions on the Planning Commission. The MPC does not permit an interim term. Both new members need to know their terms.

   Mr. Vaitl stated that both vacant positions were at the end of their terms on 12/31/2010.

   Mrs. Simonetti stated that the terms are four years.

c. Mrs. Simonetti stated that Mr. Mike Todaro was appointed to the Zoning Hearing Board.
d. Mrs. Simonetti stated that there will be a Relay For Life fundraiser at Mr. G's on Thursday. The fee is $20 and appetizers will be served from 5:00 pm to 8:00 pm.
e. Mrs. Simonetti stated that the Borough Council meeting for April was moved up to April 4th because of the Borough Association conference. It is the 100th Anniversary of PSAB (Pennsylvania State Association of Boroughs).

3. OLD BUSINESS.

a. Article 4 Subdivision Amendment - Plan Specifications and Procedures

Ms. Brock stated that Article 4 review has been completed.

b. Article 5 Design and Improvement Standards.

Ms. Brock stated that Streets, Access Drives and Driveways from Article 8, 9 and 10 of the Lancaster County Model SALDO should be completed at the April work session. The well ordinance can also be reviewed and completed at the April work session.

Ms. Brock stated that all members should attend the May 11, 2011 work session to review the draft ordinance that consolidated Article 8, 9 and 10 of the Lancaster County Model SALDO which is the Borough's Article 5.

Mrs. Simonetti stated that Lancaster County is in the process of adopting a new storm water management ordinance that will regulate every farm regardless of size for loads into the Chesapeake Bay. She recommends that the Planning Commission review the ordinance to incorporate applicable sections into the Borough's SALDO.

c. Well Ordinance.

Ms. Brock stated that the well ordinance will be finalized at the April work session meeting.

4. **NEW BUSINESS. NONE**

5. **GENERAL ANNOUNCEMENTS.**

    a. The Tri County Planning Commission annual report was provided.
    b. Perry County Planning Commission amended their SALDO. The amendment does not affect the Borough.

6. **REPORT ON BOROUGH COUNCIL MEETING (Next Council Meeting 4/4/11).**

Mrs. Simonetti stated that Borough Council passed the T-Mobile conditional use application at their March 14th meeting.

7. **ADJOURNMENT/NEXT SPECIAL MEETING DATE 4/13/11 @ 6:30pm/NEXT REGULAR MEETING 4/26/11 @ 7:30 pm, WORK SESSION @ 6:30 pm.**

Motion: Mrs. Stoner moved, seconded by Mr. Albright to adjourn the meeting at 8:18 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Janet Hardman,
Code Enforcement Officer